THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

HITTING THE WALL: DYSTOPIAN METAPHORS OF IDEOLOGY IN SCIENCE FICTION.

Elsa D. BOUET

PhD in English Literature
The University of Edinburgh
2013.

THESIS ABSTRACT

HITTING THE WALL: DYSTOPIAN METAPHORS OF IDEOLOGY IN SCIENCE FICTION.

This thesis explores the depictions of the relationship between utopia and ideology by looking at metaphors of the wall in of utopian and dystopian science fiction, such as Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the Strugatsky brothers' *Roadside Picnic*. The wall is an image symbolising the ambiguity between ideology and utopia: the wall could be perceived to be the barrier protecting utopia while it is in fact the symbol for ideological restrictions and containment which are generating dystopia. The thesis looks at how these novels engage with the theme of the wall: it is used as an image altering history, constricting space and as a linguistic barrier. The characters' presence in and experience of the worlds is restricted by the ideological walls, and an alternate reality is created. The thesis looks at how the novels create such alternate, ideological realities and how the wall becomes the entity altering time, history, space and language. This alternate reality is used as an image of stability, but this takes on negative connotations: it becomes a constrictive force, embodying Fredric Jameson's idea that science fiction creates images of "world reduction", caging the characters' desires, disabling the utopian impulse. The thesis therefore instigates the possibility of utopia: the wall negates all possibility of change and denies the hopes of the utopian impulse; however the characters' desire to regain humanity by destroying the ideological walls offers hope and opens up utopia, thus concluding that utopia is change and progress.

DECLARATION BY CANDIDATE

I, Elsa D. Bouet, hereby declare that the following work is my own work and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or award. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I presented for examination. Where other sources and other material have been used, they have been appropriately acknowledged.

Signed…….....

Date: …../…../…..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like thank the people who have made my writing and submitting of this thesis possible. I would like to thank my partner, Mo, for having been a rock throughout the process, for his encouragements, his unconditional support, his motivational words and forcing me to relax when I was only thinking of working. I would like to thank him for believing in me, and for helping me to believe in myself and enabling me to be more positive.

I would like to convey appreciation to my supervisor, Dr Simon Malpas, for sharing his wisdom and enabling me to envisage my project in a clearer manner. I would like to express my gratitude as he has constantly motivated me, pushed me to improve on all aspects of my project as a whole, helped to think in a clearer, more constructive and more concise (which I especially needed) manner. I cannot express the depth of my appreciation for the care, the help and the guidance he has shown. This thesis was completed thanks to his invaluable support: he has helped me not to give up despite the difficulties that I have faced throughout my PhD. I am also grateful for his guidance on all academic matters.

I would like to thank my family. I would like to thank my sister, Emma, for all her kind words and her utter and blind faith in me. I would like to thank my father for talking nonsense and making me laugh when I needed it. I would like to thank my mother for asking me of the progress of my work and for reminding me of the commitments I made to them, and especially to myself. Thank you. I would also like to thank Farah for always being so fun to be around: she has helped me to relax.

I would like to particularly thank my friend, Chris, for being there every time I needed him, especially at the end of the process, when things were getting very difficult. To all my other friends, thank you for helping me have fun. I would finally like to thank Honey, for being literally there, and for keeping me company, every time I worked from home.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

The titles of the works frequently referred to have been abbreviated. Here is the list of the works whose titles have been abbreviated, which can also be found in the bibliography:

AOTF: Jameson, Fredric. *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. London: Verso, 2005. Print.

TPU: Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. New York: Cornell Universtity Press, 1982. Print.

SOI: Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1999. Print.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to explore depictions of the metaphor of the wall in science fiction literature and to show how the wall serves as an image underscoring the similarities and differences between utopia and ideology. The thesis will look at works written around the time of and during the Cold War and will specifically focus on the utopian and dystopian subgenres of science fiction. By looking at metaphors of the wall, the thesis will engage with the distinction between utopia and ideology. Both concepts create discourses about themselves, generate identities for themselves and others, and engage with the concepts of reality, perception, experience and construct images of the worlds they inhabit or would like to inhabit. Typically, utopian and dystopian fiction create a differentiation between ideology, which tends to control and constrain, and utopia, which is the expression and the reaching of a goal or the realisation of hopes. The thesis will therefore look at how the wall is ideologically used to create a façade of security and protection, thus instating a physical, psychological line or border defining one's identity and creating constrictions, repression and subjugation.

Before further detailing the specific aims, goals and spectrum of the thesis, I would like to give a short historical contextualisation of the concept of ideology during the Cold War, as the images of struggle, enmity and ideology generated during the conflict seeped into science fiction narratives.[1] Looking into the historical background of the ideological propaganda serves to provide a perspective on rhetorical nature of the conflict. Martin J. Medhurst, in his essay entitled "Rhetoric and Cold War: A Strategic Approach", details the role of ideology in the conflict of the Cold War. He states that the Cold War was a contest between systems, led by the Soviet Union and the United States (p.19). Medhurst specifies that this conflict is not necessarily one marked with bloodshed:

> It is a contest involving tangibles such as geography, markets, spheres of influence, and military alliances, as well as such tangibles as public opinion,

[1] See Keith Booker's *Post Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s* (29) and David Seed's *American Science Fiction and the Cold War: Literature and Film*.

> attitudes, images, expectations and beliefs about whatever system is currently in ascendency. The contest, in other words, is both material and psychological in nature.
>
> The currency of the Cold War combat—the tokens used in the contest—is rhetorical discourse: discourse intentionally designed to achieve a particular goal with one or more specific audience. [...] Cold War weapons are words, images, symbolic actions, and, on occasions, physical actions undertaken by covert means. (19)

Medhurst explains that the Cold War was waged on different fronts: it was a geographical, colonising war, in which the two parties tried to increase their spheres of influence. It was also an economic war, as seen through the nuclear arms race, the space race, and an increase in militarization. As Medhurst points out, the war was fought on public expectations and beliefs. He further illustrates this by explaining that language played an important part of the warfare: words and images were used to manipulate opinion and used for propaganda purposes. Without ever using the word "propaganda" or "ideology" in his explanation, he argues that the Cold War was mainly an ideological war fought with language. Medhurst's point can be related to the fact that utopian fiction and science fiction of the time have portrayed and re-enacted this ideological conflict. The works chosen for this study depict nations at war and expose the ideological discourses and manipulation used by the parties to present themselves and their ideas as utopian and shape and mould their appearance to gain popularity and to discredit their opponents. This is epitomised in Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed* in which two enemy planets with different political systems present themselves as the utopia achieved, while vilifying the other, opposite side as the dystopia to fear. Such science fiction exploits the ideological nature of the Cold War: it denounces the rhetorical propaganda that was created during the conflict and the myths each side has created for itself.

Wojciech Sokolowski echoes the statement made by Medhurst:

> The post-World War II geopolitical division of the spheres of influence separated by the Iron Curtain set the stage for the latter-day cosmic drama of a moral struggle between two elemental forces of modern political-economic universe: the menacing bureaucratic juggernaut of the State, and the Free Market allowing the common folks to pursue their liberty and happiness. Needless to add that this Manichean imagery was duly mirrored on the "other side" of the Iron Curtain, where the forces of light under the fearless leadership of the Party battled the tyranny and decadence of the "black reaction" (69).

Sokolowski exposes the fact that the Cold War was waged on the level of images: each side created a dichotomy of good and evil. These Manichean caricatures were part of the war and embody the elements of rejection, dejection and renunciation of the other part that were acted out during the conflict. Through their Manichean propaganda, each side rejects its opponent; thus reinforcing the "Iron Curtain", the divide between the Soviet Union and the United States. However, the Iron Curtain stood for more than a geographical line: it became an ideological line separating East and West, a divide also represented by the Berlin Wall. The idea of the line, the wall or a barrier became a predominant symbol of differentiation during the Cold War, an image which became a recurrent motif in science fiction.

Such a context of ideological warfare, differentiation and exclusion of otherness provides science fiction with the motif of the wall: the images of barriers enable the exploitation of the themes of enmity and ideological conflict. The aim of this thesis will be to look at the imagery of the wall, and its relation to ideology in some selected science fiction and utopian fiction. Science fiction has been critically accepted as a genre that is difficult to define; definitions are sometimes too narrow or too broad to be accurate. [2] It is therefore necessary to narrow down the scope of the chosen genre and offer some definition to understand what is meant by "science fiction" in this study. James Gunn defines the genre as "a literature of (1) ideas; (2) change; (3) anticipations; (4) the human species […] (5) discontinuity" (8). Gunn admits that his first four points are not particularly helpful to define science fiction if not associated with the idea of discontinuity, of the speculation and of the "what if" (8) intrinsic to the genre. The timelines of science fiction break away from traditional continuity, whether in terms of historicity, change and difference; that is, it escapes the continuum of our current reality by projecting itself into the future or by depicting an alternative past or present. Despite being so broad, Gunn's definition is key in showing that science fiction is a genre that toys with the notion of "ideas", the human, his perceptions and his wish for change; that is, science fiction is a genre concerned with ideology.

[2] See Adams Charles Robert's *Science Fiction* (especially his introduction in which he exposes definition of the genre, 1-36), in which he states that science fiction is a "much broader category than is usually admitted" (4). See also James Gunn's *Speculations on Speculation* (5-12) and finally Paul Kincaid's *What It Is We Do When We Read Science Fiction* in which he states "This inability to define science fiction is a problem we have long recognised" (13, see also pages 13-25).

Another key figure of science fiction criticism, Darko Suvin, defines the genre as the literature of "cognitive estrangement" (*Defined by a Hollow*, 42), therefore making science fiction a genre creating alternate realities and imagining different worlds. This is echoed by Keith Booker and Anne-Marie Thomas who state that science fiction "might be defined as fiction set in an imagined world that is different from our own in ways that are rationally explicable" (4). Science fiction therefore presents itself as different and alienating but in ways that can be logically, scientifically and thoughtfully explained—as opposed to the lack of explanation of the magical and supernatural of the fairy tale for example. Booker and Thomas argue that science fiction is a genre challenging the reader's ideas, a statement echoed by Farah Mendlesohn, who believes that "in sf 'the idea' is the hero" (*Cambridge Companion*, 4). For Mendlesohn, science fiction is a genre preoccupied with the ideas of human nature, discourse, relation with otherness or of ideology. The genre of science fiction can also be defined by looking at its sub-genres, which once again are numerous: cyberpunk, space opera, utopia and dystopia, to name but a few.[3] This avenue can be useful for the purpose of this thesis, as it will specifically look at the utopian and dystopian genres of science fiction.

The utopian genre saw a resurgence in the 1960s and 1970s.[4] As Tom Moylan illustrates, the utopian genre saw its revival "in reaction to the failed utopias of the Soviet Union and in fear of a successful 'utopia'" ("The Locus of Hope", 162-3"): the historical, political context detailed above provides ground to understand the involvement of the utopian genre with the notion of ideology. Before understanding the relation between utopia, ideology and the metaphor of the wall, it is important to define the notion of utopia. The notion is difficult to define and has had critics debate over it, as Ruth Levitas underscores in *The Concept of Utopia*: the "absence of a clear definition of utopia" (2) means that utopia is a notion difficult to debate. The

[3] *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*, edited by Mark Bould looks at science fiction from historical, theoretical, thematic perspectives as well as defining the different subgenres that are part of the wider genre of science-fiction, thus providing an extensive picture of the features of science fiction. Carl Howard Freedman, in *Critical Theory and Science Fiction*, shows that the definitions of science fiction can be so narrow as to include pulp authors such as Philip K. Dick, William Gibson or Joe Haldeman. Conversely, the definition can be so broad that it could works by Aligheri Dante or John Milton. In doing so, Freeman demonstrates the inadequacy of the existing definitions.

[4] See Fatima Vieira's "The Concept of Utopia" in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*, p. 20; see also Raffaella Baccolini "Finding Utopia in Dystopia: Feminism, Memory, Nostalgia, and Hope", in *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming*, p.165.

word was coined by Thomas More, when he wrote his major work *Utopia* in 1516. Levitas notes that the title of the work and the name of the city where the action takes place is a pun. It uses the idea of eutopia, a good place, and outopia, no place, which can be related to Suvin's idea of "estrangement". Levitas's ideas on utopia and Suvin's definition of science fiction accentuate that they both deal with the displacement of the cognition of the subject. This idea of the positive utopia is present in the commonplace conception that utopia signifies perfection. However, as Fatima Vieira explains, utopia's most recognisable trait is "its speculative discourse on a non-existent social organisation which is better than the real society" (7): utopian literature is an imaginative, estranging literature which deals with a place that is better than the present. Darko Suvin defined the utopia as "not a genre but the sociopolitical sub-genre of science fiction" (op. cit, 42), which would make the utopian subgenre the representation of better social models, dealing with the socio-political displacement of the humanistic cognition related to the humanistic and ideological issues raised by science fiction.

The sociologist Karl Mannheim is another key figure who can further one's understanding of utopia, as he details the relation between ideology and utopia. In *Ideology and Utopia*, he exposes the difference between the two: ideology encompasses the ideas that are used to cloud, control and falsify beliefs, while utopia is seen as the group of ideas and thoughts used to shatter the established order. Ideology is therefore a restrictive force, while utopia enables change. Fredric Jameson holds a fairly similar view in the sense that he equates the concept of utopia to that of "Hope" (*AOTF*, 294).[5] Hope becomes the force instigating and enabling change, which would make utopia a dynamic notion.

Jameson argues that "Utopian space is an imaginary enclave within real social space, in other words, that the very possibility of Utopian space is itself a result of spatial and social differentiation" (*AOTF*, 15). Utopia is only made possible in the imaginary, in the arts, but instead of being completely separated from reality, it is a sub-genre inspired by the dissatisfaction with reality. Jameson highlights a very important factor of utopia; it is an enclave that is separated, cut off from reality. This

[5] Tom Moylan makes a similar point when he views utopia as a "counter-ideology" (163) as he states in "The Locus of Hope; Utopia Versus Ideology".

idea of separation is very similar to the concept of the dividing wall, which, during the Cold War, was an ideologically charged symbol. Jameson states that "all of our images of Utopia, all possible images of Utopia, will always be ideological and distorted by a point of view which cannot be corrected or even accounted for" (*AOTF*, 171). Here, Jameson adopts a radical stance when he states that Utopia cannot be understood and envisaged without an ideological standpoint: our image of utopia is bound to be clouded, consciously or not, by an ideological indoctrination. Jameson's work engages with the question of the possibility of utopia. He asks whether utopia is possible without it being tainted by ideology: is the desire for change not made impossible by ideological constraints imposed on us? Jameson looks at the differences between the two concepts, which fuels the debate on the nature of ideology and the nature of utopia. Jameson's conclusion suggests then that utopia is the force of change, while ideology restrains, as the images of the wall analysed in this work will demonstrate.

Terry Eagleton, in the opening to his work *Ideology: An Introduction*, lists the various ways in which ideology can be defined:

> (a) the process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life;
> (b) a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class;
> (c) ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power;
> (d) false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power;
> (e) systematically distorted communication;
> (f) that which offers a position for a subject;
> (g) forms of thought motivated by social interest;
> (h) identity thinking;
> (i) socially necessary illusion;
> (j) the conjuncture of discourse and power;
> (k) the medium in which conscious social actors make sense of their world;
> (l) action-oriented sets of beliefs;
> (m) the confusion of linguistic and phenomenal reality;
> (n) semiotic closure;
> (o) the indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relation to a social structure;
> (p) the process whereby social life is converted to a natural reality. (p. 1-2)

Eagleton gives many definitions of ideology: it is possible to draw four main features from these, which can thus give us some characteristics of ideology. First of all, there is the semiotic aspect of ideology: as Eagleton first states, the word "ideology" can describe the ways in which meaning is created. Next, Eagleton also indicates that ideology stands for "a body of ideas". This body of ideas serves to articulate, convey

and express the identity—or ideas pertaining to the identity—of that very group. In this definition, the concept of "ideology" is very close to the concept of identity creation, self-awareness and building of a self-image. In turn, this can also be used to express ideas about the identity of others—whether these are wrong, true or intended to deceive. This brings us to the next category, which conveys the meaning of the manipulation of ideas to convey a false or distorted meaning, to gain force, power or win over an argument. This is very close to the notion that ideology has something to do with power: "ideology" can signify the body of ideas used by the people or forces in power to reinforce, legitimate, maintain or put in place a specific power, political, military or religious. Finally, the last category that one can draw from Eagleton's definitions would be that ideology relates to the way reality is perceived or created, which is reminiscent of the definition of self-expression. In this definition, people use ideology to perform, express and articulate their beliefs about themselves, which might be different from the reality of what things are.[6] Therefore, in this thesis, the word "ideology" will often be used to designate the depicted discourses used by those in power to coerce, deceive, manipulate or uphold a reality, but also to denote the body of ideas that promotes and implements control. Also, from these definitions, the word "ideology" will be used to characterise the representations of a body of ideas: ideology is not necessarily about truth, rather about the argumentative deliverance of the statements made by a party.

These definitions show how close utopia and ideology are: they both deal with ideas about oneself, self-representation and the manufacture of reality, although ideology aims to control and utopia aims to implement positive change. Both concepts deal with the idea of differentiation. As was the case during the Cold War, ideology was used to depict the other side in a negative, demeaning light. Ideology can be used by a state to differentiate itself from another, or from an enemy, or even to depict another state as an enemy. Utopia also creates that sense of differentiation, as it is the non-existent place, of the dream, of the wish to be achieved. However, the

[6] Those definitions are manifold, and I would have to refer the reader to Eagleton's work for more details. See also Žižek's *Sublime Object of Ideology* (28-33), for whom ideology traditionally signifies the body of falsified ideas used to deceive; this need to deceive is turned into an apparent positive force, a justification of ideology, which upholds social cohesion. Habermas's *Legitimation Crisis* (22-23) makes a similar point by viewing ideology as the body of excuses and lies necessary to justify faults and shortcomings.

dreams and aspirations can be ideologically tainted, showing that there is only a very fine distinction between ideology and utopia. This idea of separation, of differentiation can be found in the symbol of the wall. The thesis will analyse utopian and dystopian science fiction works to understand how the image of the wall is used to embody utopian aspirations, ideological control and to show how it creates tension between the concepts of ideology and utopia.

These definitions of utopia and ideology illustrate how they deal with some similar points of representation and experience, which will create the foundations of the structure of the thesis. Both concepts are concerned with time, space and language. The wall serves as an ideological symbol of control: it can be used to manipulate, contain and alter historical representations and discourses, restrict and contain language, manipulate and map space and cities. The wall also stands for the idea of containment, differentiation and exclusion, which, as I want to argue, is the very barrier to utopia. I want to show how the idea of the traditional enclave as a haven for safety and protection of the outside world—the former utopian enclave—has been turned on itself to in fact become dystopian. I will demonstrate this point by looking at how utopia is itself used by ideology: the possibility of a better future or the creation of a perfect present becomes itself ideological and is used for ideological purposes by the power structures represented in the novels, therefore denying the chance of utopia.

To do so, I will open up the thesis by looking at Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed.* In *The Dispossessed*, the wall is a leitmotiv which stands for spatial, but even more so, for temporal exclusion. The wall creates a differentiation between past, present and future, so that history and memory become tools of control. The first chapter will investigate how the wall becomes a symbol for temporal exclusion and therefore becomes ideologically charged. By looking at how the two enemy planets depict each other and deny each other's experience, the opening chapter will investigate how the wall becomes an impediment to utopia, to moving forward. However, as will be detailed, hope can be found in the concept of unity, a concept that will be analysed by looking at the actions of the main protagonist, Shevek.

As the second chapter will show, language is also used to support, create and uphold the dystopian reality, to alter and change the past to shape the present and the

future. I will look at how language is used, specifically in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell. His dystopian society is supported by a new language, Newspeak. Newspeak becomes the barrier for freedom of expression and freedom of thought, which becomes the leading theme of the novel. The concept of controlling language in order to control thinking opens up the concept of the relation between language and ideology. The thesis will therefore investigate the paradox of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: language is the tool of control, but also that of resistance, as illustrated by Winston who tries to free himself by writing. In this sense, the thesis will look at how language becomes a dystopian barrier, but also the means enabling happiness.

Finally, I will look at the mysterious "Zone" in Boris and Arkady Strugatsky's *Roadside Picnic*, and how the Zone is used and misused to gain control over the precious artefacts on which the economy is based, therefore creating a social and economic hierarchy. The third chapter will examine how the Zone in *Roadside Picnic* becomes a space symbolising the city. The Zone is dual in nature: it represents the suburbs and the struggle of its inhabitant, as well as the western city centre and the wealth generated there.[7] The Zone becomes walled off, to prevent the stealing of the very artefacts that offer the means for the struggling stalkers to survive. By being walled off, the Zone becomes even more coveted, therefore engulfing the whole city, becoming the force and the expression of greed and of capitalist ideology. But the wall can again be broken by hope: a mythical artefact can grant any wish and realise utopia by dismantling the wall. Looking at perceptions and creations of ideologies to manipulate time and history, language, space and geography will serve to demonstrate that the wall has become an ideological, dystopian image, neutralising utopia.

Each novel studied in this thesis focuses on a specific aspect of the effects of ideology: *The Dispossessed* addresses the question of the effects of ideology on time, *Roadside Picnic* on our perception of space, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* on our linguistic abilities. Each novel focuses on a specific point of ideological manipulation, while still making reference to other areas of manipulation, thus they work together to create a comprehensive picture of the effects of ideology. For, example, the linguistic manipulation present through Newspeak in *Nineteen Eighty-*

[7] As shown in the third chapter, the city centre is often associated with the central business district, the place where banks, stock market and other economic activities are located. See p. 157, 167.

Four is also present in *The Dispossessed* and in *Roadside Picnic* as the characters wonder how much their ability to think relates to their freedom. In this sense, all the novels are in dialogue with one another, providing answers to one other. Ideas that were only touched upon in one plot are re-enacted and re-addressed by another. Reading the novels together enables an intertextual reading of the image of the ideological wall in science fiction, which is actualised in the opening of Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*.

CHAPTER 1. The Wall and the End of Time in *The Dispossessed*

Ursula K Le Guin wrote *The Dispossessed* in 1974, in a climate of high tension between two blocks waging an ideological war. The Soviet Union and the United States engaged in an economic, technological, military, political and most of all, ideological war. The conflict was epitomised by the ideological and physical barriers that they erected. This is mirrored in the novel by the two conflicting factions: two planets, Anarres and Urras, oppose each other. Each planet purports that its model was more politically sound. Anarres believes that its anarchist society offers freedom, equality and fairness to its population. Urras, and more specifically the capitalist nation A-Io, believes it offers comfort, individualism and pleasure to those who can achieve it. The conflict between the two planets is also marked by the spatial void between them, reinforced by a wall erected on the landing port of Anarres, the only boundary on the anarchist world. The wall, as this chapter will illustrate, is the symbol for the rejection, the enmity and the mutual isolation between the two planets.

Robert Philmus explains that the two planets depicted in Le Guin's novel, Anarres and Urras, are "polar opposites" (224). This "evokes the Cold War model for the fictional world on which two mutually hostile powers precariously co-exist and over which each seeks exclusive hegemony" (Ibid.). Philmus sees the Cold War as an essential background to *The Dispossessed*: the two enemy planets seek ideological domination over each other. Peter Stillman states that the Cold War impacted on the themes of the novel: "the identity of geographic place and socio-political content is dangerous and destructive: it segments human solidarity and fragments humans' ability to share pain" ("*The Dispossessed* as Ecological Political Theory", 66). For Stillman, the strong ideological orientations of the populations of Anarres and Urras can cause fragmentation, as it did during the Cold War. Philmus's statement is also a strong indication that the wall is an impediment to utopia: our ability to communicate and share pain, to help each other, can enable us to better our world.

