THE OTHER SPACE: HETEROTOPIA, MEMORY AND INDIVIDUALITY IN DYSTOPIAN NOVELS *THE MEMORY POLICE* AND *THE GIVER*

ECEM SARILALE

YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

İSTANBUL, 2023

THE OTHER SPACE: HETEROTOPIA, MEMORY AND INDIVIDUALITY IN DYSTOPIAN NOVELS *THE MEMORY POLICE* AND *THE GIVER*

ECEM SARILALE

SUPERVISOR

ASST.PROF.DR. F.BAHAR KARLIDAĞ

SUBMITTED TO GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY

JANUARY, 2023

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date : 03.01.2023

Name/Surname: Ecem SARILALE

ÖZET

Bu tezin amacı, Yoko Ogawa'nın *The Memory Police* ve Lois Lowry'nin *The Giver* adlı distopik romanlarındaki hafıza kavramının heterotopik doğasını karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemek ve böylece hafızanın öncelikle bu heterotopik alanın ve bireyselliğin yok edilmesiyle bir baskı aracı olarak uygulanabileceğini tartışmaktır. Her iki romandaki kahramanlar, topluluklarındaki totaliter otorite tarafından planlanmış bir hafıza kaybından muzdariptir. Tez, ütopya, distopya ve heterotopya kavramlarının ortaya çıkışları açısından aralarındaki karşılıklı bağlantıya dair bir anlayış sağlamak için bu kavramlara odaklanarak başlar ve Michel Foucault'nun çeşitli tanımları ve yorumlamaları bulunan heterotopya kavramı üzerinden analiz edilen bir karşı-mekan olarak hafıza üzerine yoğunlaşarak devam eder. Bireysel ve toplumsal hafızaya ilişkin yaklaşımlar, kimlik oluşumu bağlamında sunulmaktadır. Tez nihai olarak, bireysel hafızanın, kolektif hafızanın bir parçası olmasının yanı sıra, bahsi geçen romanlardaki karakterler için, manipule edilmiş kolektif hafıza tarafıdan oluşturulan ve karakterlerin içinde yaşamaya zorlandığı mekana karşı yaratılmış bir öteki mekan olması sebebiyle heterotopik bir alan işlevi gördüğünü tartışır.

Anahtar kelimeler: heterotopya, hafıza, bireysel hafıza, kolektif hafıza, ütopya, distopya, baskı, direnç, Michel Foucault

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to explore the heterotopic nature of the concept of memory in dystopian fictions *The Memory Police* by Yoko Ogawa and *The Giver* by Lois Lowry comparatively and thereby to discuss that memory is possible to be applied as a means of oppression primarily through the destruction of this heterotopic space and individuality. The protagonists in both novels suffer from memory loss that is schemed by the totalitarian authority in their communities. The thesis begins by focusing on the concepts of utopia, dystopia and heterotopia to provide an understanding about the interconnection between them in terms of their emergence, and continues concentrating on memory as a counter-site analysed through Michel Foucault's variously defined and interpreted concept of heterotopia. The approaches regarding individual and collective memory are presented in relation to identity formation. The thesis ultimately discusses that individual memory, in the novels mentioned, besides being a part of collective memory, acts as a heterotopic space for the protagonists since it is a form of the other space created as opposed to the space that is formed by the manipulated collective memory and that the characters are forced to live in.

Keywords: heterotopia, memory, individual memory, collective memory, utopia, dystopia, oppression, resistance, Michel Foucault

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. F.Bahar Karlıdağ for her invaluable guidance, generous support and belief in me throughout the process.

I would also like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Nina Cemiloğlu and Asst. Prof. Dr. Burcu Gürsel for serving on my thesis committee and providing helpful feedback and suggestions, and Prof. Dr. Charles Daniel Sabatos for his insightful comments.

I am deeply indebted to my friends for encouraging and supporting me whenever I needed them.

Last but not least, I wish to thank my family. Without their unconditional love and endless support, I would not have been able to complete this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....i
ÖZET.....ii
ABSTRACT.....iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv
CHAPTER 1: Utopia and Dystopia..... 1
1.1. Utopia..... 2
1.2. Dystopia.....7
1.3. Dystopian Fiction.....12
CHAPTER 2: Heterotopia and Memory.....20
2.1. The Concept of Heterotopia.....21
2.2. Heterotopia as the Site of Resistance.....30
2.3. Memory.....35
CHAPTER 3: Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Memory Police*.....41
CHAPTER 4: Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Giver*.....59
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion.....71
REFERENCES.....76

CHAPTER 1: Utopia and Dystopia

Michel Foucault is an influential philosopher who introduced groundbreaking theories and concepts in the 20th century. One of these concepts is heterotopia, which fundamentally addresses 'real places' but at the same time embraces 'space'. In *Of Other Spaces*, when Foucault first mentions heterotopia, he presents it in relation to utopia, which is in line with his statement in an interview: "What is interesting is always interconnection, not the primacy of this over that" (Rabinow, 1984, p254). Having chosen his quote from the interview as a starting point in dealing with the concepts of utopia and dystopia, this chapter initially explores the presence of these two concepts in a way that proposes a link between them rather than examining them separately, and later focuses on dystopian fiction as a genre. The first part of the chapter presents the historical background of the concept of utopia to discuss that the idea of the ideal or better place basically springs from the realization or thought that present social conditions should be better. As well as the ones who appreciate a better version of a society, there are others who believe that the creation of the ideal society occurs by force when a group's ideals are dictated to the other, which turn one's utopia into the other's dystopia. All in all, it might be claimed that rather than being the counter concept of utopia, dystopia is a result of utopia. The second part focuses on the emergence of the term dystopia and dystopian narrative. The fact that the characters in a dystopian narrative become aware of the flaws (and totalitarian control) in the society and decide to take action at some point results in the emergence of heterotopias that gives them a space for resistance. Given that the genre of the novels to be analyzed in this thesis, last part aims to provide an outline of dystopian fiction. It plans to cover common themes of dystopian fiction such as surveillance societies, loss of individuality, oppression, exemplified by widely known works of the genre, as

these themes requires heterotopias to appear for the individuals. All things considered, the main focuses of the chapter are to explain the terms utopia and dystopia showing the connection between them and to imply that heterotopia is the space where individuals stand up against the dominant power in society that turns out to be a dystopian one

1.1. Utopia

The invention of the word "utopia" is attributed to Thomas More following his work *Utopia* (1516), which introduces the ideal society built on the imaginary island of the same name. Besides giving its name to the genre, his work also marks the emergence of the term with an equivocal trait in meaning through a poem in the book which claims the island should be called *Eutopia* instead of *Utopia*. More creates the term utopia combining two Greek words: *ou* meaning 'no, not' and *topos* meaning 'place'[1] which is translated as 'no place'. In parallel with his pun in the poem, however, on *eu*-topos which means "good place", utopia is widely accepted to be the imaginary or desired place with a better version of society or life, when compared to the actual one that individuals live, but still non-existent.

Unlike the relatively recent emergence of the term, the concept of utopia is apparently much older. The following depiction of the golden age in Hesiod's *Works and Days* can be referred to trace one of the first examples of utopian thought:

> The race of men that the immortals who dwell on Olympus made first of all was of gold. They were in the time of Kronos, when he was king in heaven; and they lived like gods, with carefree heart, remote

[1] https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803115009560

> from toil and misery. Wretched old age did not affect them either, but with hands and feet ever unchanged they enjoyed themselves in feasting, beyond all ills, and they died as if overcome by sleep. All good things were theirs, and the grain-giving soil bore its fruits of its own accord in unstinted plenty, while they are at leisure harvested their fields in contentment amid abundance. Since the earth covered up that race, they have been divine spirits by great Zeus' design, good spirits on face of the earth, watchers over mortal men, bestowers of wealth: such is the kingly honour that they received (West, 1988, p.40).

In Greek mythology, the golden age is the first of five ages of man. It is the age that humans, despite being mortal, live with the gods and in harmony with nature, and unaware of pain, they enjoy prosperity and peace. However, through subsequent ages, mankind experiences a continuous decline, which later creates an infinite longing for the idyllic state of the golden age. Hesiod was the first poet to mention the imaginary, ideal place but obviously, he was not the only one. Roman poets Ovid, Virgil, and Horace applied the concept in their works, too (Burd, 1915). The stories that tell of an ideal past and the desire to return to this past, or the stories of a lost paradise exist in different cultures, beliefs, and literatures as well as in ancient Greek and Roman literature. In the *Gilgamesh*, for example, Gilgamesh tries to reach Dilmun, a place that resembles the Garden of Eden considering its description provided by an ancient Sumerian tablet. Dilmun was a place devoid of pain and “there was no widow, no sickness, no old age, no lamentation” (Sandars, 1973).

Although the versions of the golden age myth referred here mostly portray a past experience, Baldry (1952) expresses that this "imaginary and happy state" of the

golden age is experienced both "in the dim future" and "in the distant past", which may lead to the conclusion that it does not necessarily have to be a longing for the past. One might as well envision a version of the golden age society that will occur sometime in the future through the change of the existing one. Considering the reference to past and future (time) as an aspect of the re-realization of the golden age, Baldry's point might serve as a definition that can be applied to utopia, too. Similarly, Lewis Mumford's categorization of utopias in his book *The Story of Utopias* (1962) as utopias of reconstruction and utopias of escape can arguably be based on the time period, past or future, that these utopias are expected to be realized. While utopias of reconstruction aim for a transition from a malfunctioning present-day society to a better one in the future, utopias of escape have no intention of correcting the society. Instead, they search for a new world that offers a refuge from the restraints within the society. Depending on Mumford's categorization, The Golden Age myth may not be an example of the utopia of reconstruction because it is all in the past nor of escape. After all, it is a yearning for the past. Still, the golden age myth inspires Plato to "construct a utopia...of a different type from the primitive ones"(Dillon, 1992, p.21).

Plato's *Republic* is considered and referred to as a primary work with utopian qualities and most presumably a precursor to many who study antiquity and utopia. Therefore it probably rightly resides on top of the list of key utopian works by Claeys.

> Probably more people alive have read the Republic than any other single work of philosophy. It is the earliest surviving systematic utopia in Europe’s history. It also contains the first theory of psychology, the first examination of the origins of government, the

> first proposals for educational reform, and the first theoretical aesthetics (Pappas, 2013, p.32).

During Plato's early years of his life, Athens, a democratic state, was in a prolonged war with Sparta, an oligarchic state, and Athens was defeated in the end. In his book, *A History of Literary Criticism From Plato to the Present,* Rafey Habib (2015) explains that the war between these two states had also ideological grounds and it affected Plato's thoughts. Thus he claims Plato wrote *Republic* as a response to the losing of the Peloponnesian war and it almost sounds like he wants to return to the age of the kingdom, only the kings are to be replaced by philosophers, so *Republic* indeed points to the tenets of the idea of utopia.

Republic outlines the ideal society on the basis of justice, the just man, and how justice is/should be understood and applied by the citizens. In *Republic*, the ideal city is supposed to be comprised of individuals who would have a sense of justice and learn the good and also of women who would be assigned similar practices as men depending on their 'nature', in order words, their ability regardless of gender. Plato proposes new regulations regarding the ruler and ruling of the state, the political system, functions of the classes so it would not be wrong to claim that Plato's ideal city has its roots in the anticipation of a restored/upgraded version of Athens, Athenian democracy and politics - the anticipation that arises from the criticism of the present order.

Thomas More's *Utopia*, like *Republic*, depicts an orderly and ideal society in which the influence of Plato or rather "Greek ethical framework" (Nelson, 2001, p.894) is quite obvious. Thomas More was one of the literary scholars of English Humanism. Renaissance humanists were intellectuals that were deeply interested in

classical works of antiquity in that they believed, by studying the past they could "edify the present" (Marius, 1999, p.65). As explained by Marius (1999), More's engagement with classical tradition was through his circle of humanists friends that includes Desiderius Erasmus, More's friend and a key humanist, William Grocyn, "the first Englishman to teach Greek" (p.72) and More's instructor in Greek, and John Colet, a priest and humanist scholar. Renaissance humanists were reading, translating, and interpreting classical texts. This devoted study shaped the mindset of Renaissance humanism. They praised human knowledge and benefited from these classical works to show the human potential to change medieval thinking and improve the state of society. Their treatment of the past through antiquity affected their understanding of the future as well as the present. Horzum (2017) claims that humanists' "critical, analytical and empirical observation" (p.21) of the past provided them with an insight into how the present and future should be constructed with better conditions. Marius (1999) concentrates on the connection between past and present. They could compare "the miserable state of current society... with the glories of the past" (p.152). The outcome of this comparison might be "[humanists'] ideal world [where] citizens lived orderly lives, and the professions of society and its conduct were in symmetry with each other" (p.66). In *Utopia*, More attempts to create a representation of such a world.

Given their typical and recognized qualities, both More's *Utopia* and Plato's *Republic* essentially justify utopia's being defined as a dream or a yearning for a better life or future. However, there have been many other attempts to define utopia which contributed to the concept itself in the end. Quite contradictory to the basic notion of betterness constantly referred to while defining utopias, Lyman Tower Sargent (1994), the American scholar on utopian studies, for example, advocates that perfection

should not be a defining characteristic of utopia grounding his opinion in the possible reaction of "opponents of utopianism" (p.9). Those opponents "argue that a perfect society can only be achieved by force; thus, utopianism is said to lead to totalitarianism and the use of force and violence against people" (p.9). Sargent's point might also be associated with dystopias and be claimed to undermine the so-called opposition between dystopia and utopia by implying dystopia is an inevitable result of utopia when associated with perfectionism.

Considering the early works of utopia and attempts to define the ideal place, it is seen that the tendency is either longing for the past or referring to the past to gain wisdom and constitute a better present or future. The connection with the past is arguably through memory and the heterotopic space of the memory, because, as it will be discussed in detail in the following chapter, heterotopias can juxtapose contradicting spaces and periods of time like past and present. The memories, experiences, and knowledge stored in that heterotopic space, thus, offer a chance to compare past and present. Additionally, as it has been argued, the perfection that is insisted in the ideal society carries the risk of turning utopia into dystopia led by a totalitarian system, which connects utopia and dystopia rather than separating them. The totalitarian system, on the other hand, will be mentioned in the upcoming chapters as a cause of resistance driven by heterotopias.

1.2. Dystopia

The attempts to define utopia and the various ways authors and researchers from other disciplines used it resulted in the emergence of several associated terms, the most noteworthy of which could be dystopia. As a subsequently emerging term, dystopia is defined as "a modern term invented as the opposite of Utopia" and is used

to describe "any alarmingly unpleasant imaginary world, usually of the projected future" (Baldick, 2021, p.74). Despite the dictionary writing "modern term", it is also known that the word was coined in 1747 and was first used, with the meaning of "diseased, bad, faulty or unfavourable place" (Claeys, 2017, p.4), in 1868 by John Stuart Mill in a parliament speech as an antonym for utopia. The view that dystopia is the opposite of utopia might be claimed to have its roots in "disastrous current trends" (Booker, 1994, p.5) in the twentieth century, such as totalitarian and oppressive regimes, and scientific advancements. Such tremendous and, at times detrimental changes in society are hard to neglect, so these changes or phenomena manifest themselves in dystopias as a way of warning and make dystopias, for many, function as the opposite of utopias. The emergence of dystopian works might also be interpreted as a response to these changes in the society which require an unavoidable transition from utopias to dystopias in the end. Despite the prevalent conviction of dystopia being the negation of utopia, that dystopia and utopia are intertwined is a widely shared view by scholars. Gordin (2010), to begin with, defines dystopia as "utopia's twentieth-century doppelganger" and clearly states that "dystopia is not simply the opposite of utopia" (p.1). A dystopia either is born of a dysfunctional utopia, or it is actually a utopia that promises betterment only for a group that can monopolize the system:

> A true opposite of utopia would be a society that is either completely unplanned or is planned to be deliberately terrifying and awful. Dystopia, typically invoked, is neither of these things; rather, it is a utopia that has gone wrong, or a utopia that functions only for a particular segment of society (Gordin, 2010, p.1).

