INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES BULLETIN
ISSN: (E) 3007-1917 (P) 3007-1909
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026

CLASS HEGEMONY AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTROL IN WINTER'S *THE RAGE OF DRAGONS*

Jawaria Muqaddus[1], Prof. Dr. Mazhar Hayat[*2]

[1]*M. Phil. Scholar, Department of English, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan*
[*2]*HOD, Department of English Linguistics and Literature, Riphah International University, Faisalabad Campus, Pakistan*

[1]alihakardar@gmail.com, [*2]dr.mazharhayat@riphahfsd.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *
Prof. Dr. Mazhar Hayat
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19274432

Received	Accepted	Published
28 January 2026	13 March 2026	28 March 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes Evan Winter's The Rage of Dragons from a Marxist perspective. The study explores the role of class hierarchy and ideological institutions in maintaining and reproducing hegemonic control of the Omehi social structures and aristocratic class. With Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony and Louis Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses as its foundations, this study contends that Omehi feudal caste system, a tool for class reproduction and social reproduction, socializes the lower caste Omehi into a servant body, a stock of human capital for the maintenance of caste-based ruling aristocracy. Militaristic discipline, honor culture and ritualized violence function as ideological means by which consent to political domination and systemic exploitation is formed and class consciousness is eluded by the governed. The article shows how class hegemony in Omehi society is reproduced through ideological institutions that standardize the social domains of hierarchy and legitimize the authority of the ruling elite. Military discipline and honor cultures secure the consent of the subaltern and frame sacrificial death as a moral obligation. Such ideological control conceals material exploitation and suppresses the possibility of collective class resistance. Consequently, the caste system keeps being reproduced, regardless of its structural violence.

Keywords: *class hegemony, feudal caste system, ideology, Marxism, military discipline, systemic exploitation,*

1. Introduction

Traditionally, fantasy literature has been viewed as a form of escapism. Readers escape from material reality into worlds and realities beyond the material through heroic stories set in alternate realities. However, modern scholarship has increasingly adopted a view of fantasy as profoundly engaged with social, political, and economic dimensions of reality, engaging with and reproducing the space of dominance and submission symbolically as well as materially. Contemporary fantasy in particular, some have argued, has become the space to subtly critique repression. Many fantasy worlds replicate the social order of the reader, reproducing hierarchies and violence in novels set in fictional worlds precisely so that they may be interrogated. Evan Winter's *The Rage of Dragons* (2017) is no exception: it depicts the reproduction and critique of class war, economic exploitation, militarism, and forced labor in the social organization of the fictional nation of the Omehi. While many argue

that the novel is best understood as a narrative of revenge, filmic stylization, and martial race heroism, a significant political concern provides the paradoxical hidden logic behind fantasy's action: the reproduction of social hierarchy. The novel's basis in systematized caste differences reproduces the class system of the real world and highlights the ideological basis of social restructuring.

This article propounds that the literature *The Rage of Dragons* reveals in what way the ruling classes maintain class rule by encoding caste hierarchy, stressing the apparent nobility of sacrifice-driven violence and disciplining subaltern bodies into docility. Using a Marxist paradigm in which Gramsci's concept of hegemonic ideology and Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses provide analytical reference points, this research exposes ideology as a fundamental of social domination in the state of Omehi. State institutions such as militarized body training, ancestral and ethnic myths, and ceremonial codes of honor cause class re-production by giving rise to subordinate people's consent for as opposed to repression from above. Gramsci's concept of hegemonic colonization is indispensable in illustrating how Omehi rulers gain alliance by propagating their class interests by ostentatiously asserting that their values and worldviews are eminently substantive to the extent that dismissing their interests can amount to inflicting harm on the entire nation. While on the other hand, Althusser's theorization reveals ideological practices such as a militarized conception of adolescence and early manhood. As expounded through the interpellation of social subjects proactively adopt roles that subscribe them to class reproduction across generations. This way ideological manipulation continually discorded opposition and puts the revolutionary world at bay.