This chapter opens by analysing the idea of closure, by looking at the metaphor of the wall in *The Dispossessed*, thus illustrating the importance of the theme of duality in the novel and reflecting Stillman's concept of differentiation. The

chapter will then move onto looking at how the wall is used to create a spatial divide, but also a temporal one between the twin planets: Urras is focused on its past, while Anarres is focused on its future. Both planets ignore their existing condition, and instead manipulate time and history to reinforce the political system in place. The chapter will investigate how the metaphor of the wall is used to impact on the teaching of history and create further exclusion. The wall subsequently becomes a symbol for the containment of memory: implementing what could be described as an ideological—or fake memory—is a way to reinforce the divide between the two planets, but also between individuals. Therefore, the chapter will first look at the idea of a historical turning point: a new world order is created in *The Dispossessed* by falsifying memory and creating new traditions. In *The Dispossessed*, ideological memory is used as a way to implement and reinforce the imagery and symbolism of the wall. Establishing the role the wall has on creating exclusion as far as memory is concerned will affect the way memory, and history are perceived. These steps will be taken in order to further analyse the novel, which is subtitled as "*An Ambiguous Utopia*". *The Dispossessed* is ambiguous: A-Io and Anarres pose as utopian societies, but will be read as dystopian. The images the two nations depict of themselves and the other differ from the actuality of the political, economic and social bleak living reality: this reflects the duality of the wall and exposes how the utopian impulse is susceptible to be crushed by power and ideology.[8]

[8] *The Dispossessed* has been given the subtitled of *An Ambiguous Utopia*. For a list of which editions possess the subtitle, see the editorial note in *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed, edited by L. Davis and P.Stillman, p.viii. Note that I am using the 2006 Gollancz Edition, which simply reads *The Dispossessed* but will refer to the subtitle to evaluate ambiguity of utopia.

I/ The Wall as a Dual, Ambiguous Temporal Symbol

For Philmus, the spatial fragmentation created in *The Dispossessed* is a fitting expression of the ideological divide between the two planets, Anarres and Urras. This is notably expressed in the image of the wall that serves to delimitate the territory between the two planets: the wall is the physical, graspable barrier separating the two worlds. However, I will demonstrate that the wall has a greater significance: it has a temporal and historical importance which impacts on the structure and the contents of the novel and becomes a symbol of obstacle, an impediment to utopia.

Fredric Jameson, in *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fiction*, denotes that the world of *The Dispossessed* is a prime example of what he labels "world reduction" (271). Jameson defines Le Guin's novel as based on:

> a principle of systematic exclusion, a kind of surgical excision of empirical reality, something like a process of ontological attenuation in which the sheer teeming multiplicity of what exists, of what we call reality, is deliberately thinned and weeded out through an operation of radical abstraction and simplification which I will henceforth term *world reduction*. (271) [9]

Jameson explains that Le Guin's novels depict "reduced" realities: they consciously and purposely impoverish reality by diminishing the variety and multiplicity of life, thus resulting in a depressed world. In *The Dispossessed*, this is accomplished via the absence of many biological species on Anarres, which constitutes the omission of the "Darwinian life-cycle itself" (271). Jameson views this as the ability of man to surmount "historical determinism" (272). This principle of self-determinism—as opposed to the historical one—becomes "an instrument in the conscious elaboration of a utopia" (272). For Jameson, the very lack of life and of reality depicted in *The Dispossessed* bears the utopian impulse.

This impulse is perverted through the idea of exclusion and excision of reality. While Jameson talks about animal species; it is possible to apply his idea to more abstract notions. The excision of reality, of truth, would give way to ideology and enable the manipulation of utopia, of world views. The concept of world reduction could have ideological implications: *The Dispossessed* is based on world-

[9] Jameson uses Le Guin's *Left Hand of Darkness* to base his idea of world reduction, which he also applies to *The Dispossessed*.

view reduction, an excision of reality that gives sway to dystopian ideology.[10] As I will now show, the wall on Anarres becomes the symbol of ideology, the symbol of the propaganda that alters and minimises the hope for change, reinforces the status quo and rejects utopia. The wall on Anarres becomes the symbol of that reduction, an entity that constrains and restricts change, therefore becoming dystopian.

It becomes apparent that the wall is an ideologically charged symbol in the very first paragraph of the novel. The only boundary on Anarres is located at the port, where aliens from other worlds can land. Anarres is therefore a unified nation encompassing the whole planet. Aliens are not allowed beyond the port, beyond the wall, which acts as a protection from the outside.[11] The novels opens:

> There was a wall. It did not look important. It was built of uncut rocks roughly mortared; an adult could look right over it, and even a child could climb it. Where it crossed the roadway, instead of having a gate it degenerated into mere geometry, a line, an idea of boundary. But the idea was real. It was important. For seven generations there had been nothing in the world more important than that wall. (1)

The first sentence is very brief and impacts on the reader; it is demonstrating the importance of the wall. The statement is abrupt: it does not offer any clarification as to why the wall is present, almost as if none is required and as if the fact just has to be accepted as reality. The wall looks inconsequential and trivial: it is a makeshift wall made of raw material. This is on par with the fact that Anarres is mainly made up of deserts and lacks resources.[12] The rough appearance of the wall gives the sense

---

[10] This is notably embodied through the idea that the outside world is confined to the Anarresti port: for an Anarresti, the whole universe is contained within the Anarresti wall. The word "urras" comes from the Scottish Gaelic and means "trust" or "assurance". In the case of Urras, there is a perversion of the name of the planet. The excision of trust is an onomastic irony.

[11] This is reminiscent of the Japanese policy of *sakoku* (which translates as "closed country") in place from the seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries. The policy had for effect to close off Japan: their inhabitants were prohibited any contact with foreign traders. As part of the policy, the island of Dejima became the only port of trade where only Chinese and Dutch traders were allowed to dock. The rest of Japan remained closed to them. See Louis Frédéric *Japan Encyclopaedia*, entries "*sakoku*" and "Dejima". It is also reminiscent of the idea of "closed city" such as Chelyabinsk in Russia, where nuclear experiments were carried out, or Oak Ridge in the US, the seat of the Manhattan project. These two cities imposed travel restrictions: people had to have special permission to enter and leave the cities. See p. 182.

[12] Peter Stillman points in his essay "The Dispossessed as Ecological Political Theory", that environmental issues are present in the novel. Both Urras and Anarres have ways to preserve the planets' resources. Anarres is a barren planet where few resources are available. Urras, on the contrary, has found another way to preserve its resources: only the rich are enabled—though their wealth—to use the machinery which pollutes. Stillman points out that this raise environmental questions: Anarres can be interpreted as a warning of what could happen to Urras if they do not preserve their environment.

that it was sloppily built, as if in a rush to delimit boundaries. The wall does not need to be impressive, tall or insurmountable—like the Great Wall of China for example. Instead, its unassuming nature echoes the principles of humbleness, self-sacrifice and mutual aid present in their anarchist philosophy. A mighty wall would contradict these principles. The fact that adults and children alike can look over the wall evidences the physical irrelevance of the wall, accentuates its importance as the only boundary on Anarres and emphasises its ideological symbol of protection and self-preservation. Despite being only a modest symbol, the idea of what the wall represents for Anarresti has been treasured for generations.

However, the notions of safety and security traditionally associated with the wall are not attached to the Anarresti wall, which is in fact depicted in a negative light. Laurence Davis demonstrates: "Unlike many early modern utopias, where wall imagery conveys a sense of the security and permanence of utopia (think, for example, of the walls surrounding each of the seven concentric circles of Campanella's *City of the Sun*), in *The Dispossessed* this image takes on a much more negative evaluative charge" (13). Here, Davis states that the wall is traditionally an image conveying protection, security and stability.[13] The wall conveys a sense of constancy that Davis implies is not present on Anarres. The wall of Anarres is not protective; rather, it is a means to imprison Anarresti and can in fact be read as an ominous symbol. The sense of constancy and stability associated with utopias is perverted: Anarres is an anarchist planet, and therefore is not meant to have hierarchies, institutions of power such as the controlling and manipulative Production and Distribution Coordination (PDC) committee, or walls of any kind. The wall becomes a symbol of that control, and the symbol for ideology walling out utopia. Thus, the symbol of the wall has shifted in *The Dispossessed*: it becomes a negative, oppressive entity and no longer symbolises protection.

This statement is echoed by Bülent Somay who writes: "the utopian tradition, up until the 'open-ended' utopias of the 1970s, was authoritarian in style as well as totalitarian in content. Any social order, which is described as something final or

[13]One may also recall the description made of the walls in Thomas More's *Utopia*: "The city is compassed about with a high and thick stone wall full of turrets and bulwark" (64). In comparison to the wall in *The Dispossessed*, the walls of the cities in *Utopia* are thick, and provide for adequate defence.

something *finally achieved*, leaves no room for further change" (235). Somay makes the point that utopias which attempt to enforce closure or present their system as definitive tend to depict a totalitarian system and lean towards dystopia. The wall is a symbol offering such sense of enclosure, spatially, temporally and ideologically. I will now detail how this applies to the Anarresti wall.

On Anarres, the wall is the border with the outside world, with what is foreign and represents the need for protection of the anarchist system from the risk of invasion by outsiders and the enemy, Urras. Anarres is depicted as fearing Urras: the Anarresti political system based on the balance between freedom and the social good could be destroyed by the invasion of Urras, who would instate its own political system based on class and capitalism.[14] Anarres is perceived as having achieved and fulfilled its utopian ideal, although it is not necessarily so. For Anarresti, the wall embodies the freedom achieved and finalised: the wall "enclosed the universe, leaving Anarres outside, free" (1). But it also demonstrates the required protection from the invader. When the population asks why Anarres keeps on trading with Urras, the PDC replies: "It would cost the Urrasti more to dig, therefore they don't invade us" and "Seven generation of peace had not brought trust" (81). The threat of invasion of the overthrow of their system is perceived as real.[15]

The threat coming from the outside and the role of the wall in keeping this threat out is detailed in the very first page. The port is in fact described as "a quarantine" (1), reminiscent of the decontamination centre New-Yorkers have to go through when they enter Spacetown to prevent outbreaks of disease in Asimov's *The Caves of Steel*. The Spacers, the benevolent emigrated humans, watching over men,

[14]Andrew Reynolds denotes that one of the difficulties with the novel lies in the fact that freedom is a subjective and abstract notion. Reynolds points out that "freedom […] is itself an empty ideal. For freedom has no fixed referent or logic" (89): "freedom" arouses debate as it means different things for different groups.

[15] In science fiction, the concept of borders evokes the notion of a danger zone, an area to be protected from invasion, as it marks one's territory and therefore determine an area of conflict. In Philip K. Dick's *The Man in the High Castle,* the coastal region of the former United States—which constitutes the border of the country—is dangerous. Patricia Warrick, in "Taoism and Fascism in *The Man in the High Castle*", details how both Germany and Japan are oblivious to their evil acts: Germany is domineering, Japan is imbued in its Taoist religion. This results in their being oblivious to the reality of the atom bomb (p.27-52). In Isaac Asimov's *The Caves of Steel,* the limits of Spacetown, the alien outpost in New York, is also heavily controlled to prevent any incident between locals and aliens. This sense of tension and dangers associated with borders is also present on Anarres, through the image of the wall and the fear of Urrasti invasion.

“put up a force barrier between themselves and the City. They established a combination Immigration Service and Customs Inspection. If you had business, you identified yourself, allowed yourself to be searched, and submitted to a medical examination and a routine disinfection” (16-7). Spacetown is heavily regulated and sheltered by a wall. This concept of the wall acting as a perceived protection is also present in *The Dispossessed*: “The wall shut in not only the landing field but the ships that came down out of space, and the men that came on the ships, and the worlds they came from, and the rest of the universe. It enclosed the universe, leaving Anarres outside, free” (1). This demonstrates that Anarres is wilfully attempting to keep the world outside, to shut off itself off from it to preserve its own way of life. This introduces the notion of enmity: Anarres wants to protect itself from the threats posed by the outside worlds, just as Earthlings pose a threat to the Spacers.

The narrator gives another perspective on the wall: from an outsider's point of view, the wall makes Anarres look like a “great prison camp” (1). This statement makes the image of the wall shift from one of protection, of preservation of freedom, to that of the prison barrier. This shows a different perspective: while the wall is viewed as a protective barricade, it can also be perceived by outsiders as a restrictive obstacle. This shows that the wall is not just what it seems: the application of two diametrically opposite perspectives onto the wall highlights its ideological nature. This is further enhanced by its redundant nature. Anarres, and its enemy Urras, are naturally separated from each other by the spatial void between them. Anarres’s natural planetary boundary should be enough to delimitate its identity. What is more, the physical insignificance of the wall reinforces that its role is only symbolic: if a child can climb the wall, so can the enemy. Anarres erects this supplementary, unnecessary wall; this ideological stance makes of Urras an enemy. It thus raises an ideological otherness, which goes against the Odonian principles of equality, freedom and altruism.

These conflicting perspectives introduce the concept of subjectivity, which is confirmed by the following description: “Like all walls it was ambiguous, two-faced. What was inside it and what was outside it depended upon which side of it you were on” (1). These two sentences, making up the whole of the second paragraph of the novel, constitute what Bülent Somay calls the “problem” (243) of the novel: the wall.

Somay uses this strong language to describe the ambiguity and the tension associated with the image of the wall. Somay explains that the ambiguity arises when Anarres present itself as a utopia, but it cannot be so precisely because it walls itself in or out, denying the contact with the outside and the possibility of change.[16] He states: "a utopia, when walled in, generates an excess, a surplus, which is the utopian horizon or the utopian ideal itself. What remains inside the wall is a series of rules, regulations, prohibitions and arrangements" (243). The fact that the utopia is enclosed works on a symbolic level: the wall denies contact with the other, denies the possibility of change. By building a wall, Anarres closes itself off, and denies itself the possibility of utopia and instates a dystopian state, in which rules and regulations, and therefore hierarchy and inequality, prevail.

Somay asserts that conflicting ideologies result in a denial of difference, and in a rejection of different points of view. The wall is ambiguous, two faced and Somay explains that this reflects the relation between Urras and Anarres. Somay explains "in walling themselves in, the Anarresti also walled the Urrasti in, generating a surplus of inside for them too. These 'surpluses' or excesses of inside can only find themselves in the 'thirteenth floor,' the nonexistent floor between floors, or in the case of Anarres/Urras, in the nonexistent space between the two planets" (242).[17] The two-sided nature of the wall denotes the tension of the novel:

[16] Many psychologist, theorists and philosophers have noted the importance that alterity and otherness plays in subject building. Lacan is makes a distinction between the "other" and the "Other". The other is inscribed in the imaginary order, conceivable and understandable, and therefore is not really other. The Other is alterity itself, unassimilable and relates of the symbolic. See Dylan Evans's *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, p.132-3. The "other" has also been used by Edward Said in *Orientalism* to describe the imperialist attitude of the West towards the East; the West being condescending towards the East. This hints at the fact that the "other" can be used to describe an opposing faction, which is the connotation I want to use while talking about the other. It is the enemy, the alien, the rejected and the misunderstood. However, it is important to bear in mind that the other is capital in the creation and changing of the self: it is the mirror reflecting our identity—whether social or personal—and therefore enabling us to assess ourselves, to change ourselves. See Judith Butler "Giving an Account of Oneself". These connotations of the other as a tool for self-introspection and self-awareness will also be used.

[17]The idea of the "thirteenth floor" refers to Žižek's "the Undergrowth of Enjoyment", where he explains that "It seems that as soon as we wall in a given space, there is more of it 'inside' than it appears possible to an outside view. Continuity and proportion are not possible, because this disproportion, the surplus of inside in relation to outside, is a necessary structural effect of the very separation of the two; it can only be abolished by demolishing the barrier and letting the outside swallow the inside. What I want to suggest, then, is that this excess of 'inside' consists, precisely, in the fantasy-space—the mysterious thirteenth floor, the surplus space which is the persistent motif in science fiction and mystery stories" (qtd in Somay, 242). Žižek suggests here that when space is walled in, that is contained and limited, a surplus of space arises, as the inside implodes; creating an outside void. It is this presumed non-existence, this science-fictional "as if" that constitutes a fantasy

the two planets are mutually excluded, each denying otherness. Both planets exploit the concept of the Žižekian "thirteenth floor", that is the imaginary space in which science fiction creates fantasy and displaces reality. This mutual exclusion of the other enables both planets to create myths and tales about itself and the other, thus furthering the divide and enmity between the two planets. This interplanetary void becomes the ideological fixation of Anarres, filling it with ideological threats coming from Urras, and caging the ideological promise of an everlasting utopia.

The wall is important in representing the conflict and tensions between Anarres and Urras. The theme of two divided sides, of fighting off the alien, is a recurrent one in science fiction. Le Guin, in her essay "American SF and the Other", condemns the duality of caricatural attitudes towards the alien, which denote overtly intolerant or reverential attitudes towards otherness, thus demonstrating a lack of neutrality and openness.[18] These caricatures can be viewed as a metaphor for the ways in which the two opposing blocks during the Cold War depicted each other, as with the vilifying of communists as witches under McCarthyism for example. Le Guin states that on the one side, there is "the Alien everybody recognises as alien, supposed to be the special concern of SF. Well, in the old pulp SF, it's very simple. The only good alien is a dead alien" (84). The pulp science fiction from the 1930s to 1960s depicts the alien as entirely, inconceivably different, entirely foreign and incomprehensible and it thus poses a threat, which must be destroyed.[19] Robert Heinlein's *The Puppet Master* depicts aliens as parasites which are able to control the humans they host. In Herbert G. Well's *The War of the Worlds*, Martians are

---

space, where desires and wishes can be formulated and realised. For example, American buildings are build "as if" there were no thirteenth floor, the thirteenth being label as fourteenth—but is nonetheless very real. The continuity of numbering, of reality of the number of floors is disrupted, made imaginary and non-realistic. The same occurs in *The Dispossessed*: by denying the existence and reality of Urras, Anarres creates an imaginary existence for itself, which can only be dismantled by opening up to the outside, letting the reality of the other shape the inside.

[18] Interestingly, the satirical short story by Ray Bradbury "The Concrete Mixer" centres on the caricatures of the alien as either good or evil. The main character is Ettil, a well-read Martian initially refusing to invade Earth. He is confronted by his father-in-law who asks him "Who ever heard of a Martian not invading? Who!"(187). Ettil replies: "Nobody. It is, I admit, quite incredible" (187). He views the invasion as foolishness and goes against the "bad" Martians who want to conquer the Earth. Earth welcomes the "merciful invaders"(193) with open arms. Martians are welcomed like brothers, buying into the capitalist ways of Earth, letting Earth invade the Martians with their capitalist ways. In this short story, the caricatures of the good and bad aliens are mocked: the rather naïve nature of the aliens, corrupted by greed makes this a satirical depiction of otherness, suggesting that self-reflection is required before rejecting or sanctifying the other.

[19]See Farah Mendlesohn's "Fiction, 1926-1949" (52-61) and Mark Jancovich and Derek Johnston's "Film and Television, the 1950s" (p.71-79).

attempting to destroy humanity. In John Carpenter's *The Thing*, the alien use humans as prey or as incubation mediums. The alien is depicted as a threat, since its aim is to destroy, disembody or alter humanity, notably by assimilating and mutating it.

Le Guin pursues:

> Then there's the other side of the same coin. If you hold a thing to be totally different from yourself, your fear of it may come out as hatred, or as awe—reverence. So we get all those wise and kindly beings who design to rescue Earth from her sins and perils. The Alien ends up on a pedestal in a white nightgown and a vicious smirk— exactly as the 'good woman' did in the Victorian Age (84).

The other side of the hatred and the will to annihilate aliens is the fascination for them. Instead of being invaders, they can become rescuers, coming to save us from our own potential for self-destruction. This is the case in Arthur C. Clarke's *Childhood's End*. The Earth is on the brink of a nuclear disaster as the tension between Soviet Union and the U.S keeps on rising. All tensions and warfare are put to a stop when alien invaders, reverently nicknamed "Overlords", reach the Earth. Their superiority brings a new age of peace and prosperity: men "realized that those silent ships had brought peace to all the world for the first time in history" (21). Aliens have brought peace to humans and prevent them from causing themselves total extinction. By idolising the aliens as more than gods, as Overlords, men have turned them into something more than what they are, from sentient, benevolent beings to deities. What transpires through Le Guin's exposition of the dual attitudes towards the alien is man's inability man to see them for what they are: they offer difference, advances and the possibility of change. Instead, the alien is seen as a threat and a deity, as in Harry Bates's short story *Farewell to the Master*: a benevolent alien, Klaatu, comes to warn the Earth of its apocalyptic doom, but is shot by a human who fears him. A tomb is erected for Klaatu so that people can pay their respects. The murder of Klaatu synthesises mankind's fear of or overt awe of the other and his inability to open itself up to change.

Whether the alien is depicted as good or bad, science fiction often shows that man is unable to grasp or comprehend the alien objectively, but instead has to resort to a paradigm of good and evil. This caricature of the alien as "bad" or as "good" stands for the image of human limitations: man's limited perception prevents him from opening himself up objectively to what is truly different. This image is also

present in *The Dispossessed*: Anarres and Urras are aliens to each other. The wall constitutes a key ideological symbol: it protects from the "bad" alien, the enemy, the threat that must be obliterated. The other side of the coin, that is the positive aspects of Urras, is negated and disregarded. This is where the concept of excision of reality penetrates: Anarres's one-sided view prevents it from achieving its utopia. The wall becomes the symbol of spatial enmity; more than a spatial one, it is a temporal, historical enmity. The next sections will show how the concept of the duality of the wall can apply to the manipulation of Anarres's and Urras's history, and their views of the past, the present and the future.

II/ Chiasmus and World Reduction

The opening description of the wall introduces the physical, spatial nature of the wall. However, some elements present in that description can draw the reader's attention to the temporal themes of the novel. The wall attracts people: “an adult could look right over it, and even a child could climb it” (1). This statement shows the non-imposing constitution of the wall, but also demonstrates that people of different ages are attracted to the wall. This is confirmed in the next pages as the narrator details that “People often came out from the nearby city of Abbenay in hopes of seeing a space ship” (2) and “Adolescents, particularly, were drawn to it. They came up to the wall; they sat on it.” (2). This shows that different generations are attracted by and to the wall, almost as if it were a tourist attraction, since it is “the only boundary wall on their world” (2). It also illustrates the differences in the changing attitudes to the wall: children learn what it symbolises, adolescents defy the “No Trespassing” sign, and adults come to accept and respect what it symbolises.[20] This statement introduces the idea of time: as time passes, one's attitude to the wall changes. But before detailing how this applies to the teaching and the understanding of history, I would like to analyse how the two-sided nature of the wall reflects the structure of the novel and how it affects Shevek, the physicist working on *The Principles of Simultaneity*.

Le Guin’s novel revisits the conventions of the utopian genre and explores a possible future direction. *The Dispossessed* is itself a chronosophy: it explores and builds on the utopian voices of time. James Bittner explores this idea when he labels the novel as anachronistic: “By the time Ursula K. Le Guin set out to create her ambiguous utopia in the early 1970s, the positive utopia had been displaced in the system of literary genres available to novelists” (“Chronosophy, Aesthetics, and Ethics in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia*”, 244). Le Guin’s utopia was written during a time when dystopia had become more prevalent, as Bittner indicates: “the form available in the literary system for constructing alternate worlds had changed from utopia to nightmare” (Ibid.). The Dispossessed is an

[20]Jurgen Habermas, in *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, details the changes of attitudes towards the law, which change according to the different stage of life—childhood, adolescence and adolescence (84-5).

anachronism because it has been written after the utopian genre fell out of favour, supplanted instead by dystopia. In fact, *The Dispossessed* is a post-utopia, to borrow Andrew Reynolds and Keith Booker's expression.[21]

Reynolds relates the concept of post-utopia to that of postmodernism as expressed by Fredric Jameson and draws similarities between the two concepts.[22] For Reynolds, "the post-utopian condition designates a cessation or failure of utopian imagination and narrative practice" (75). The post-utopian genre reflects on the upcoming failures of the utopian genre, in the face of the Soviet, Nazi tortures and atrocities, and the failed promises of capitalism. As Reynolds indicates, "the post-utopian can thus be a valuable concept for demarcating and conceptualising the twentieth century transformation—rather than demise—of utopian thought and narrative" (75). For Reynolds, post-utopia is self-reflective. As noted by Booker, post-utopia is marked by "a failure to project viable utopian alternatives to the present social order" (in Reynolds, 76). The post-utopian genre is marked by revisiting the failures of past utopias, whilst seemingly not offering any new grand utopian narrative. However, this is sparked by a recognition that utopia has exhausted itself. In the case of the American utopia, capitalism was a built on a desire that can never be satisfied (Booker, 4). In fact, post-utopian narratives beg to reconsider the foundations of utopia, the foundations of satisfaction. Reynolds hints at the fact that, in the case of Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, satisfaction lies in non-consumerism, in existentialism and in the reconstitution and reinstitution of work (90-1).