The twentieth century abounds with dysfunctional or, as Sargent (2005) puts it, 'defeated' utopias. Sargent claims that dystopias in the twentieth century are essentially failed "utopian aspirations", some examples of which include communism that turned into Stalinism, the Cambodian leader Pol Pot's desire for a communist society that resulted in the dystopia of the suffering Cambodian people, and the Shiite regime in Iran that later transformed into a totalitarian regime. What turns these aspirations into dystopias comes from the very desire to build a perfect society. However, although starting with 'good' intentions, the desire for perfection in society requires full control over the people to the point of limiting them or depriving them of their freedom.

> ...the utopian impulse was itself inherently dystopian. That is to say, the desire to create a much improved society in which human behaviour was dramatically superior to the norm implies an intrinsic drift towards punitive methods of controlling behaviour which inexorably results in some form of police state (Claeys, 2010, p.108).

Likewise, Claeys treats dystopia as the primary element, the 'essence' of utopia instead of separating them from each other or naming dystopia as the negation of utopia. According to him, what one calls utopia might be the other's dystopia or vice versa depending on what side to take with these concepts. It is quite understandable considering how one's background, position, previous experiences, or the way they define the concepts like freedom, power, or order may influence and affect his perception and ability to interpret. Some works of dystopian fiction with an illusionary utopian atmosphere such as Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World,* which presents a classed society where every citizen's class is predetermined and the happiness of the citizens is maintained by a drug called 'soma' which is freely distributed, or Peter

Weir's film *The Truman Show*, which tells the story of a man who realizes the society he grows up into is a TV show set, may confirm Claey's claim.

In addition to Gordin, Sargent, and Claey's, there are many more, various definitions that in one way or another tend to tie up utopia and dystopia: " “every utopia contains dystopia” (Ribeiro); ... dystopia can well be seen as the “shadow of utopia” as it emerged in the wake of the latter (Kumar); or we can think of it as the alter ego of utopia, always “pull[ing] its dreamy companion back to earth” (Davis)" (Vieira, 2013, p.1). Aside from the literary definitions, the meaning of utopia has transformed "in ordinary speech" so much so that it almost takes the negativity attributed to dystopia upon itself. Utopia "has not only positive connotation but even more commonly a negative, pejorative one: 'impractical', therefore useless and even dangerous because it diverts attention and effort from the realizable" (Finley, 1968, p.4).

The literary critic Fredric Jameson (1994), on the other hand, neither sees a strong organic relation between utopia and dystopia nor favours the "facile deployment of the opposition between Utopia and dystopia" (p.53). Rather, he "disjoin[s]" the pair focusing on the narrative. "The dystopia is generally a narrative, which happens to a specific subject or character, whereas the Utopian text is mostly nonnarrative and ... somehow without a subject-position"(p.53-54). That the narrative pattern of dystopian novels does not seem to differ from each other most of the time possibly verifies Jameson's claim. The characters of the dystopian story live in a nightmarish and repressive society constructed in the future world and "the focus is frequently on a character who questions the dystopian society" (Baccolini& Moylan, 2003, p.5). And this 'specific' character's questioning of the restraining system creates

the "narrative of resistance" as opposed to the "narrative of hegemonic order" (Baccolini& Moylan, 2003, p.5).

On the comparison between utopia and dystopia, Jameson (1994) further notes that dystopias tell stories of disasters awaiting the people in the future. The disasters that appear on the list by Jameson are mainly human-related: "ecology, overpopulation, plague, nuclear accident" (p.56). This cause-and-effect relationship between future disasters and human activity in dystopias is also mentioned by Sargent with a distinct/noticeable addition. Resonating with Jameson, Sargent (2013) points out that dystopias are stories of the outcomes of people's doings or, more precisely, of their "messing up" (p.12). The examples of these outcomes are visible in the twentieth-century dystopias, especially in the ones that are called totalitarian political dystopias where people "mess up" with the idea of forming a perfect society and end up with a hegemonic order. As for utopias, on the other hand, Jameson claims that instead of telling stories, utopias construct a "mechanism" or a "machine" that serves to imagine "a stable well-nigh permanent kind of lives" (p.56). The mechanism mentioned here organizes the life and society in the way they are supposed to be in a utopian society, and the narrative is set to feature the structure of this mechanism rather than focusing on a protagonist's perspective. Arguably in most dystopian narratives, on the other hand, a version of the mechanism or the machine which fails to serve is applied. Instead of utopian text without a subject position, there is a subject that realizes the defects in the mechanism and thus dystopian narrative begins to be constructed. Dystopian narrative requires this dysfunctional mechanism.

An additional, and somewhat optimistic view that connects dystopia to utopia might arguably be the positivity it carries through the sense of hope. Dystopias do portray a future, a past or present which is gloomy and full of fear. They highlight the

possibility that the present-day reality is a dystopia that could get worse in the future. However, dystopias might also be considered "a necessary step towards a better world" (Ashworth, 2013, p.69) because they awaken people to the potential dangers or threats, and thus, they lead people to change and construct the future knowing a better alternative exists. Thus, dystopias might contain a "tiny element of hope, always glimmering, that the forces of dystopia will inspire in some part of humanity at least, an impulse to stand against (...) and make the future brighter (...)" (Davidson, 2013, pp.77-78). Then, maybe not every dystopia but at least many dystopias might as well contain "the other spaces", or in other words, heterotopias, that might provide the subjects with the strength to resist and survive, and might spark these "tiny element[s] of hope" to imagine and realize the better world.

To sum up, various definitions of dystopia, "dysfunctional" or "defeated" utopia just being some of them, obviously connect dystopia and utopia instead of positioning them as opposites. Accordingly, it can be claimed that many dystopian narratives tell the stories of a society that was planned to be perfect but failed. A dystopian society is very much like a version of a utopian one whose mechanism or machine (Jameson, 1994) that organizes the life in it actually fails to operate. On the other hand, however dysfunctional the mechanism is in dystopias, and however critical they are of the societies of the time they are written, dystopias also signal a warning about the future and of a change, of a better alternative.

1.3. Dystopian Fiction

The origins of dystopian literature lie in utopian thought although the terms utopia and dystopia are accepted as opposites. While utopian fictions describe ideal, completely improved - socially and politically - societies, dystopian fictions can be

critical of the extent of the utopian ideals that are forming these societies and point at a blurry division between an ideal dream and a nightmare. Thus, this kind of criticism leads to the creation of notable and influential works in dystopian literature. This section briefly focuses on the circumstances that have flourished dystopian fiction and the major themes that govern the genre. These major themes will also be readdressed in relation to the concept of heterotopia in subsequent chapters.

As mentioned earlier in the previous part, utopian ideals and the thought of forming a perfect society date back as far as Ancient Greek. Later, in the 16th century, Thomas More coined the word "Utopia" and presented the possibility of a better future and society "which had solved most of the human problems … [and] which corresponds the deepest longings of man" (Fromm, n.d., para.4). The rise of modern science and technology in the 17th century and Enlightenment reason has made a great contribution to utopian thought. Especially, in the Enlightenment era the faith in human progress, which was expected to be realized through the power of science and technology, became the key concept in the Western mindset. People believed that the collaboration of reason, science, and technology "could result in the essentially unlimited improvement of human society" (Booker, 1994, p.34). Industrial development through the use of machines in manufacturing was a clear indication of the contribution that scientific advancements made to society. However, there were also shortcomings as well as benefits. On the one hand, the industrial revolution was truly a state of progress offering economic growth, but on the other hand, it caused exploitation of people and forced them, and children who worked in factories, into a life of indignity which included housing, sanitation and nutrition problems. Among other negative consequences were workplaces with inadequate safety regulations, gender inequality in the workplace, and harm to the environment. Since modern

technology came with its drawbacks, it might be claimed that "the faith in human progress and in man's capacity to create a world of justice and peace" (Fromm, n.d., para. 2) was shaken. The 20th century witnessed the breakout of two world wars, an economic crisis, atomic weapons, and the Cold War. The new technological inventions in the 21st century provided governments with the power to supervise their citizens and invade their privacy. This recent power also paved the way for the formation of oppressive governments through surveillance. Hence, it might be concluded that modern technology creates new hardships while it helps overcome many of them. Considering the critical aspect of dystopian literature towards the existing social and political conditions, the emergence of dystopian narrative in the 20th century and its rise in the 21st century, therefore, is no coincidence.

Scholars and modern thinkers have pointed to the "suspicion of utopian thought" as the reason for the shift to dystopian depictions of society in literature (Booker, 1994, p.5). As it is observed, when utopian projections are realized in a real-life society, the outcomes might not be as expected . Thus, the disappointment over these failed outcomes has raised the suspicion of utopian ideals, and the possibility of facing a failed society has created a sense of fear. It might be said that flaws of the age of Enlightenment or drastic experiences in the 20th and 21st centuries proved that this fear was not unfounded, and they caused the development of dystopian vision. In *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, the Frankfurt School philosophers Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno discuss the failure of the age of Enlightenment and claim that although man's drive is to control or dominate the nature through the power of technology and reason, it turns out that it is the society and individuals that are controlled or dominated in the end. Depending on "their Marxist origins" it can easily be inferred that the form of domination they imply is capitalism (Özmacun, 2015).

> … Horkheimer and Adorno suggest that the scientific impetus of the Enlightenment is informed by a quest not for a liberating truth, but for a power that ultimately enslaves. In particular, they suggest that the emphasis on the power of the individual in Enlightenment thought is related to a drive to dominate nature, a drive that inevitably turns back upon itself and leads to the formation of individuals who are internally repressed and of societies consisting of individual subjects who strive for domination of each other (Booker, 1994, p.12).

There are views, too, claiming that Marx's criticism of capitalism can be associated with "dystopian thought … [since] much of his work involves an attempt to reveal the illusionary nature of the rather utopian claims of capitalism itself" (Booker, 1994, p.32). According to Marx, industrial capitalism values the benefits of the owners of the capital over the individuals' interests, which might be interpreted as a step in ending the individual progress as well as forming a society which includes individuals of different socioeconomic statuses.

Another dystopian vision, which is related to contemporary society, is suggested by Foucault (1995) in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. In his work, the society Foucault describes is controlled by the government that interferes with the citizens' private lives. Advances in technology such as the internet, phones, and surveillance cameras provide governments with the power to track and monitor the citizens' movements, whereabouts, or interactions. The citizens are now under constant surveillance by the government, which can be associated with an implicit but dehumanizing form of punishment. The Panopticon, Jeremy Bentham's model for the ideal prison, influences Foucault's idea of power and surveillance, and also 'the carceral society'. The panopticon model of prison is a ring-shaped structure with a

central tower. The cells are positioned surrounding the tower, and while the guards in the tower can monitor all the cells and prisoners, the prisoners can only see the tower but not the guards or other prisoners. However, they are aware that they are being observed by an omnipresent authority at any time. Thus, when applied to society, the idea of surveillance, which "is worse than the punishment itself" (Beiner, 2014, p.52) and dehumanizing, makes the citizens similar to the prisoners.

> Worst of all, from Foucault's standpoint, is that the kind of modern liberal society that deploys this sort of monitoring and tracking apparatus congratulates itself on its humanity and its liberality; Foucault's overriding mission is to expose this complacent self-image as a perverse ideology of modern "humanism" (Beiner, 2014, p.52).

Besides philosophers, there are writers such as Aldous Huxley, Yevgeny Zamyatin, and George Orwell who could foresee that utopian ideals might fail and create systems or societies which can only benefit specific groups. Their observations and critiques of the existing societies manifest themselves in their novels in the forms of projected societies that aim to uncover the flaws of the existing ones. "After all, utopias and dystopias by definition seek to alter the social order on a fundamental, systemic level" (Gordin, 2010, p.2). Arguably, dystopian fictions choose to focus on the negative consequences of utopian thought to criticize the order and warn readers. And accordingly, the major themes that dystopian fictions mainly deal with centre around environmental ruin, government oppression, repressed society, technological control, and issues related to individualism and memory in order to create dystopian settings.

The genre-defining novels *Brave New World* by Huxley, *We* by Zamyatin or *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by Orwell present the most famous and exceptional examples of dystopian settings that reveal the defects in social conditions and political systems. Additionally, they show how these defects turn the utopian dreams into nightmares.. These notable novels aim for social criticism of their own time and they foreground oppressive government as the most distinctive theme.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley's criticism results from the strong belief in technology. He portrays a future society named the World State that owes its development to science and technology. The citizens of the World State belong to different predetermined classes that are named after the first five letters of the Greek Alphabet - Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon - and have a hierarchical arrangement among them. With the help of technology, the government manages to conduct a fierce birth control procedure. The fertilization happens outside the women's body, embryos grow in bottles and babies are born from bottles. Women are prohibited from getting pregnant in the traditional way and if they do they are referred to abortion clinics. The underlying reason for this kind of birth control is the government's will to exert full authority over people by interfering even with their private lives. The government prioritizes the happiness of citizens and prevents them from suffering from pain, yet it might be claimed that this is the tool the government created to control people.

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* depicts another version of 'a world gone wrong' which is called Oceania. Oceania is one of the three states that fight an endless war. As a perfect example of an oppressive government, The Party, the unity that rules the state, exploits the idea of war and technology to its advantage. From the very beginning of the first chapter in the book, it is seen that the society is constantly

exposed to the slogan "War is Peace", which is written on the building of the Ministry of Truth, and the poster with the caption "Big Brother is Watching You". Although the war is going on in a distant land and the people of Oceania don't observe or experience it before their eyes, they believe that they might be attacked at any time due to the Party's policies. The slogan of the Party conveys clear messages. Since war makes people unite against one shared enemy making this enemy their biggest concern, they can easily be distracted from the present and probably more crucial problems existing in the society.

Last but not least, "memory holes" in Oceania are one of the most effective inventions of the Party that prove its determination to persist full control not only over the people but also over the past, present, and future. The Party presupposes the control of the present day and future lies in the control of the past, so the workers in the Ministry of Truth are assigned to rewrite historical events in a way that serves the goals of the Party. Then, the original documents are discarded via memory holes, which eventually enables the Party to control the past and thus indirectly the present. In addition to the disposal process in the Ministry of Truth, people are not allowed to keep any written personal records in case they might contradict the history the Party constructs later. In addition, these records might guide people to perceive and analyze what happens around them, in the society that they are a part of, and what makes them unique individuals. Rafey Habib (2015) clearly puts the importance of the past into words as such:

> In order to make sense of our own present, we need to understand our own past. We need to look critically at the various documents, cultural, political, and religious, which furnish our identity, which tell us who we are, who we should be, and what we might become (p.1).

As a result, in Oceania, people have no memory left and they fail to understand the present situation of their society and fail to realize true motives of the Party. When they are left "[i]n a world where the literature of the past is nonexistent or exists only in its newspeak forms, the allusions become a textual past which intersects and modifies the Orwellian present" (Blakemore, 1984, p.351).