The main argument in this paper is that Winter's fantasy novel *The Rage of Dragon* presents the class hegemony of its setting through its presentation of ideology as the key obstacle to the unified revolt of the oppressed. Instead of illustrating how domination typically functions as violent and brutal, the author creates a world that demonstrates the most effective exercise of imperial power through the suturing of exploitation as custom, submission as upstanding behavior, and pain as fate. In doing so, it transforms the potential for fantasy as a genre in political literature and provides a rich fictional insight into how present-day nation-states sustain inequality through ideology rather than violence.

2. Literature Review

In recent years, popular and academic opinions on fantasy as a genre have challenged earlier notions that it was a genre that was either escapist or politically disengaged. Fantasy writers are now seen as authors who produce a literature of critique whereby spatial, social, political, ideological and material realities are reproduced and examined through the forms of the genre. Such ideas of fantasy as a mode of critique instead of escapism have begun to be developed by critics such as Farah Mendelsohn (2008). She defines fantasy as a form of imaginary genre that pays close attention to a system of boundaries and order with worlds within worlds that reflect the center in their internal logics. This attention to genre structures also resonates with Brian Attebery (1992), who argues that fantasy operates through narrative strategies that shape ideological meaning, and with John Frow (2015), who emphasizes genre as a social contract that regulates expectations and cultural production.

Similarly, Fredric Jameson (2005) considers fantasy as a distinct ideological genre which assimilates containment of the real world and dispersal of historical concerns. His approach reflects broader Marxist cultural theory, particularly the arguments of Raymond Williams (1977), who views literature as embedded within material social processes rather than standing apart from them. Both above authors would be of the notion that fantasy makes an effective mode of enquiry into such politicized questions such as legitimacy, power, resistance and subjection.

Building on these arguments, readings by critics like Darko Suvin (1979) and China Miéville (2012) place the political value of speculative fiction at the fore: secondary worlds are imperfect mirrors of current social realities, and 'cognitive estrangement'. In Suvin's terminology, 'cognitive

estrangement' is when a reader is able to see a familiar institution (e.g. classness, state violence) with fresh eyes. Such estrangement also reflects the dialectical consciousness described by Georg Lukács (1971), who argues that literature can expose reified social relations by making them historically visible. Miéville, in turn, claims fantasy is able to reveal the ideological basis of regimes of authority by exaggerating and reconfiguring political systems. Both lines of thinking underpin studies in fantasy and show that, rather than being apolitical and merely constituting escapism through narration, fantasy can effectively analyze contemporary history and ideologies.

Recent trends within modern fantasy scholarship have also seen a heightened focus on questions of militarism, violence and embodied subjectivities. Insightful work by Helen Young (2016) and Stefan Ekman (2013) has explored fantasy's tendency to naturalize a form of heroic waging of war whilst concealing the social tolls inflicted on the marginalized. Dramatized worlds of fantasy militarism tend to be widespread with rigid hierarchies that glorify elite fighters while treating lowly peasantries as an expendable asset. Such tendencies echo Marxist analysis of the militarization of labour whereby it is conceptualized as the socialization of the value of subordinated bodies through an ideological State apparatus, a process that can also be understood through Pierre Bourdieu (1991), who examines how symbolic power naturalizes domination through language and institutional practice, and through Frantz Fanon (1963), who exposes how violence structures subjectivity within oppressive regimes.

Winter's *The Rage of Dragons* has garnered relatively little critical attention outside of its balanced treatment of revenge, alienation, and resilience on the part of the individual within a culture that prizes violence. Most responses to the book center on Tau and his personal desire for revenge, viewing his quest for ascension (power) as a response to external traumas of loss and grief rather than an internal, politically motivated response to systemic oppression. Several responses have pointed to how the Rage displaces the heroic fantasy canon by replacing noble destinies and moral temptations with suffering, anger, and endurance of many bodies. Others have pointed out how narratives of trauma inform identity and drive action in the Rage.