As this chapter shows, Le Guin's novel anchors itself in the dystopian tradition of its time. However, it also breaks from the dystopian genre by creating utopian elements. Anarres should be a utopia in the making: its status as a locked,

---

[21] Andrew Reynolds attributes the use of the word to Keith Booker, as expressed in his study *The Post-Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s.* In this work, Booker details how American utopian imagination collapsed as American capitalism grows. Booker's work exposes the contradictions between the capitalist ideology and the consumer culture of the 1950s and the disparities in equalities, opportunities and freedom that this was meant to provide. See Booker p.1-4. See also Andrew Reynolds's "Ursula K. Le Guin, Herbert Marcuse and The Fate of Utopia in the Postmodern".

[22] Booker refers to the idea of postmodernism exposed by Jameson in *Postmodernism , or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. In his introduction, Jameson states that the postmodern looks "for shifts and irrevocable changes in the representation of things and of the way they change. The moderns were interested in what was likely to come of such changes and their general tendency: they thought about the thing itself" (ix). For Jameson, postmodernism is primarily marked by a self-reflective process and the fragmentation characteristic of such a process.

achieved utopia renders it dystopian. The fact that Anarres is in a limbo between a utopia and a dystopia pushes the reader to reflect on its status, to look at the conventions of the genre and how they have been distorted and manipulated in the novel in a post-utopian reflective manner. The wall is a post-utopian symbol: its tradition as a protective symbol has failed the previous utopian narratives. The caging and exclusion that it created have become dystopian. However, not all hope is lost and utopia can be found in the hard work, ethical approach and experiences of Shevek, as Reynolds has it.

Chronospohy is intrinsic to the post-utopian nature of the novel, but also to the plot. The idea that *The Dispossessed* is a novel engaging with the concept of time is expresses by James Bittner, who states "So if *The Dispossessed* is an anachronism, it is an anachronism about chronism, or, more properly, 'chronosophy,' the study of the 'voices of time.'" (245).[23] For Bittner, the focal point of the novel lies in its study of historical texts, memories and perceptions of history. This applies to the contents of the novel, in that Shevek works on temporal physics and is interested in the concepts of perception of time, but also to the very structure and subgenre of the novel.

Bittner highlights the importance that chronosophy holds for the understanding of experience and understanding of time. He explains:

> *The Dispossessed* is about the reality of the present moment, the 'here, now'. Le Guin uses the utopian genre to argue that the present is made only real only as one com-prehends (grasps together) the internal relations, the complementary and dialectical relationships of the past (memory and history, a promise made) and the future (intention and hope, a direction taken). (245)

Bittner argues that Le Guin makes a statement about time through the utopian genre: one can appreciate the present and comprehend one's experience only when understanding and grasping the past as well as embracing the future. This highlights the duality of time: time becomes unified through the acceptance of causality and the dialectic of experience. Le Guin's utopia becomes successful insofar that causality and simultaneity become unified. However, before reaching that stage, the plot exposes how the Anarresti and Urrasti societies wall out their temporal counterpart,

[23]Bittner explains that *The Dispossessed* is an anachronism because "By the time Ursula K. Le Guin set out to create her ambiguous utopia in the early 1970s, the positive utopia had been displaced in the system of literary genres available to novelists" (244). The Dispossessed is an anachronism because it has been written far after the utopian genre had ceased to attract novelist, replaced instead by dystopias, nonetheless displaying utopian tendencies.

that is their past or their future respectively. Their shutting off time becomes dystopian, as I will detail in the subsequent sections.

The study of time and of the expression of time in relation to utopia raises issues that are well expressed by Shevek: "chronosophy does involve ethics. Because our sense of time involves our ability to separate cause and effect, means and end" (195). Shevek expresses the idea that chronosophy is subjective: it can be tainted by the choices made by looking at causality, choosing which means and which end is defined as a key element. This subjectivity is exemplified in a discussion between guests that occurs shortly after Shevek explains the issues at stake with causality: people are seen speculating on the continuation of the war. Shevek observes: "They were off prediction, now, and on to politics. They were all disputing about the war, about what Thu would do next, what A-Io would do next, what the CWG would do next" (197). Here, people are seen guessing the subsequent steps the war between the socialist nation Thu and A-Io would take. This speculating is labelled ironically as "politics" by the narrator, who notes that the conversation has seemingly moved from "prediction", while in fact it has not. In this sense, politics is equated to historical prediction and speculation. Shevek's observation denounces the Urrasti application of causality to try to predict historical events.

However, as the subsequent sections will show, using causality retrospectively can also be used to manipulate facts and to create and maintain a certain ideology—to create history.[24] Briefly, the exodus of the Anarresti Settlers from Urras is seen as prevalent in their society, as opposed to the publication of Odo's philosophy, which inspired people to rebel and break their chains. Shevek hints at the fact that chronosophy needs to be envisaged ethically: "If time and reason

[24] Edward Said commented on the manipulation of history and memory in "Invention, Memory, and Place". He exemplifies his point by quoting the manipulation of tradition and the creation of celebration in French culture, that is "the invention of public ceremonies. The most important of these, Bastille Day, can be exactly dated in 1880" (178). Said states that Bastille Day became a memorable celebratory event a century after it happened, and its significance was asserted only for social cohesion. Said denounces the manipulation of memory "The invention of tradition is a method for using collective memory selectively by manipulating certain bits of the national past, suppressing others, elevating still others in an entirely functional way. Thus memory is not necessarily authentic, but rather useful" (179). Memory can be prefabricated to serve a social, political purpose. Said purports that memory should be something that "sits inertly there for each person to possess and contain" as opposed to being tainted and manipulated for ideological purpose. (179). It is the concept of invention of memory that I would like to transposed onto a reading of *The Dispossessed* in which the authorities manipulate the past to create new memories.

are functions of each other, if we are creatures of time, then we had better know it, and try to make the best of it. To act responsibly" (196). Responsibility has to be applied when considering all aspects of chronosophy, which can enable Anarresti and Urrasti to understand how they view and comprehend time, and how it shapes their reality and their experience. Shevek believes in the simultaneity of time: "But as surely as the future becomes the past, the past becomes the future" (78). By keeping an open mind in regards to the past or the future, bridges can be built between the two planets.

This temporal duality, in the shape of causality and simultaneity, past and future, is reflected in the image of the wall and is reflected in the structure of the novel. Bittner writes that "the form of narrative which [Shevek] lives in is itself a chiasmus: the first and last chapter are entitled 'Anarres Urras' and 'Urras Anarres'" (246). A chiasmus is a trope signifying that the order of words has been inverted. However, in *The Dispossessed*, it signifies that the order of time has been reversed: the departure from Anarres to Urras at the beginning of the novel results in the departure from Urras to Anarres at the end. The timeline is "criss-crossed" (Ibid): the chapters alternate between past and future, the present being only actualised in the last chapter. The novel starts with Shevek's departure from Anarres to Urras, and more specifically the capitalist nation A-Io. The plot then alternates between Shevek's childhood and the events leading to his departure to Anarres—that is, his growing up on Anarres—and the events taking place in his adult life on Urras, ending with his return to Anarres.[25] Therefore, the reader follows Shevek's life on two separate time lines, which are nonetheless intertwined and connected.

[25]In fact, it is possible to read the construction of the novel as similar to that of John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*, where the primary narrative is seemingly interrupted by "intercalary", reportage-like chapters describing the landscape and the broader social context. The more general, descriptive chapters precede the chapters depicting the struggles of Tom Joad. The intercalary chapters give a contextualisation for the primary narrative and serve to anchor these events into a broader context. They might appear at a glance as disconnected from the storyline but give a background to the story, and even bring a different light on the main plot. For example, in chapter 3, the narrator describes the toil a turtle faces walking on a path under a scorching heat. In chapter 4, Tom walks along the same path, indicating that he too suffers the same conditions as the turtle. Tom picks up the turtle, and this gesture would not make sense if a chapter was not devoted to describe its struggle. This makes his gesture of picking it up, rescuing it from the heat, all the more humane. What is more, the turtle is slightly out of place in the Oklahoma landscape, it reinforces the fact that the working class is made to feel out of place. In this sense the construction of *The Dispossessed* can be read in the same light as *The Grapes of Wrath*: the chapters are interlinked and give extra depth to one another.

Philip Smith proposes a chronological reading of a novel, which, he claims, would enrich one's understanding of the imagery of the wall:

> A reading of the novel following the temporal sequence of Shevek's life (that is, first reading the even-numbered chapters and then the odd-numbered chapters) offers an approach to understanding the several ways in which wall imagery enriches the characterisation of Shevek and the structure of ideas in *The Dispossessed*. (88)

Smith here details the fact that if one wants to follow the chronological timeline of Shevek's life, one would need to start with the second chapter, continue reading the chapters entitled "Anarres" in the order given in the novel, read the chapter entitled "Anarres Urras", continue with the chapters given the name "Urras" and end with the final chapter. Smith explains that this would enable the reader to make more sense of the wall imagery as the two intertwined narrative timelines can be "ambiguous" (88). However, reading the novel in its chronological timeline takes out the element of simultaneity and the chiasmus-like structure of the novel, thus annihilating the key concept of the "circle of time" (*The Dispossessed*, 194), of the overall simultaneous experience of time, thus undermining the importance to read the novel as it is: a singular experience composed of multiple intertwined events.

The structure of the chiasmus, of the intricate timelines, reflects Shevek's interest in simultaneity: "Sequency explains beautifully our sense of linear time, and the evidence of evolution. It includes creation and mortality. But there it stops. It deals with all that changes but it cannot explain why things also endure. It speaks only, of the arrow of time—never the circle of time" (194). Bittner's idea of the chiasmus, of the reversed yet unified picture of time, transpires in Shevek's explanation of simultaneity as the circle of time. Shevek understands that his life can be seen as a string of a cause and effect, small events that make up the parts of his whole life. I will now offer a few examples of how the juxtaposed, entwined chapters relate to each other, therefore exposing the presence of causality, as well giving a sense of the singular experience that is Shevek's life.[26]

[26]*The Dispossessed* can be compared to *The Left Hand of Darkness*, as Frederic Jameson points out: the novel, like *The Dispossessed*, is characterised by "'generic discontinuities', and the novel can be shown to be constructed from a heterogeneous group of narrative modes artfully superimposed and intertwined, thereby constituting a virtual anthology of narrative strands of different kinds. So we find here intermingled: the travel narrative (with anthropological data), the pastiche of myth, the political novel (in the restricted sense of the drama of the court intrigue), straight SF (the Hainish colonisation,

It is possible to observe the direct juxtaposition of events in alternate chapters: I would like to analyse how chapters refer to the previous and subsequent ones, therefore exemplifying the concept of causality, also giving a unified picture of Shevek's life. An event taking place in one chapter is immediately referred to in the following one. To illustrate this point, I will expose various images of the wall present in the first three chapters of the novel, which will incidentally serve to further associate the image of the wall with ideology.[27] In the opening lines of the first chapter, the wall serves to create a sense of difference, exclusion and introversion, and because of it, Anarres is compared to "a great prison camp" (1). This idea of imprisonment is present again when Shevek boards the space ship that will take him to Urras, the *Mindful*. Shevek is kept in a "very small room, with seamed, blank walls" (6) and "the walls stood tight about him" (8). This confers the room a sense of claustrophobia, which is reinforced by the silent and desert atmosphere outside the room: "there was only a silence, an awful utter silence, just outside the walls" (6). Shevek is left isolated and no help is at hand to rescue him out of the room. Shevek panics and turns to rage and slams his hand against the door (9). After knocking the wall and being freed, Shevek comments on his imprisonment: "To lock out, to lock in, in the same act" (10). This statement is reminiscent of the narrator's comment on the Anarresti wall: "What was inside it and what was outside it depended upon which side of it you were on" (1). These two very similar statements should draw the reader's attention to the metaphor of the wall and indicate that further similarities will be drawn.

Shevek feels imprisoned in his room aboard the Urrasti ship, *The Mindful.* He is kept isolated for his "safety" (10) as the doctor on board tells him. His clothes have been cleaned and sterilised (10) and he is in quarantine, which reminds the reader of the quarantine and exclusion occurring on the port of Anarres (1). Shevek's room aboard the *Mindful* is "locked" (9), mirroring the idea that Anarres is a "prison camp"

---

the spaceship in orbit around Gethen's sun), Orwellian dystopia (the imprisonment on the Voluntary Farm and Resettlement Agency), adventure story (the flight across the glacier), and finally even, perhaps, something like a multicultural love story (the drama of communication between the two cultures and species)" (*AOTF*, 267).

[27] For further exemplification of the juxtaposition of events in the novel, see Mark Tunik's "The Need for Walls: Privacy, Community and Freedom in *The Dispossessed*", Winter Elliott's "Breaching Invisible Walls: Individual Anarchy in *The Dispossessed*" and Philip's Smith's "Unbuilding Walls: Human Nature and the Nature of Evolutionary and Political Theory in *The Dispossessed*".

(1). After hitting the wall of his room in frustration and before being freed from his room, the narrator, reporting on Shevek's point of view, indicates that someone is speaking out on the intercom. However, the voice is depersonalised: the "wall speaker began to babble" (9), and this occurs on another occasion too, when about to land: "The wall speaker was blatting orders" (17). Men have lost the ability to communicate. Instead, the very walls they have raised speak for them. This is made explicit when Shevek talks with Kimoe, the doctor working on the space ship. Their conversations do not flow easily: "Kimoe's ideas never seemed to be able to go in a straight line; they had to walk around this and avoid that, and then they ended up smack against a wall. There were walls all around his thoughts, and he seemed utterly unaware of them though he was perpetually hiding behind them" (14). Kimoe is conditioned by avoiding certain subjects and concepts, and does so without realising that his thoughts are caged and imprisoned, constructed and shaped by ideological walls.[28]

In the following chapter, Shevek is a little boy and one of his recurrent childhood dreams echoes the scene aboard the *Mindful*. In his dream, Shevek is in a bare land and can see a line. As he approaches the line, he realised that it is a wall: "The wall stopped him. A painful, angry fear rose up in him" (29). Shevek wants to go on but he is stopped by the wall, the line symbolising chronosophy, causality, exclusion and enmity; he is stopped by the ideologies embodied in the wall. His freedom is limited by the Anarresti ideology that prevents him from pursuing his research for the benefit of the Nine Known Worlds. In A-Io, his freedom is restricted by the people who want to profit from his research and prevent him from resurrecting the revolution. On a symbolic level, the ideological reasons, which will be developed in the subsequent section, for Anarres to deny its past and for Urras to close itself to future possibilities are what prevent Shevek from moving. Filled with anger, Shevek "beat at the smooth surface with his hands and yelled at it" (29). His hitting the wall is a repetition of his slamming his hands against the doors on the *Mindful* in the previous chapter. In his dream, Shevek is freed: he is given a stone by his mother—who abandoned him when he was a child. The stone is marked with the number "1",

[28]The relation between language and thought will be dealt with in greater details in the second chapter. This relates to the idea that linguistic ideology makes people act as automatons repeating propaganda. See p.106, 111, 117 and 154.

which “was both unity and plurality” (29), and suddenly “there was no wall” (Ibid). The wall is an ideological line: causality impairs the perception of singularity, of simultaneity. However, this is only a dream, foretelling Shevek's quest to unify causality and simultaneity and his wish to see “the walls down” (120).

The images of the wall as a prison evoked in the first chapter are summoned again in the second one. Shevek's experience of being locked in the room in the space ship is not a new experience: as a child, Shevek and his friend played a pretence game of prisoners and guards. One of the boys, Kadagv, is locked in a small cave for thirty hours. The rest of the boys start to behave differently: Tirin, one of the children playing the role of guard, becomes arrogant. Shevek and Tirin get so caught up in their game that: “they were not playing the role now, it was playing them” (33). The children have lost control of who they are, and instead, are perverted by the power and the secret they share. When asked by a teacher where their comrade is, Tirin does not reply and Shevek “felt clever, he felt a sense of power, in not replying” (34). Tirin lies to the whereabouts of Kadagv, which makes Shevek feel uncomfortable and guilty. The boys experience the walls around their thoughts: they experience the paradigm of superiority, boundary and rules associated with hierarchy and power through their roles as prison guards. This alters their behaviour and cages their experience: the freedom they know is impaired by the roles that they have to play and by the rules by which they have to abide. Their role-play enabled them to understand the concepts of imprisonment and restriction embodied in the wall: it can restrict thinking and cage one’s experience. Ironically, the boys do not reconsider the nature of the Anarresti wall: it remains standing, protecting the bureaucracy in place.[29]

The imagery of the wall as a prison and the characteristics of how Shevek experienced it are carried forward in the following chapter. Shevek is taken around A-Io and sees that “There was still a Fort in Drio” (77), where Odo, the founder of Anarchy, was imprisoned. However, he does not feel the need to visit it: “He did not need to enter it and seek down ruined halls for the cell in which Odo had spent nine years. He knew what a prison cell was like” (77). This is a direct reference to the

[29] This will be treated in greater details further on in this chapter. See p. 51-3 for ways in which the boys questions the validity of the teachings of the PDC and p. 53-5 for the ways in which the PDC instils its rule.

events of the previous chapters, of his imprisonment aboard the *Mindful* and his role play on Anarres, and these intertwined events demonstrate that the novel is about temporality.[30]

The structure of the novel alternates between Anarres and Urras and between two timelines, which are nonetheless intertwined, reflecting how Shevek's experience as a child shaped his actions and reactions as an adult. The juxtaposition between past and present or future create a singular picture of time, manifest of the singularity of the experience. However, ideology, embodied in the wall and in limitations, constricts Shevek's experience: he is contained within the chiasmus of the structure, trapped within the principle of world reduction, between past and future and never ingrained in the present, caught between two conflicting worlds. This conflict is mirrored in the limitation of the story to two worlds, Urras and Anarres, although other planets are mentioned. The alternation of the chapters between the two planets begs the reader to compare the two systems, to see how they relate and view each other, to evaluate their differences and see how each system operates and depicts time. In the next section, I will analyse how this ideological tainting of time and memory becomes a tool to reinforce the status quo.

[30]For a detailed study of the representation of time in The Dispossessed, and how it affects the construction of the novel, see James Bittner's "Chronosophy, Aesthetics, and Ethics in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia*".

III/ Dispossessing Ideology: Turning the Page by Creating an Alternate History

The wall is a symbol of mutual exclusion, of differentiation. In *The Dispossessed*, the wall separates Anarres and Urras, its "ideological enemy" (138). The two worlds are in constant comparison: they are economically, politically and socially different, but use similar means to impose control. In this section, I will look at how both Anarres and the Urrasti nation A-Io are portrayed as highly ideological systems and how the two nations depict each other in a negative light, thus drawing attention to their similar hatred for each other, which they root in history.

Darko Suvin comments that the two planets can be seen as similar, notably when looking at the title of the novel. Suvin states:

> The dispossessed are those who have no more possessions, the non-propertarians, but also those who are no more possessed (in the Dostoevskian sense of demon-ridden) or obsessed by the principle of Having instead of Being, no more ridden by profiteering possessiveness whether applied to things, other people, nature, knowledge (Sabul's and Urrasian physics) or to oneself (Urrasian—e.g. Veia's— sexuality). From a propertarian point of view, the Anarresians have voluntarily dispossessed themselves of life-sustaining property, of their very planet; from an anarchist or socialist/communist/utopian point of view, they have rid themselves of the demon possession. The Dispossessed means thus literally—in more beautiful, semantically richer, and thus more forceful English—The De-Alienated, those rid of alienation both as physical reification (by things and impersonal apparatuses) and as psychical obsession (by demons and what Marx calls fetishes). The things that are in saddle and ride the reified Possessed recur in the imagery of barriers between individuals as well as between people and things on Urras—its walls and wrappings. (*Positions and Presuppositions*, 138-9)[31]

Suvin details the relation between the wall and the idea of possession: walls can cage and possess people. Suvin explains the title is a reference to Dostoyevsky's novel, *The Possessed*, which is a political, religious work commenting on how ideology can get hold of one being. Similarly, Le Guin's title refers to the idea of possession, as envisaged from the viewpoint of the Ioti, who are indoctrinated by the idea of commodity fetishism. The Ioti relations with one another, their political, social and ideological system are founded on the structure created by the property market: money establishes a hierarchy and differentiates the propertied class from the non-

[31] The next section will deal with the concept of fetishism in greater details. It is clear that the Ioti's model is based on the capitalist society, and that the concept of materialist fetish can apply to their society, as detailed by Suvin. The next section explains in greater details the idea of ideological fetishism.

propertied, the wealthy from the poor. However, the concept can also apply to non-materialistic notions of possession. Suvin explains that *The Dispossessed* explores the absence of possession, whether in the shape of material goods, assets or estate, domain or ground, relationship (sexual, affectionate, professional), or intellectual property. Anarresti have voluntarily done away with forms of material properties from a traditional Marxist or anarchist point of view: they have done away with the greed that pushes human beings to chain themselves to a thing. The word "Dispossessed" therefore bears strong Marxist and Dostoevskian connotations and according to Suvin, amounts to the concept of alienation: alienation through Marxist fetishes, power and exploitative structures or Dostoevskian idealistic demons, or enslaving ideologies. However, Suvin demonstrates that even on Anarres, where chains are said to no longer exist, greed and power structures are still in place, notably through Sabul, the head of research in physics and prominent figure of the PDC, the committee regulating life on Anarres. Ideology and power structures are generated, yet they bare the face of Odonism, the philosophy of anarchy, becoming akin to a possessing force, the wall or the wrappings enslaving the population.[32]

The Anarresti possession by ideology, that is their self-imprisonment through ideological obsession, is generated by the wall, which creates a temporal, political differentiation between them and Urras. This is apparent through the idea of a turning point: by focusing on a specific, ideological event that was to mark a change of the course of history, both planets create a temporalisation of politics; this becomes the ideological demon preventing utopia from being fully realised. I will now look at how the idea of "alternate history", a subgenre of science fiction: looking into the features of this subgenre can serve to illustrate how the political systems in *The Dispossessed* create a temporalisation of politics. By excluding and despising each other, Anarres and Urras reinforce their wish for isolation: they create discourses which change and alter their history, their memory and their perspective of each other.

[32] Douglas Spencer also details the association of the wall to ideology and the creation of enmity, between possession and freedom: "The motifs of walls, containment and packaging that run throughout *The Dispossessed*, contrasted with those of mobility and communication as freedom, suggests a spatialization of politics" (98).

This changing of historical perspectives can be seen as creating "alternate histories". Lisa Yaszek explains "Sf authors also use alternate histories to explore how science and society might evolve outside Western paradigms" (197). For Yaszek, science fiction distorts reality in order to experience what direction technological, social and political progress might take outside of the authors' contemporary ideologies. She pursues this by stating that "writers associated with postmodern sf have raised similar questions about the nature of historical reality in their own writings" (197). While some authors' narratives focus specifically on the possible progress that could be achieved if we lived in a different system, "alternate history" narratives transform actual events, making them take different turns. Examples of alternate histories include Philip K. Dick's *The Man in the High Castle*, in which Japan and Germany have won the Second World War and share the rule over the United States. In Steven Barnes's *Lion's Blood*, America is colonised by Africans using European slaves.[33] Such novels place the focus of their novels predominantly on the actuality of history, on the genuine nature of historical inquiry and their ideological perception and depiction.