In terms of their main focuses and the themes they cover, such as a utopian world that fails, the possible threats of totalitarianism, oppression, memory as a tool of oppression, treatment of the past and resistance, the novels that are briefly summarized in this section are considered as precursors and similar to the novels that will be discussed in this thesis. Both novels, *The Memory Police* (1994) and *The Giver* (1993), describe surveillance societies. Instead of memory holes, *The Memory Police* has a totalitarian government that erases the memories of the citizens. Although the community is well-organized in every aspect in *The Giver* like the one in *Brave New World*, it is revealed that the community is nothing other than a world gone wrong like Oceania. In conclusion, this section provides an understanding regarding dystopian visions that shape the genre and treatment of the past, memory and oppressive authority in major works.

CHAPTER 2: Heterotopia and Memory

"Space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power"

- Michel Foucault, 1984

This chapter sets out to analyze the notion of heterotopia by Foucault and to discuss that heterotopia functions as the site of resistance and the other space. The first part of the chapter introduces the concept of heterotopia and focuses on Foucault's elaborations of the concept. The second part aims to present heterotopia in the context of resistance. The last part explains the relation between memory and individuality. The chapter ultimately suggests memory might be considered a heterotopic space through which individual resistance is reflected when confronted with a totalitarian, oppressive entity.

Among the varied themes of dystopian fiction, the most common, even fundamental, one is the existence of an oppressive state, and the medium that this state uses to dominate, supervise, or control the citizens is creating spaces and remodelling the existing ones in a way that serves its authority and ideology. "[S]paces become metonymic expressions of the dominant ideology" (Terentowicz-Fotyga, 2018, p.19), and there are many examples of such spaces in dystopian novels. The Wall that marks the boundary of the city of Gilead and where the executed bodies are displayed in *The Handmaid's Tale*, Walter's room that is under constant surveillance by telescreens in *Brave New World*, Elsewhere where people are 'released' in *The Giver*, people's memories and minds where objects and related concepts vanish by the order of ruling units in *The Memory Police* are all spaces where the states exercise their power. As opposed to the spaces controlled by the state, on the other hand, the individuals might create their "sites of resistance", which can be directly linked to the concept of

heterotopia by Foucault. Heterotopia is considered "a new approach to space and spatial thinking" (Soja, 1996, p.154) and in Foucault's understanding, space is "an instrument of resistance and change" (Wicomb, 2015, p.49).

2.1. The Concept of Heterotopia

Before Michel Foucault elaborated on the concept of heterotopia and offered new perspectives on space and spatial thinking (Soja, 1996, p.154), the term was already used in the medical context to describe the occurrence of a particular tissue that appears to exist in an abnormal, "different" (hetero) "place" (topos) without causing any complications to the organism (Sohn, 2008). Similar to the meaning in the medical context, the term heterotopia in Foucault refers to " location[s] that stand outside the normal spatiality" (Barba & Richardson, 2019, p. 108) while challenging the existing order at the same time. In addition to physical locations, Foucault's heterotopic spaces might as well be 'textual' "which subvert ontological and epistemological certainties" (Barba & Richardson, 2019, p. 108).

When Foucault uses the term 'heterotopia' for the first time in the Preface to *The Order of Things* (1966), he refers to textual heterotopia rather than physical locations. He explains what inspires him to write *The Order of Things* is a passage about the classification of animals which is presented in the fictional Chinese Encyclopaedia in Jorge Luis Borges' essay "The Analytical Language of John Wilkins" (1942) and "shattered ... all the familiar landmarks of [his] thought" (Foucault, 2005, p.xvi).

> This passage quotes a ‘certain Chinese encyclopaedia’ in which it is written that ‘animals are divided into: (a) belonging to the Emperor, (b)

> embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) *et cetera*, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies' (Foucault, 2005, p.xvii).

This passage is accepted as an example of textual heterotopias, which, as Foucault defines, "secretly undermine language ... destroy 'syntax' in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to 'hold together' (Foucault, 2005, p.xix). Textual heterotopias destroy the conventional, usual system of thought in the real world, and, as Kevin Hetherington puts it, because they are "incongruous forms of writing and text" they can "challenge and make impossible discursive statements" (Hetherington, 2003, p.41). Considering the variety of categories juxtaposing real and imaginary animals in it, the passage in the encyclopaedia is claimed to challenge the ontological basis. For Foucault, what matters is not whether these "things" mentioned in the passage, which have no common ground, can co-exist but where "their propinquity would be possible" (Foucault, 2005, p.xviii). According to him, establishing this classification that juxtaposes different categories is only possible in the "non-place of language" because the basis of the categorization in the Encyclopaedia does not bear a connection with the real-world classification ontologically. So the combination of the real and the imaginary subverts "our normal understanding of the world" and as a result, it creates a heterotopic space offering an alternative ordering that is only possible in language (Barba&Richardson,2019).

In "Of Other Spaces" (1967), which is based on a lecture given by himself to architecture students, Foucault mentions heterotopia once again. However, unlike *The Order of Things* where he refers to heterotopias as textual spaces, in "Of Other Spaces" he defines them as physical locations - real spaces that exist in society - in contrast to utopias, which are unreal spaces presenting a perfected form.

"Of Other Spaces" is arguably the most thorough outline of the concept of heterotopia. At the beginning of his lecture, Foucault foregrounds space over time and claims that while the main focus was history in the nineteenth century, it shifts to space in the present era. He argues that space has its own history and as a concept, it has transformed through history. In the Middle Ages space was hierarchical; there was a "hierarchic ensemble of places" which creates binary sets of places such as sacred and profane, protected and exposed, urban and rural, celestial and terrestrial (Foucault, 1967). Foucault names the medieval view of space as space of localization. Then, the notion of space of localization was replaced by the notion of space of extension when Galileo discovered that space is open and infinite and disclosed that "a thing's place was no longer anything but a point in its movement [...] In other words, starting with Galileo, starting with the seventeenth century, extension supplanted localization. Today the *emplacement* substitutes extension, which itself had replaced localization." (Foucault, 1967, p.15). The final transformation of the concept of space is the emplacement. For Foucault, emplacement is not just a location but the relation between different locations, and in our age, the "space is given to us in the form of relations between emplacements" (Foucault, 1967, p.15). These relations shape the way space is perceived. People assign meanings to different spaces by considering the relations between them. Today, we live in a heterogeneous space, "inside a set of relations that delineates emplacements that cannot be equated or in any way

superimposed" (Foucault, 1967, p.16). Foucault claims that through these sets of relations one might define emplacements:

> Of course one could no doubt take up the description of these different emplacements, by looking for the set of relations by which a given site can be defined. For example, describing the set of relations that define the emplacements of passage, the streets, trains (a train is an extraordinary bundle of relations because it is something through which one passes, it is also something by means of which one can go from one point to another, and then it is also something that passes by). [...] Likewise one could define, via its network of relations, the closed or semi-closed emplacements of rest that make up the house, the bedroom, the bed, and so forth (Foucault, 1967, p.16).

Among various emplacements, Foucault is primarily interested in utopias and heterotopias, which are connected to all the other emplacements and yet contradict them. According to Foucault, utopias are unreal spaces although they are in relation to "the real space of society". Utopias do not exist in real life; they are just the spaces that present society in a perfected form - probably "too perfect or too imperfect to be real" (Putthoff, 2020, p.5). Heterotopias, however, are real spaces that exist in almost every culture in various forms. Foucault defines intrinsic characteristics of heterotopias as follows:

> ... a sort of counter-emplacements, a sort of effectively realized utopias in which the real emplacements, all the other real emplacements that can be found within culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted; a kind of places that are outside all places, even though they are

> actually localizable. Since these places are absolutely other than all the emplacements that they reflect, and of which they speak, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias (Foucault, 1967, p.17).

As an insightful example, or rather a metaphor, Foucault chooses the mirror through which he explains the relation between the conflicting emplacements utopia and heterotopia. He believes the mirror embraces the real and unreal space simultaneously (Bairagya,2020). The mirror is a utopia because "it is a place without place" (Foucault, 1967, p.15). The images or the subjects reflected in the mirror exist in an unreal space at that moment. In other words they seem to exist in a place where they are not actually present. The mirror is also a heterotopia since, first of all, it is a real object existing in reality, and it is through the mirror the subject realizes that he is in fact absent in the place where he observes himself to be existing. In addition, the reflection "on the other side of the looking glass" makes it possible for the subject to establish himself in the place where he exists.

In the next part of the lecture, Foucault lists six principles to provide "a sort of systematic description", which he also calls 'heterotopology', of heterotopias. Each one of these principles explains a different quality of heterotopia. The first principle in the list is that every culture in the world creates heterotopias. However, it is not possible to say that there exists a universal form of heterotopia since cultures and societies can be in diverse forms. Yet, instead of a universal form, Foucault suggests two main categories of heterotopias, namely heterotopias of crisis and of deviation. The former refers to places that are seen as "privileged, or sacred, or forbidden" and are "reserved for" people such as "adolescents, menstruating women, pregnant women, the elderly", who go through a transitional phase of their lives. Foucault does not particularly state but the common ground of these crises, or transitional phases, is

that they are all associated with "bodily time - becoming an adult, periods, reproduction, and ageing or dying" (Davies, 2011, p.96). Although boarding schools, military service, or honeymoon trips are listed as examples of crisis heterotopias, today they are replaced by "rest homes and psychiatric hospitals [...] prisons [...] retirement homes" which Foucault names as heterotopias of deviation. These places are inhabited by people whose behaviours do not comply with or are different from the norms of the society.

The second principle emphasizes that the function of heterotopias a society makes might shift over time. Each heterotopia keeps its main function, though. Foucault elaborates on the principle by referring to the drastic change in the significance and meaning of cemeteries as heterotopias concerning their location. In the eighteenth century, cemeteries were located next to or inside "the sacred space of the church" because they were accepted as a medium for emotional or spiritual connection to the dead. Starting with the nineteenth century they were moved to the "outer edges of the city" to avoid dead bodies that were presumed to spread contagious illnesses since they were buried in spaces close to public life. The displacement of cemeteries into areas far from the city caused them to change from "sacred and immortal" into the "other city where each family possesses its dark dwelling" (Foucault, 1967, p.19).

The third principle explains that heterotopia is able to bring together in a real space multiple contradictory, irreconcilable spaces. Cinemas, for example, are heterotopias where various three-dimensional spaces overlap in films, and these films are later reflected on the two-dimensional screen. Foucault also refers to the traditional Persian garden as "the oldest example" of heterotopia that juxtaposes contradictory spaces. The Persian garden is a sacred space that brings diverse plants

together and make them grow inside, and it unifies four different parts[2] of the world in its rectangular, walled design. It establishes an order inside. While the garden represents the world through the diversity it includes, it also fills a space in the world and becomes a part of the world. Thus, for Foucault, the garden “has been a universalizing heterotopia” (Foucault, 1967, p.20). As Foucault states, the garden as a heterotopia is "a kind of place that [is] outside all places, even though [it is] actually localizable" (Foucault, 1967, p.17).

In the fourth principle, Foucault introduces the term “heterochronies”. Heterochronies, or heterotopias of time, are spaces that are linked to time and allow people "an absolute break with their traditional time" (Foucault, 1967, p.17). Heterochronies like museums or libraries offer a totality, a collection of time by bringing "all times, all epochs" together, and time keeps piling up in these places. In addition, accumulating all different times in a single, enclosed place turns heterochronies into spaces that are outside of time.

The fifth principle explains that heterotopias are not 'freely accessible' contrary to public spaces although they are "necessarily collective or shared spaces"(Dehaene &Cauter, 2008, p.6). Instead, heterotopias have an opening and closing system, which "both isolates them and makes them penetrable" (Foucault, 1967 p.21). Access to such heterotopias requires permissions (barracks or prison) or fulfilment of some rites and rituals of purifications (the Muslim hammam or Scandinavian sauna). Foucault adds that entry to some heterotopias creates a kind of illusion: people are actually excluded when they think they enter the place. "The famous rooms that existed on the large farms of Brazil and elsewhere in South America" perfectly exemplify the illusionary entrance. A visitor or a traveller can open the door to rooms on the farms of Brazil

[2] The Persian Gardens traditionally have a quadratic pattern, which is based on the “Chahar Bagh” meaning four gardens. The four parts of the garden refer to the elements; water, wind, soil and fire that are believed to be sacred in Zoroastrianism in Persia (Mahmoudi Farahani et al., 2016).

since they are welcomed to "enter into the room and sleep there for a night". Yet, due to the architectural style of these farms, the door never opens directly to the central - and private - space of the family. For this reason, although the visitor seems to be granted permission to be inside the room, he is in fact excluded from the family's main residence (Foucault, 1967, p.21).

The last principle explains that heterotopias function either as a space of illusion or as a space of compensation based on their relation to the space around them. Heterotopias of illusion create real spaces that "expose all real spaces, all the emplacements in the interior of which human life is enclosed and partitioned, as even more illusionary" (Foucault, 1967, p.21). Heterotopias are spaces that reveal the illusionary nature of real spaces. As a space of illusion, brothels, for instance, reveal hidden pleasures and activities, behaviours that are accepted as deviant by the society due to its "illusionary nature ... [which is] founded on monogamy and fidelity" (White, 2018, p.97). Heterotopias of compensation, on the other hand, create the "other space" that is completely opposite the existing one, and that is "as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is disorderly, ill construed and sketchy" (Foucault, 1967, p.21). Foucault states that the first colonies of the seventeenth-century Puritan societies and Jesuit colonies in South America are the best examples of "absolutely perfect other places" (Foucault, 1967, p.21).

> The Jesuits of Paraguay established colonies in which existence was regulated in all of its points. The village was laid out ... around a rectangular place at the foot of which was the church; on one side, there was the school; on the other, the cemetery, ... The daily life of the individuals was regulated, not by the whistle, but by the bell. Awakening was set for everybody at the same hour, work began for

> everybody at the same hour; meals were at noon and at five o’clock, then everybody went to bed, and at midnight came what was called the conjugal wake-up, that is to say, when the convent bell rang, everybody accomplished his duty (Foucault, 1967, p.22).

Foucault concludes the lecture with the heterotopia par excellence, that is the ship. It is "a place without a place" like the mirror because it floats without requiring a permanent location. Although it is an enclosed site, it has relations to all the other sites - it travels "from the port to port, from bank to bank"- and through these relations it also reflects them.

Although "Of Other Spaces" was originally lecture notes that were not initially planned to be published, it might be claimed that it is the most thorough outline of the concept of heterotopia. Yet, there are diverse views regarding the concept as well. E.W. Soja, a political geographer and a professor of urban planning who introduced the concept of 'Thirdspace', finds Foucault's heterotopology "frustratingly incomplete, inconsistent, incoherent" (Soja, 1996, p.162) while M. Dehaene, a professor in urbanism, and L. De Cauter, a philosopher and art historian, claim that Foucault's work "has been a source of inspiration in urban and architectural theory" though it might be "too encompassing" and causes confusion (2008, p.4). On the other hand, H. Sohn states that after it was translated into English, “Of Other Spaces" seemed to be a "groundwork" for spatial disciplines (Sohn,43). P. Johnson, an influential author and researcher of heterotopia studies, expands the extent of disciplines by adding art, literary studies and sociology, and he notes that it is "the elusive quality" of the concept of heterotopia that provokes "conflicting interpretations" (Johnson, 2013, p.790) in various disciplines. Considering the novels that will be studied in this thesis,

the next part will focus on the associations of the concept of heterotopia with resistance and counter-site among multiple interpretations and views.