This response looks more closely at how literary representation of social and political realities remains something of a convenient abstraction in such political writings (even those that touch on the social), even in the case of rage-fueled fictional narratives deeply invested in the effect of violence and trauma. The Omehi caste system, the quasi-religions formation of military sacrifice, and the dispatching of impoverished bodies to war as morally, socio-politically costs, are included in many readings of the Rage, but only insofar as they support the dominant findings, without nuanced, probing explanation. Questions of how the Omehi military caste system functions as a political tool remain steadfastly under theorized. This shortcoming is representative of a more widespread tendency within fantasy criticism of neglecting structural mechanisms in favor of personal experience. In relation to Slant, Terry Eagleton (1976) warns that: Hypersensitive readers risk taking their personal pain out of the context of the relations of material oppression that caused it, and thus inadvertently reproduce their suffering as part of some unfortunate and unavoidable tradition. Such ideological reproduction is further illuminated by Slavoj Žižek (1989), who argues that ideology operates most effectively when it is perceived as natural and invisible.

As demonstrated above, Tau's experience of pain in The Rage of Dragons cannot be disentangled from the caste system that continuously re-victimizes the Lessers. Although existing scholarship has yet to frame this imbalance in relation to a critical theory focused on ideology and class. Marxist literary criticism offers a vital methodology for explaining why and how literature acts as a contributor rather than a mirror in the reproduction of class-based relations, and thus already has the potential to fill the gaps in fantasy criticism like those encountered here. Karl Marx (1867/1976) believed that class-related hegemony had been expressed within cultural texts long before his time, since those texts are either intended to reproduce class relations or

challenge them. Antonio Gramsci (1971) theory of hegemony highlights how those in power always attempt to gain and maintain control through common cultural values by convincing people that social inequalities are just; indeed, a social hierarchy appears to be a natural order.

Louis Althusser (1971) ideas on Ideological State Apparatuses provide an excellent lens through which to analyze a militarized society as portrayed in fantasy fiction. This article builds on Marxist, Gramscian, and Althusserian theories and turns *The Rage of Dragons* in the direction of debate on class ideology and hegemony. In this way the work establishes that Winter's fantasy novel is, in essence, a sustained critique of class injustice that is served by the fantasy genre and discussed within contemporary criticism of the genre.

3. Theoretical Framework

This research utilizes a Marxist (Ideological) theoretical framework. Most importantly, it uses insights from Antonio Gramsci's utilization of hegemony and Louis Althusser's theory on Ideological State Apparatuses in tandem. These operate as a structural and systemic analytical lens by which social inequality is reproduced.

3.1 Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony

Antonio Gramsci conceptualizes hegemony as the process through which ruling classes maintain dominance by securing the consent of subordinate groups rather than relying solely on coercion (Gramsci, 1971). Hegemony operates through culture, tradition, moral values, and everyday practices that normalize inequality and present existing power relations as natural and inevitable. According to Gramsci, subordinate classes often internalize ruling-class ideology, perceiving dominant interests as common sense. Within a Marxist framework, hegemony explains why systemic injustice can persist even in the absence of constant repression. It highlights how consent is manufactured through ideological leadership, allowing ruling groups to stabilize their authority while minimizing resistance. This concept is central to analyzing societies where oppression is accepted as tradition, honor, or moral duty.

3.2 Althusser's Ideological State Apparatuses

Louis Althusser distinguishes between the material conditions of Ideology and the specific institutions that work to produce the subjects to which this ideology is addressed. He identifies and defines these institutions as ISAs Ideological State Apparatuses (Althusser 1971). How do ISAs produce the subjects to which Ideology is addressed? Roughly, ISAs produce the ideological subject by subjectivating the individual over a period of time and eventually producing subjects who are obedient and loyal to the ruling-class ideology. These ISAs are made up of the various institutions such as the family, education, religion and the military. Where the Repressive State Apparatus uses force the ISA's work through Ideology. The ISA's produce the ideological subject by 'interpellating' individuals.

3.3 Marxist Concepts: Class Reproduction and False Consciousness

Marxist theory also stresses the idea of class reproduction. This is how social classes persist through time by functions of institutions and ideology. Through this process, social mobility is inhibited, and class position is ascribed by structural relations instead of personal achievement. Second, false consciousness contributes to the understanding of how subordinate classes refuse to see their exploitation. They would see their domination instead as their moral responsibility or natural control situation. These two use of the concepts of Gramsci and Althusser can be shown as an explanatory framework for ideology's role in upholding unequal social structures.