An example of alternate history is Philip K. Dick's *The Man in the High Castle.* The novel takes place at the end of the Second World War; Germany and Japan are the victorious side and they shape the occupation of the United States. The novel is also self-reflective: an important part of the plot revolves around a book within the book, *The Grasshopper Lies Heavy*. This book effects a mise en abyme: it is itself an alternate history depicting what could have occurred if the United States and its allies had won the war instead of Germany and Japan. In the novel, the characters are seen to ponder over the same question that the reader should be engaging with while reading *The Man in the High Castle*: in the midst of war, can there really be a victorious side? Should we reconsider our ideological dichotomy of war winners and war loser? Do we not all lose in light of the horrors and cruelties of war? Juliana, the female character who met the author of the book, states how within the frame of *The Man in the High Castle* there is no winning faction: "there's nothing to be afraid of, nothing to want or hate or avoid, here, or run from. Or pursue" (244). The expression of discord and hatred and war are a sign of the loss of humanity and

[33] For more examples or details on alternate histories see Lisa Yaszek "Cultural Histories" and Andy Duncan "Alternate History".

civilisation, and therefore the idea of a winning side can be seen as ideologically manufactured. The creation of a turning point in the victories of Japan and Germany engender hatred and avoidance of the other. Felt by the German, the Japanese and the American sides alike, exclusion and extermination impair the possibility and promise of happiness. *The Man in the High Castle*, through the alteration of the historical timeline, begs the reader to reconsider the ideological stance that one can impart on history. Novels such as *The Man in the High Castle* warn against the dangers of considering history "through a single frame of reference" (Yaszek, 197), that is to say from a single ideological standpoint and to reconsider the ideological turning point.

The creation of an alternate history is also present within *The Dispossessed* through the fact that authorities manipulate the historical timeline and create a "single frame of reference". In the novel, the course of events is used and manipulated to create and further the divide between the two factions, Anarres and Urras. Both nations create histories about themselves: they create a tipping or demarcating point, which marks the beginning of change. This instils an ideological hierarchy of historical events, placing some over others. On Anarres, the ideological turning point is constituted by the settlers leaving Urras. Although Odo's writings could be regarded as the ideological tipping point because it instigated the departure of the settlers from Urras, emphasis is placed on the exodus of the Settlers.

To illustrate this fact, it is interesting to note the capitalisation of the word "Settlers": this shows that they are regarded as important, almost divine. The Settlers are perceived as having made possible a new era of freedom, notably through the guidelines present in "the Terms of the Settlement" (308) and "the Terms of Closure of the Settlement" (309). The Terms of the Settlement were principles established by the Settlers, forbidding entry to outsiders. It acts as a law: "No Urrasti off the ship, except the Settlers, then, or ever. No mixing. No contact. To abandon that principle now is to say to the tyrants whom we defeated once, the experiment has failed, come re-enslave us!" (308). This statement was made by Shevek's mother, Rulag, during a meeting with the PDC in which Shevek propounds more contact between the two enemy planets. Despite the Anarresti claim of having "no government, no laws" (143), Rulag emphasises the importance placed on these laws: the Terms of the Settlement are elevated above the Odonian principles of freedom, as the Terms are

meant to protect Anarres from invaders and outsiders. Potential newcomers wanting to flee Urrasti oppression are not given the opportunity and the freedom to settle on Anarres because more importance is placed on the law.

The importance of the Settlers' arrival from Urras transpires through the way children look at the historical event. As teenagers, Shevek and his friends discuss the arrival of the settlers on Anarres, which illustrates how teenagers view the Urrasti. The youths are disgusted by the material they viewed in class, which are films given to them by the PDC. Tirin explains: "All the material on Urras available to students is the same. Disgusting, immoral, excremental" (38). Urrasti are depicted as diseased, repulsive and depraved. They discuss how these films are meant to instil hatred for Urras, by questioning the authenticity of the movie. They do not believe what the movie shows them: if it were true, Urrasti should have long died of illness and their system should have collapsed. Tirin wonders: "What are we so afraid of?" (38), therefore questioning the necessity of fearing the Urrasti. The teenagers are divided: Kvetur supports the reasons why they are meant to believe the PDC, the teachers and the threat posed by the Urrasti, arguing "Look how they treated us Odonian!" (38). Bedap attempts to appease the hatred for the Urrasti and to challenge the view of the PDC by stating "they gave us their Moon didn't they?" (38). Bedap finds compassion and a middle ground by saying that Urras had the thoughtfulness of giving away its Moon to the Urrasti who wanted exile. However, this statement is slightly unfair, considering the harshness of Anarres's environment.[34] Tirin also remarks that the gift of the Moon was done "to keep us from wrecking their profiteering States and setting up the just society there. And as soon as they got rid of us I'll bet they started building up governments and armies faster than ever, because nobody was there to stop them" (38). Urras has given its arid Moon to the revolutionaries to prevent them from overthrowing the capitalist government, which Anarres uses to justify its hatred for Urras.

Another example of the Anarresti negative view of its Urrasti past is illustrated by Shevek, who thinks to himself: "The Settlers of Anarres had turn their backs on the Old World and its past, opted for the future only" (78), and this shows through in the Terms of the Settlement. Anarresti are dismissive of their past, instead

[34] See Peter Stillman's essay "*The Dispossessed* as Ecological Political Theory".

depicting it as something vile that should be forgotten. The reference to the "Old World" embodies the fact that Anarres's past is something in decay, on the verge of disappearance, or in the words of Tirin, "Disgusting, immoral, excremental". These statements show that the "turning point", in this case moving away from Urras, is used as a demarcation, a wall, between the past, the present, and the future. It is used as an ideological standpoint from which to move on, to build a future presented as better, leaving behind and forgetting about a different past.[35]

The Dispossessed is not the only work of science fiction to create a past from which society wants to break away. Zamyatin's *We* is remarkably creating a break between the One State and previous systems, referred to as the "Ancients", something long gone, inaccessible, almost forgotten. D-503 frequently refers to "the Ancients" as "unorganised" (13), "absurd" (41) or "tortuous" (41). In John Wyndham's *The Chrysalids*, the inhabitants of Labrador believe the "Old People" were punished by God for their sins—that is their technological advances. The people of Labrador believe that genetic mutation is the continuing punishment from God; they want to remain as genetically pure as possible for fear of divine punishment. In George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the capitalists living before the Revolution are presented as "fat, ugly with wicked faces" (76), having the power to imprison everyone who disobeyed them; contrasting with the appearance of fairness of the Oceanian system.[36] In Clifford Simak's *City*, the dogs call the tales of Man, the cities and war "legends", which shows that they regard the existence of man and of cities as mythical, fabulous and dubious. These depictions serve to show that portraying the past as a time of pain and cruelty can contrastively serve to

[35] This idea of the new and old orders is detailed by D. Suvin, who explains the linguistic origins of the name. He explains that "Its name testifies to its being not only the country of An-Archy (non-domination) and negated (an) or reinvented (ana) Urras, but also the Country Without Things (res); and Urras is not only a phonetically heightened shadow of Earth, but the primitive (Ur) and stunted (only disyllabic) opposite of Anarres; it is the place which has not yet got rid of res" (*Positions and Presuppositions,* 139). The name "Anarres" embodies its ideology and its will to break away from its past. More importantly, the construction of the word "Anarres" reflects the fact that it has done away with material possessions, unlike its counterpart "Urras", which is reflective of the fact that it is attached to the past.

[36] Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* shows the creation of a new language, Newspeak, to try to create a break from the present and the past. Lewis Call, in "Postmodern Anarchism in the Novels of Ursula K. Le Guin", explains how the creation of the Anarresti language, Pravic, serves to create a break from the capitalist Urrasti ways (p.99-100). Just as the concepts of freedom cannot be expressed in Newspeak, the concept of property are not linguistically supported in Pravic: both language use the principles of linguistic determinism, hoping that by removing some words in the language, the thoughts will no longer exist. See p. 101; 104-7 of this thesis.

promote a present and current system as a better opportunity to be cherished and offering a better, utopian alternative.

In contrast, the past can also be envisaged with nostalgia, as is the case in Isaac Asimov's *The Caves of Steel*. The investigator Elijah Bailey has to look into the murder of a Spacer, the race of humans who left the Earth, conquer outer worlds, and evolved into a disease fearing species. The people on Earth are forbidden to leave the planet to reach the outer colonies, as the Spacers believe that their inability to manage resources, population, and disease would pose a threat to the comfort and the wealth of those living in the outer worlds. Bailey reminisces on what is known as Medievalism, the attitude of looking at the time when man lived happily in the city, when "people lived in the open" (7) as opposed to living under the dome built to contain the city and help the agoraphobic population to shut out the outside. It was a time when people "lived close to nature. It's healthier, better. The troubles of modern life come from being divorced from nature." (7) The Medievalist view the past, most specifically what seems to equate to the twentieth century, as a time when "Everything was simpler" (18), when the Spacers did not impose restrictions on Earthmen and were not degrading them: "Most Earthmen were Medievalists in one way or another. It was an easy thing to be when it meant looking back to a time when Earth was the world and not just one of fifty. The misfit one of fifty at that" (18). The time before the exodus of the Spacers is looked at with awe and nostalgia, yet it is still an ideological turning point marking a change.

Urras, to a lesser extent, also has a historical shifting point, although less clearly stated, but, unlike Anarres who celebrates its turning point, the Urrasti privileged class looks at it with bitterness and nostalgia. By focusing too much on the past and wanting to re-instate it, Urras denies its future and tries to at least uphold the status quo and this is made apparent when Shevek and Vea visit a museum. They look at "a glass case in which lay the cloak of Queen Teaea, made of the tanned skins of rebels flayed alive, which that terrible and defiant woman had worn when she went among her plague-stricken people to pray God to end the pestilence, fourteen hundred years ago" (188). Queen Teaea embodies royalty, privilege and power as she tamed the rebellion and managed to quiet a revolution. Her cloak is testament of her valour and righteousness in the same manner as Jason's retrieving the Golden Fleece

reinstates him as a king—his throne being usurped by his uncle. Queen Teaea can be seen as a figure embodying the monarchy holding onto power, holding onto their birth right, wanting to assert authority and impede change, impede revolutions and the institution of new systems.

Queen Teaea embodies a lost past that the Ioti upper class longs for, as is the case when Vea simply dismissed her as only a figure in history. Shevek is shocked by the brutality represented in the cloak, as the skin of dissidents was removed from them for her to wear, indicative of her authority. Shevek asks Vea: "Why do you people cling to your shame?" (189), which is a statement reflecting that A-Io is strongly attached to its past, even though it can be seen as immoral, outrageous and barbarous. Vea answers "But it's all just history. Things like that could not happen now!" (189). Although Vea initially dismisses this cruelty to the past, to a foregone history, her commenting on Queen Teaea's cloak that it "looks awfully like goatskin" (188) shows a lack of concern for the suffering of the degraded rebels, of the hierarchical strata of society: Ioti have not learnt the lessons of history, especially since the lower class still struggles. Things have changed, but the ruling classes still look at the past with nostalgia, ignoring the future.

A distinction seems here to be drawn between the differences in the ways the two planets depict time; which is very well summarised by Shevek. When talking to Ioti scientists, he explains: "We ignore you; you ignore us. You are our history. We are perhaps your future.[…] We must know each other" (66). Shevek explains that Anarresti ignore and reject their past, focusing instead on their present creation of an anarchist utopian heaven. Ioti display the opposite attitude: they favour their past, as Vea's admiring their late Queen, ignoring the future that could be embraced by having contact with Anarres.

Shevek has more to say on Anarres ignoring their past: "To deny is not to achieve. The Odonians who left Urras had been wrong, wrong in their desperate courage, to deny their history, to forego the possibility of return" (78). Shevek explains that by entirely shutting themselves off, Odonians deny themselves the possibility of change and utopia. However, Shevek does not necessarily speak of a literal return to Urras, but rather a return of the repressed: Anarres repressed its

Urrasti past, but Urras becomes depicted as an evil entity only retroactively.[37] As Anarres creates ideological pictures of its past, it turns Urras into an enemy only in the future: at the time of the revolution on Urras, Odonians were not Anarresti, as Anarres had not been founded, Urras was not an enemy, the propertied class was. The bureaucratic PDC, by creating this repressed enemy in the future, can exert control over the Odonian society in the present by making it deny its past.

The idea of the return of the repressed exposes the idea of linearity, of backtracking the events leading to the repressed, that is, illustrating the fact that certain events are consciously chosen over others in order to explain and justify the repressed. However, the repressed in itself is present and latent, awaiting to be discovered; the repressed just *is* singular. Before analysing how this idea of linearity is promoted over the concept of simultaneity and understand how it contributes to fashion a dystopian picture of the society of Anarres, I would like to show how ideology is created, passed on and generated on Anarres in order to validate the constructed turning point. Walls are established, fetishistic illusions realised by erecting walls, thus reintroducing the notion of being possessed in the novel. Just as with the implementation of the turning point and a hierarchy of historical events, I want to show how tradition and the celebration of certain chosen historical events can also be fabricated, in order to promote the system in place.

[37]See Žižek's *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, p.55-8. Žižek explains that it is only through retrospection that one can make sense of the repressed: by mapping the symptom backwards, one can make sense of how the repressed was shaped. Hence the repressed, although shaped in the past, is only actualised in the future of its realisation.

IV/ Hiding Behind the Wall: Promoting and Upholding the Ideological Mask.

Many critics hold *The Dispossessed*, and more specifically Anarres, to be a utopia, even if it is ambiguous. This section will examine the extent to which Anarres can be read as a dystopia. It will specifically focus on the mechanisms of indoctrination on Anarres and show how they are historically justified: one can observe the emergence of traditions and new institutions promoting the dominating, absolute ideology in place. This ideology becomes in turn a mask, an important fact legitimising all decisions taken on Anarres, a constant fantasy that keeps on fuelling itself, creating a social body moving as one.

Edward Bulwer-Lytton's *The Coming Race* also shows the idea of how habit can be formed and instated in order to create social cohesion. In *The Coming Race*, the inhabitants of a subterranean land are able to master a power, vril, that enables them to destroy, heal and change. The power of vril is so great that individuals need to learn to master it responsibly. This mastery, or self-discipline turns into law and itself into obedience: "Obedience to the rule adopted by the community has become as much an instinct as if it were implanted by nature. Even in every household the head of it makes a regulation for its guidance, which is never resisted nor even cavilled at by those who belong to the family" (61-2). Rules and guidance become unquestionable laws. B.G. Knepper, in his essay "*The Coming Race*: Hell? Or Paradise Foretasted?" states: "Law, too, is a casualty to unlimited individual power in *The Coming Race*. Anarchy, however, does not result, mainly because the habit of restraint is presented as transmissible hereditarily, just as vril itself is. While the habit is formed, restraint must be enforced by rigid custom" (27). In order to live with such power, people learn individual restraint, which is presented as a set of rules that become habit and custom. Knepper states that the result is not chaos. In *The Coming Race*, restraint, as a practise, is presented as genetically transmitted. However, what shows through in Knepper's assertion is the idea that the habit is formed, that is to say, that it is taught, as opposed to inherent to the child, and soon becomes habit, that

is assimilated and part of normality.[38] This is also reminiscent to the concept of orthodoxy adopted in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: to avoid being imprisoned for facecrime, the population of Oceania has to learn to repress any facial expression of emotional or intellectual surprise or disagreement.

The Dispossessed also shows how children are taught something structurally defining for the Odonian society. This knowledge is passed on through school, through the teaching of history and echoes what Edward Said states in "Invention, Memory and Place":

> Far from being a neutral exercise in facts and basic truths, the study of history, which of course is the underpinning of memory, both in schools and university, is to some considerable extent a nationalistic effort premised on the need to construct a desirable loyalty to and insider's understanding of one's country, tradition, and faith. (176)

Said mainly views the teaching of history as a propaganda exercise, in which the dominant ideology legitimises itself historically, as the result of an inescapable cause and effect. History is legitimised to ensure that the population has an understanding of the condition of its society, but also to ensure that the population has faith in the current system. Every cultural, ideological, customary aspect is covered under the subject of history: it deals with the formation, tradition and institutionalisation of the country. Anarresti socially inherit their customs, which turn into habit, ideologically presented as tradition. The children are depicted as being indoctrinated with ideology, and this from a young age: the child's natural inclination for possession is moulded into egalitarian Odonism. This idea is pushed to an extreme when the narrator explains: "Little children might say, 'My mother', but very soon they learned to say 'the mother'" (51). Children want to associate with their mothers but they are prevented from turning their mothers into a property, as it goes against Odonian ideology.[39]

This is echoed by Bedap later in the novel, "We don't educate for freedom. Education, the most important activity of the social organism, has got rigid, moralistic authoritarian. Kids learn to parrot Odo's words as if they were *laws*"

[38] This is also visible in *Roadside Picnic*: Red becomes accustomed to the Zone as it is part of his life since early childhood. See p.213.

[39] See Andrew Sawyer's "'Backward, Turn Backward': Narratives of Reversed Time in Science-Fiction" and Bernard Selinger's *Le Guin and Identity in Contemporary Fiction*; in which they discuss Shevek's relation with his mother—notably on a temporal level.

(146). Bedap shows the role of the PDC: it does not teach, it imposes knowledge on children, whom, instead of questioning and re-appropriating it like any free Odonian should do, assimilate the information. John Brennan and Michael Downs, in "Anarchism and Utopian Tradition in *The Dispossessed"* discuss the way children are taught the imprisonment of Odo:

> In a prisonless society this story has gradually acquired the proportions and function of myth. It substitutes for the direct experience of the lack of freedom a nightmare vision of this most fearful and undesirable condition as if it were a legend, turning into a myth, therefore substituting the direct experience of something awful for a nightmarish vision (119). [40]

The experience of the imprisonment of Odo, of her suffering is turned into a myth, a legend of torture and horror. The reality of experience is therefore removed, substituted by ideologically tainted information. The vision given of the imprisonment is not realistic, since it is not experienced and known, which enables the PDC to depict Urrasti in a negative light and make Anarresti hate them.

This becomes all the more evident when the children discuss the material given to them by the PDC on Urras. Tirin, who is later referred as "a natural Odonian—a real one!" (286), questions the authenticity of the material: "How old are those films?" (37) and stating that "All the material on Urras available to student is the same" (38), Tirin expresses the view that the films and documents children see on Urras is one sided, and possibly outdated. The PDC, who distributes the teaching material, shows only one view of Urras and has turned schools propaganda agencies. In a similar way as children in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* are conditioned to find the marital and monogamous life appalling, being told that "most historical facts *are* unpleasant" (32), or the children of *Nineteen Eighty*-Four learn to love Big Brother above their own parents, children on Anarres are conditioned by the PDC to view the Odonian philosophy as unquestionable, an ultimate truth upheld by the PDC, to be followed by all. The PDC does not teach anyone to challenge the system and free oneself, as Odo promoted in her writings; instead children learn to repeat the

[40]John P Brennan and Michael C. Downs, in "Anarchism and Utopian Tradition in *The Dispossessed*" discuss that Odo gave Odonian a blueprint, a starting point for their society (152). Their deviating from this by teaching myths, can be seen as contradictory to Odonian principles.

words of Odo dutifully, without learning about their implications, without developing their own interpretations and making their own decisions.[41]

This raises the question of tradition. Edward Said sheds light on the founding of custom: “The invention of tradition is a method for using collective memory selectively by manipulating certain bits of the national past, suppressing others, elevating still others in an entirely functional way. Thus memory is not necessarily authentic, but rather useful” (179). Said explains that the past of one’s society can be altered to fit some ideological needs: some events of the past can be obliterated, enhanced or changed, to fit an ideological purpose. In turn, tradition can be invented to reinforce, uphold and glorify the adopted historical view. Memory is therefore manipulated and loses its genuine essence.

Just as *The Coming Race* exhibits the consequences of rules and family guidance, *The Dispossessed* exposes and displays the institutionalisation of tradition. By looking at two different festivals, the difference between the ideological, fabricated habit and tradition created by the PDC and the genuine experience of History can be exposed. The eighth chapter opens on Anarres during Insurrection day, which commemorates the “first great uprising in the Nio Esseia in the Urrasti year 740, nearly two hundred years ago” (203).[42] Insurrection Day is a political celebration of the beginning of the Odonians' uprising against Urrasti oppression. The very fact that the narrator mentions the Urrasti is an indication that Anarresti are celebrating their freeing from their enemy. The narrator sheds more light on this festival stating that “There were many such traditions and festivals on Anarres, some instituted by the Settlers and others, like the harvest-homes and the Feast of the Solstice, which had risen spontaneously out of the rhythms of life on the planet and the need for those who work together to celebrate together” (203). The narrator indicates that similar festivals to Insurrection Day exist; all institutionalised by the Settlers, created to manufacture a new tradition. It is interesting to note the sentence structure, as it creates a double meaning. The comma breaks the rhythm of the sentence, which shows that some traditions were “instituted by Settlers and others”,

[41]This view is echoed by Charlotte Spivack who states that the Anarresti school system fosters “mediocrity and conformism” and is detrimental to creativity (80).
[42]James W. Bittner, in "Chronosophy, Aesthetics, and Ethics in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia*." states that Insurrection Day is a reference to the split between Marxists and Anarchist, when Marx ousted Bakunin in the 1872 Hague Congress (250).

implying that the PDC, who has authority to organise life on Anarres, initiates new tradition. In contrast to this, the narrator spends more time detailing the other festivals. They are spontaneous, authentic and genuine. They arise from a real need and wish to celebrate life, to celebrate the bounties of the harvest and the solstice; and differ from the institutionalised celebrations.

Victor Urbanowicz shows that festivals are not the only type of custom that have been institutionalised: "custom has made most persons ashamed to refuse postings even when acceptance means being separated for years from a mate or from one's chosen work" (148).[43] Urbanowicz explains that it has become a habit for Anarresti to obey the orders of the PDC, not to question and refuse postings, confirming that the PDC is at the origin of the institution of new customs. Bedap also demonstrates the establishment of power structures. Bedap explains that although there are no governments as such on Anarres there is a force akin to it: "Tomar's *Definitions*: 'Government: The legal use of power to maintain and extend power.'—Replace 'legal' with 'customary', and you've got Sabul, and the Syndicate of Instruction, and the PDC" (144). Bedap exposes the fact that forms of power have instated themselves as customs, as habits, and this means that the bureaucratic agencies, which have obtained power, have control over the population.

Bedap sheds further light on how this customary form of power has been normalised: "*ideas* were never controlled by laws and governments" (143), and that "You can't crush ideas by suppressing them. You can only crush them by ignoring them. By refusing to think—refusing to change" (143). Bedap purports that ideals cannot be dismantled by laws and governments: thinking cannot be made illegal. The only way to crush ideals is by making them inexistent or through instigating a refusal to change or to think independently. A way of achieving this could be through keeping the population distracted, as is the case in Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*: the population is kept busy through permanent advertising and cheap entertainment so that they do not focus on and realise the control exerted over them. Bedap explains how this blindness to control on Anarres is effected: "from the innate cowardice of the average human mind. Public opinion! That's the power structure [Sabul of the PDC] is part of, and knows how to use" (143-4). The fear to stand up

[43]Victor Urbanowicz points at the fact that the PDC gained its power during past emergencies, and that it clings to the power (148).

to others, to be set apart and seen as different from the general opinion drives Anarresti not to question the actions of the PDC.

Shevek experiences the power of public opinion, of the new habits and of the power of the PDC's influence when he is talking to Sabul, a prominent figure in the PDC, who fires him from his post as a physicist. Sabul's words embody the PDC's stance on difference: "You are thirty, aren't you? By that age a man should know not only his cellular function, but his organic function—what his optimum role in the social organism is. You haven't had to think about that, perhaps, as much as most people" (230).[44] Sabul accuses Shevek of being different from other Anarresti: as a researcher, he is accused of having focused on his personal interest as opposed to his place in the social organism, which is known as the "brotherhood". Sabul justifies his firing Shevek by saying that the theory he was working on was seen by other teachers and students as reflecting "a degree of privatism" (231), thus showing that Shevek is seen as egoising. Sabul reflects "In a year or so, we'll be looking back on it, proud of the sacrifices we made and the work we did, standing by each other, share and share alike" (231). This emphasises the idea that the population is sacrificing itself for the good of the community; that the sense of pride and pleasure is to be found in the community, forgetting about what personal freedom, such as Shevek's research, could give back in the long term. A distance is thus created between the anarchist ideology and the reality of implementing altruism and forsaking personal freedom.