2.2. Heterotopia as the Site of Resistance

Various disciplines such as medicine, architecture, geography and literary studies make use of the concept of heterotopia and it is often considered ambiguous and difficult to define, but as Johnson states, heterotopia is “persistently linked to forms of resistance” and “Of Other Spaces”, which presents heterotopia in detail, “lends itself to a reading of heterotopias as sites of resistance (Johnson qtd. In Topinka, 2010, p.58). As the medical term specifies, heterotopia refers to incident of an organ working properly in spite of its being 'misplaced', being in an 'abnormal location', being in place where it is not supposed to exist, so it can be claimed that heterotopia is inherently different from what is around. It is 'the other' in the surrounding where it is not expected to appear in the first place. Therefore, when associated with resistance, it becomes a different space that appears in the present order and encourages an alternative re-ordering in itself as opposed to the system implemented by the dominant - and often the oppressive - order. Heterotopia resists following the imposition of the mainstream order. Utopia depicts spaces with alternative orders as well but these spaces are imaginary and distant, and although perfect, they "can never be achieved" (Gray, 2007, as cited in Sargisson, 2012). Contrary to utopia, heterotopia is a real space and it represents and challenges the real and unreal spaces at the same time. While utopia idealises the world, heterotopia questions how reasonable and acceptable the world is (Kafar, 2014, p.8). It "contests the space we live in” by mirroring it, and it reveals the defects in the order and raises the possibility of the existence of different and alternative spaces in the minds of

people. Heterotopia is "thus a disruptive force, a way to think about things differently" (Bairagya, 2020, p.1). A parental bed, for example, which Foucault refers to on a radio broadcast, is a part of real space and it “mirrors what is around” (Johnson, 2006, p.76) and creates many whimsical alternative spaces when it becomes a playground for children:

> In this bed a child can discover the ocean by swimming between the covers or the sky by bouncing on the springs and leaping into the air; the great bed becomes a forest where one can hide or a zone of titillating pleasure because the child knows that punishment will follow when the parents return (Boyer, 2008, p.,53).

Since heterotopias allow one to approach what is around - either a system or another space - in a different way, they consequently offer a new ordering that contrasts the existing one and from which “a shock effect [might] derive” (Hetherington, 2003, p.42) as it happens in the case of Chinese Encyclopaedia, which “shatter[s] the landmarks of [Foucault’s] thought” (Foucault, 2005, p.xvi). The heterotopia of the Chinese Encyclopaedia is able to bring together real and imaginary animals only in the non-space of language while our pre-established system of thought and language, as “the limitation of our own”, does not allow such a juxtaposition. The classification offered in the Encyclopaedia exists as an alternative to show how the prevalent system of thought has predetermined and limited the extent of what can be thought. In a way, it challenges the existing thought system. When heterotopia challenges and offers a different, alternative way of ordering, resistance might be seen as a natural outcome.

Although heterotopic space is different from the spaces of mainstream society, it is connected to the other spaces around. It poses a challenge to the system conducted

by that mainstream society or to "the way we think, especially the way our thinking is ordered" (Hetherington, 2003, p.42) via those spaces. Instead of complying with the order, heterotopia stands up against it. Heterotopia resists, however, the controlling order not by rebelling or criticizing but by indicating the possibility of alternative spaces. Scholars, such as Topinka and Hetherington, point out that the spaces surrounding heterotopia play a part in its challenge and resistance. According to Topinka, contrary to utopias, heterotopias are not completely outside of the order and because they are connected to real spaces, they challenge and "hold up an alternate order to the dominant order, providing glimpses of the governing principles of order" (Topinka, 2010, p.60). Similarly, Hetherington, too, suggests that it is necessary to bear in mind that heterotopia is not just a space in itself but it "perform(s) in relation to other sites" (Hetherington, 2003, p.49). Thanks to their relations and connections to other real spaces, heterotopias are able to make the flaws in the prevalent order visible, "reveal … the contradictions" that a society is unable to overcome, and defy the order and offer alternatives (Dehaene& De Cauter, 2008, p.25). The alternatives they provide help heterotopias cast a doubt on the conviction that the existing order which people are a part of is the only one. They reveal the possibility that "ours is not the only order, that there are other ways" (Dennis, 2017, p.169). Thus, by showing the likelihood of generating alternative orders, heterotopias intrinsically challenge and resist the existing orders. As Hetherington argues the spaces of alternative ordering, heterotopias, pave the way for "resistance to hegemony" (Topinka, 2010, p.59) and to "the taken-for-granted mundane idea of social order that exists within society" (Hetherington, 2003, p.40).

Besides enabling alternative ordering to show "resistance towards the normalizing rationales of government" (Beckett & Campbell, 2017, p.172),

heterotopias also “provide an escape route from power” (Johnson, 2006, p.86). Considering Foucault’s statement that reads “Where there is power, there is resistance” (Foucault, 1978, p.95), it is arguably possible to relate the concept of heterotopia to Foucault’s understanding of power in terms of resistance. In Foucault’s reasoning power creates “resistant bodies” (Beckett & Campbell, 2017, p.173). Similar to the approach emphasizing the interconnection between utopia and dystopia which has been discussed earlier in this thesis, or the relationship between heterotopia and the spaces around, Foucault’s idea of power focuses on the relationship that includes “individuals, groups, institutions and structures” and “shifting and changing relations among and between” (Taylor, 2014, p.3) these variables. This might be the reason why Foucault prefers not to use the word power alone when referring to the concept: “I hardly ever use the word ‘power’,” Foucault states, “and if I do sometimes, it is always a short cut to the expression I always use: the relationships of power” (Foucault as cited in Taylor, 2014, p.3).

In his understanding, power is not in a repressive form. Instead, Foucault argues that power can only be exercised over free subjects who are able to respond to the one who acts upon them. In the case of slavery, for example, there is no relationship of power because the slave is in chains and unable to react (Foucault, 1982, p.790).

> “…a power relationship can only be articulated on the basis of two elements which are each indispensable if it is really to be a power relationship: that "the other" (the one over whom power is exercised) be thoroughly recognized and maintained to the very end as a person who acts; and that, faced with a relationship of power, a whole field

> of responses, reactions, results, and possible inventions may open up (Foucault, 1982, p.789).

In the context of power and resistance, heterotopia arguably takes its place by emerging as the place where these free subjects can react in the relationships of power. It might not be right to study Foucault's power only in repressive form, however, when heterotopia is combined with resistance, individual subjects respond to and resist the oppression they face in a relationship of power by acting in and through heterotopic spaces. Heterotopic spaces allow them to resist the restricting order which requires the individuals to adopt the expected set of behaviours and way of thinking enforced upon them by the dominant order. Individuals who fulfil this requirement help the order achieve its goal - the sameness among the members of the society. However, "Heterotopia opens up pathways for the deconstruction of sameness and its subversion" and is "both a result of such oppression as well as a response to it" (Palladino, 2015, p.72).

To sum up, the resistance shown by heterotopia does not aim to disparage or openly criticise the existing order. The heterotopian form of resistance is not "based on [the idea of] a space of liberation" contrary to utopia. Instead, heterotopic space "facilitate[s] and organize[s] resistance practices" (Beckett, 2017, p.174) and enables individuals to act against the order. It refuses to be a part of the order (Hetherington, 2003, p.47) and helps society notice the possible alternative orders in contrast to "what is regular and regulated in our environment" (Dennis, 2017, p.168). Thus, heterotopia has an unsettling effect on the order. This is also because by creating alternative spaces where individuals act against the restraining one, it "challenge[s] all settled representations; it challenges order and its sense of fixity and certainty" (Hetherington, 2003, p.50). As long as people are aware of the defects of the order and

opt for exploring the alternatives that are introduced by heterotopias, resistance by heterotopias functions to prevent “dreams [from] dry[ing] up, espionage [from] replace[ing] adventure, and the police [from replacing] the pirates” (Foucault, 2008, p.22). Otherwise, any situation where heterotopias disappear or are non-existent will cause the formation of “surveillance societies” of dystopias and of the oppression these societies want to exercise (Dennis, 2017, p.168). Applied as a tool in dystopias to control people, the concept of memory as one of the heterotopic spaces that provide people with the opportunity to resist oppression will be discussed in the next part.

2.3. Memory

In dystopian fiction that describes surveillance societies and totalitarian governments, the concept of memory, either individual or collective, has always been an important theme since it is used to create individuals and societies that act in accordance with the demands and interests of the governing order. Memory is deployed to rewrite the past, re-construct the present and control the future. While it is a tool of manipulation for the government, for the individuals it is a tool of preserving identity and “independence of thought and action” (Opreanu, 2013, p.17). This part of the chapter starts with explaining the memory and identity relationship and continues discussing memory as a heterotopic space which allows resistance by individuals towards the manipulative and oppressive attempt of the totalitarian order in dystopian fiction .

Definitions of memory and the treatment of the concept have varied according to the contexts and the disciplines it is used in. In his "Memoires for Paul de Man", for example, Derrida refers to altering meanings of the word mémoire in French depending on its “generic determination (masculine / feminine) or its number

(singular / plural)" and concludes that memory is "hardly translatable" (Derrida, 1989, p.16). Yet, memory has become a topic of discussion starting from classical antiquity.

In *Theaetetus*, through the dialogue between Socrates and Theaetetus, Plato explores knowledge linking it to memory. He likens memory to a wax tablet on which "we imprint … whatever we wish to remember from among the things we see or hear or the thoughts we ourselves have" (Rowe, 2015, p.70). According to him, humans have innate knowledge and through remembering, which is activated by the objects of 'the sensible world', they can access this knowledge. Aristotle starts defining memory by distinguishing it from expectation and perception, the concepts which he associates with future and with present respectively. In *On Memory*, he claims that memory is related to the past because it is not possible to remember what is perceived now. He explains that one perceives the thing the moment they see it, which occurs in the present, and since memory requires a time-lapse to remember what is experienced, only after some time passes "one remembers now what one saw or otherwise experienced formerly"(451a31). For Aristotle, in order to remember, one "must say within himself that he formerly heard or perceived or thought of that"(449b22-23). In "Aristotle on Memory and the Self", Julia Annas claims that Aristotle's definition of memory fits personal memory and she concludes what is stored in the memory is the "image [that] represent[s] something in the past [and] one's past experiences of the object"(Annas, 1986,p.108).

In the seventeenth century, although it has some drawbacks and faced rejections, a different and new treatment of memory was introduced by John Locke. When he presents memory as a key factor in forming personal identity, he offers a novel understanding of the concept which focuses on "self-knowledge" instead of

“knowledge acquisition” provided earlier by the ancient philosophy (Clucas 2015, p.174). In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Locke’s theory of personal identity is based on consciousness and memory. He claims that an individual's past experiences that are stored in memory are brought into consciousness by remembrance and “as far as consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person”(Locke 1690,319 ed.). "For Locke, ... personal identity is identical with remembering one’s own actions ... [and] with consciousness" (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). Locke does not exclude forgetting from his theory, though. He recognizes that individuals might fail to recall or lose "the memory of certain parts of his life" (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). In such cases, he concludes, the individual is not the same man as the performer of the actions since "his consciousness does not extend to that period of his life (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). In sum, as long as one can remember a past experience, this experience is a part of the identity and it is what makes this person in the present the same as the person in the past. Therefore, it would not be wrong to associate what is referred to as memory in Locke’s theory with ‘individual memory’ because of its connection to personal identity and consciousness.

According to Scottish philosopher Thomas Reid, too, the fact that a person remembers a past action indicates the existence of this person at the time when the action takes place. In other words, memory validates that the person who remembers is the performer of the action (Klein & Nichols, 2012). The awareness of being “the same person as someone in the past” is raised through memories and helps constitute personal identity. As well as philosophical discussions about memory and identity relation, Stanley Klein and Shaun Nichols’ case study makes contributions to the topic from a neurological point.

Episodic and semantic memories are two types of memory. While semantic memory records concepts, facts like grammar or algebra, and general knowledge which does not have any relations to experiences, episodic memory records personal experiences. Episodic memory is unique for each person so it can be a resource to turn to which reveals “traits of self-knowledge” (Klein & Nichols, 2012, p.681). In the case study that Klein and Nichols discuss, a patient named D.B. is unable to remember any of his past experiences because of the damage to his episodic memory after he suffers from a cardiac arrest and brain injury. In addition, it is concluded that since he cannot remember the past, he cannot conceive of himself in the future. “This absence of episodic memory in D.B. explains his lack of a sense that he existed in the past. Episodic memory seems to be essential for the sense of personal identity across time" (Atance and O’Neill 2005).

Collective memory is another important term regarding memory and identity. It was coined by French philosopher and sociologist Maurice Halbwachs and refers to memories that are common to and shared by a group. Although individual memory and collective memory seem to be in conflict with each other, for Halbwachs, they are associated in that individual memory is like a component of collective memory. “[I]t is in society that people normally acquire their memories [and] [i]t is also in society that they recall, recognize, and localize their memories” (Halbwachs, 1992, p.38). Individuals recall their memories in the group, of which they are a member, through interaction and with the help of other members i.e. meeting a friend after a long time evokes memories and “past events stand out more sharply” (Halbwachs, 1980, p.22-23). Halbwachs does not put the individual memory completely aside but he believes that what is stored in the individual's memory “is connected with the thoughts that come to us from the social milieu”(1992, p.53) and is recalled as long as they are

associated with the group. After all, by being a part of a group, an individual identifies himself with the group's concerns and thoughts (Whitehead, 2008, p.126). Accordingly, Halbwachs also claims that memories are 'reconstructed' by the present society. "[A]s our conceptions of the past are affected by the mental images we employ to solve present problems, so that collective memory is essentially a reconstruction of the past in the light of the present" (Coser, 1992, p.372).

The relationship between memory and identity makes memory one of the key concepts like the idea of totalitarian control in dystopian narratives. The constant control and collective mentality of the state in dystopias target individual identity and make it cease to exist so that individuals, who are no different from a machine lacking any control over their minds, can serve the state's interests. Since individual memory and collective memory can be said to be fundamental to identity and society respectively, practices of the totalitarian state on memory allow it to re(shape) or exterminate individuals and create a new society with a tailor-made collective memory. The practices of the state are manipulative. As it will be discussed in the next chapters, when a manipulative attempt, which is intended to idealize the society, is initially directed towards the individual memory and ultimately collective memory, the so called ideal society turns into a dystopian one in the novels *The Memory Police* and *The Giver*. In such societies, what citizens need to remember and forget is determined through the effects of manipulation, and thus citizens cease to be individual beings and become a part of the totality which favours sameness. However, the manipulation of memory might not have the same effect on every individual and these individuals notice the flaws in the imposed order. It is then that they focus on the existence of alternative orders. As the subjects that face the oppression, they are also able to retreat into their memory to withstand the manipulation and oppression.

Everything they struggle to remember and resist forgetting takes place in their memory. As long as they hold onto their memory, they succeed in preserving their identity and resisting oppression because "[c]ulture [or an individual] absent of memory ceases to exist, or rather, never forms in the first place" (Hanson, 2020, p.2).

> Heterotopian spaces are spaces that present an order which is completely different – even opposite – to that of real spaces. Within the context of dystopian literature, heterotopias represent a kind of a haven for the protagonists, and are very often to be found in their memories, in their dreams, or in places which, for some reason, are out of the reach of the invigilation system which normally prevails in those societies (Vieira, 2010, p.18).