Research Questions

1. How does *The Rage of Dragons* represent class hierarchy and social inequality within Omehi society?
2. In what ways does ideology through hegemony and Ideological State Apparatuses sustain elite dominance in the novel?
3. How does Tau's narrative reveal both the emergence and limitations of class consciousness?

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Class Structure in Omehi Society

The caste order of Omehi is formed, maintained, and presented as a strict hierarchy which tightly controls access to political rulership, martial strength, and material security. Although the text repeatedly regards the caste system as grounded in divine order or cultural convention, functionally the system is exploitatively material; the caste system embodies a class system in which power and privilege are centralized in the hands of the Nobles and Lessers are located within the system only as disposable labor. Nobles rule the councils, lead martial orders, and ritualize their position as sent by the Goddess; Lessers fulfill the roles of manual labor and sacrificial warriors. The implicit reader would be hard pressed to read the caste relations into Omehi society as anything but a stratified system of elite domination, such is the process of valuation carried out on human life: the oppression of caste life becomes most clear in the martial economy of Omehi warfare, a war economy which displays the class stratification of resource flows in clear terms when the tacit dimensions of the narrative inform us *"Each cycle, Indlovu warriors received nine dragon-scale weapons to the Ihashe's one. An Ihashe's value could thus be calculated. They were worth one-tenth of a single Indlovu"* (Winter, 2017, p. 150). Here we see that human value is suspended in number, cast within the strict hierarchical context of caste, with Lessers rendered purely calculable as units of warfare and disposable fighting bodies. A Marxist perspective interpret this calculation of each caste as a human measurement within the context of warring, a crude form of the capitalist valuation of human beings where each soldier's life and death is an additional input into the shop-floor or battlefield production process.

The denial of full humanity reveals the contradiction of the Omehi state. The state freely boasts about a divinely sanctioned chosenness among all Omehi. Meanwhile, the state's military structures, and their implications, undercut such claims. The 'chosenness' of all Omehi is a rhetorical deferral, pointing to the unequal allotment of defense, resources, and value. Elites are defended and their bodies are given institutional worth. 'Lessers' are dehumanized, seen as disposable bodies, and their deaths are framed as necessary losses to maintain the hegemony of the Nobles. Thus, in Omehi society, the caste system also functions as a class system, guaranteeing that comfort and safety are structural inheritances rather than socially merited attainments.

Beyond structures, the everyday acts of social control and discipline reproduce caste's domination. The manner in which the writer describes *"The Drudge would be beaten if he met the eyes of his betters"* (Winter, 2017, p. 34). Here Tau shows how social control is enacted through anxiety and the casting of rituals. Domination in this regard functions outside of legal or hard power. Control is exercised through the mundane and the unremarkable; control over movement, the body, and in the observation of others. The behaviors and the absence of certain behaviors to which others must habitually surrender are enforced through a variety of means. Control, in this manner, is equitable to the embodiment of a state of subordination where the absence of control remains a burden for others. In these everyday internal assaults, we see the reproduction of class in every generation, except that the repetition is in the continuing presence of torment, an endemic pecking order through which lower castes are systematically and repeatedly socialized for feeling subordinate as a question of history rather than natural fact. Participation of fear, practices of obedience. Class dominance is reproduced not by threat of violence but the slow normalization of social practices, chronic fear becoming chronic consent. Omehi class hierarchy thus reproduces itself as a double helix of ideology and economic control.