Bedap shows that the idea of custom, of the habit of being part of the brotherhood embodies the wall, thus creating a power structure on Anarres: "An archist can break a law and hope to get away unpunished, but you can't 'break' a custom; it's the framework of your life with other people" (314). Someone who lives in a society structured by apparent laws can break the protocol that the laws represent, and hope to be unpunished, whereas in a society based on mutual aid and customs between people, complacency and peer pressure can take over individual initiative. Conformity becomes customary: any change to the customs, habits and relations between people are seen as a threat to the communal society.

[44]For more details on how Sabul impairs Shevek's progress, or how he breaks the rules of Odonism, see Laurence Davis's "The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin".

There are consequences for those who stray from the social conformity exposed above, from the welfare of the brotherhood. Before illustrating some of the punishments inflicted to those who are seen to go against the communal good—Shevek's being fired is one of them—I would like to show how the Anarresti attitude can be viewed to create a new form of fetishism. This in turn generates new structures and means of defending the walls of control upheld by the PDC. Le Guin's examination of the ideology that every man is equal to the other, that every man is free from any laws is an experimentation with a new system, and as such, new forms of fetishism which have never been experienced before arise. Suvin's idea that Anarresti are possessed by ideology echoes Andrew Reynolds idea of "fetishization of hardship and harshness" (89): Anarresti become obsessed with their capability to endure and cope with the harshness of their environment. *The Dispossessed* illustrates what can be called opinion or ideological fetishism.[45] This idea of ideological fetishism can be explained by looking at the ideological distortion of Odonism, the one fabricated by the various bureaucratic agencies on Anarres, not the theory of Odo itself. In Marxist theory, fetishism establishes the relation between a thing and people: in a capitalist society, human relations are established through the idea of commodity and money. The exchange of labour, in order to produce something, goods that can be exchanged for a wage, establishes a relation of social and economic status, in the shape of what Marx calls classes. Fetishism is the belief that commodities rule human relation, despite the fact that they should only be "functions of the human organism" (Žižek, *SOI*, 164), in which the relation between things are put forward, and "the relations of domination and servitude are *repressed*" (Ibid. 26).[46] Commodities are only a function of human social relations: commodities should be only a way to fulfil a need, or a want. However, because they are fetishised, it seems *as if* things rule the relation between men, that the value of a thing—labour, money, commodity—defines the social status of this person.[47]

Anarresti do not have possessions or commodities, therefore things do not shape their relations. They do not have a hierarchy—or the majority of them do not

[45]See p. 41 for Suvin's quotation.
[46]See also, Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I or *The German Ideology* (84-5).
[47]See Žižek's *The Sublime Object of Ideology*: Žižek explains that when we act in society, we do so guided by the fetishist illusion and only act a fantasy of relations. See p.30-33. For the exposition of commodity fetishism and fetishism of the relation between men, of servitude and kingship, see p.24-6.

admit that one has been put in place—and therefore their relations are not shaped by placing value in those who are holding power. In fact, the mechanisms of domination between people become repressed, because what dominates the relation between Anarresti is the idea of ideological fetishism. This idea of fetishism works on a fantastic level: people act as if opinion ruled the relations between them. Anarresti create a fetishist illusion: they behave as if their relations are determined by the idea of Odonism, when they are in reality ruled by the PDC.

Relations between people seem to be guided by opinion in the sense that Anarresti let the need for conformity regulate their lives and choices. This is exemplified by the fact that people "felt illness to be a crime" (104) and that Anarresti are "ashamed to say [they]'ve refused a posting. That the social conscience completely dominates the individual conscience, instead of striking a balance with it" (286). The domination of the social over the individual is so strong that Anarresti fear to be seen as weak or "egoising" and not helping the community. Anarresti have let the organism known as the "brotherhood" take the reins of their relations, and they act as if this one had more importance than the actuality of Odonism. Chris Ferns summarises this idea: "Through having made a fetish of their own superiority, and with the example of Urras as the Other which they must at all costs resist turning into, the Anarresti have created an environment where the prospect of any further change is seen as threatening" (254). The PDC has instilled a strong sense of superiority in Anarresti, making them believe that it is their communal cohesion which makes them stronger, that it has generated a fear of invasion in the population. This fear of this superiority being undermined by invasion which would institutionalise individualism and property, is a prime example of ideological fetishism. As a result, individuals fear social exclusion which is instilled in the population as a way of controlling their movements and activities. Therefore, Anarresti's apparent belief in bureaucratic Odonism guides their relation: they condemn those who rebel, who act of their own accord for the better of society, although this might seem at first to conflict with the better of society and the guidelines of Odonian freedom.[48]

[48] Žižek explains of capitalist societies that people "are fetishist in practice, not in theory" (*SOI*, 31), which means that people act as if they are really believing in the fetishism, without really believing in

Shevek's departure to Urras is an instance demonstrating how Anarresti act out the fantasy that the brotherhood is an organism apparently motivated by the good of society. People are opposed to Shevek's journey to Urras, Shevek is regarded as a traitor, and "there are people all over Anarres watching [him]" (309-10), showing the united front of the social organism at work. Shevek's departure is seen as breaking the Terms of Closure of the Settlement, and opening the gates to Urrasti: the social body feels it has to defend its borders as Shevek intends to open them. In spite of the claim of freedom, Shevek is not entirely free to leave Urras; it is not achieved without conflict. He is threatened with violence, before his departure or on his return. A crowd gathers to watch Shevek depart protesting and insulting him, also ready to kill him. This shows that people are following bureaucratic ideology to a certain extent: they feel Shevek's free act is a threat to Anarres. However, it is interesting to note that Shevek is not alone, that other people want to break the mob's rule and the control of the PDC, as embodied by Takver's statement: "I think there are more people on our side, on the Syndicate's side, than we realise" (328). This shows that other people are aware of the repressive actions of the PDC, therefore actualising its repressive reality and embodying the fact that the brotherhood is only a fantastic creation.

Shevek's discomfort within his society enables the reader to understand the effects of the ideology fetishism and to further illustrate its workings. Shevek lives outside the fantasy created by the PDC; his genuine care for his fellow Odonians means that he can see through the ideological fabrications. Shevek talks about his discomfort from being made an outcast to Bedap, who explains that "Intellectuals are always being led astray, because they think about irrelevant things like time and space and reality, things that have nothing to do with real life, so they are easily fooled by wicked deviationists" (318). Shevek struggles with the ideological fantasy created by the PDC and other bureaucratic agencies, because his reality, the one in which the PDC is totalitarian, does not correspond to the practical reality of people. Incidentally, the word "deviation" is also used in John Wyndham's *The Chrysalids* to describe the mutated humans: those who do not follow reality, anchored in biology,

---

it, creating an illusion. This idea can be transposed onto *The Dispossessed*: an illusion of collectivism is created, when, in reality, the PDC can be seen as totalitarian.

are rejected and killed. Shevek can be read in those terms: he is a mutant, one who can see beyond the structuring ideology. For a long time, as Bedap explains, Shevek was fooled by individuals such as Sabul, who made him believe in the reality of the brotherhood, when it is in fact a manipulative ideological construction. Being aware of this illusion means becoming a deviation, an outcast.

Bedap explains to Shevek that his depression and desire to commit suicide emanate from the void created by the gap between reality and fantasy. Bedap explains: "What drives people crazy is trying to live outside reality. Reality is terrible. It can kill you" (144). On Anarres, reality takes the shape of the PDC, the Brotherhood and is supported by the distorted Odonian philosophy. However, to Bedap, this is only an ideological fantasy: reality lies in the living of that illusion. What is perceived as real is only an ideological fantasy supported by opinion fetishism, a fact that Shevek finds hard to bear. The sickness Shevek has to face is that he has become aware that his Anarresti society is founded on ideology and a form of fetishism: this contradicts the principles of Odo who purports individual freedom balanced with consideration for others and personal restraint, but not one imposed on by others. Shevek has to understand that his society is founded on a contradiction: the "sickness" (145) of his society lies in its professing freedom whilst restricting individual liberty. Shevek faces the fact that the ideological reality created by the PDC is an ideological masquerade, merely guided by a perverted practise of Odonism. This begs the questions of why more people on Anarres are not seen to question the system and the actions of the PDC. Anarresti are not asking questions because they are caught up playing and acting out the social fantasy created by the PDC, in the same manner as Shevek and his friends were caught up in their role-play of playing prison guards.[49] This can be equated to the idea of wearing a mask and playing a part, as an actor would read out his script.[50]

---

[49] See p. 39.

[50] Slavoj Žižek equates this ideological fantasy as wearing a mask. In this fantasy of the ideological masquerade, new traditions and masks are created and all members involved in this adopt and wear masks in order to perform their role. Carl Jung's concept of "persona", exposed in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, link the collective psyche to that of an individual actor wearing a mask, which symbolises the role of the bearer. This mask takes the shape of titles, work, function, etc. For Jung, the masks are not entirely real, they only perform a secondary reality for the individual and serve as a compromise function (157). Jung explains that the persona is a mask "of the collective psyche, a mask that *feigns individuality*, making others and oneself believe that one is individual, whereas one is simply acting a role through which the psyche speaks" (157). For Jung, the mask enables people to

Ironically, in *The Dispossessed*, the mask worn by Anarresti begs them to deny their individuality for the sake of collectivism, although this is contrary to the principles of Odo. Instead, Anarresti should try to strike the balance between fulfilled individuals striving to better society through solidarity. Shevek refuses to wear the mask of what can be called ideological, fantastic collectivism. Through his attempt not to wear a mask, Shevek is trying to abide by and restore the principles of Odonism: true anarchy is devoid of social, political, ideological masks, as everyone is free to follow his or her own inclination. Shevek's refusal to play the ideological game and act as if the collective psyche was more important represents his attempt to tear down the wall and remove the masks that all Odonian wear: this constitutes his personal revolution.

Winter Elliott explains: "the walls of *The Dispossessed* are constructed and torn down invisibly, inside each person, before they are made tangibly real. *The Dispossessed*, is thus, a novel of individual anarchy, a depiction of a utopia secured through personal rebellion and renewal" (150-1). Although Elliott is correct in stating that the walls are created within every person, it is important to note that they are created for them. Once the inner walls are built, it is difficult for people to tear them down and awaken to ideology: the self-restraint demanded by Odonism has been replaced with the controlling, restrictive brotherhood, reinstating new barriers which impede private revolution, thus causing the rejection and annihilation of the anarchist utopia. In contrast, Shevek is a person who attempts to destroy these fantastic walls and the utopian impulse can be felt through him. The same does not apply to all the characters, because they do not embrace the concept of kynicism, as Shevek does, and do not perceive the cynicism of the PDC; notions that I will now define. Looking into the ideas of cynicism and kynicism will enable to further the understanding of the dismantling of the inner walls and of the construction, justification and instigation of power structures, and thus open up utopia.

---

act as if they were individuals. However, the roles they play demonstrate their involvement in the collective psyche and reinforce the status quo.

V/ Temporality of Censorship: Kynicism, Cynicism and the Conflict of Voicing Change

Žižek details the difference between cynicism and kynicism: cynicism is the attitude of the one who sees and understands the ideological structure but insists on the "ideological mask" (*SOI*, 29), or the wall, and kynicism the attitude of rejection of the ruling ideology.[51] Timothy Bewes in *Cynicism and Postmodernity* explains that kynicism is "the critical insight which informs modern cynicism. Thus his concept of 'kynicism' is based above all on a recognition of the satirical roots of critique, and it is polemically opposed to the kind of idealised 'objective' critique that masquerades as something respectable" (29). Kynicism is a more postmodern form of cynicism, as it sees the impossibility, the flaws behind the idea of a neutral, objective critique. Bewes explains by taking itself too seriously, kynicism "becomes vulnerable to precisely its own critical process" (41), that is to say that turning the ridicule into something serious is opened to attacks from opponents or the people in power, and thus can serve to reinforce the ideological masquerade, known as cynicism. Kynicism is a stance adopted by the population, especially those subjugated to cynical forms of power.[52] Kynicism is a form of rejection of this subjugation, and undermines the ways in which power is expressed or exerted. Irony and sarcasm are used to show the feeble ways in which a dominant ideology asserts itself, by ridiculing its shape, its tone and all the ceremonial ways in which it is expressed. Therefore, and at least temporarily, kynicism breaks the ideological mask, showing the true face of ideology: the dismantling of the carefully chosen, considerate words, unravels the ideological violence, exploitation and expression of private interests hidden behind the mask. Underlying the idea of kynicism is the utopian impulse for

[51]Žižek obtains these concepts from Peter Sloterdijk's *Critique of Cynical Reason*. Žižek defines kynicism as: "the popular, plebeian rejection of official culture by means of irony and sarcasm: the classical kynical procedure is to confront the pathetic phrases of the ruling official ideology—its solemn, grave tonality—with everyday banality and to hold them up to ridicule, thus exposing behind the sublime *noblesse* of the ideological phrases the egoistical interests, the violence, the brutal claim to power". (29)

[52] It is interesting to note that the word "kynicism", which belongs to the philosophical vocabulary or jargon, is similar to the standard, common use of the word cynicism, as defined by the *OED*: "A person disposed to rail or find fault; now usually: One who shows a disposition to disbelieve in the sincerity or goodness of human motives and actions, and is wont to express this by sneers and sarcasms; a sneering fault-finder." (See Cynic in the *OED*). This definition is close to Žižek's idea of "plebeian rejection of official culture by means of irony and sarcasm", and inability to believe in the apparent sincerity of the official bodies.

change: sarcasm, irony and the rejection of the official culture are ways to express this discontent, which can also be present in art through satire, parody and allegory.[53]

However, kynicism is not entirely sufficient to subvert the authorities, who use cynicism as a response to and an attack on kynicism. Neil Wilson notes that: "The concept 'cynicism' is reserved for the reply of the dominant culture to the ever-present kynical provocations." (56): the authorities or dominant groups re-assert their power by using cynicism, thus shutting down the kynical impulse. This statement is echoed by George Kunz who explains that cynicism is connected to "the modern tendency to be arrogantly critical, manipulative, and self- indulgent. Cynicism is the corrosive effort of modern self-righteousness that has contaminated much of our academic, political, economic institutions" (166). Cynicism is the attitude adopted by many powerful institutions, notably political, using it to express their decency, adequacy and legitimacy. The ruling class uses cynicism as a type of discourse that seeks to defend the mask, despite acknowledging the difference between the applied reality and the ideological discourse. Cynicism works as a "negation of the negation" (Sloterdijk, in Bewes, 41), that is, a negation and dissolution of the kynical discourse. This is reminiscent of the idea of adopting a stance of morality to justify immorality, or as one adopts a justificatory stance to acknowledge the consequence of ideology.[54] Cynicism is the highest form of deceit and perversion that authorities can use: one fully acknowledges the suffering caused by ideology, but views the sufferings, the control and the repression necessary for the maintenance and the sustaining of social order which serves as the justification for upholding the ideology. Therefore cynicism denotes an ultimate sense of perversion, as those in power are ready to ignore the pain and repression inflicted upon the population or the dominated for the sake of power and maintenance of the ideological structures, ideas which are at play in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*.

The Dispossessed engages with the interaction between kynicism and cynicism. This is observable in the relation between artists and scientists and their censors. Shevek has to face his project being undermined and rejected by Sabul, the

[53] For the relation on parody, irony and satire, see Fredrick Jameson's *Postmdoernism, or, The Cultural Logic of late Capitalism*, p.17.
[54] This point is very similar to Orwell's idea that "political speech and writing are largely in the defence of the indefensible" (356). See p.102.

person in charge of the institute and part of the PDC. Salas, a musician, faces censorship from the Music Syndicate and Tirin, a playwright and actor, was sent to the Asylum for his satirical play ridiculing an Urrasti attempting to buy Anarres. Douglas Spencer views the control of artists and censorship in the Soviet Union as the inspiration for the restriction imposed on Anarresti creative minds.[55] He explains: "On Anarres, as in Soviet Russia, ideas had become abstracted into an autonomous ideology unresponsive to the lived, spontaneous nature of everyday life." (102). Introducing Soviet-style censorship in the novel serves to show that, despite its claim for freedom, the PDC is an agency that imposes and restricts individual freedom by preventing characters such as Salas, Tirin, or Shevek from communicating that kynicism, which becomes a tool for resistance. Also, seeing the PDC or Syndicates justifying the censorship serves to illustrate the bureaucratic response of the PDC: one needs to put forward the needs and the valour of Anarres before their own creative needs, as this can be perceived as egoistic, thus suggesting that art has a dissident and utopian value that can enable one to free oneself. *The Dispossessed* is anchored in the historical context of repression and censorship of the Soviet Union. Art in the Soviet Union was supposed to support the ideology of the Party through a movement called Socialist Realism. The ideological nature of Soviet art is reflected in *The Dispossessed* through the censorship and repression that the characters experience. Giving a background on the life of artists in the Soviet Union might help shed light on the censorship depicted in *The Dispossessed*, and further the understanding of the interaction between kynicism and cynicism.

Socialist Realism is a complex concept; it is at once an art form and an ideological doctrine used to disseminate the Communist Party's ideology and galvanise the population to support the totalitarian rule. This twofold aspect of Socialist Realism is exposed by Kevin Mulcahy: "As Stalin promoted greater Party

[55] Douglas Spencer comments that "The conditions in the newly formed USSR generated a similar confluence of Utopian thought and radical design practice." (96) and "There are critical moments when the invention of Utopias appears either as urgent necessity—Morris's industrial England or the consumer society of postwar Europe—or an immanent possibility—as in the Soviet Union of the 1920s." (101) The post-Bolshevik revolution generated a surge of utopian hope in the 1920s, a necessity to break away from the failures of capitalism. The formation of the USSR attracted attention to evaluate whether the utopian wish generated by the desire for equality, fairness and protection claimed by the USSR would be a successful project and generate a real Utopia. However, as history has shown, this project was turned into a totalitarian enterprise. *The Dispossessed* engages with this idea of the perversion of the utopian impulse, whilst maintaining the utopian mask.

control and ideological conformity, a new official style of heroic (or so-called socialist) realism was decreed" (72). The principles of Socialist Realism were sketched out by the Association of Revolutionary Artists of Russia: "For the expression of these new forms created by the Revolution a new style is essential . . . called heroic realism . . . The creation of a revolutionary art is first and foremost the creation of an art that will have the honor of shaping and organizing the psychology of the generations to come." (Mulcahy, 72).[56] The new social structure which rose from the Revolution required a new form of art to express and support this new social organisation and this new ideology, perceived as heroic—or utopian. Stalin thanks writers for contributing to the dissemination of propaganda: ''The production of souls is more important than the production of tanks. . . . And therefore I raise my glass to you, writers, the engineers of the human soul.'' (Kolakowski, 860) Stalin expresses that opinions and minds can be shifted and moulded through art, which becomes the Party's "servant" (Mulcahy, 73).[57] Having an army of faithful followers is a more effective weapon than weapons themselves: having army of indoctrinated followers ready to sacrifice themselves for the cause of Communism ensures that the tanks will be loyally operated.

Some guidelines were issues in *Pravda*, the official paper of the Soviet Union, indicating what Socialist Realism was meant to be: "First, the work must have a 'socialist' theme, that is, one approved by the Party. Second, the plot must be 'positive,' that is, one with a happy ending or at least a positive tone. Third, the music must be 'realistic,' that is, without dissonance or other degenerate modernist

[56] Herman Ermolaev explains how Socialist Realism was described: Mikhail Kalinin, a member of the Central Committee explained that writers should "learn from Stalin the 'terseness, clarity, and the crystal purity of his language;" and a *Literaturnaia gazeta* editorial cited excerpts from Stalin's speeches as 'concrete examples of Socialist Realism" (53). Irina Gutkin echoes that statement: "socialist realism, as the cultural expression of this new 'socialism achieved' view of time is therefore characterized first of all by a peculiar schizophrenia, or double standard, of its guiding historical perspective. On the one hand, the present is a close approximation of the future and this leads to a desire to maintain the status quo; on the other, the projected character of the revolutionary mentality has not been entirely fulfilled—in other words, every act is evaluated in terms of how it contributes to the anticipated future." (36) This concept is reminiscent of George Orwell's concept of "doublethink" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which consists in an "unending series of victories over your own memory" (37), that is it consists in the ability to forget what one knows and to accept what the Party says at face value, even if it means that it produces contradictory statements. See p. 100-3.

[57] Mulcahy details how "Culture became a compliant companion of the Central Committee" (73), indicating that it was fully regulated.

elements." (in Mulcahy, 73).[58] That is, art needs to depict socialist themes in glorious colours and avoid vague, fragmented, bleak modern elements, which would supposedly impair and taint the idealistic depiction of socialism, which needs to be accessible to all, notably to be approved for publication by the authorities.[59] The congress of Soviet writers described the official formula of Socialist Realism: it "demands from the artist a truthful, historically concrete depiction of reality in its revolutionary development…combined with the task of ideologically remoulding and educating the working people in the spirit of socialism." (Ermolaev, 53). Art has to depict the idea that the utopian revolution has been achieved and convince the population of this fact.

Not complying with the rules of Socialist Realism was a dangerous affair: one could face being censored, exiled, imprisoned, incarcerated in psychiatric institutions or executed. However, as I will shortly detail, artists were on occasions successful in communicating their criticism of the totalitarian state. Dmitri Shostakovitch was a Soviet composer who worked towards getting his work heard despite the heavy censorship and criticism that he faced in the Soviet Union. A review of his Fourth Symphony, *Lady Macbeth of the Mstensk District*, was entitled "Muddle Instead of Music". Shostakovich had to cancel the opera, despite its initial success, since Stalin disproved of its modernism and lack of socialist realism when he saw it in 1934 (Keefer, 112; Emerson, 59; Wells, E. 163). The review published in *Pravda* threatens that his ingenuity of formalism or realism "may end very badly" (in E. Wells, 164), foretelling Stalin's terror and his purging of artists he saw as dissidents.[60] Whether this statement is directed specifically at Shostakovich or not, it more generally warns artists against not complying with the Socialist Realism prescribed by Stalin.

[58] If an artist failed to comply to Socialist Realism, he would face execution. Mulcahy explains that "What made these cultural purges so insidious was the absence of a clear definition of what was meant by formalism" (74-5), that is deviating from the principles of Socialist Realism, and being formalist, was subjective.

[59] See Mulcahy, p.71, where he explains that "the Communist Party Central Committee called for an art that would be understandable to the millions", that is for an art that does not conceal, deceive or open to interpretation, in order to convey and communicate the propaganda to as many as possible. This requirement can be seen as a way to deter artists from concealing dissident messages in their works and to deter them from trying to avoid being censored.

[60] There is speculation that Stalin himself wrote the review. See Wells E., p. 163

Shostakovich is able to exploit the ideological surface of Stalinism and Socialist Realism. He displays compliance with the ideology through titles and explanations in order to mask the true themes of his work, as is the case with the Eleventh Symphony, "The Year 1905", which, despite its apparent praise of the worker uprising of that year, deals with the oppression and tyranny of the Soviet government (Brown, M., 352). His use of titles enables him to elude the censorship and repression in place. Shostakovich uses kynicism in order to subvert Soviet repression, which is confirmed in the following statement: Shostakovich, in a letter, wrote that: "It is the attitude of the composer to a particular subject which he wishes to illustrate that defines his ideology." (in Wells, E., p.163). Shostakovich's use of the word "ideology" is interesting in that he contrasts the idea of ideology or the private attitude of the artist to that of the state ideology. There, Shostakovich hints at the attitude of the artist towards ideology, and in his case, censorship and repression. Shostakovich's statement embodies the need for the artist to adopt a kynical attitude, especially if he wants his work published.