Therefore, memory acts as a heterotopic space and provides individuals with the insight into the system they are ruled by, with the chance to resist what oppresses them and the space where they can continue to exist.

In accordance with the ultimate aim of this thesis, the discussions in the next chapters will focus on memory as a heterotopic space of resistance to the attempts of totalitarian control in the novels *The Memory Police* and *The Giver.*

CHAPTER 3: Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Memory Police*

In the dystopian novel *The Memory Police* (2019), Yoko Ogawa, inspired by *The Diary of Anne Frank* (Rich, 2019), tells the story of a struggling woman who resides on an island where the government group called the Memory Police forces the disappearance of things from the island and citizens' memory. The novel was first published in its original language, Japanese, in 1994 and was translated into English in 2019 by Stephen Snyder. Despite being translated 25 years after its publication, it has been well-received by English-speaking readers (The Nippon Foundation, 2020). While the novel deals with many universal themes of dystopian fiction such as trauma, surveillance society, authoritarianism, (loss of) memory and resistance, memory will be the main focus of this chapter. Memory, both individual and collective, is the space where memories and experiences of the past are stored. Depending on what is kept there, individuals create meanings and at the same time build their identities. Therefore, in a dystopian setting, memory is the target of power structures that aim to control individuals and create a collective memory later which coincides with the power structures' ideals. When the memory is suppressed by the authority for manipulative purposes, individuals do not manage to refer to the experiences they had in the past to interpret the situation they face in the present. For them, oppression continues but they do not act against the authority. However, if they can recall memories, people in this dystopian setting possibly discover that the past is better than the present and an alternative order might exist in the present as it did in the past, and they end up resisting what is enforced upon them. When it faces the oppression of authority, memory becomes a heterotopic space where individuals feel the urge to preserve and retain their memories. As a heterotopia, it provides the chance to stand up against the power structure and an "escape route from power" (Johnson, 2006,

p.86) because retaining memories despite the attempts of the authority is an act of resistance against its goals. In the novel *The Memory Police*, it is observed that the protagonist fails to preserve/remember her memories and identity from the authority of The Memory Police and consequently, she cannot resist the oppression without a heterotopic space of memory while the editor R keeps his memories intact in the heterotopic space and survives the oppression. This chapter aims to analyze memory in *The Memory Police* as a heterotopic space, from the perspective of Michel Foucault, by associating it with resistance against the attempts of totalitarian control. Additionally, considering the idea that memory has a role in constructing identity, this chapter also explores how identity disappears unless the memory is preserved and used in an act of resistance.

Yoko Ogawa's *The Memory Police* depicts a dystopian society that is set on an unnamed island under the control of an authoritarian rule. The authority of the government is imposed on the citizens of the island by The Memory Police by forcing the disappearance of living and non-living things from the island and the memories of the inhabitants. In the novel, what disappeared first and when it disappeared is not revealed. The technique the Memory Police apply to erase the memories of the people is never mentioned either. People wake up to the day feeling that something has disappeared from the island. When something vanishes overnight, it simultaneously starts to vanish from people's memories. "If it is a physical object", people are supposed to get rid of it either by burning or burying it in their gardens or throwing it into the river before its memory fades away. And before long, people continue their lives without remembering what happened and what disappeared.

The story of *The Memory Police* is narrated from the perspective of a young woman novelist, who has no memories of the lost objects because the disappearances

started before she was born. She has published three novels that are clearly influenced by her living conditions. Each one of her novels was about "something that had been disappeared" (Ogawa, 2019, p. 15). The first one tells the story of a piano tuner who is searching for her lover who has vanished, the second one is about a ballerina who lost her leg, and the third one is about a young woman who looks after her younger brother whose chromosomes are damaged by a disease. The final novel she is working on is about a typist who loses her voice. Similar to the character in her last novel, she, too, starts working as a typist when the books disappear after the order of the Memory Police. While struggling to continue her life on the island, she is accompanied by the Old Man, who is a dear friend to the narrator and who has known her since she was a little girl, and her editor, R, who is not affected by the disappearances unlike the narrator and the Old Man.

The society of the island is structured by the totalitarian regime, represented by the Memory Police, through repeated and forced interventions in the memory of the citizens with the purpose of preventing them from imagining or dreaming a better or different present and future compared to the one they established. The reason is that memory is the space where past experiences are stored and it has an important role in configuring the present and future thanks to past experiences. Relying on these experiences, memory "interpret[s] and integrat[es] new information" (Seng & Chadran, 2020, p.101), which in the end helps individuals to compare the past with the present. By ".. discovering through memory that life in the past was better than in the present, dystopian dissidents, ... find a focal point in the past that channels their resistance" (Hanson, 2020, p.10). In the context of the dystopian setting of *The Memory Police*, individuals' ability to make comparison, which is provided by memory, turns memory into a heterotopic space because as long as they keep their

memories safe there and remember their past experiences, the discovery and resistance Hanson mentions are realized. Then, they are able to compare past and present situations of the society, see the "brutal methods" (Ogawa, 2019) of the government, notice the effects of disappearances on the island and the inhabitants, and show resistance against the system conducted by this government.

> It’s subtle but it seems to be speeding up, and we have to watch out. If it goes on like this and we can’t compensate for the things that get lost, the island will soon be nothing but absences and holes, and when it’s completely hollowed out, we’ll disappear without a trace (...)When I was a child, the whole place seemed…how can I put this? … a lot fuller, a lot more real. But as things got thinner, more full of holes, our hearts got thinner, too, diluted somehow (Ogawa, 2019, pp.53-54).

On the other hand, to prevent the possible resistance, the Memory Police repress and try to control the people's memories through disappearances leaving them no chance for comparison. Since there is no limitation for the disappearances on the island, anything might vanish at any moment: birds, roses, hats, ribbons, calendars, maps, perfume, music boxes, and even words and body parts. Along with the objects, all memories vanish too. When hats disappear, for example, people neither remember hats nor their memories of hats. If a disappearance affects people's jobs, they find "some other line of work quickly" (Ogawa, 2019, p.9) and the man who makes hats, for example, starts making umbrellas, or "a mechanic on the ferryboat, [becomes] a security guard at a warehouse" (Ogawa, 2019, p.9). After the disappearance of hats, the narrator states that people who made hats earlier "seemed to have no regrets about

losing the old one" (Ogawa, 2019, p.10) even if now they cannot make as much money as they did in their previous job. As people have no information or memory to recall, they are not able to compare then and now and resist doing the new job in a worse condition. Without the heterotopic space of the memory, for them, the act of resistance is not initiated.

Besides thinking about past and present thanks to memories, retaining memories against the will of the Memory Police is itself an act of resistance that starts in the heterotopic space since it is where the memories related to the lost objects and concepts are kept. Forgetting which prevails in the society indicates the power of the authority over the subjects and it is required to be performed by all in the society. As the only authority on the island, the Memory Police consider the resistance to forgetting as a violation of its authority. As a result, they hunt down the people whose memories cannot be erased. That some people are immune to forgetting enforced by the Memory Police is revealed in the first chapter of the novel when the narrator tells a memory she has with her mother. Her mother - a sculptor - is not affected by forgetting and she feels bitter about how "people who live here haven't been able to hold such marvellous things in their hearts and minds" (Ogawa, 2019, p.3). Since she can remember, she does not discard the objects that are supposed to vanish. Instead, she keeps some of them in the drawers of an old cabinet in her studio and also inside her sculptures. When they spend time together in the studio, the mother shows a bell, a stamp, and perfume to her daughter. Then she starts telling what they are and shares her memories about them with her daughter. Unfortunately, the daughter cannot remember any of them. The mother is the first person introduced whose memory functions as a heterotopic space and who fights against the Memory Police by not forgetting. While she hides objects in her old cabinet, in a real place, she keeps what

she experienced due to these objects in her memory, in an abstract place. Without her memories of these objects, there is no meaning to hide them from the Memory Police because it is not the objects that trigger resistance, but the memories of them. Therefore, it might be claimed that in order to resist, the characters need that heterotopic space of memory and keep remembering.

As the novel progresses, the narrator reveals that the people who don't lose their memories of the things that vanished like her mother hide from the Memory Police in places such as safe houses, "storage rooms, under the beds, in the back of closets" (Ogawa, 2019, p.64). The reason is that they are a threat to the order the Memory Police has established and determined to keep having. People who still remember already resist the manipulation of the Memory Police by not forgetting any memories and concepts in the first place, and this is considered a violation of the authority for the Memory Police. In addition, for those individuals, memory is a heterotopic space where past and present, individual and collective experiences are juxtaposed without conflicting with each other as the third principle of heterotopia argues. Their memory as a heterotopia distinguishes them from other people because contrary to others, they still remember what the past is like and they might compare it to the present. The comparison they possibly make provides them with an insight into the actions and motives of the Memory Police, and eventually, they might observe the outcomes of the intervention of the Memory Police into memory. As a result, instead of a society where "the citizens were ... quite accustomed to these losses" (Ogawa, 2019, p.65) they might claim a better version of it - a society, for example, where "the next thing to disappear would be the Memory Police themselves" (Ogawa, 2019, p.237).

Aside from prompting the idea of a different but better order, the heterotopic space of memory also ensures people's awareness of identity. By not following the instruction of the Memory Police to forget, they basically resist giving up their identities and becoming like the others, who are used to "the methods ... by the Memory Police [which] were becoming more and more brutal" (Ogawa, 2019, p.64). In other words, they refuse to be a part of a group of identical individuals shaped by the Memory Police leaving them with almost no personal memories. According to the Memory Police, preserving the memories means that they cannot “weaken their [citizens’] sense of individual identity” and thus cannot make them act like “the social whole” (Walsh, 1972, p.143). Since the Memory Police try to create a collective mentality and memory, the solution they have for the individuals who do not fit into the social whole is to exterminate them completely, which is why these people hide from them. In the novel, when the Memory Police can identify the ones who remember, they have the right to search for them everywhere they can. If anyone is caught, the punishment they receive is the disappearance of their existence, like all the rest that disappeared from the island, by getting executed. The narrator's mother is an example of the people who are killed by the Memory Police.

> ... some people, like my mother, did not lose their memories of the things that had disappeared, and the Memory Police began taking them all away. Though no one had any idea where they were being held.” (Ogawa, 2019, p. 13)

> it became increasingly common to hear that someone had suddenly vanished—a friend from the next town, an acquaintance from school, a distant relative of the fishmonger. You never knew whether

> they had been taken away or had been fortunate enough to find a place to hide—or if the place they'd been hiding had been discovered and they'd been arrested (Ogawa, 2019, p.65).

In this way, the Memory Police and the government it represents become the typical powerful state in a dystopian setting which "attack[s] dystopian citizens in both body and mind" in order to control them in line with its benefits (Gerhard, 2012, p.15). They attack citizens' minds and memory by forcing them to forget while attacking them in the body by limiting them in their actions, by not permitting them to keep any objects and by ceasing their bodily existence. It might be claimed that the manipulation of memories is the form of the attack in mind since people, who forget, even cannot think about resisting or complaining about the order of society. As for the body, the power of the authority is felt most when people forget about their own body parts: first, the left leg, next the right arm, and then gradually the whole body.

> The problem was the pants, which seemed to have two openings. Once I'd slid my right leg into one of them, I had no idea what to do with the other... I finally realized what had disappeared: my left leg. I had trouble getting down the stairs without falling. Holding on to the railing, I had to drag the thing—my disappeared leg—one step at a time. .. The neighbors were... in the street outside... [they] seemed to be wondering how to deal with their own bodies (Ogawa, 2019, p.247).

However, while the purpose of the Memory Police is to perpetuate the authority over the people through their body and mind in the novel and erase their sense of identity from the memory, the excessive control is implied to lead to their own

"disappearance" as well since there are no individuals left to control for them after the disappearance of people's whole bodies.

As for identity, the manipulation directed towards heterotopic space of memory to reduce individuality might have serious outcomes regarding identity construction as well. By enforcing the disappearances, the Memory Police manipulate the memory of the citizens and obviously aim to control them and reduce them into beings that have no identities and no will to resist but follow any orders for the sake of the government. As mentioned earlier, memories help construct identities, too, so losing the memories that are significant to identity formation might shatter the self-knowledge of the individual about who he is and was. That the narrator, the island, and the Old Man are presented as unnamed characters in the novel, is arguably an outcome of their lacking memories fundamental to their identity, the most important of which is their names. The names of the characters are never mentioned, probably because they have already forgotten them. Considering there is “a close connection [...] between an individual's name and her/his personal identity and sense of self” (Dion, 1983, p.245), they might not fully acknowledge who they are when they don’t remember their names. By erasing memories including the names, the Memory Police destroy people’s individual existence, which is a foremost result of the Memory Police’s manipulation of memory. In the end, when people forget about their identities, they become similar to each other and form a society with a collective memory in which everybody remembers what only the Memory Police determine.

Considering the role of memory in identity formation, it might also be claimed that the heterotopia of memory resembles the mirror heterotopia that Foucault explains in "Of Other Spaces" because similarly, it allows people to perceive

themselves but through memories this time. In "Of Other Spaces", Foucault says that the mirror is a heterotopia because it enables the subject to observe himself in a place where he is actually absent. That is to say, the subject sees himself existing in a place where he is not present. In the case of memory, as a heterotopia it creates a similar situation. When people remember a past experience along with where and when they had this experience, they go back to that place and time even though they really do not exist in that place at the moment of remembering. During the process of recalling the past experiences, they can constitute themselves in that place and time through memory. This also means that the performer of the past action and the one who remembers it now are the same person, which proves that this experience is a part of his identity. In the novel, it is seen that the narrator lacks having a recollection of objects the Memory Police erased so it might be concluded that every disappearance of objects and related memories causes losses in her identity, too. However, in the second chapter of the novel, the narrator remembers the memories of her father, who was an ornithologist long before the birds disappeared. She remembers her father working in his office while she was with him.

> I would sit on my father's lap and study his creatures through his binoculars. The shape of a beak, the color of the feathers around the eyes, the way the wings moved—nothing escaped his notice as he worked to identify them. The binoculars were too heavy for a little girl, and when my arms grew tired, my father would slip his hand under them to support the weight (Ogawa, 2019, p.8).

It is revealed that she tries to hold on to these memories since they are the only ones that remain for her. She strives to keep "the traces of [her] father's presence" (Ogawa,2019,p.14) by preserving the room he used to study in the house as it was

until the Memory Police arrived to check if they could find "anything that contained the word 'bird' "(Ogawa, 2019, p.13). Later, she uses her father's room to write her novels.

> I work in my father's old room. But it's much neater and more orderly now, since my novels require no notes or other materials. My desk holds only a stack of paper, a pencil, a small knife to sharpen it, and an eraser. Though I've tried, I've found no way to fill in the voids left by the Memory Police (Ogawa, 2019, p.16).

Since she can observe her father and herself again in that room through her memory it can be considered an example of her memory as heterotopia. Throughout most of the novel, she is unable to remember the disappeared objects, so she does not show any resistance against the Memory Police without her memories. However, this memory of her father about how he works and spends time with her is the one that is out of the Memory police's reach. It can be claimed that this might be a reason why she chooses her father's study to create a safe room under its floorboards to protect R - the editor of her books and a man who keeps his memories of the lost objects - from the Memory Police. Since the memory Police cannot reach the room, they cannot reach the memories that are going to be kept there so the room can be considered an indicator of her individual resistance. Even if she is vulnerable to the Memory Police as she does not remember the lost objects and related memories, the safe room as a heterotopia is not. This room welcomes and hides not only R but also the objects that R and the narrator's mother tried to keep secretly from the Memory Police. In addition, because her memory about her father is an important part of her identity, by building the safe room based on this memory, the narrator probably tries to keep her identity intact against the Memory Police, as well.