4.2 The Military as an Ideological State Apparatus

The Omehi military is purely an Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) in the Althusserian model, which does more than be an arena for training soldiers to fight wars. It is a production facility for compliant ideological subject individuals that believe in a particular view of the world, and are thus willing to sacrifice and die to maintain the

structure. Although it may appear to serve a purely strategic purpose, and while it arguably does hold the role of defending the nation, the military is identified as a vehicle for the spread of ruling class ideology that helps shape how Omehi view responsibility, manhood, and martyrdom. Even the concept of war is constantly framed as an act of bloody devotion to the Goddess and the State, which then conceals its utility as a tool for caste control. The military institution achieves this transformation of structural exploiting into noble moral service through ritual, insipid discipline, and mass repetition that inevitably makes reality seem like divine calling. The specific ideological manipulation carried out by the military is made explicit in this particular excerpt, when a Lesser is heard to be saying: *"We distract the hedeni with our dying, so the Indlovu and Gifted can kill 'em back'"* (Winter 2017, p. 229). The moment is notable because it exposes awareness of structural exploitation, but not consciousness or the desire to resist it. The indoctrinated Lower recognizes the truth that Lessers bodies serve as a cash crop for the upper castes who hunt.

The military exploits ideologically focused training that equates suffering with moral worth, as a mechanism of further control. Endurance is emphasized not as forced submission, but rather a personal achievement, a virtue, and pain as a marker of one's worth. This line of reasoning is captured in the rule of instruction that states, *"Improvement can only come through intentioned effort… The days without difficulty are the days you do not improve"* (Winter 2017, p. 200). Such reframing of systemic violence as self-improvement reframes the voiding of violence, leaving the soldier's self-narrative as the only descriptive mechanism for violence. Hardship is imposed not as imposed predatory discipline, but as self-imposed discipline. The ideological narrative reframing of the structure of violence and the accompanying predatory discipline of the structures into a virtue of perseverance and merit. When the military justifies suffering as a means of achieving deservingness, the military conceals that Lessers face a greater, not lesser, risk not due to inferior ability, but due to a predatory structuring of the tiered system. Moralizing the discipline of the structures of violence disallows soldiers the recognition of the class hierarchies that predetermine the protected and the expendable. Ideologically, this is the function of Marxism. It seeks to hide material predation through the reframing of a violative ethos.

In this case, the Omehi military proves Althusser's point that Class Ideological State Apparatuses perpetuate class domination through means other than brute force. Soldiers are not only pushed into obedience, they are conditioned to want it, to see sacrifice as honorable, and suffering as having a greater purpose. Thus, the military reproduces the caste system by making the Lessers see their disposability as part of their divine destiny, making the power of the elites safe without the need for regular blatant oppression.

4.3 Caste and the Reproduction of Ideology

The Omehi caste system is one of the many systems of inequality that relies on the ideological obedience of family structures and social systems in the intergenerational reproduction of inequality. People are socialized into a caste system in childhood and learn that inequitable systems are inevitably a part of divine order. While in the caste system, unfair systems are normalized for society, and therefore social inequity reproduction does not need to be reinforced by forcibly dominant individuals. Ideology is internalized in all aspects of social life and influences every social perception. He is not describing the workings of the caste system in Omehi society. Instead, he is explaining the workings of every system of inequality, whether it be a caste system, patriarchy, apartheid, etc. That, *"The nobles like it that way. Reminds us where we stand"* (Winter 2017, p. 202) is an example of the rationalization of oppression, an awareness of inequality, and an expression of acquiescence and resistance, yet resignation to a life of domination.

The fact that Lessers do not openly revolt shows the likelihood of hegemonic ideology holding effective power. Inequality is not experienced as oppression but is rather seen as the 'given' social order that is not subject to questioning. Because the order is so deeply ingrained the hierarchy ensures that subordination remains in place even

in the absence of constant watchfulness or punishment. As Gramsci puts it most concisely, hegemony is most powerful when dominion is considered 'common sense' and, in this regard, Omehi society is a perfect example of this ideology with the marginal compliance of society to its hegemonic frameworks. The ideological need for a social order based on caste is most visible in the unequal administration of justice. The brutality of caste power is exemplified in the case of punishment on a Lesser by the statement, *"Death? Death? Stay in the dirt where your kind belong"* (Winter 2017, p. 318). This situation shows that the caste system is the most brutal and dehumanizing social order in which Lessers are not recognized as legal or moral beings or even acknowledged as social justice constituents. Justice is not blind; it is selectively apportioned, and this is the primary principle that underscores the social order that maintains the worthlessness of a lower caste.