Elana Gomel views this attitude as central to the fiction of Arkady and Boris Strugatsky. In "The Poetics of Censorship: Allegory as Form and Ideology in the Novels of Arkady and Boris Strugatsky", she explains that in order to avoid being censored, the Strugatsky brothers used allegory to cover their message. She states:

> Allegory's relation to political power is two-fold. On the one hand, as *enigma*, an obscure text whose meaning is accessible only to the initiated, allegory is a language of the literary opposition, flaunting its dissident at the face of the dumb authorities that overlook its secondary meaning. On the other hand, whatever its message, the allegorical structure is inevitably hierarchical, highly ordered, and tightly controlled. It counters the political authority of the censorship-wielding state with its own textual power to define meaning. (96)

The Strugatsky brothers allegorical narrative has at least two features that enable it to subvert political control and escape censorship. In the first instance, the meaning of the text is not made obvious. Gomel exemplifies her point by quoting examples from *Hard to be a God*. She explains that the criticism of the hardship and censorship in the Soviet Union are hidden beneath the veil of the fantasy "feudal-fascist" world and in the allegory of the colour black, which stands for terror and repression, seemingly conveying the image of the "Dark Ages", the medieval era (94-95). This code is not decipherable by everyone: only those familiar with the concept of

allegory are able to understand the hidden meaning in the text. Allegory is a way to show political resistance, without being caught and punished for its offence.

However, not all authors escape the censors or wish to cover their message. Vsevolod Meyerhold was a theatre director and actor working closely with the playwright Vladimir Mayakovsky: Meyerhold's staging was non-realistic and experimental, and Mayakovsky's writing satirical. Both artists were perceived as non-compliant with Socialist Realism. They collaborated on several plays, such as *The Bedbug* (with a score by Dmitri Shostakovich). *The Bedbug* is a satirical play unmasking the petty bourgeois in Soviet society. In *The Bedbug*, the main protagonist Ivan Prisypkin, a "former Party member" (241) falls into decadent, bourgeois ways, stating to his future mother in law: "My future children must be brought up refined. There, buy one! […] my house must be filled like a horn […] of plenty" (246) and "What did I fight for? I fought for the good life, and now I've got it right here in my hands—a wife, a home and real etiquette. I'll do my duty, if need be, but it's only we who held the bridgehead who have a right to rest by the river! […] I can raise the standards of the whole proletariat by looking after my own comforts" (259). Prisypkin embodies the capitalist greed which could put a halt to the Revolution. For him, the struggle and the overthrow of the tsarist regime during the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 have fulfilled their promise, and he wants to reap the rewards of his efforts, aware that the people at the head of the bureaucracy are doing just that. In a Kafkaesque turn, Prispkin is metamorphosed into a "*Bourgeoisius vulgaris*", a parasite which "gorged itself on the body of all mankind" (300), epitomising human greed.

Despite its satirical content featuring the main character as a capitalist, Mayakovsky's play serves to praise the Bolshevik revolution and reaffirms Meyerhold and Mayakovsky's commitment to "politicized art" (Schmidt, 215) and the need for vigilance and to maintain the revolution. Mayakovsky highlights his process and intentions when writing *The Bedbug*: "The problem is the unmasking of the contemporary petty bourgeoisie. I have tried in every way I could to make the play different from the usual recent type of representational plays." (in Schmidt, p.217). In *The Bedbug*, Mayakovsky used new techniques, a new language, and satire to condemn the petty bourgeoisie living in the Soviet Union and the bureaucracy

impeding the revolutionary effort and thus created a bleak vision of the future.[61] Meyerhold's staging of another of Mayakovsky's play, *The Mystery-Bouffe*, was deemed "poorly finished from an artistic point of view" and as having "no logical and inevitable connection between acts, not even between the parts of each act." (Dimitry Furmanov, in Schmidt, 217-8). The use of new techniques, of a disjointed, modernist approach contributing to the effects of satire gained the artists the label of "formalism" (Hochman, 359). Meyerhold experienced the consequences of the "formalist" label: he had his theatres closed, his production stopped and he was subsequently accused of espionage and was imprisoned and executed. Meyerhold was aware of the danger of his actions and of his profession as seen when he talks about Mayakovsky's suicide, which he equates to murder. Meyerhold regrets "the vulnerability of lyric poets, who must be protected from suicide as we protect the worker in an unhealthful industry by giving him milk antidotes. The death of Mayakovsky violates the rules of the protection of labor in the most dangerous of industries—poetry." (Schmidt, 215). Meyerhold views poetry as a dangerous craft: working outside the prescribe guidelines can result in oppression, rejection and lack of understanding from the critics and the population. Meyerhold explains that Mayakovsky was "ahead" (Ibid.) of his time. However, Mayakovsky was not protected: Meyerhold's statement shows that the poet was not defended against the censors, rather, he was persecuted, and pushed to take his own life. Meyerhold hints at the idea that the safeguard of the artist's spirit lies in his freedom of expression.

In *The Dispossessed*, art becomes a means to resist. However, the PDC restricts the artists' ability to express themselves freely, excluding them from the rest of society by institutionalising them or censoring them. The contention between the claimed freedom and the restrictions symbolises the tension between kynicism and cynicism: new forms of art, new forms of thoughts and satire are perceived negatively, and thus censored. For Shevek, kynicism progressively becomes a means to resist, counteract and undermine the ideological mask: kynicism can be expressed in art. This can be observed when Shevek is giving advice to his acquaintance, the musician called Salas. Salas's composition is censored: he cannot get a posting in

[61] See Victor Erlich "The Dead Hand of the Future: The Predicament of Vladimir Mayakovsky" p.438-9; Alexander Mikhailov and Nancy Tittler "At the Feet of a Giant (Arguments Surrounding Mayakovsky)" p.115-28.

the Music Syndicate because the "the Music syndics don't like [his] compositions" (152). Being creative, he writes chamber music composed of five independent cyclic themes, meeting in "harmony" (152). The people of the Music Syndicate refuse to circulate and broadcast, to "share" (152) the piece of music Salas composed. He explains "they don't hear [the harmony]. They won't hear it. They can't!" as it is not in the "organic style" supported by the PDC (152), reminiscent of Shostakovich being accused of formalism. The Music Syndicate disapproves of Salas's compositions as they are seen not to comply with the style approved and applauded by the PDC.

Shevek suggests to his friend Salas to give an ideologically acceptable façade to his work. Shevek tells Salas to give his Symphony the Odonian name: "*The Joys of Solidarity*" would make a title fitting the communal ideology of the PDC, in the same manner as Shostakovich calling his Eleventh Symphony "The Year 1905" fitted in with the principles of Socialist Realism. By seemingly cooperating with the artistic ideology of the PDC, Salas would be able to release his work into the public sphere. This would constitute a form of kynicism: Salas's dilemma embodies the fact that the PDC exerts control in the anarchist society and this control and contradictory ideology can be exposed by producing works which bear the face of Odonism, whilst offering alternative views to that of the PDC. Bedap, the men's mutual friend who was listening in on their conversation, comments on Shevek's idea of giving the piece of music a glorifying title: "That's the first [k]ynical thing" Shevek ever said (152).[62] Shevek has finally understood the mechanisms of control and the distance between the claimed ideology of freedom and the social control of the PDC, and has found the ways to breach this censorship: kynicism. In the case of Salas, this is expressed through satirical labels.

Looking at Adam Roberts' *Yellow Blue Tibia* also illustrates the importance of titles, labels and satire in order to avoid censorship. In *Yellow Blue Tibia,* several science fiction writers gather as they are summoned by Stalin himself. Stalin wants them to write a plausible invasion narrative that would galvanize the world—once communism triumphs over it—into an everlasting struggle, seen as essential to

[62] The original quotation reads: "That's the first cynical thing you ever said in your life" (152). However, the common, everyday—that is non-philosophical—word for "kynical" is "cynical". See footnote 52 p.61 for the OED definition of the word.

"prolong the necessary vigour" required to test the "collective heroism" (8). The writers, understanding the importance of their work for the war effort and for communism, but also to preserve their lives, concoct a story depicting aliens destroying an American rocket and destroying part of Ukraine, contaminating it with radiation. However, the project is put to a complete halt and the writers are told that they have to "no longer sit around here [in the dacha where they were gathered], idling at state expense enjoying the best food and free vodka! Back to the real work" (24). The writers are told that they have to forget what they are told, forget that they have ever met Stalin and forget that they ever concocted the story; that is, they have to apply self-censorship, a practice common amongst the artist who wanted to avoid punishment from the Soviet regime.

One of the writers, Nikolai Nikolavaitch is afraid that the authorities will find that his work was not entirely original: he borrowed his narratives from Western writers. He explains that he changed the titles, purging novels of their "bourgeois details and adding a few of the standard Russian touches" (16). Nikolai was unable to write any original piece for a decade, presumably for fear of condemnation and punishment, as he understands how "*unmerciful* authority… needs to be." (16) However, his contribution to literature can be felt: he explains that he was the owner of forbidden American novels and translated them into Russian, and gave them the face of Socialist Realism by "purging [the texts] of bourgeois details and adding a few Russian details" (16). Nikolai successfully translated American novels—linguistically and artistically—and made them available by subverting the authorities and fooling the censors. Nikolai has managed to avoid having his works, or rather his translations, being censored by giving them a façade of Socialist Realism, thus making the "bourgeois" works acceptable to those in control of the publishing. Nikolai has given a façade of acceptability to the censors, which is what, in *The Dispossessed*, Shevek suggests Salas to do.

Shevek has to face his own censor: in *The Dispossessed,* Sabul embodies the cynical stance and the one in control of publications. He is part of the PDC, which regulates publishing, assigns teaching posts and control distribution of various items throughout the institute, including the paper Shevek was denied but needed to publish his work. Through cynicism, Sabul is able to justify the actions of the PDC and to

acknowledge the flaws of the bureaucratic system, but nonetheless legitimising the control and the repression in place. This confrontation between Shevek's kynicism and Sabul's cynicism is present in the conflict and the contrast between the two characters. Shevek is a genuine creative and original physicist, while Sabul plagiarises works written in Ioti, as his lack of creativity and ingenuity impedes his ability to conduct research.[63] Sabul initially prevents Shevek from publishing his work and from sending his essays to Urras but eventually allows him to publish his theory, because Shevek has let him co-author his work. Sabul's position in the PDC also enables him to fire Shevek from his job at the institute.[64]

Sabul explaining Shevek the reasons why he lost his job perfectly exemplifies the cynical stance:

> What worked against you was a combination of things. The abstruse, irrelevant nature of the research you've done these last several years. Plus a certain feeling, not necessarily justified, but existing among many student and teaching members of the Institute, that both your teaching and your behavior reflect a certain disaffection, a degree of privatism, of nonaltruism. This was spoken of in meeting. I spoke for you of course. (231)

Shevek is dismissed because his research is perceived as not functional or concrete enough for the purpose of Odonism, as not following the guidelines prescribed by the PDC. Therefore, Shevek is seen as an egoist character, who wants to advance his own career, but not work towards the higher ideals of the social organism, in the same manner as Soviet artists would be accused of and censored for not following principles of Soviet Realism. Sabul retains the ideological mask through his cynicism, especially when he states that the feeling against Shevek is hard to justify. Yet he expresses the necessity to fire Shevek: "We've had to release five people for reposting. I'm sorry to say that you are one of them" (231), but that in the meeting he spoke for Shevek. This is dubious since Sabul does not recommend Shevek for

[63] Bernard Selinger explains that Shevek's principles of Simultaneity attempt to unify the self and the world, and vice-and versa, which traditionally is the pre-occupation of the "artist and the developing infant" (105). Shevek symbolises the artist, who, through his research, wants to create a breach in the ideological wall. This is contrasted to Sabul, and the rest of the population, who comply with the mainstream ideology, slip into silent obedience of the guidelines and who does not show any sign of resistance. For more details on how Sabul impairs Shevek's progress, or how he breaks the rules of Odonism, see Laurence Davis's "The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin".

[64] It is interesting to note that Shevek meets with Sabul in the place that is referred to as "Sabul's office". Sabul has property, a principle contradictory to Odonism, yet this is never questioned in the novel. This embodies the cynical stance: it is acceptable for those in power to deviate from the ideological prescription, but not the rest of the population.

another teaching post. Sabul punishes and censors Shevek and justifies his cynical "self-righteousness" by asserting the need to comply with ideology: his supposed lack of social contribution has to be penalised for the better of society and the maintenance of the system.

Shevek only faces a light punishment compared to what his playwright friend, Tirin, endures as he is sent to an asylum to be treated. Tirin staged a play in which an Urrasti succeeds in entering Anarres and tries to purchase his way into power, calling himself the "Owner of Anarres" (283). The play portrays the Urrasti unable to have sex with a woman until he pays her but stops before consuming the act, exclaiming that his actions are wicked. Tirin's satire was deemed "immoral" (285) and he was deemed a criminal (286), as the satire was misunderstood and taken as a literal as a wish for invasion and a wish for change. Tirin's fate is reminiscent to that of Valery Tarsis incarceration in a psychiatric hospital, or the lack of understanding Vladimir Mayakovsky received. Bedap, Shevek and Tirin's mutual friend, explains that Tirin was "bullied into asking for therapy" (284), after which, he was "a destroyed person" (Ibid), although the Asylum is meant to provide "shelter, a refuge" (Ibid), in the same way that the asylum provided a refuge from execution in Soviet Russia.[65] Tirin was sent to Segvina Asylum as he was deemed insane for not complying with the standards of Odonian society (284). Tirin's being segregated from society and compelled to therapy can be likened to being sent to prison and going through rehabilitation.

However, as Shevek explains, Tirin is faithful to Odonian principles. His play "could seem anti-Odonian, if you were stupid. A lot of people are stupid. There was a fuss. He got reprimanded. Public reprimand." (147) The public reprimand constitutes the punishment, as it is equated to being cast out of society. Shevek illustrates this:

> We have created crime, just as the propertarians did. We force a man outside the sphere of our approval, and then condemn him for it. We've made laws, laws of conventional behaviour, built walls all around ourselves, and we can't see them, because they are part of our thinking. Tir never did that. I knew him since we were ten years old. He never did it, he never could build wall. He was a natural

[65] As Alex Simirenko explains, the credentials of Soviet psychiatry were "compromised in the 1930s when it was used as an agency of control and detention. However, in the years when millions of people were being shot or sent to Siberia, a psychiatric hospital was considered a desirable refuge" (165). Artists, scientists and writers were sent to psychiatric institutions, a means to evade persecution, prosecution or execution.

> rebel. He was a natural Odonian—a real one! He was a free man, and the rest of us, his brother, drove him insane in punishment for his first free act. (286)

Tirin acted as a free person, by writing his play. However, he was judged by his peers. The communal disapproval led him to insanity and discomfort; Tirin has experienced the distance between reality and the ideological fantasy, the same that makes Shevek want to end his life. The mark of disapproval from the brotherhood was the very punishment for Tirin wanting to act freely, that is to express his views into a play. Tirin finds himself cut off from society, from the very core of the communal Odonian society. Crime becomes institutionalised: Tirin is faced with a form of imprisonment by being sent to a retreat. Anarresti who do not comply with the sentiment of public opinion are thrown out and excluded by their peers.

The assertion of authority and cynicism of the PDC is clearly stated during the meeting between the Syndicate of Initiative that Shevek has set up with his friends and some members of the PDC.[66] Shevek expresses his wish to travel to Urras, as part of the enterprise of the Syndicate. The proposal suggests to open the port of Anarres and let in Odonians from other worlds, or to let out Anarresti who want to share Anarresti wisdom. Rulag, Shevek's mother, who is part of the PDC, expresses its official position on this matter, and perfectly illustrates the ideological stance of the PDC. She states:

> 'Your Syndicate of Initiative,' she said, emphasizing the pronoun, 'has proceeded with building a transmitter, with broadcasting to Urras and receiving from them, and with publishing the communications. You've done all this against the advice of the majority of the PDC, and increasing protests from the entire Brotherhood. There have been no reprisals against your equipment or yourselves yet, largely, I believe, because we Odonians have become unused to the very idea of anyone's adopting a course harmful to others and persisting in it against advice and protest. (307)

Rulag explains that the Syndicate of Initiative has acted against the guidelines of the PDC. Her statement expresses a threat as it can be read as "There have been no reprisals against your equipment or yourselves *yet*" (my italics): the addition of the several juxtapositions breaks the sentence and is suggestive of a possible punishment, in the same manner as the *Pravda* warned Shostakovich and other artists that not following concepts of Socialist Realism could "end very badly" (in E. Wells

[66] For more details on how the Syndicate operates and how it communicates with Urras and is faced with Anarresti resistance, see Jennifer Rodgers's "Fulfillment as a Function of Time, or the Ambiguous Process of Utopia".

164). Rulag here implies that the Syndicate of Initiative has not followed the PDC's advice, a rule, almost a law and could be punished. The Syndicate has built a transmitter, found a way to open a door to Urras, despite the wish of the governing bureaucracy, and the wish of the social organism—both controlled by ideology—not to do so. The Syndicate is perceived to have broken a law, a communal rule, embodied in the Terms of Closure of the Settlement. It attempts to expose the flaw in the system: Anarres has laws, although claiming it does not.

Rulag, the voice of the PDC, believes that the Syndicate is opening the door to propertarian Urrasti who would share Anarres between themselves. This paranoid simplification of the action of the Syndicate shows her upholding the ideological mask and turning back to the structuring ideology. This is reinforced by her calling the members of the Syndicate, including her own son, "*ammari*" (307), the word for "brother". Her threatening tone, her opening up to the ideological distance but re-instating hierarchy makes her use of "*ammari*" ironic and satirical: the Syndicate members are not her equal, rather her subordinates, but she needs to uphold the appearance of equality. This, alongside the fact that by emphasising the word "your" to distance herself from the Syndicate, shows clearly that she insists upon holding the current ideology, the one manufactured by the PDC, while nonetheless responding to the Syndicate kynicism: Rulag is cynically asserting the PDC authority. The Syndicate hints at the bureaucracy having become too powerful; this is confirmed by the actuality of the PDC cynicism and their utter rejection for opening the door, for broadening Anarres's horizon, thus offering utopia. The PDC threatens the Syndicate with punishment: the ideological utopia is used as a mask covering dystopia.

Critics see *The Dispossessed* as "expressions of the utopian myth" (Rochelle, 65), that "Le Guin has created a Utopia" (Curtis, 269). Christopher Ferns stated that "Anarres is not perfect, not static: it is a utopia, but one shown to be the product of unceasing human effort, not created once and for all, but rather perpetually recreated" (*Narrating Utopia*, 227).[67] While it is true that utopia needs constant reassessment and embodies change and adaptability, the previous analysis of the

[67]Other critics reading *The Dispossessed* as a utopia include Elizabeth Cummins in "Understanding Ursula K. Le Guin"; or Sharona Ben-Tov in "The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality".

behaviour of the PDC has illustrated how Anarres is a closed-off, static dystopia.[68] This section has dealt with the creation of myths archetypal of ideology. However, the myth of Odo, the myths of anarchy and utopia are taken to an extreme, and become a way to indoctrinate people, to reinforce the walls founding the ideological society. History is altered and changed to fit the purpose of ideology: that of creating fear and control people's action. This practise becomes a fantasy, a game, in which the population and the governing bodies play their part and wear the masks necessary for the continuation of the masquerade.

Life on Anarres is not as idyllic as it would seem or as it could be envisaged from a utopian point of view. The anarchist utopia, valuing the balance between freedom and mutual aid as fundamental for the personal and communal good has been disrupted. A strong bureaucracy has been put in place and controls life on Anarres. Public opinion directs and controls the fabric of society: relations between people, movement and production are controlled by the PDC. The utopian ideal of freedom, ideologically present through the constant summoning of Odonism, is perverted by the introduction of hierarchy, of control and punishment. Ideological walls have been erected, impeding the utopian process. To find where utopia lies in *The Dispossessed*, one has to turn to Shevek: his working on unifying sequential and simultaneous time, encompassing past, present and future, is the attempt to create relations between Anarres and Urras, to undo the ideological walls and give way to utopian hopes.

[68]Toni Burns details how *The Dispossessed* can be viewed as a dystopia. In fact, more than being utopian or dystopian, the novel engages with the question of utopianism. Another critic who questions the purely utopian nature of the novel is Avery Plaw, in his essay "Empty Hands: Communication, Pluralism, and Community in Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*".

VI/ Utopia and the Process of Dismantling the Walls

The Anarresti attitude of looking at a singular event to justify a string of historical events is a causal view of history. As I will now demonstrate, this expression of causality can be seen as a practice opening the door to ideology and its constrictive hold; a practice which Shevek deems harmful if not considered alongside the simultaneous occurrence of time. This section will study how Shevek, through his *Principles* and his research into physics, can enable the dismantling of the ideological hold on Anarresti society: by exposing causality as subjective, he opens up the debate on the perception of time and the necessity to appreciate the singularity of time. Denying one temporal aspect or the other renders utopia impossible. This chapter will look at how Shevek, by initiating the debate on the nature of the perception of time, and his journeying in time, opens up the possibility of utopia, echoing Elliott's claim that the anarchist utopia is achievable "through personal rebellion" (151).

Fredric Jameson has shown how closely linked utopia and ideology are: in the introduction to *Archaeologies of the Future*, he states that "Utopia serves as the mere lure and bait for ideology" (3), that when conceiving of utopia, "all of our images of Utopia, all possible images of Utopia, will always be ideological and distorted by a point of view which cannot be corrected or even accounted for" (171). Jameson highlights the difficulty of an ideologically free utopia and the image of utopia itself can be used to mask ideology. Utopia is strongly related to temporal and historical notions since, as Karl Mannheim stated utopia is "the type of orientation which transcends reality and which at the same time breaks the bond of existing order" (192). Utopia is the attempt to free oneself or one's society from ideological shackles, from an ideological fantasy, and to break away from the present order, that is to say to make history. This claim is echoed by Henry Vogt, who states that "utopia always guards the path of change—keeps it open" (79), and also explains that utopia "has the capacity to transform existing conditions, while ideology tries to defend them" (76). For Vogt, the concept of utopia embraces the desire for change if the present state becomes unsatisfactory. In this sense, utopia consists in the making of history, while ideology is the sustaining of history.

Paradoxically, the illusion of or the mask of utopia can be used ideologically to create a history: the illusion of utopia is created by manufacturing an ideological historical turning point from which the society perceived as perfect can start. In *The Dispossessed,* an alternate history is created to give the Anarresti society the illusion of the utopia achieved, which is made transparent through the Settlers' exodus. This illusion is logically justified by creating a sense of causality, by creating a series of convincing, apparently legitimate cause and effect: the Settlers have left Urras and as a result have founded Anarres. This idea of causality is prevalent in *The Dispossessed*, and presented as mechanistic, or as Althusser has it, "transitive" (in Jameson *TPU*, 24).[69]

Considering history as a mere series of unfolding cause and effect can be seen as erroneous, or even ideological. Jacques Ehrman condemns the idea of transitive causality: he denounces "the cliché hidden in the metaphor of the thread of history. As if history developed like a thread unwinding!" Ehrman views the metaphor that history can be accounted as a single linear sequence of events as absurd. He continues: "in fact, it is *we* (!) who impose upon causality both its direction and its meaning." (16) Ehrman explains that we—subjects considering historical events—place subjective and almost arbitrary origins and causes to the unfolding of events.[70] When talking about Jorge Louis Borges's short story "The Cruel Redeemer Lazarus Morell", Jean Franco explains that

---

[69]Rafail Nudleman expresses the recurrence of the theme of causality within the genre of science fiction: "It is normal in SF for a causal connection to exist between episodic tales: the upshot of events of a preceding episode prepares, directly or indirectly, the point of departure for the following tale (e.g., Heinlein, Asimov, the Strugatskys). Accordingly, the episodes are in a simple, chronological order, and take place in a unified space. Such a science-fictional model of history is equivalent to a natural-science picture of the universe on which the fruitful extrapolations of SF are generally based" (1975). Nudleman explains that many authors have used causality between different texts, to connect their different novels, as is the case for Asimov's Robot Series. This model of "series" mirrors the billiard ball causality that Jameson talks about, which will be analysed shortly (See p.77-83). However, Nudleman also states that in the later science fiction series "the temporal flow becomes indifferent to the events occurring within that time: qualitative changes are absent from the universe of the adventure novel" (Ibid). This is certainly true within Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*: causality disappears, due to the structure of the novel, replaced by the simultaneity of events.