Every disappearance enforced by the Memory Police on the people creates a void in their hearts and memories since they lose the bonds they have grown with these objects and all associated meanings and memories about them. The safe room, and also the secret, the narrator builds with the help of the Old Man functions as a heterotopia that is out of reach of the Memory Police and so it is there to fill the void the narrator feels. In the novel, in addition to the objects that vanish, the narrator also loses her people. She first loses her mother when she is taken away by the Memory Police, then her father and the Old Man die. As she is a writer, she has a bond with books and when the Memory Police decide that books are to disappear, there appears another void for her. Until after building the safe room, it might be claimed that "though [she has] tried, [she has] found no way to fill in the voids left by the Memory Police" (Ogawa, 2019, p.16). Before the safe room, her struggles are probably in vain because these voids are hard to fill in for her as long as she is not able to recall what is missing and her memory does not allow her to resist disappearances. First of all, the safe room fills the void inside her becoming a heterotopic space that helps her to resist the instruction of the Memory Police. Even though the Memory Police are after the people who continue remembering, she hides one of these people, R in the room. They also keep hiding the objects that are supposed to vanish from the Memory Police. Both the objects R has with him and the things the narrator's mother hid before she was arrested and taken away are now stored in the room, and R sometimes shows these objects and explains what they are hoping that the narrator and the Old Man will also remember. Keeping all these objects hidden and touching and feeling them in order to remember is a practice that is not favoured by the Memory Police because by doing that they violate the system. So it might be concluded that they resist the Memory Police again thanks to the heterotopic space of the room. Another way that

the safe room as a heterotopic space fills the void she feels is that it allows her to have new memories if she can, and the new memories she gets through the hidden objects in this room stay there without vanishing. The narrator and the Old Man's first encounter with a lost object in the room is on the day they plan to celebrate the Old Man's birthday. R offers the Old Man a music box as a birthday present.

> R opened the lid, and as he did it almost seemed to me that warm rays of light came from his hands. The old man and I looked at each other and held our breath. … then we heard a sound coming from inside the box. … No record spinning, no hidden instrument, and yet a melody was coming from it. … As I listened, transfixed, I felt the same slow, spinning sensation that I felt every time something disappeared. … "It's like magic!" added the old man. "I don't know how I can accept a gift like this." … "It's not really magic," R said. "It's an orugōru." … We whispered it to ourselves again and again in order to commit it to memory. "It's a music box. It plays music all by itself thanks to an internal mechanism. You don't remember? Even when you're looking at one? … I desperately wanted to be able to tell R that I remembered, but no matter how hard I concentrated, the object sitting before me did not trigger a single memory. "So this is something that has already disappeared?" asked the old man (Ogawa, 2019, pp.144-145).

The music box is the first object R hides from the Memory Police and he states that as a person who is not affected by the disappearances, it is not possible for him to throw away any of the objects. He also adds that the existence of these objects proves

that he is “still a whole”(Ogawa, 2019, p.146). He is whole as a person and his identity is still intact, without any voids since he doesn’t lose any of his memories. R wishes the same for the old man and the narrator.

Like the music box that galvanizes R to keep the other objects and probably gives him the strength to stand up against the order of the Memory Police, a ferry ticket that the narrator’s mother hid inside one of her sculptures might be claimed as the proof of the mother’s resistance, too. Ships and maps have already disappeared when the novel starts, which means people have no idea about the borders of the island, other places around, or if there are any other places at all. However, the mother used to remember “the distant past when one could still take a boat to other places” (Ogawa, 2019, p.18) and believed an alternative place with an alternative order other than what the Memory Police established, and kept the ticket. When R asked the narrator if she could remember what the ferry ticket is, she replies that she doesn't. However, when she tries, she "seems to remember something but it's very vague" (Ogawa, 2019, p.212). She recalls the time that she sees the ticket in her mother's drawer and how carefully she takes it from her mother since she feels it is something valuable for her mother. Although she doesn't remember what it is, she remembers an associated memory, which might help her to fill the void she has. The music box, the ferry ticket, and all the objects that are kept hidden and safe in the secret room and the memories associated with them show that the resistance will continue as long as they are remembered, and the “hope for a better world beyond the island” (Leung, 2019) will be realized for people who do not forget.

Other than individual memories of the people and the safe room, there are different heterotopias which are connected to collective memory and therefore

targeted by the Memory Police as expected from a totalitarian authority. The Memory Police aim for collective memory that they shape so they terminate public places such as the library, rose garden, and ferryboat, all of which are listed as heterotopias by Foucault. In the fourth principle in "Of Other Spaces", Foucault explains that the library is a heterotopia of time - also called a heterochrony - where "all times, all epochs" are brought together. Libraries provide a collection of various books and materials created in different times in one specific place. While the archive they have continues to grow, they become places where the "accumulation of time" never stops. On the outside, a library is a part of the present time but on the inside, it offers "an absolute break with … traditional time" because, due to the collection it has, people can travel back and forth between different periods of time. Additionally, since they are heterotopias of time, they record time and can be considered the memory of society. For this reason, any attempt to destroy a library or book is inherently damaging for the collective memory. As the narrator states "Men who start by burning books end up by burning other men" (Ogawa, 2019, p.184). Without the books and the memories they preserve, it might not be possible to talk about the existence of individuals and the societies that the individuals form. When it is time for the novels to disappear in *The Memory Police*, the narrator is the one who is affected the most by the disappearance as a writer. She feels like "an important bond" (Ogawa, 2019, p.176), between herself and the books, is disappearing. The disappearance of the books means another void for her and another loss related to her identity. When the bond between her identity as a writer and her novels is broken following the disappearance, she has no memories left about her job and her works, and consequently, she is not able to identify herself as a writer anymore. She now lacks a key memory that helps constitute her identity. Accordingly, at the end of *The Memory*

Police, the narrator cannot survive because she neither is able to escape forgetting her memories nor losing her identity.

As for the collective memory, the disappearance of books and the library serves the purpose of the Memory Police to create it according to their advantage. The ritual is the same for the books. Everyone has to discard the books before their memories fade away. People start fires on the streets to burn the "books of all sorts—some in slipcases, some bound in leather, weighty tomes and slender novellas—piled together awaiting their turn in the flames" (Ogawa, 2019, p.179). The library is also on fire. The narrator discloses the reason why the Memory Police aim to erase the books and the library from the memories of people through the dialogue of the citizens that gathered around the fire to burn the books. And one of them hears that "they'll build a headquarters for the Memory Police someday" (Ogawa, 2019, p.183). In the collective memory of the society, the library is thus planned to be replaced by the Memory Police leaving no heterotopic space for them to realize the attempts of the Memory Police and resist.

Every disappearance on the island forces people to give up on the ideas, concepts, and meanings as well as the objects. Due to the disappearance of books, more words gradually disappear from the memory of the people and the language. Language is considered a tool, "a key weapon for the reigning dystopian power structure[s]" (Bacccolini& Moylan, 2003, p.5) like the Memory Police. According to Baccolini and Moylan, the resistance of the main character in dystopian fiction often manifests itself in the "reappropriation of language" because the power structure restrains its subjects by forbidding them to use the language. They argue that only if the protagonist gains the control of "language, representation, memory", the resistance

they show results in a change in the society, so it is clear that language has an essential role both in the manipulation process of totalitarian authority and the resistance of individuals to that authority. In the case of *The Memory Police*, the restriction of the language occurs due to the disappearance of the books, or rather textual heterotopias, from the memory of individuals. In *The Order of Things,* Foucault defines heterotopias as textual spaces that are located in language and contest language. Literature can be given as an example of textual heterotopias that contest language by offering a different ordering and relation between the language and things that exists in our knowledge. The Chinese Encyclopaedia that Foucault presents as a textual heterotopia, for example, offers a different classification of animals that does not exist in our system of thought but this classification is possible in the space of language and literature. Thus, it can be concluded that the existence of textual heterotopias requires language first before they "secretly undermine language ... destroy ‘syntax’ in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to ‘hold together’ (Foucault, 2005, p.xix). By erasing books and words, and consequently language, from the memory, the Memory Police cause the disappearance of this textual heterotopia while they destroy the 'real space' of library heterotopia at the same time. The outcome of the disappearance of these heterotopic spaces for the individuals on the island is that they now lack any spaces that remind them different orderings are possible and where they can show resistance to the authority in order to protect their identities. In the novel, for example, the narrator fears so much about “what will happen if words disappear” that she even avoids saying it loudly because “it might come true” (Ogawa, 2019, p.26). The reason why is that if it comes true, she will not be able to keep writing because she can’t remember the words. This also

means that she can't create or reappropriate the language that lets her resist unless she remembers. For the Memory Police, on the other hand, language becomes a tool through which they can easily reach the memory of people and manipulate it however they wish. As "the more restricted a language gets the easier it becomes for the government to control … what people think" (Baldwin, 2019, p.11), the Memory Police is able to create a society that follows their order without showing any signs of rebellion and resistance.

Considering the attempts of the Memory Police, all disappearances seem to be related to their aim to overpower the citizens in the dystopian society they established. As the characters in this dystopian setting, the narrator, the Old Man, R and the mother need to have the heterotopic space of memory to notice the flaws in the order and to act against the authority of the Memory Police. Memory provides them with the space where their experiences are stored, and thanks to this space and what is in there, they can realize how different the present is from the past, construct their identity and decide to resist the manipulative attempts and the oppression of the Memory Police. Memory includes both real and discursive spaces like a room, library or language, which are connected to memory and serve in a different way to the characters in their act of resistance. As long as the characters remember and hold onto their memories, they survive the oppression like the editor R, who never gives up remembering his name, the objects, books, the library, the words, and his limbs. Otherwise, like the protagonist of the novel, they fail to resist and fall victim to the Memory Police in the end.

CHAPTER 4: Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Giver*

As the second novel studied in this thesis, *The Giver* (1993) by Lois Lowry describes, too, a dystopian setting in which the inhabitants' memories have been erased by an unseen governing state for the totalitarian control to last. Unlike Ogawa's *The Memory Police*, however, in Lowry's world memories are not lost gradually. All the members of the community, except the protagonist Jonas, have already had no individual and collective memories regarding the past in that for the government in *The Giver* memory is a tool for the oppression of the citizens. Additionally, the absence of memory leads to the absence of individuality which results in the 'Sameness' that forms the basis of community in *The Giver*. Since "it is almost impossible to see that what is going on around us was not always the same" (Moylan, *Scraps* 26) without memories, by erasing memories the government also hinders any acts of resistance that might arise after a possible realization of the difference between past and present ruling order. Therefore, memory is arguably a heterotopic space, as it is in *The Memory Police,* that secures the idea of resistance against the flawed system. When compared to the protagonist who cannot resist the oppression as she is not able to hold onto her memories in *The Memory Police*, Jonas, the twelve-year-old protagonist of *The Giver* is well aware of the role of heterotopic space of memory in his resistance against the order in his community. This chapter aims to analyze memory in *The Giver* as a heterotopic space that helps the protagonist succeed in his opposition to the system of his so-called utopian society. The spaces that carry heterotopic characteristics, and therefore are attempted to be destroyed by the government, will also be examined in relation to the concepts of memory, resistance, and identity to discuss how Jonas realizes the government's control over the people and how he represents a successful example that stands up against oppression and

becomes an individual who can make his own choices thanks to heterotopia of memory.

The Giver narrates the story of twelve-year-old Jonas, who lives with his family unit in a community that is seemingly utopian, from a third-person point of view. The name of the community or its location is not mentioned. The community follows the guidance and rules of the Committee of Elders but it is also implied that there is a "larger political body"(Hanson, 2020, p.112) of which the community is a part. This larger political body delivers supplies by cargo planes or tracks down people if they try to escape. Traces of totalitarian control are observed both in the formation of society and in people's behaviours. The structure of the community has thoroughly been organized and people have neither control over their lives nor freedom of choice: the careers people will have are predetermined by the Committee of Elders after they are carefully observed starting from their childhood. When children turn twelve, they are assigned their jobs at the Ceremony of Twelve held every December. Assignments include being a Nurturer, Birthmother, Laborer, Instructor of Sixes, Caretaker of the Old as well as Doctor, Engineer, Law and Justice. The spouses they will have is also determined by the Committee because the Matching of Spouses is important for the community. An adult applies for a spouse and waits until the Committee agrees on a match whose "disposition, energy level, intelligence and interests ... correspond and ... interact perfectly" (Lowry, 1993, p.48). After the Matching of Spouses, a couple waits for three years before they are allowed to apply to have the children who are delivered by Birthmothers. And, the number of children a family has is limited to two - one boy and one girl. Jonas' family is formed in the same way. His father is a Nurturer and takes care of newborn babies at the Nurturing Centre. His mother works for the Department of Justice. He has a little

sister named Lily who has been given to the family as the second child. At the Ceremony of Twelve, Jonas is "selected to be ... [the] next Receiver of Memory" (Lowry, 1993, p.60). The position is considered to be "the most honored" (Lowry, 1993, p.61) because the Receiver is the only person who is able to keep "the memories of the whole world"(Lowry, 1993, p.77). The memories are transmitted by the Giver, who is actually the previous Receiver, in a community where all the members lack individual or collective memories of the past. The totalitarian control erases all memories of the people so that they live free from "the pain, knowledge and guilt of human history" (Levy as quoted in Hanson, 2020, p.111). However, together with painful memories, people also lose good, comforting, and useful memories. The government has built a society where people do not remember any memories and thus are easy to control and manipulate, and since people do not have the heterotopic space of memory, they cannot compare past and present, or realize that they lose what is good and bad altogether and ask for their freedom of choice. On the other hand, the reason why the Receiver keeps all the memories in this community is that the Committee uses the wisdom memories give (Lowry, 1993) before it makes a decision by consulting the Receiver. When the citizens wanted Birthmothers to give birth to four babies instead of three, the Committee decided not to change the number of births because the only memory the Receiver remembered was that of hunger, starvation and warfare caused by the rise of population.

The government aims for "Sameness" in The Giver, so as well as losing memories, the community is devoid of many things such as colours, music, and emotions. The government controls the climate and it never snows so that they grow food without any problems related to weather and transportation is better without

snow. Landscape changes, too. Hills disappear and it becomes more convenient for trucks and buses to move. In addition, skin, hair and eye colors are almost the same.

> The Giver shook his head. "No, flesh isn't red. But it has red tones in it. There was a time, actually - you will see this in the memories later - when flesh was many different colors. That was before we went to Sameness. Today the flesh is all the same, and what you saw was the red tones (Lowry, 1993, p.94).

Since sameness does not require any features regarding individuality, the state removes all memories. However, memories are important in identity formation because through these memories the individual confirms that the person who performed the action in the past and the person who remembers it are the same. As discussed in the previous chapter, in the novel *The Giver*, too, memory functions like a mirror heterotopia. Just as individuals can observe themselves in a mirror where they do not exist, they can go back again to the time and place by remembering memories. Because memories belong to them and are part of their identity.