From a Marxist lens, these depict apprehension regarding the class justice nexus with the state, where the legal and the moral paradigm are aligned with the ruling class. The punishment of the Lessers is tantamount to not just a disciplining, but an ideological disciplining, where the reaffirming of the boundary of the caste system is an ideological reminder to the lower and the lesser, to the dominated, of their ordained space within the social hierarchy. In operationalizing these, the caste system buttresses shield itself within the realm of ideological reproduction and cover of consent, normalization, and systemic dehumanization of the dominated, to perpetuate the ideology of social inequality for the succeeding generations.

4.4 Tau and Emerging Class Consciousness

Tau functions within the narrative as a subaltern subject whose experience instigates a slow process of recognition of structural violence. Although his rage comes from very personal loss, it does not solely stay as an individual grievance. He starts to see how, from his suffering, a lens of the wider exploitative system of violence is revealed. In that sense, it starts to cultivate an incipient political consciousness as personal trauma shows the material and ideological conditions of a Lesser existence in Omehi society. Most explicitly, this shift of consciousness towards a class is articulated when Tau questions the human price of unending violence: *"How many fathers have died in this war? How many more will die because the Nobles use Lessers like a break wall?"* (Winter 2017, p. 463). This is the climax of the transition from singular rage to multiple units of systemic violence. He sees, for the first time, that the tragic loss of life and the romanticized idea of sacrificing themselves for a worthy cause is the product of the caste system of treating deaths of the Lessers as a given. In Marxist terms, this is the encapsulation of class consciousness, which personal suffering is reinterpreted and universalized to the outcome of systemic violence.

Current realizations point to the fact that Tau's resistance is still individual, not collective. While he can point to the mechanisms by which Nobles maintain their control, he does not have access to a broader unified coalition or resistant movements. His fight is solitary, manifested through private suffering, violence, and not combat through rebellion. This extreme isolation captures an essential feature of Marxism. Being awake ideologically does not change oppressive structures, and that, Tau's anger, captures the essence as well as the restrictions of an ideological break in the system. Tau feels the injustices that come with caste oppression and the violence of militarized exploitation, but with fractured ideologies, the elite system fails to bring the collective. Tau's isolation is a reflection of ideology working. Tau is the quintessential example. Lessers are, in fact, ideologically restrained and unable to understand their collective oppression, the most actionable ideology available to Tau. This also captures the essence of Tau's still incomplete awakening. This isolation makes it quite apparent the struggle that comes along with working on oneself and still being ideologically wrapped up in the structures that exist.

4.5 False Consciousness and Fragmentation

The Omehi false military permeates the system and shapes how Lessers view the military. The Lessers view exploitation as an honor, and disposability as a virtue. Rather than seeing the

value of solidarity amongst each other, the strategy of the military is to deploy a system of divisions and compete within the ranks. The military positions are designed as temporary leaves. They give positions as a way to determine status within the ranks of the Lessers of the military. This approach deepens the ideological system and creates losers. This system of Indlovu and Ihashe creates the military ranks within the system of domination. The military is sophisticated. They claim losers across various divisions. This explains why losing creates Lessers within the system. It explains why a Lesser within the system states, *"We're the fodder that feeds the Chosen military's insatiable appetite"* (Winter 2017, p. 229). This is a well-developed system of military and stands as a recognition of the sophisticated military. The military creates Lessers for each position within the ranks. They take dividers on each lower position. The ones who fail in military are selected for governor post or worst treated as Drudges.

The theory of Marxism states, if subjects are fragments, they cannot successfully confront the powers of structure, which means the lack of solidarity in the case of Lessers is not an outcome of chance, but the outcome of an ideology. The system of Omehi, through the hierarchy of roles in which each person is placed, makes each person value individual suffering over collective struggle, thereby increasing the likelihood that suffering is experienced in a personal, rather than, political way. In this case, the class system is exploitation. The case is presented in the narratives of honor and sacrifice. The case presented by Winter, oppression is not a case of violence, but of the ideological and efficient violence of consent. Winter illustrates a social system where subjugation is justified for a certain group of people. Within this system, suffering is not an imbalance but a reconfigured sacrifice, making oppression seem justified, or worse, required. The icons and representations that this system rewards do not endorse justice or promote equity, but make people accustomed to compliance and make dying for a cause appear justifiable. Rationalizing and normalizing injury in everyday life makes oppression seem self-evident rather than artificially constructed. What Winter reveals is a self-sustaining system that rationalizes oppression disguised as social order.