[70] Jameson details what this transitive, or mechanistic, view of causality entails: "This unsatisfactory category is not merely a form of false consciousness or error, but also a form of objective contradictions that are still within us" (*TPU*, 26). Jameson strongly criticises the fact that the practice of history is sometimes regarded as a series of singular cause and effect. Jameson condemns this as an error, which could be attributed to a fantastic reality, disconnected from the actual physical world. This idea of contradiction between reality and perception can be paralleled with quantum physics: the atomic world is very different from the reality we know, from our perception. See Stephen W. Hawking's *A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*.

> Borges would describe natural causality as 'the incessant result of endless, uncontrollable processes.' Now this denial of causality takes a crucial place in Borges's thinking and writing. To trace the 'causes' of any particular event is equivalent to trying to speak of infinity; to ascribe causality to human events and invoke historical law seems doubly absurd, given the fact that even a meeting between two people depends on a properly infinite chain of accidents and coincidences. (68)

For Borges, the laws of nature are not dictated by causality, rather by chance. The same terms applies to historical causality. The multiplicity and infinity of potential causes to one event or to history makes it impossible to accurately locate the origin of the event. History is rather a chain of chance events, untraceable due to their unaccountability and multiplicity, a somewhat unforeseeable, inexplicable, unsolvable "butterfly effect". Therefore, reconstructing the "thread of history" can be seen as an absurd, ideological practice.[71]

In his short story "The Cruel Redeemer Lazarus Morell", Borges engages with this ideological causality. In the introduction to the short story, entitled "The Remote Cause" (7), the narrator explains how the displacement of Black Slaves to the Caribbean islands impacted on "the mythological stature of Abraham Lincoln," "the *habanera* that is the mother of the tango," "the blood of goats whose throats are slashed by the *pa-paloi's*," and even on the slaves who "grow worn and lean in the drudging infernos of the Antillean gold mines" (7). Different events are here given the same original cause: the migration of African slaves caused the slaughtering of goats in Haiti, the tired and slim physical appearance of slaves, the birth of new dance styles and the rise of a heroic, mythical figure, Abraham Lincoln. [72] However,

[71] In fact, the concept of historical causality is assimilated to that of narrative, as Jameson points out: "Diachronic causality, the single string of causes, the billiard-ball theory of change, tends to isolate a causal line which might have been different, a single shot effectivity (even an ultimately determining instance) which can easily be replaced by an alternate hypothesis" (*AOTF*, 88). Placing the cause and effect in a single event can undermine history: one story can easily be supplanted by another. Jameson purports the importance of looking at the full picture and the wide array of causes.

[72] Howard Zinn explains that the myths of Abraham Lincoln having freed the slaves is fairly relative. In *A People's History of the United States*, he explains that "With slavery abolished by order of the government […], [slavery's] end could be orchestrated so as to set limits to emancipation. Liberation from the top would go only so far as the interests of the dominant groups permitted" (167). The immediate violence that a slave revolution would have cause has been avoided by abolishing slavery. However, equality was not achieved, as Black people did not have the same rights as White people: they could only vote if they had property, slave owners were compensated for the loss of their slaves, whilst the slaves themselves received no compensation and laws were still pass to make segregation lawful. The images of the glorification of the abolition of slavery can therefore be seen as an ideological construction of causality. For more details, see Zinn, p. 167-205. For more information on the complexity of the issue of the salve trade, see De Graft, p.18-19, where he talks about the

Borges intentionally does not mention the European colonists or the atrocities committed by the slave owners. By doing so, he shows how events can be manipulated and made to look inconsequential, and he shows how crimes can be expunged from the guilty party. By focusing on the displacement of African slaves, as opposed to the inhumane travelling and harsh work conditions they faced, their being torn from their country and families, their being stolen by colonists and treated as goods by their owners, Borges illustrates how the ideological back-tracking of events, privileging some over others, transforms facts, undermines suffering, and can result in absurd, ideologically tainted historical bias.

This concept of subjective causality, of applying specific cause and effect to a historical event, can be observed in *The Dispossessed.* Although the reader can interpret the events that pushed the Settlers to leave Urras as more than the consequence of cause and effect, they are presented as such by the power structure in place, the PDC. An old man speaking at a PDC meeting, where the issue of letting an Anarresti leave to Urras is being discussed, embodies this idea of causality: "we didn't come to Anarres for safety, but for freedom" (311). This implies the fact that Odonians have left Urras because of the repression, lack of freedom, and enslavement they were facing on Urras. However, the fact that they were looking for freedom from repression, and in retrospect, from the violence of the Ioti authorities against the rebelling population, it is possible to see that the Settlers were looking for safety. This highlights that the causality the man applies onto the actions of the Settlers is ideologically tainted: he applies the ideological, Odonian logic onto the exodus.

Tirin, as a school child, is depicted as questioning the reasons the PDC gives for the Settlers' departure: he questions the causality expressed by the PDC: "If it was that bad when the Settlers left, how has it kept on going for a hundred and fifty years? If they were so sick, why aren't they dead? Why haven't their propertarian societies collapsed? What are we so afraid of?" (38). The PDC claim that the Settlers' exile was due to the sickness of the Ioti system, figuratively and literally speaking, however, Tirin ridicules the claims made by the PDC. On Urras, causality is also used to justify current measures: the war is justified by the threat that Thu poses to

---

papaloi's voodoo custom of sacrificing a goat not to sacrifice a human, and Basil Davidson's *The African Slave Trade* and Herbert Klein's *The Atlantic Slave Trade*.

A-Io. Atro embodies this stance: when Shevek asks about the attitude of the people in regards to the war, Atro replies: "You don't think we'd lie down and let the damned Thuvians walk all over us?" (248). This illustrates that the threat and the response of the need to defend oneself against it is nothing more than the expression of ideological causality. Again, there is a sense of ridicule attached to the threat posed by the small nation of Thu, which reflects on the causal stance of the people in charge: their attitude towards history and their using historical events to justify their action is ludicrous.

Foucault's states: "We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed" (*OS*, 22).[73] Foucault states that we have moved on from the nineteenth century ideology of causality, and we are now in the epoch of quantum physics, in which man understands that two electrons can be at the same place at the same time, when time is singular and multiple, when manifold causes can be found in the recent and distant past equally.[74] This is what Shevek attempts to demonstrate with his theory of simultaneity. Shevek's theory is trying to unify causality—that is sequency—and simultaneity. Shevek, when expressing his wish to study Simultaneity, is reprimanded by Sabul: "Time to grow up. You're here now. We're working on physics here, not religion" (91). Sabul equates Shevek's field with a childish, mystical subject and would like him to adopt what he perceives as a more scientific, logical approach.[75] By undermining him, Sabul ingrains Shevek in the present and tries to get him to adopt the PDC's ideological causality so that he focuses on his and his society's current condition and forgets about studying for his future or the future

[73] Jameson is aware that the practise of classifying this multiplicity is risky: it subjects itself to "postmodern relativism". The strand of narratives can be reconstructed and classified into different categories. Creating categories can then lead to a redefinition, a reinterpretation of history: "But if, instead of this diachronic strand, we begin to posit causality as an immense synchronic interrelationship, as a web of overdetermination, a Spinozan substance made up of innumerable simultaneously coexisting cells or veins, then it is harder to object some causal alternative: all causes are already there" (*AOTF*, 88-9).

[74] See Hawking, op. cit.

[75] The philosopher Fritz Mauthner explains that "The oldest belief of mankind, the belief in the world of reality coincides with another very old article of belief, which we are in the habit of parading as science, it coincides with the belief in causality, with the belief in the notion of cause and effect in nature." (qtd in Franco, 68). Mauthner exposes the tendency and the tradition of viewing causality as the base of and as supporting reality, which is incidentally perceived as being correct. Mauthner calls for the deconstruction of the view of causality in order to look at the other possibilities that can be excluded by the idea of causation.

of his society. However, reducing Simultaneity to a childish concept is an enclosed, prejudiced attitude closing off the path of change. Simultaneity, as Shevek wants to demonstrate, is similar to an immutable singular energy. Sabul equates Simultaneity to "mysticism", a sublime concept that even experts such as Shevek find hard to define and to comprehend.[76] However, the concept of simultaneity is essential to the opening of utopia, as it rejects specific ideological inclinations of historical and ideological causality, positing time as an entity, a circle, open to the multiplicity of events and of truths.

Looking at how Kurt Vonnegut's *The Sirens of Titan* exposes the idea of Simultaneity can shed light on how it is to be understood in *The Dispossessed*. In Vonnegut's work, this mystical idea of Simultaneity takes a very concrete form, that of a time-space distortion, known as the chrono-synclastic infundibula. The compound is defined as: "Chrono means time.", "Synclastic means curved towards the same side in all directions", just like the shell of a ball or an "orange" and the "infundibulum" is the Latin root for funnel (12). This description of the chrono-synclastic infundibula highlights the dual nature of time: it is one, just as the image of the sphere symbolises, but at the same time, it has the ability to be filtered and narrowed through a funnel image, understood as a string. Niles Rumfoord runs into a chrono-synclastic infundibulum and his existence is turned into "wave phenomena—apparently pulsing" (11), that is the wave-Niles materialises when he intercepts the Earth. Being turned into energy enables Niles to live on two simultaneous frames. In one of these frames, he becomes omniscient and aware of time's possibilities, "where all the different kinds of truths fit together" (12) and in the other, he is aware of the fact that "life for a punctual person is like a roller coaster", a linear string made up of

[76] The concept of "*wu*" in *The Man in the High Castle* can clarify the ideals expressed behind the concept of Simultaneity. Childan and Paul discuss the value of a piece of jewellery made by Frank Fink and Ed McCarthy, a piece of "new" American Art, opposed to the pre-war artefacts which are collected by the Japanese. Paul details why the pin has *wu*, which enables the reader to understand what *wu* is: the pin "is complete. […] We experience the tranquillity associated not with Art but with holy thing" (171). It is interesting to note that N.B. Hayles explains: "Although it is clear that Dick intends the property of *wu* to be the opposite of historicity, it is not clear exactly what the term means. It remains almost definitely without shape, like the abstract for of Edfrank jewelry" (64). The definition of *wu* in the novel works by exclusion: *wu* is opposed to *wabi*. *Wabi-Sabi* is a form of Japanese art, an aesthetic concept which is anchored in the now, on impermanence. *Wu* is therefore atemporal and associated with the divine. See also Jake Jakaitis's essay "The Idea of the Asian in Philip K. Dick's *The Man in the High Castle*".

life's ups and downs, a fact he experiences every fifty nine days when he materialises.

This idea of the possibility of a multiplicity of truths, reified in the concept of simultaneity, is present in Ward Moore's *Bring the Jubilee* in which a time-traveling historian, Hodge Backmaker, engages with the concept of history and truth. He discusses predestination and time, and his friend Tyss explains: it is possible to see that "time is a convention and that all events occur simultaneously. Or if I grant its dimension I can ask, What makes you think time is a simple straight line running flatly through eternity? Why do you assume that time isn't curved? Can you conceive of its end? Can you really imagine its beginning?" (38-9). Time exists on circular and linear levels. However, linear time is a human predicament, an expression of human perception, which can be moulded. This is reflected in Hodge's other friend's—Endandin—statement:

> what is history? How is it written? How is it read? Is it a dispassionate chronicle of events scientifically determined and set down in the precise measure of their importance? Is this ever possible? Or is it the transmutation of the ordinary into the celebrated? Or the cunning distortion which gives a clearer picture than accurate blueprints? (59)

Enfandin here questions and lists the value judgments that might affect the study and the understanding of history. On the one hand, causality, which can be equated to predetermination, can be seen as an impartial, scientific series of cause of events. On the other history is a subjective hierarchisation of events deemed more or less important, or somehow extraordinary. Hodge understands from this that "truth is relative" (Ibid.). Efandin corrects him saying that "Truth is absolute and for all time. But one man cannot envisage all of truth; the best he can do is see a single aspect of it whole. […] Be a skeptic" (74). Enfandin does explain that for man, truth is relative. However, truth exists on another level, an infinite, circular, simultaneous level, suspended in time. In order to experience this multiplicity, this simultaneity, one needs to question the punctual aspects of time and causal conventions to challenge the ideological history and open oneself to the multitude of possibilities.

The difference between causality, or sequency, and Singularity, or time as an entity is also present in *The Lathe of Heaven* by Ursula K. Le Guin. In this novel, the main character George Orr has the power to change reality through his dreams. He

goes to see a psychiatrist, William Haber, who soon discovers that George is not lying; he truly has a power to change the shape of things through his dreams. Haber starts to exploit George's ability to change reality, in an attempt to create a utopia: he has George dreaming that various sources of conflict are put to an end. Haber's alternate reality is a failure: racism is solved by making everyone the same colour, resulting in the disappearance of Miss Lelache, the Black lawyer with whom George is in love; overpopulation is reduced by committing genocides; and the current conflict is replaced by a worse one. Haber loses his sense of righteousness, as his inability to create utopia becomes increasingly flagrant.

Faber and George argue over the negative changes made on reality as Haber attempts to create a better, fairer society: their dialogue illustrates the contention between simultaneity and sequency. Faber states: "What's wrong with changing things? […] [C]hange need not unbalance you; life's not a static object, after all. It's a process. There's nothing holding still. […] Life—evolution—the whole universe of space/time, matter/energy—existence itself—is essentially change" (138). Haber is trying to justify his using George by arguing that change itself is the essence of life, of history, evolution and causality, and that change does not create an imbalance, that change itself is imbalance. George's reply nonetheless indicates that this is not as simple as Haber has it: "That is one aspect of it […]. The other is stillness". This idea of stillness is akin to the idea of simultaneity, of a change happening as part of the natural order of life, not one tainted by world-views. Haber tries to advance his argument, claiming that there is only one direction, one can only go further in time, can only initiate change, interrupting George's objection: "But there is—" (139). His sentence is left incomplete, interrupted by Faber, but one could be tempted to add: there is "the circle of time". This is subsequently confirmed by the assertion that "the world *is*" (139).[77] Haber does not agree with the idea of stillness, of singularity, as he discloses: "When things don't change any longer, that's the end result of entropy, the heat-death of the universe." (138-9).[78] This applies to the physical world of the cosmos, where the idea of death-heat of the universe amounts to the universe "freezing"—reaching a temperature close to zero—it is possible to transpose this

[77] This idea of circular time is reminiscent of the idea of the return of the repressed, see p. 48-9.
[78] See Hawking's, op. cit, where he explains that the universe, at least in its expansion phase, has a state of increasing disorder (143-153).

metaphor onto the human sphere of perception of time. Haber advocates the imposition of change, unlike the natural changes that take place out of necessity.[79] Haber makes ideological choices based on his own perception of utopia in order to change the world. His choices have repercussions, because, as George points out, he does not take into account the still aspect of time, the singularity that is simultaneity, the circle of time. Haber does not take into account the idea that history is in the "happening [Geschehen] of existence" (Heidegger in Nancy, 156), or as Jameson has it "a bewildering torrent of Becoming", a larger force which our mortal condition cannot "com-prehend" (Bittner, 245).[80] All these statements utter the duality of history: simultaneous and sequential at the same time.

The creation of utopia is a temporal matter: if utopia is an open enterprise, as has been posited so far, then it should not restrict the flow of time and restrict to one linear explanation, as the utopian works have shown so far. Utopia is therefore not created from an agenda, from causation, rather from a real need, the authentic wish for an all-inclusive revolution. This key idea of embracing and accepting difference whilst promoting unity is expressed by H. G Wells in *A Modern Utopia*: although his point is a geographical and spatial one, it echoes the temporal need for harmony:

> No less than a planet will serve the purpose of a Modern Utopia. Time was when a mountain valley or an island seemed to promise sufficient isolation for a polity to maintain itself from outward force; the Republic of Plato stood armed ready for defensive war, and the New Atlantis and the Utopia of More in theory, like China and Japan throughout many centuries of effectual practise, held themselves isolated from intruders […]World-state, therefore, it must be. (318).[81]

---

[79] Frederic Jameson criticises Ernst Bloch view, presented in *The Principles of Hope*, which states that utopia stems from the unconscious. Jameson criticises the fact that these private unconscious wishes do not necessarily reflect common wishes, and this raises the question of utopia becoming a social agenda (*AOTF*, 3). By raising this point, Jameson creates a further distinction in regards to the term "utopia"; it can denote the "intent on the realisation of the Utopian program" or "an obscure yet omnipresent Utopian impulse finding its way to the surface in a variety of covert expressions and practices" (3). This type of utopia is almost ideological and contrasts with Karl Manheim's idea that utopia is "the type of orientation which transcends reality and which at the same time breaks the bond of existing order" (192). This quote re-iterates that the social, broader utopian wish is a wish to break barriers and change the current ideology.

[80] See Bittner's quotation, p. 33.

[81] It is interesting to note that Manheim details of the utopia that "the forms of human yearnings can be stated in terms of general principles, and that in certain historical periods wish-fulfilment takes place through projection into time while, in others, it proceeded through projection into space" (205). It seems interesting to note that, although this statement refers to cultural, political and historical movements, science fiction has grasped it entirely, creating future out-of-space worlds, embracing the infinite universe, technological opportunities and higher enlightenment, as utopian fiction and science fiction are intrinsically linked (See Alcena M. D. Rogan, p.308). It seems that Wells also hints at the

Wells explains that the Modern Utopia cannot have a boundary, as they are a source of disagreement and cause warfare. Instead, he sets his utopia on a planet, so that all different races, genders, possible cultures would live in harmony, just as different people are meant to live on Anarres, or a peaceful, united Earth. Wells aims at breaking away from the past models of utopia, since they have all engendered exclusions.[82] Plato's Republic was setting itself up for conflict; other depicted nations protected and severed by armies or walls, or using nature's landscape to separate themselves from other cultures and parts of the world. Thomas More's island of utopia and the island of Bensalem in Sir Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* expose civilisation that are self-sufficient and autonomous, resulting in an obtained totality; however at the cost of contact with the other. Wells is breaking away from the previous utopias in that he creates a new kind of totality: it no longer is a self-sufficient, exclusive totality, rather a mutually beneficial openness. Wells dismisses the idea of closure, but opts for change and inclusiveness, a fact that Shevek has to learn through his journey. Shevek needs to dismantle the walls between Urras and Anarres, but also the walls created by himself, his experiences and his Anarresti ideological veil if he wants to learn to accept the other. This is made mostly evident at the end of the novel, when rejected by his peers on Anarres, he tries to revolt; and when he is secluded from Ioti society, he joins the Ioti revolution, all in an attempt to implement change and create unity.

Shevek, when on Urras, temporarily yields to the promise of a better individual state of affairs, of a personal utopia as he is swayed into greed and ownership by Pae, the physicist chaperoning him in A-Io. Pae fears that Shevek's

---

fact that Literature and other forms of Art are successful medium for Utopia, as stated in *A Modern Utopia*: "Our business is here to be Utopian, to make vivid and creditable if we can, first this facet and then that, of an imaginary whole and happy world" (315).

[82] This idea of embracing difference within Utopia is exposed by Jameson who states that "Totality is then precisely this combination of closure and system, in the name of autonomy and self-sufficiency and which is ultimately the source of that otherness or radical, even alien, difference. […]. Yet it is precisely this category of totality that presides over the forms of Utopian realization: the Utopian city, the Utopian revolution, the Utopian commune or village, and of course the Utopian text itself." (*AOTF*, 5). The idea of totality is conveyed through the idea of closure: everything required by a society is depicted as available within the utopian enclave—from its setting to the depiction of that setting within the literary mode—and therefore change is not required. Traditionally, the utopian mode depicts enclosed and finite spaces which promote the exclusion and rejection of Otherness as a means to protect itself from outside threat. This depiction has shifted, and can be perceived as totalitarian; utopia needs to open itself to a positive recognition and inclusion of difference.

arrival in A-Io could trigger a revolution from the oppressed working class, and therefore keeps him secluded and tries to corrupt him by offering him money, luxurious clothing, luscious food, alcohol and women.[83] Shevek becomes used to the idea of ownership, as demonstrated through his expressing the idea of possession when he invites Chifoilisk to "*his*" (117; my italics) rooms.[84] The narrator explains that Shevek "was accustomed to the constant use of the possessive pronoun by now, and spoke it without self-consciousness" (117).[85] Shevek adopts the Ioti concepts of possessions as shown through his use of the possessive pronoun, something that is forbidden in his own language. Pae has successfully corrupted Shevek's anarchist way of thinking, carefully constructing profiteering walls, throwing Shevek back to the Ioti roots of the Settlers, denying his Anarresti linguistic future. Shevek realises that he is being caged by the idea of possession. He reflects that he is influenced by Pae's restrictive and restricted world view: Pae has a "trivial, abortive quality to his mind; it lacked depth, effect, imagination" (240). Pae becomes further associated with the idea of enclosure, stagnation and imprisonment, as he "hold[s] the keys".[86]

This imprisonment makes Shevek realise that the purpose of his journey has been defeated: he wanted to free himself to experience freedom and open himself up to new ideas, but was prevented from doing so. Shevek realises that he is the one holding the key to his present, to his future, but also to unlocking his past. Shevek, after speaking Ioti for so long, reverts back to his mother tongue, swearing at Pae, as he leaves Shevek's room. Shevek shouts "You filthy profiteering liar" (239) in Pravic. This is the moment when Shevek throws off all the Ioti ideological hold: by breaking the ideological and linguistic wall, he sets his revolution in motion and asserts his wish to be free and to re-join his people. For Shevek, Pravic constitutes the key to his past, which was denied by his using Ioti, and thus to his future. He understands that Pae is his "enemy" (241) and a "power-seeker" (240), a full realisation which results in the climax of the novel: "The wall was down" (243). This

[83] Pae's attitude also extends to women, notably when he states that women have no "head for abstract thought" and that they are "quicker than men at repetitive tasks, and more docile—less easily bored" (65). His dismissive attitude to women embodies his exclusion of difference. For criticism and works on feminism in Le Guin's fiction, see U.K Le Guin's "Is Gender Necessary?", N.B Hayles "Androgyny, Ambivalence and Assimilation in *The Left Hand of Darkness*" and Pamela, J Annas's "New Worlds, New Words: Androgyny in Feminist Science Fiction".
[84] The relation between language and thoughts will be further detailed in the next chapter.
[85] See Lewis Call, quoted p.46, where he states that language is related to consciousness.
[86] Shevek has a strong experience of what a prison entails. See p. 39-40.

action can be seen in post-colonial terms. Bill Ashcroft explains that "The crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that post-colonial writing defines itself by seizing the language of the centre and re-placing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonised place." (37)[87] Shevek has experienced the power of the centre: colonised by the Ioti ideology, he adopted its language. Imprisoned and unable to move freely, he reflects on his past, on his reasons for travelling to Urras and feels the need to act, which will be embodied in his talking to Efor, his working class servant, whose condition Shevek ignored, subdued by the Ioti linguistics.

This concept of writing back to the centre is reminiscent of the expression of revolution in Robert Heinlein's *The Moon is a Harsh Mistress*. In this novel, the Moon, or Luna as it is referred to, is a colony from Earth and inhabited by the descendent of humans: the loonies, the inhabitants of the Moon, are organising a rebellion to shackle the hold of the colonial Earth. The unrest grows from the fact that the conditions on Luna are far from ideal as it transpires from the onset of the novel. Mannie, a computer engineer, opens the novel by describing what he reads in the press: " I see in Lunaya Pravda that Luna City Council has passed on first reading a bill to examine, license, inspect—and tax—public food vendors operating inside municipal pressure. I see also is to be mass meeting tonight to organize 'Sons of Revolution' talk-talk" (9). This extract shows how Luna feels oppressed and wants to break the ties with its coloniser. The Lunar authorities make it clear in the newspaper that they are ready to organise a revolution if they do not obtain freedom. This also transpires on the name of "Pravda", which is the Russian word for "truth": it is to be associated with the revolutionary, Soviet newspaper, which was also used as the main tool for disseminating propaganda. The newspaper Pravda is used to write back to the centre, expose the abuse exerted by Earth onto the Loonies, express the wish for freedom from the colonised past to build a better future for themselves.