The more Jonas receives memories, the more he understands the drawbacks of aiming for Sameness and giving up memories. As a result, as the keeper of memories, he becomes the only one who can make comparisons and judgements between past and present, and can decide to resist the order of his community. In his resistance, Jonas' only supporter is the Giver, the next person who has access to all the memories like Jonas.

The only act of resistance is shown by Jonas since he is the possessor of the memories. Although he first receives the memories of "generations before him" (Lowry, 1993, p.78) that he does not know they ever existed, then not only does he

realize how different the world was before Sameness but also he starts to have new, individual memories which "exist completely outside of his society's ideology" and which he "actively anticipate[s] a future with color, choices, and collectively held memories" (Hanson, 2020, p.119). The first principle that Foucault mentions while defining heterotopias is that every culture creates heterotopias so heterotopias are not universal. It can be claimed that they are unique to every culture. In the community in *The Giver*, however, it is not possible to talk about the presence of unique heterotopia of memory because this aspect of memory as a heterotopic space is targeted by the state. Due to the loss of all memories, which is a result of the state's policy of sameness, neither collective nor individual memory is formed. Thus, the state annihilates the possibility of resistance against society's system in the first place by not allowing the existence of memory. Apart from losing memories, having no collective memory is related to the way the state forms the family units in the community. The formation of family units does not allow memories to be transmitted or kept. Parents are given children without any bloodline due to Birthmothers. When children become old enough to have their own predetermined family units, parents and children are separated from each other, and until the day they are released, parents spend the rest of their lives in the House of the Old, where "they were so well cared for and respected" (Lowry, 1993, p.123). Therefore, a family unit does not include any grandparents, or in other words, any previous generations, who can transmit memories, history or traditions. That's why all the people in the community, like Jonas, "do not know what you [the Giver] mean when you say 'the whole world' or 'generations before him'. I thought there was only us...there was only now" (Lowry, 1993, p.78). In this way, the state prevents the formation of collective memory as well as individual memory of family members in order to control people and leave them no

space to realize the situation and resist. Without the heterotopic space of memory, the whole society that is formed by the family units never attempts to resist even the way they have their families. Additionally, considering "our identities are simply an accumulation of memories" (Simon, 2021), by having no space for memories, they are forced to give up their identities and conform with the state's idea of Sameness, as well.

Receivers of Memory have a quality that makes them different from the rest of the society and this quality signals that they will be the next Receiver. While the previous Receiver (The Giver) has the capacity to hear beyond, Jonas can see beyond. The Giver explains that through memories, he will be a lot wiser along with his capacity. The capacity Jonas has can arguably be considered a requirement to receive memories and to have the heterotopic space of memory, which later gives him the wisdom to understand the true nature of his community and to resist. According to the fifth principle, Foucault explains, heterotopias are not 'freely accessible'. Instead, they have an opening and closing system and they require some rituals to be fulfilled. A similar ritual and requirement go for Jonas to have the access to heterotopic space of memory, as well. First, he is identified with a capacity to see beyond by the Giver before he is chosen. He has to be twelve years old and as a ritual of his community, he is assigned to be the next Receiver at the Ceremony of Twelve. Additionally, the fifth principle also explains that some heterotopias create a kind of illusion when one enters these heterotopias. One enters and believes he is inside but he is actually excluded. Similarly, when Jonas becomes the Receiver, he turns into a kind of vessel for the memories of the past. Although he is the possessor of the memories, these memories do not fully belong to him. Since they are not his own memories, not his own experiences, just by being a vessel he is in a way excluded.

The place where the Giver transmits the memories to Jonas is the Annex behind the House of the Olds. The Annex is arguably another heterotopic space related to memory that might be associated with the fifth principle because it creates a kind of illusion. In the community, the spaces are designed and controlled by the state. Houses, for example, are identical to each other furnished only with “practical, sturdy” furniture such as "[a] bed for sleeping. A table for eating. A desk for sleeping” (Lowry, 1993, p.74). All the furniture in a house is only functional. Everywhere, including the family unit’s dwellings, is surrounded by loudspeakers for the announcements of the state and to remind the citizens of the rules in case of a violation. In addition, “[n]o doors in the community were locked, ever”. Since these places are products of the system, they are not heterotopic and they do not include any personal items or furniture that cause the formation of memories for the individuals. Instead, they are the spaces where the state’s surveillance and control is intensely revealed. The Annex, however, is different from the places in the community on the inside while it looks quite ordinary with an unremarkable door on the outside (Lowry, 1993). First of all, there is a lock on the door to ensure “the Receiver’s privacy” (Lowry, 1993, p.73). It has no loudspeakers for surveillance. Instead, there are lots of books inside the Annex, which Jonas sees for the first time, because in his house the only books allowed are “a dictionary, a … community volume [describing] every office, factory, building and committee. [And] the Book of Rules” (Lowry, 1993, p.74). The Annex is actually a part of the community and is located behind the House of the Old, but it is free from the rules and arrangements of the state, which “isolates [it] [but] makes [it] penetrable” (Foucault) at the same time. Therefore, by the time Jonas enters the Annex thanks to him being the Receiver of Memory, he symbolically

goes out of the community and its restrictions, which can be considered an illusion the Annex heterotopia creates.

As mentioned earlier, in the fourth principle of heterotopias, Foucault considers libraries as heterochronies where time is accumulated in one place through the written materials archived. A library is a part of the present time that it exists in but at the same time, it separates itself from the present since it brings together different ages and becomes a place beyond time. By providing the written records of the past that might turn into memories later for the next generations, they play a key role in emerging collective memory which the totalitarian state assumes to be a threat to their control. In order to eliminate the threat, the state in *The Giver* removes the books from the people's memory. Except for a dictionary, a community volume, and the Book of Rules that are among the limited furniture in the dwellings, the citizens in Jonas' community are not granted access to the books by the state. Similarly, throughout the novel, the existence of a library is not mentioned at all. Judging from Jonas' astonishment, it is confirmed that there is not one in the community and it is the first time he has seen a place that resembles a library. Since people have no memories of the past, books and libraries, and they are not educated about history or geography because of the erased memories related to other communities and cultures, Jonas concludes that these books must also be the books of rules.

> But this room's walls were completely covered by the bookcases, filled, which reached to the ceiling. There must have been hundreds - perhaps thousands - of books, their titles embossed in shiny letters.

> Jonas stared at them. He couldn’t imagine what the thousands of pages contained. Could there be rules beyond the rules that governed the community? (Lowry, 1993, p.74)

Jonas' conclusion is a result of the control of the state over the memory and individuals. The state has made books and libraries vanish from people's memories by erasing all the memories about them. In this way, it prevents the creation of collective memory and a possible resistance that might be resulted from the comparison between the past that books and libraries kept safe and the present with no books where control is easier but resistance is impossible.

The absence of books and emotions, colours, and even animals from the memories causes losses in the language, which is also used by the totalitarian state to control people in the novel. The state believes that "community can’t function smoothly if people don’t use precise language" (Lowry, 1993, p.127) so it forces them to use the precise language that excludes words to express feelings, colours and many other concepts and ideas because of lost memories. This precise language is an outcome of the state's attempt to destroy what Foucault mentions as “textual heterotopia” that can be found in language. Textual heterotopias, such as literature, are related to language and they show that in language, other orders, which are different from our usual thought system enforces, are possible. Therefore, the state's control over the language by removing books and certain words erases the idea of possible different orders that flourishes in textual heterotopias. Without textual heterotopia, the citizens do not have the space that reminds them theirs is not the only order, and that they can resist that order. As Baccolini and Moylan (2003) discuss that it is not possible for people to resist unless they possess control of language and memory. In the novel, before Jonas becomes the next Receiver and has the heterotopic space of

memory, he realizes the colour of an apple for a second, but in his community, there is no idea of colours. Nobody remembers the colours so the words explaining the colours do not exist in the language they use, too. As a member of the community, Jonas, too, cannot properly understand and explain what he sees because he lacks memory of colours and proper words. He can only name the incident as a "change" until he receives the memories of colours from the Giver:

> But suddenly, Jonas had noticed, following the path of the apple through the air with his eyes, that the piece of fruit had - well, this was the part that he couldn't adequately understand - the apple had *changed*. Just for an instant (Lowry, 1993, p.24).

Jonas continues to have memories that reveal how the state suppresses people through the language they use. He receives the memory about a family who celebrates a holiday - probably Christmas - and although he likes the memory "couldn't quite get the word for the whole feeling of it" (Lowry, 1993, p. 125). He cannot understand and name the feeling of 'love' even if he senses it because the state erases the memory of emotions and the words related to them. After this memory, the Giver tells him it is the feeling of love. Later, he asks his family if they love him but as an answer, he is told to use precise language because for them, as they have no memories of the concept, the word love is "meaningless" and "almost obsolete" (Lowry, 1993, p. 127). This experience of Jonas with his family can be claimed as the beginning of his individual resistance, that is, he stops taking his pills that are for suppressing Stirring, which refers to emotions and feelings of pleasure people start experiencing at the beginning of adolescence. In addition, after he learns more about emotions due to the memories, he starts to feel more affection for the baby Gabriel, who his father brings home to nurture him more and save him from being released. The concept of

releasing, too, shows the state's violation of language as a textual heterotopia. The community does not have memories and words that can be associated with pain or suffering, so the words like death, dying, and killing are all removed from the language while related emotions and memories are erased at the same time. As a result, people do not suffer from the pain and fear of dying, losing the loved ones, killing, and getting killed because they neither remember the memory and feeling nor have the words to describe the situation. Instead, they have the word "release". After a session with the Giver, Jonas learns about the horrors of warfare and what dying means. The memory of war he receives and a tape in which his father releases a baby help him realize the word 'release' actually means 'dying' in his community. He now knows that when somebody is released as a punishment or the olds and babies are released, they actually die. He understands that the "Release of the elderly, which was a time of celebration for a life well and fully lived" (Lowry, 1993, p.7) is a lie. The more memories he gets, the more he starts to believe that the society needs to remember.

> "Things could be different ... there must be some way for the things to be different... There could be colours...And grandparents...And everybody would have the memories" (Lowry, 1993, p.128).

The change Jonas mentions is only possible with the existence of a heterotopic space of memory in people because only if they have memories they can understand the flaws in the system of their seemingly utopian community. If they have memories back, they can compare the past and present. Although "it has been this way for what seems forever ... the memories tell (them) that it has not *always* been" (Lowry, 1993, p.154). Jonas cannot share his memories with them because of the rule that forbids him. However, even if he is determined to break the rule and share, he won't be able to

share any memories because words are not enough and they lack feelings. In order to give them their memories back and make them see the true nature of the state's actions, Jonas decides to flee to Elsewhere - the only place outside the community that is expected to offer what Jonas has in his memories. The escape of Jonas from the community means the release of the memories he keeps. If he reaches Elsewhere, the memories return to people and "they will acquire some wisdom" (Lowry, 1993, p.156) which paves the way for them to resist and claim their individuality back.

Carter F. Hanson describes the community in *The Giver* as "an engineered utopia gone wrong". The destructive and excessive intrusion of the totalitarian state into people's memories, individualities, and lives is arguably the main cause for the community to turn from a utopia into a dystopia. Since the members of the community do not have the heterotopic space of memory, they do not know about the past and the order enforced upon them. They cannot "[move] from apparent contentment into an experience of ... resistance" (Baccolini & Moylan, 2003, p.5) because they lack memories that provide them with knowledge about how different the present is actually from the past. They believe the suppressive order in their community is the only one. As a young boy who receives the memories of the past, Jonas proves the importance of keeping memories in case of resistance against any oppressive authority. In the real and discursive heterotopic spaces of memory like the Annex and language, Jonas keeps the memories, differentiates between good and bad, and finally understands the underlying purposes of the state unlike the rest of the community. Although Jonas' decision to leave the community seems to be an escape plan rather than an act of resistance, he actually shows that he turns his individual resistance into a collective one by creating the heterotopic space of memory for the people in his community, too, by releasing and returning the memories to them through his escape.

CHAPTER 5: Conclusion

This thesis has discussed that in the dystopian novels *The Memory Police* by Yoko Ogawa and *The Giver* by Lois Lowry, memory functions as a space with heterotopic features and foregrounds the idea of resistance for the characters who face the oppression of totalitarian authorities. It has additionally been argued that memory is fundamental to identity formation, and when memory is absent or disappears, identity starts to disappear along with it or is never constructed in the first place. Qualities of memory that turn it into a site of resistance for the characters in the novels have been explained based on Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia and on the principles he refers to when defining the concept. In both novels, it is observed that, in terms of individuals' resistance, heterotopic space of memory and other real and textual heterotopias related to memory exist in the presence of a dominant, restricting power structure, which exploits the memory of its subjects to continue to rule.

The determination and motivation to build a perfect society cause extreme control over people and turn a utopia into a dystopia, where oppressive societies conduct a hegemonic order. Both the unnamed protagonist, who is also the narrator, of *The Memory Police* and Jonas of *The Giver* are inhabitants in such dystopian societies, and the members of these societies have been restrained from reaching their memories. In the novels, how the governments manage to manipulate the citizens' memories and make them forget is not explained. Instead, the novels focus more on implying how societies function while people do not remember and on main characters' reactions to oppressive methods of the governments. Dystopian aspects of society in *The Memory Police* are presented through forced disappearances of objects and concepts from the memories of the people. Most of the inhabitants of the island helplessly forget their memories while The Memory Police hunt people who are

immune to forgetting. People have no control over their lives, their personal experiences against the restricting order. In *The Giver*, although citizens believe they live in a utopian society, the practices of the state prove otherwise. People's lives - careers, spouses, the number of children they have, the house they live in - have already been organized by the state. In this community, people have no memories of the past and therefore no feelings, like pain or fear. By depriving people of their memories and emotions, and by predetermining everything for them, the government demonstrates that a policy of sameness is pursued. Methods of the ruling authorities in the novels lead up to main characters' resistance shown by heterotopias.

In dystopian narratives, the leading character realizes the flaws in the system of society and starts questioning , which is later followed by his resistance. In the novels studied in this thesis, too, the characters start questioning the order in their own societies and resist at some point and their resistance is triggered by the memories of the past. The questioning and resistance allow them to anticipate a different and better version of society as opposed to a dystopian one. This is when heterotopia is included because in dystopian narratives heterotopias reveal the defects of the governing order. They create a space where the characters are illuminated, react and resist to realize a better society to live in. Thus, they are considered sites of resistance that contest the order established by the authority. However, the resistance that is shown is not a violent, destructive action, but rather a challenge to the prevailing order just because heterotopias show a different, probably better, order could be possible. In the novels, *The Memory Police* and *The Giver*, memory functions as a heterotopic site of resistance. In *The Memory Police,* it is a heterotopic space as the memories stored are like a passage that allows the characters to access the past and compare it to the present so that they can realize the "brutal methods" (Ogawa, 2019) of the Memory

Police and resist. R, the narrator's editor, is the one who has the heterotopic space of memories and can resist while the unnamed narrator lacks her memories, and so she does not have a truly heterotopic space to show resistance individually. However, she tries to resist by building a safe room inside her house and protects her editor, who is considered a threat to the prevalent order as his memories are still intact, from The Memory Police. The safe room, therefore, replaces the memory of the narrator. In *The Giver*, Jonas who has been chosen as 'the Receiver', becomes the only person who remembers. Thanks to the memories he receives from the Giver , he has access to the heterotopic spaces of memory and these memories provide him with a connection to the past full of colours, snow, hills, pain, and joy. Memories let him observe himself in the past and he is thus able to compare the past and present and in this dystopian setting Jonas becomes the one who starts questioning the system of his community and finds out the defects in this seemingly utopian environment.