Winter stands out from most narratives. While most narratives identify a strong enemy as an antagonist, Winter focuses on the state and the military as instruments of domination and an internal class division as the source of conflict. Instead of attending to an internal enemy, Winter narrates how the ruling classes bypass all the state structures and establish control. As a result of this process the external enemy is relegated to a minimal role, and the state becomes the most active participant in the creation of class antagonism and inequality. Most of the domination described involves a 'soft' touch and is exercised through ideology, belief systems, and values. This has been a hallmark of elite-centered fantasy narratives and has been theorized by Marx, Gramsci, and Althusser. Just as ruling classes perpetuate their power through ideological control, so too do such narratives perpetuate subordination by controlling ideology. In this regard, control of the ideological discourse is one of the most important means through which class oppression is exercised in contemporary narratives.

5. Conclusion

In this case, analysis Evan Winter's *The Rage of Dragons* as a sustained critique of class hegemony and ideological control through a Marxist lens. Having a militarized, disciplined caste system and cultural assimilation, the novel shows the processes through which elite control manifests beyond the use of coercive power. The novel exemplifies the reproduction of dominance through the social order of the Omehi, in which inequality is accepted, sacrifice is made moral, and the social contract is that order, in which obedience is to be honorable and the order is to suppress the emergence of a revolutionary class. Tau is a character whose narrative exemplifies this sense of consciousness, and, through this character, and this study intends to show the consciousness of revolution in terms of class, alienation, and the loss of a mass class/collective. The loss of a mass class is the driving factor, and Marx's critique is the key factor, with regard to

individual resistance. He does illustrate how the ideology of class oppression does not deal with the fragmentation of the class as a whole to make it oppressed, and it does not make the class dominant in terms of class power. In the end, it is a deeply rooted ideological problem that dominates at the subconscious level, and in order to make this power dominant, it is to make a visible, structural power problematic.

Winter's *The Rage of Dragons* is a novel that deals with the problem of the dominant ideology that is rooted in subconscious power systems. One of the big ideological problems in The Rage of Dragons is the caste system, and the dominant ideology is a subconscious order. The Rage of Dragons is a major ideological sub-text, in terms of sub-conscious power structures, and in order to be dominant, it must act firmly and decisively, to raise the level of great, apparent political oppression that exists. In the end, it must stress that this is a dominant caste system, and regard the order of ideology that is rooted in this book as a great sub-text. Thus, *The Rage of Dragons* is a unique work of dominant ideological sub-text. Emphasizing ideology as a mechanism of control, Winter's novel reshapes the political possibility of fantasy literature, establishing the genre as a legitimate, critically engaged, and politically complex form of critique regarding class, social, and systemic oppression.

REFERENCES

Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–186). New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and literary criticism*. London, England: Methuen.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London, England: Verso.

Ekman, S. (2013). *Here be dragons: Exploring fantasy maps and settings*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. & Trans.). New York, NY: International Publishers.

Jameson, F. (2005). *Archaeologies of the future: The desire called utopia and other science fictions*. London, England: Verso.

Marx, K. (1976). *Capital: Volume I* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). London, England: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1867)

Mendelsohn, F. (2008). *Rhetorics of fantasy*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Miéville, C. (2012). *Between equal rights: A Marxist theory of international law*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Suvin, D. (1979). *Metamorphoses of science fiction: On the poetics and history of a literary genre*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Young, H. (2016). *Race and popular fantasy literature: Habits of whiteness*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Winter, E. (2019). *The rage of dragons*. London, England: Orbit.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York, NY: Grove Press.

Lukács, G. (1971). *History and class consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics* (R. Livingstone, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Žižek, S. (1989). *The sublime object of ideology*. London, England: Verso.

Frow, J. (2015). *Genre* (2nd ed.). London, England: Routledge.

Attebery, B. (1992). *Strategies of fantasy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.