Totalitarian power structures in dystopian narratives aim to drain subjects of their individual identities so that they can form a society consisting of people who are like robots without any differences, personal ideals, or interests. Memory is considered as an essential element for the formation of identity and has been discussed in relation to experience. John Locke, for example, elaborates on individual memory by connecting it to personal identity. He claims that remembering a past experience and the actions performed in the past show that the person who performed the action then and the person who remembers it now is the same because the experience of the past becomes a part of identity. Since it is almost fundamental for personal identity, memory becomes a tool for a dystopian government to manipulate and control people. They are stripped of their memories and lose their identities to later act according to the government's interests. In *The Memory Police*, the narrator, keeps losing her

memories and her identity, as well. When books and words disappear, an important part of identity as a writer disappears, too. In addition, the ending of the novel, where the protagonist eventually disappears, highlights that without memories and heterotopic spaces, which show that resistance is a requirement in oppressed societies, individuals lose their identities besides their memory and they perish, too. In *The Giver*, Jonas confronts a similar manipulation of the authority, as well. In the society he lives, the government favours sameness over individual identities. However, Jonas shoulders the burden of preserving all the memories his society forgets and challenges a life without memories, any colours, any harsh weather conditions or challenging landscapes. As a result, as an act of resistance, he plans his escape which lets his memories loose and affects the rest of the people by making them remember as well.

Not only individual memory but also collective memory is the target of totalitarian state in dystopias. In both novels, libraries are heterochronies, as explained in the fourth principle of Foucault, and libraries are where collective memory is established. In *The Memory Police*, library vanishes too, because the Memory Police aim to create a collective memory, through disappearances, which only they can control and shape. In *The Giver*, there are only some certain books allowed but there are no libraries, except the one in the Annex, in the community. The state does not build a library since memories, individual or collective, are not required. Additionally, without collective memory, the state avoids any threats of resistance that might be triggered by memories.

In the novels, there are textual heterotopic spaces connected to memory as well as the real ones. Following the disappearance of books, concepts and words along with the objects people are forced to use a limited language which is controlled by the Memory Police. The precise language people use in the community in *The Giver* is

again a creation of the state and it is as a textual heterotopia. Through the precise language, which does not contain any words for colours, emotions or animals, the state dominates people, for example, by not letting them talk about feelings. Since the people cannot use the language however they want, they actually cannot word their resistance.

Heterotopic spaces associated with memory like the safe room, the library and the language in *The Memory Police* and like the Annex, the library in the Annex and the precise language in *The Giver* are similar in the way they promote the protagonists' act of resistance. Although the protagonists' capacity to hold onto and bring back their memories in the communities where they suffer from loss of memory differs, the novels point out the same conclusion, that is, as long as one has the heterotopia of memory and can keep his memories intact, he will succeed in protecting his identity and in his resistance to oppression. It might even be possible that heterotopia of memory creates his personal utopia but this time in reality.

REFERENCES:

A., & Sandars, N. K. (1973).*The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Revised ed.) [E-book].Penguin Classics.

Annas, J. (1987). *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy: Volume IV: 1987 (Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy, 5)* (1987 ed.). Clarendon Press.

Aristotle, & Barnes, J. (1991). On Memory. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation, Vol. 1 (Bollingen Series LXXI-2)* (Revised ed.). Princeton University Press.

Ashworth, L.M. (2013). Dystopia And Global Utopias: A Necessary Step Towards A Better World?. In *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage* (pp. 69-71). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Baccolini, R., & Moylan, T. (2003).*Dark Horizons: Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*. Routledge.

Bairagya,K. (2020). Theory of Space/s: Rereading Foucault's 'Heterotopias' and its Various Implications. *postScriptum: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Literary Studies,5(2), 304-311*. https://zenodo.org/record/3972313

Baldry, H. C. (1952). Who Invented the Golden Age? *The Classical Quarterly, 2*(1/2), 83–92. http://www.jstor.org/stable/636861

Baldick, C. (2001). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Baldwin, M. (2019). The evolution of dystopian literature. *Ramapo College Honors Program*.

Beckett, A. E., Bagguley, P., & Campbell, T. (2017). Foucault, social movements and heterotopic horizons: rupturing the order of things. *Social Movement Studies*, *16*(2), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2016.1252666

Beiner, R. (2014). *Political Philosophy: What It Is and Why It Matters* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Blakemore, S. (1984).Language and Ideology in Orwell's 1984.*Social Theory and Practice*, *10*(3), 349–356. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571

Booker, K. M. (1994).*The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism (Contributions to the Study of Science Fiction & Fantasy)*. Praeger.

Booker, K. M. (1994).*Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide* . Greenwood.

Boyer, M.C. (2008).The many mirrors of Foucault and their architectural reflections. In M. Dehaene & D. L. Cauter (Eds) *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. Routledge.

Brisson, L.(2012). Women in Plato's *Republic.Étudesplatoniciennes*, 9, 129-136. http://journals.openedition.org/etudesplatoniciennes/277

Burd, H. A. (1915). The Golden Age Idea in Eighteenth-Century Poetry. *The Sewanee Review*, *23*(2), 172–185. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27532802

Claeys, G. (2010). *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature (Cambridge Companions to Literature)* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Claeys, G. (2017). *Dystopia: A Natural History*. Oxford University Press.

Clucas, S. (2015). Memory in the Renaissanceand Early Modern Period. In D. Nikulin (Ed) Memory: A History (pp.131-175). Oxford University Press.

Cohen, E. (2010). *Mass Surveillance and State Control: The Total Information Awareness Project*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Coser, L. A. (1992). The revival of the sociology of culture: The case of collective memory. *Sociological Forum, 7*(2), 365–373. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01125050

Davidson, L. (2013). Thoughts On Dystopia, From New Lanark. In *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage* (pp. 75-78). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Davies, B., &Funke, J. (2011).*Sex, Gender and Time in Fiction and Culture* (1st ed. 2011 ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dehaene, M., &Cauter, D. L. (2008).Heterotopia in a postcivil society. In *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. Routledge.

Dennis, A. (2017). Heterotopias: the possible and real in Foucault, Beckett, and Calvino. In R.T.Tally Jr. (Ed) *The Routledge Handbook of Literature and Space* (pp. 168-178). Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1989). *Memoires for Paul de Man* (Revised ed.). Columbia University Press.

Dillon, J. (1992). Plato and the Golden Age.*Hermathena, 153*, 21–36. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23041301

Dion, K.L. (1983) Names, Identity, and Self. *Names,* 31(4), 245-257. https://doi-org.lproxy.yeditepe.edu.tr/10.1179/nam.1983.31.4.245

Finley, M. (1968).Utopianism Ancient and Modern. In K. H. Wolff & M. Barrington, Jr (Eds.), *The Critical Spirit: Essays In Honor of Herbert Marcus* (pp.3-20). Beacon Press.

Foucault, M. (1978).*The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. (R.Hurley, Trans). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1982).The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, *8*(4), 777–795. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197

Foucault, M., Dehaene, M., &Cauter, D. L. (2008).Of Other Spaces (1967).In M. Dehaene, L. De Cauter (Eds.), *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. Routledge.

Foucault, M., & Miskowiec, J. (1986).Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics*, *16*(1), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.2307/464648

Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P. (1984). Space, Power, and Knowledge. In *The Foucault Reader* (pp.239-256).Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (A.Sheridan, Trans). Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2005).*The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* [E-book].

Fromm, E. (n.d.). *Erich Fromm - Afterword to George Orwell's 1984*. Scribd. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from https://www.scribd.com/doc/195275626/Erich-Fromm-Afterword-to-George-Orwell-s-1984

Genova, L. (2021). *Remember: The Science of Memory and the Art of Forgetting*. Harmony.

Gerhard, J. (2012). *Control And Resistance in The Dystopian Novel: A Comparative Analysis*. [Master's thesis, The California State University]. https://scholarworks.calstate.edu/concern/theses/44558f01z?sequence=1

Gordin, M. D., Tilley, H., & Prakash, G. (2010).*Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton University Press.

Habib, M.A.R. (2005). *A History of Literary Criticism From Plato to the Present*. Blackwell Publishing.

Halbwachs, M., & Coser, L. A. (1992). *On Collective Memory (Heritage of Sociology Series)*. University of Chicago Press.

Hanson, C. F. (2020). *Memory and Utopian Agency in Utopian / Dystopian Literature: Memory of the Future*. Routledge.

H., & West, M. L. (1988).*Theogony and Works and Days (The World's Classics)*.Oxford University Press.

Hetherington, K. (1997). *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering (International Library of Sociology)*.Routledge.

Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. W. (2002).*Dialectic of Enlightenment Philosophical Fragments - Cultural Memory in the Present* (G.S.Noerr, Ed) (E. Jephcott, Trans).Stanford University Press.

Horzum,Ş. (2017). "The Dialectic Interplay between Utopia and History: The Republic by Plato and Thomas More's Utopia". In D. Bozer (Ed) *Depictions of Utopias in English (pp*.17-38).Hacettepe University.

Işıkgil, S. (2017). A Study On Plato's Attitude Towards Women. FLSF FelsefeveSosyalBilimlerDergisi, 24, 393-404. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/804410

Jameson, F. (1994).*The Seeds of Time*.Columbia University Press.

Johnson, P. (2006). Unravelling Foucault's 'different spaces.'*History of the Human Sciences*, *19*(4), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695106069669

Johnson, P. (2013). The Geographies of Heterotopia. *Geography Compass*, *7*(11), 790–803. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12079

Kafar,M. (2014). Michel Foucault as a Heterotopia. In M. Kafar (ed.)*Scientific Biographies between the 'Professional' and 'Non-Professional' Dimensions of*

Humanistic Experiences (pp. 121-137). https://dspace.uni.lodz.pl/xmlui/handle/11089/26018

Kive, S. M. (2012). The other space of the Persian garden.*Polymath: An Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Journal*, *2*(3).

Klein, S. B., & Nichols, S. (2012). Memory and the Sense of Personal Identity. *Mind*, *121*(483), 677–702. https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/fzs080

Leung, J. (2019). A Paltry Little Scrap of the Past: Yoko Ogawa's The Memory Police. Asymptote Blog. https://www.asymptotejournal.com/blog/2019/10/23/a-paltry-little-scrap-of-the-past-yoko-ogawas-the-memory-police/

Lowry, L. (1993). *The Giver*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

MahmoudiFarahani, L., Motamed, B., &Jamei, E. (2016). Persian Gardens: Meanings, Symbolism, and Design. *Landscape Online*, *46*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3097/lo.201646

Marius, R. (1999). *Thomas More: A Biography*. Harvard University Press.

Mumford, L. (1962). *The Story of Utopias*.Viking Press.

Nelson, E. (2001). Greek Nonsense in More's "Utopia." *The Historical Journal*, *44*(4), 889–917. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3133544

Ogawa, Y. (2019). *The Memory Police*. Pantheon Books

Orwell, G. (2003). *1984* [eBook edition].Plume.

Opreanu, L. (2013). Remembrance Versus Reinvention: Memory As Tool Of Survival And Act Of Defiance In Dystopian Narratives. *University of Bucharest Review. Literary and Cultural Studies Series*, *02*, 110–118. https://ubr.rev.unibuc.ro//wp-content/uploads/2014/12/LuciaOpreanu.pdf

Özmacun, T. E. (2015). *Theodor Adorno, on the relationship between critical theory and art* (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University). https://open.metu.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11511/24631/index.pdf

Palladino, M. (2015). 'It's a Freedom Thing': Heterotopias and Gypsy Travellers' Spatiality. In M. Palladino& J. Miller (Eds) *The Globalization of Space: Foucault and Heterotopia* (pp. 65–80). Routledge.

Pappas, N. (2013). *The Routledge Guidebook to Plato's Republic*. New York. Routledge.

Plato & Bloom, A. (1991). *The Republic of Plato*.Basic Books.

Putthoff, T. L. (2020). *Gods and Humans in the Ancient Near East*. Cambridge University Press.

Rich, M. (2019). *Yoko Ogawa conjures spirits in hiding: 'I just peeked into their world and took notes'*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/12/books/yoko-ogawa-memory-police.html

Rowe, C. (2015). *Plato: Theaetetus and Sophist (Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy)* (Reprint ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sargent, L. T. (1994). The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited. *Utopian Studies, 5*(1), 1–37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719246

Sargent, L.T. (2005).The Necessity of Utopian Thinking: A Cross-National Perspective. In J. Rüsen, M. Fehr & T. W. Rieger, (Eds) *Thinking Utopia: Steps into Other Worlds (Making Sense of History, 4)* (pp.1-14). Berghahn Books.

Sargent, L.T. (2013). Do Dystopias Matter?. In *Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage* (pp. 10-13). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sargisson, L. (2012). Definitions, Debates and Conflicts:Utopianism, Anti-utopianism and Anti- Anti-Utopianism.In Fool's Gold?Utopianism in the Twenty-First Century (pp.6-40). Palgrave Macmillan.

Simon, E. (2021, July 1). *On Memory and Literature*. The Millions. https://themillions.com/2021/06/on-memory-and-literature.html

Son, H. (2008). Heterotopia:anamnesis of a medical term. In M. Dehaene, L. De Cauter (Eds.), *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a PostcivilSociety*.Routledge.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace*.Wiley-Blackwell.

Stausberg, M. (2008).On the State and Prospects of the Study of Zoroastrianism.*Numen, 55*(5), 561–600. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27643340

Taylor, D. (2014). *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. Routledge.

Terentowicz-Fotyga, U. (2018). Defining the dystopian chronotope: Space, time and genre in George Orwell's "Nineteen Eighty-Four."*Beyond Philology An International Journal of Linguistics, Literary Studies and English Language Teaching*, *15/3* (pp. 9–39). https://doi.org/10.26881/bp.2018.3.01

The Nippon Foundation (2020, March 27). *Writer Ogawa Yōko's stories of memory and loss*. https://www.nippon.com/en/people/bg900133/writer-ogawa-yoko%E2%80%99s-stories-of-memory-and-loss.html

Tolentino, J. (2019, November 6). *How "The Memory Police" Makes You See*. The New Yorker. https://www.newyorker.com/books/under-review/how-the-memory-police-makes-you-see

Topinka, R. J. (2010). Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces. *Foucault Studies, 9* (pp.54-70). Retrieved from https://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/63466/

Vezir, G. (2019). Two cases of the Golden Age: The hesiodic utopia and the platonic ideal state (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University). https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12623757/index.pdf

Vieira, F. (2010).The concept of utopia.In G. Claeys (Ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature (Cambridge Companions to Literature*) (pp.327). Cambridge University Press.

Vieira, F. (2013).*Dystopia(n) Matters: On the Page, on Screen, on Stage*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Walsh, C. (1972). *From Utopia to Dystopia*. Greenwood Press.

White, R. G. (2018). Spacing the interior: The carceral body as heterotopia in contemporary Palestinian Cinema. In A. Faramelli, D. W. Hancock, & R. G. White (Eds.), *Spaces of Crisis and Critique: Heterotopias Beyond Foucault* (pp. 76–104). Bloomsbury Academic.

Whitehead, A. (2008). *Memory*. Routledge.

Wicomb, Z. (2015). Heterotopia and Placelessness in Brian Chikwava's *Harare North.*In M.Palladino& J. Miller (Eds) The Globalization of Space: Foucault and Heterotopia (pp. 49-64). Routledge.