There is a similar passage in *The Dispossessed*: after realising how he was controlled by the Ioti, Shevek decides to talk to Efor, who tells him about the

[87] Ashcroft's point deals more with the way in which the colonised reject and re-appropriate the language of the coloniser: "There are two distinct processes by which it does this. The first, the abrogation or denial of the privilege of 'English' involves a rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication. The second, the appropriation and reconstitution of the language of the centre, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages, marks a separation from the site of colonial privilege." (37)

"common place horrors" (246) of the proletariat, such as the army, rats, poorhouses, pawnshops, executions, theft, infant mortality, all the things which embodied "the Urras [Shevek] had learnt about in school on Anarres" (246). Clearly, this statement reflects that Shevek is going back in time, going back to his own Anarresti ideological experiences, forgetting about what he saw for himself on Urras. Learning about the frustration of the working class, of the government's plan to raise taxes and food prices, and of the working class's will to start a general strike, in the same manner as Odo did, or the Loonies did in *The Moon is a Harsh Mistress*, Shevek decides to take part in the movement. He writes in the working class press, and when this one is shut down, he writes in the clandestine press. This brings to mind the idea that Shevek wants to write back to the colonising centre, affirming and restating the freedom gained by Anarres, reuniting the past and the present by offering "the promise, the promise that [Anarresti] made two hundred years ago in this city—the promise kept" (260). This shows that even on A-Io, utopia is not lost, it can be grasped, in the present, if people choose "to be the Revolution"(261).[88]

Shevek escapes to the Terran embassy, a neutral ground, where he will be able to bridge his views: his disappointment and failed hopes of what Urras could bring matches his disillusionment with his own Anarresti society. In the embassy, he meets Keng, the ambassador to Terra, who rescues Shevek from the Ioti police who was pursuing him after the demonstration. Keng is the neutral party having an independent viewpoint in regards to the relation between Anarres and Urras: as an outsider, she is not embroiled in any of the ideological conflicts of the twin planets.[89] Keng can be seen as the figure of the negotiator, in the same manner as, in Octavia Butler's "Amnesty", Noah Cannon attempts to bring peace between the conflicting humans and the alien, plant-like "stranger-Communities". Noah is the translator communicating between humans and aliens, enabling humans to understand the

[88] Ashcroft explains that the post-colonial act of writing back is present in Salman Rushdie's phrase that "the Empire writes back" to "the imperial 'centre', not only through nationalist assertion, proclaiming itself central and self-determining, but even more radically by questioning the bases of European and British metaphysics, challenging the world-view that can polarize the centre and periphery in the first place. In this way, concepts of polarity, of 'governor and governed, ruler and ruled' are challenged as an essential way of ordering reality" (28). That is to say, postcolonial literature confronts the Western ideology of hierarchy and dominance, undermining the way in which the dominated are portrayed, and by doing so, enables the dominated to free themselves and assert their identity , autonomy and legitimacy.

[89]See Winter Elliott, p. 151.

superiority of the aliens, and exposing the fragility of the humans to the aliens. She works for her people, as she want “to make them think” (7): she wants to make them realise that fighting and rejecting the plant-Communities means a difficult life for humanity, through conflict and lack of prospects since the Communities holds wealth and jobs. A conflict with the communities could result in the obliteration of mankind. Noah is therefore a neutral intermediary, enabling the transition between life before the Communities’ arrival and living, hopefully, with them in harmony. Keng performs the same function of intermediary as Noah does, exposing the qualities and defaults of both sides to Shevek, creating a balanced picture.

Keng is an ambiguous figure: not all critics view her in a positive light as they claim her perspective is limited by her lack of insight. Mark Tunik explains that she has a “favorable view of Urras” (137), Ellen Rigsby that Keng is prevented from understanding Anarres “by her own ideology” (175) and that she does not believe that Anarres “is a real possibility” (175); and finally Laurence Davis states that Keng has a misconception of the principles of time (28). All in all, Keng can be seen to side with Urras, to be limited to the capitalist model that she knows—from Urras—doubting the success of the Odonian experiment. In contrast, Avery Plaw advocates that Keng is that intermediary figure between Anarres and Urras. Plaw expresses that Keng's statements are “sharply opposed” (293) to Shevek’s, enabling Le Guin to present a “balanced picture” (293). Spencer views the importance of “communication as freedom” (98) intrinsic to *The Dispossessed*, which is achieved in the discussion between Keng and Shevek.

Keng’s apparent contradiction can be observed when she answers to Shevek’s statement that “Hell is Urras” (300) expressing his resentment at the imprisonment, the caging, the corruption, the greed, and the indifference he experienced there. She explains that “Urras is the kindliest, most various, most beautiful of all inhabited worlds. It is the world that comes as close as any could to Paradise” (300). She pursues: “it's full of evils, full of human injustice, greed, folly, waste. But it is also full of good, of beauty, vitality, achievement. It is what a world should be! It is *alive*, tremendously alive—alive, despite all its evils, with hope. Is that not true?”: Shevek nods and is forced to concede that she is right. Keng's statement offers balance, offers solace to Shevek’s conditioned and restricted view: this reflects the idea that

"Perhaps Anarres is the key to Urras" (296). Shevek here admits that his description of Urras as Hell was tainted and concedes that there is more to Urras than what he stated or even saw. This is the utopian moment in the novel: Shevek, through his conversation with Keng, opens up to Urras and embraces difference.

Keng's view of Urras as a paradise is fundamentally temporal: she expresses her nostalgia for a lost past, as Earth used to resemble Urras before it was destroyed, as humans "did not adapt" (301). Terrans were rescued by the Hainish, who have helped the Terrans survive: they centralise every aspect of life on Earth and they bring "a little more hope" (302). Terrans have to accept the help from the aliens if they want to survive. Keng illustrates that fact: "They came; they brought us help. They built ships and gave them to us so that we could leave our ruined world. They treat us gently, charitably, as the strong treats the sick one. They are altruists. They are moved by a guilt we don't even understand, despite all our crimes" (301). Keng retells the experience of her past: her civilisation was rescued by an altruistic people, therefore enabling the future of the Terrans. The Hainsih are truly selfless, compassionate people who have enabled another people to survive, and thus represent the future. Keng understands very well the link between past, present and future: her people was rescued from total extinction and is therefore fortunate to live in the present. She views Urras as a paradise, reminiscent of her destroyed home planet and she admits that Anarres is "a world [she] cannot imagine" (301), as she cannot imagine a future her collapsed society cannot foretell. She believes that there is hope for Urras, in the same manner as Terrans were given hope to live, as she explains that "the insurrection seems to be defeated, at least for the time being" (303), showing that change in A-Io will happen, in time.[90]

The conversation between Keng and Shevek illustrates their different views on time and politics, but they achieve a common goal. Keng obtains the theory of Simultaneity, which can make communication between worlds instant; and Shevek performs his altruistic gesture, to give freedom for people to bring down walls, to communicate, exchange and open the door to the other. This arrangement, beneficial to the Nine Worlds and to both parties was achieved through opening up to each other, through communicating: sharing their past and their aspirations for the future

[90] Ketho, the Hainish landing on Anarres, hopes to return "in time" (335). See p.95.

enabled Keng and Shevek to find common ground and find the compromise enabling utopia.

Shevek has succeeded in doing his part for the universal social organism, not just Anarres; he has open the door to change, communication and revolution. It could seem egoistic for an individual to take it upon himself to revive the revolution, but as Shevek reflects:

> His radical and unqualified will to create was, in Odonian terms, its own justification. His sense of primary responsibility towards his work did not cut him off from his fellows, from his society, as he had thought. It engaged him with them absolutely. […]
>
> This sacrificiality was what Takver had spoken of recognising in herself when she was pregnant, and she had spoken with a degree of horror, of self-disgust, because she too was an Odonian, and the separation of means and ends was, to her too, false. For her as for him, there was no end. There was process: process was all. You could go in a promising direction, or you could go wrong, but you did not set out with the expectation of ever stopping anywhere. (289)

Shevek's act, although apparently selfish because it came from the singular, personal need to create, is unequivocally altruistic. Only as Shevek departs to Urras does he understand the balance between individual and social needs. Shevek finally sees that his need to publish *The Principles of Simultaneity* or to open the doors is not selfish, but a personal need that would benefit the social organism. Up to that point, Shevek believed that, as was depicted by other members of the PDC such as Sabul, his actions were somewhat self-centred, not in touch with the social organism: this is noticeable when he explains that his people did not want his theories, or that the PDC prevents him from publishing them. However, this idea of following one's objective is intrinsically linked to a sense of having a purpose. Shevek takes Takver as an example: during her pregnancy, she felt disgusted with herself, as she was irritable, had extra portions of food during a famine. However, Takver was aware that sacrificing the ideology of altruism by having extra portions of food while pregnant was ultimately for the good of her child, for the good of the social organism. Shevek uses her as an example of the intrinsic relation that means and ends have: private and personal actions can be accepted as long as they are truly motivated by the idea of mutual aid, of Odonism, of humanity, and ultimately striking the balance between private and social goods. In this sense personal revolution becomes essential for the regeneration and maintaining of Odonism: Shevek shows that for the Odonian utopia

to be realised, revolution needs to be active and not implemented by controlling the social organism.

Shevek decides to set off to Urras to explore the past of his society because "unless the past and future were made part of the present by memory and intention, there was, in human terms, no road, nowhere to go" (159-60). He wants to open the door to Anarres's past, by reviving it, so that changing and revolutionary intentions do not linger in an ever-lasting present, but can become concrete. He tells Keng "My society is also an idea. I was made by it. An idea of freedom, of change, of human solidarity, an important idea" (299). Shevek hints at the fact men are part of ideas insofar that they contribute to their being generated, maintained, merged and disseminated. Man's potential egocentric role can be turned into a selfless agency, to benefit humanity. The transient nature of the body can be surmounted by the endurance of ideals, which is embodied in his journey. He leaves to share and discuss his idea, his society with others and most specifically with those who might prove the most resistant to it and who could benefit the most from an altruist ideal, the Ioti, in order to return to a changed, more open society.

James Bittner views the chiasmus-like structure as a parallel of the aphorism of the novel: "True journey is return" (335). Bittner views Shevek's journey as the central part of the plot: "for a landscape to be inhabitable by human beings, it only must permit, but also should encourage *human* acts, that is to say ethical acts, and those occur only in the present … not on Urras where the future is denied, nor on Anarres, where the past is denied, but in the process of a journey from one to the other and back again" (*Approaches to the Fictions of Ursula K. Le Guin*, 122). For Bittner, the true essence of being is to be found in the ability to journey, to come back, changed, and thus to share these experiences, which is embodied in the names of the ships Shevek travels in, *The Mindful* and *The Davenant*, which are starkly contrasted.

Bittner sheds important information on the name of the ship that takes Shevek back to Anarres, *The Davenant*. If 'Davenant' comes from the French *avenement* (coming, advent), or French *avenir* (future, future ages), or both, then *d'avenant* may be Le Guin's neologism meaning 'from the beginning' or 'of the future' (a synthesis

of beginning and ending, of etiology and teleology)" (96).[91] Bittner explains the name of the ship is a synthesis of the meanings of future, of becoming, an idea which involves a starting point and a future and future hopes. Therefore, the name embodies the unification of causality and simultaneity, showing that they can coexist. The name of the ship stands for the fact that the future is unlocked at this point of the novel.

Laurence Davis furthers Bittner's idea by saying that the name "*Davenant*" relates to the concept of the Circle of Life (7). Davis explains that Le Guin creates a contrast between the names of the two ships and Shevek's experience of time aboard the two vessels. His explanation details that the *Mindful* is akin to a prison in which time has stopped, in a "wretched void without past or future. The walls stood tight about him" (Le Guin, 8). On the *Mindful,* Shevek is prisoner of an empty present, anxious because his mind is full of expectations and hopes for the future, but he does not know how to unlock the door to the future. This is contrasted with the name of the ship Shevek boards to return home, the *Davenant*. Shevek is not a prisoner aboard the Hainish ship. The narrator details the distinction between the *Davenant* and the *Mindful*: "They showed Shevek all over the ship, the Interstellar *Davenant*. It was as different as it could well be from the freighter *Mindful*" (330). Here the narrator makes a stark comparison between the two ships, evoking all the past experiences Shevek has lived, closing the circle of time. Shevek is not kept in prison in his own room as in the beginning of the novel, but has access to and is made to visit the whole ship.[92] This indicates that Shevek has company, and is not isolated, unlike aboard the *Mindful*. The ship is quite spacious and comfortable. The oppressive quietness of the *Mindful* is omnipresent as "Even the bridge and engine-rooms had this quietness about them" (330) and differs from the *Davenant* which is "very quiet" (330) and where there is plenty to do for recreations: "there was a garden, where the lighting had the quality of sunlight, the air was sweet with the smell of earth and leaves; during ship-night the garden was darkened, and its ports cleared to the stars" (330).[93] These details encapsulate the breaking from the austerity

[91]Bittner explains that his speculation was confirmed in a letter from Ursula K. Le Guin dated April 21, 1978 where she states: "Davenant comes from 'avenant (plus) avenir (=future)" (96. ft 18).
[92] See p. 38-9
[93] This evokes the sense of stillness, of *wu* associated with Simultaneity. See p. 81, 168.

of the empty walls and claustrophobic room of the *Mindful*. The garden brings life, peace and the sense of a natural cycle of life, of stillness.

The *Davenant* is the symbol of singularity and simultaneity: it provides a refuge and peace for Shevek, who, having achieved his goal of unifying causality and simultaneity, can go home. The *Davenant* is a symbol of time, but also, a symbol of unity and union: “Its style had neither the opulence of Urras, nor the austerity of Anarres, but struck a balance, with the effortless grace of long practice” (330-1). The ship strikes a balance between the two systems, and indicates new directions, new possibilities for the two planets. This is confirmed by the fact that Shevek speaks to the PDC and the Syndicate of Initiative, and despite still having enemies, Shevek hears about his newfound allies: “The good news is the friends… It seems there are more of them than when [he] left” (332). This shows that Shevek is successful in dismantling the Anarresti wall, in reviving the revolutionary spark enabling his fellow Anarresti to open themselves up. Shevek and the Syndicate of Initiative have managed to reinstate people's sense of enterprise and their ability to instigate change.

Ellen Rigsby criticises Bittner's emphasis on the name of the ship and the chiasmus-like structure since he leaves out what she finds to be a more meaningful element of the novel, the introduction of the Hainish Ketho who wants to move onto Anarres. Rigsby explains that Bittner “literally looks for what the journey is, and who returns, and leaves the aphorism there” (177). Rigsby believes that Bittner does not understand the true depth of Shevek's journey, which, as she states, is “successful regarding Anarres” (177). She criticises Bittner for “focusing too much on Shevek”, whilst “Le Guin shifts to begin the story of Ketho” (177). Bittner views the utopian element of the novel as lying in Shevek's journey, whilst Rigsby places it in the return of Shevek being diminished by the beginning of a new story.

Despite the threat that Shevek faces when he comes back to Anarres and that the situation is tense since things have “broken loose” (333), he still decides to help and to lead Ketho to Anarres, not as a representative of a Government, but as a man. Ketho is the Hainishman controlling the radio contact on the *Davenant*, which further serves to symbolise the importance of communication as freedom. From this point onwards, the story is no longer about Shevek, but rather moves on to Ketho's arrival onto Anarres. This, for Rigsby, is the main illustration that utopia is achievable, as

Anarres has opened up. Ketho asks Shevek shyly about the prospects of a non-Urrasti alien being allowed to enter Anarres, despite being fully aware of the Terms of Closure of the Settlement. Ketho explains that his race had tried Anarchism, but he, as an individual, had not (334). Ketho is showing a personal curiosity as well as a sociological, political one, motivated by Shevek's own enthusiasm for the idea that Anarres represents (Davis, 30). This idea introduces an interesting duality at this stage of the novel. Ketho is about to start his own journey on Anarres, which he has begun of his own free will, to experience and fulfil his individualist intention to relive the communal experience of his people. Shevek is returning from his own journey, which he has also started willingly, despite the advice of his peers and the prospects of not being able to turn back. Ketho wants to discover and experience an idea, the idea of Anarres, while Shevek wants to dismantle the walls restricting the exchange of ideas and communication which prevents others, such as Ketho, from experiencing life on Anarres. Shevek has succeeded in opening up Anarres, in sharing the values that it symbolises, and this is certainly central to the novel. His journey is complete and he has written and shared his theory with the Universe. But as his journey is ending, another one is beginning: Ketho's journey mirrors Shevek, history continues and repeats itself. Since Shevek's journey is successful, one can understand that Ketho's journey will be too, since he hopes to return "In time" (335).

Shevek and Ketho express a strong link, which again unifies them. Shevek says in Pravic "We are the children of time" (334), which Ketho then repeats. They are the children of time, in the sense expressed by Ketho: "if each life is not new, each single life, then why are we born?" (334). Here Ketho expresses individuality: each life is different; each being experiences and feels differently, and lives and bears ideas differently. This multiplicity of ideas is intrinsically linked to his will to experience Anarchism: although his society tried anarchism, he states "But *I* have not tried it" (334). Ketho is in touch with his past; he wants to experience what his people have. This is particularly relevant since the Hainish represent the future: they enabled Terrans to live, ensuring their future, giving some resources selflessly, in a true altruistic manner, unlike Anarresti who, up to a point, never wanted to share. Ketho's wish for a new future and to understand the past have enabled him to grasp his present opportunity, to live and embrace his life. Shevek has achieved the same

feat. As well as being children of sequential time, Shevek and Ketho are children of a Simultaneous time, in which ideas never die. Ketho and Shevek are men, simple vessels conveying and generating ideas through sequential time, in the *avenir*, the future, enabling those ideas—past, present and future—to be passed on and to defy the test of time and to remain in the circle of time. Rigsby and Bittner place the important part of the end of novel on two different elements, the arrival of a foreigner on Anarres, the beginning of a new journey for Ketho; and the return of Shevek respectively. However, these two elements should be viewed as weighing equal importance. Picking one fact over the other diminishes the utopian value of the novel as they are not mutually exclusive: Shevek's open nature enables Ketho to travel, reflecting the sequential journey and the cyclical nature of time alike. Shevek's return, the name of the ships and Ketho's departure show the complexity, multiplicity and the singularity of utopia in *The Dispossessed*.

VII/ Conclusions

Just as the concepts of sequency and simultaneity, the wall symbolises difference and unity: it is ambiguous, two sided, but at the same time, it just *is*, a transcendent entity through time. This reflects the ideological situation between Anarres and Urras. The two planets are paradoxically similar and different. Anarres rejects its past by rejecting Urras. It views the planet as a single entity, when in fact it is a complex planet made up of different nations and different cultures. In fact, Anarres uses Urras for an ideological purpose: it creates myths and lies about its enemy in order to maintain the bureaucratic system, thus shattering the apparent aspect of freedom founding the system. Anarres views its system as better than others, since it does not cause the suffering of the population. This attitude results in Anarres shutting itself off from the rest of the world, therefore ignoring its past and forsaking the exchanges that could generate a better future for Anarres

On the other side of the temporal spectrum is Urras, and more specifically the nation of A-Io. A-Io is intrinsically interested in its past system of exploitation, and this is mostly seen through the fact that Ioti authorities are attempting to prevent a revolution which could overthrow the system in the future. Museums are metaphorically used as a way to preserve the past, as opposed to a window to it. In doing so, A-Io forbids change, forbids itself the chance of utopia. By exchanging thoughts with Anarres, it could find a solution to the social inequalities and the unrest felt by the exploited.

However, the wall is singular. Shevek explains "To lock out, to lock in, in the same act" (10), symbolising that two different actions are achieved in the same, single gesture. This is echoed in Le Guin's metaphor of the alien being similar to a coin, a singular, yet two-sided object.[94] In this sense, Urras and Anarres can be seen in the same light. The alternation of the action between Anarres and Urras illustrates their differences, but also illustrates that they are part of the *same* novel—almost interchangeable—as opposed to two different volumes of Shevek's life. This bouncing back and forth between Anarres and Urras highlights how they deny themselves the possibility of utopia and obstruct the openness of time, history and

[94] See p.28-9.

memory. Anarres and Urras create power structures through similar means; although these means take on different shapes. By denying different aspects of time, both planets deny the idea of singularity, of the circle of time. They deny—paradoxically—the multiplicity of aspects, truths, events and ideas that can enable them to embrace time, change and hope, that is to say, to embrace utopia. By creating alternate histories, they alter the essence of time, the essence of being. The wall therefore becomes an ideological symbol attached to the historical manipulation of time, the alteration of world views and the denial of hopes. The wall becomes the embodiment of the stillness of time, an everlasting ideological present in which change is perceived as not required, denying hope.

This dystopian depiction of worlds denying their past and their future is only broken down insofar that the main character, Shevek, is able to travel "there and back again": he journeys and explores his past, and comes back to his planet which embodies the future.[95] His journey symbolises the circle of time, although sequential too. His journey is simultaneous. It is chronological and singular, but creates a breach in the ideologically temporal wall, a breach essential to break down the wall around his thoughts, that is the ideological walls tainting humanity's view of time. Shevek's point introduces another very relevant point in regards to the image of the wall: it can be a linguistic barrier, one shaping the view of history and power structure. The next chapter will explore this relation between control and language in greater details, as epitomised in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

[95] J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* is also entitled *There and Back Again* and symbolises the pattern of the hero's journey, which, as Bittner highlights, is return. See p. 92 of this thesis.

CHAPTER 2. Framing Ideology: Language Barriers and Thought Control in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has been described as a novel imagining England under a totalitarian government. Valerie Meyers states that Orwell depicts "the worst possible 'state of England' to shock his audience into imagining what it would be like to live under a totalitarian government, and to urge them to preserve their traditional rights to privacy, freedom and obedience to the rule of law" (115). [96] For Valerie Meyers, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* aims to shock the reader through the portrayal of a powerful and repressive totalitarian system, in which the population would lose its freedom. Meyers views the novel as an appeal for the readers to work towards preserving these values, as opposed to letting their government enslave them. Meyers expresses that the novel is written in the context of the rise of totalitarianism as she argues that Orwell was "thinking of writing it as early as 1940, during the bleak years of the war with Germany, and completed it in 1948, as the Cold War with Russia was beginning" (114). For Meyers, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* explores the effects of totalitarianism as it took hold of Europe, enabling the readers to experience its brutality and its effects, also compelling the reader to preserve his political and social freedom. Orwell was thinking of and writing the novel while the world saw the rise of totalitarianism in Europe, notably in Hitler's Nazi Germany and Stalin's repressive regime. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* re-enacts this totalitarianism in Oceania, a Socialist, totalitarian federation of which England is part: the novel asks the reader to evaluate the extent of democracy in his own country and the dangers menacing his freedom. Meyers's statements are supported by that of John Atkins': "*1984* is a completely rational demonstration of the victory of irrationalism in politics and human society" (237); *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a logical, realistic novel as it shows the consequences of the foolishness and the cruelty of totalitarian

[96] For the purpose of this thesis, the idea of "totalitarianism" is to be understood as that of a governing body which does not allow for personal freedom and which requires adherence to the body in charge, their ideology and their policy. This definition is based on Orwell's own definition in "Totalitarianism and Literature" in which he states that the autonomous individual is ceasing to exist. Also, this definition is applicable to any system, whether in the socialist, nazi, authoritarian or apparently democratic states. The authoritarian connotations of a totalitarian democracy are detailed in Sheldon Wolin's *Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism* (p.41-68)

regimes. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* portrays the irrationality of totalitarianism, that is the inhumane attempts to subjugate and control a whole population for the sake of power, and does so by exposing the flawed rationale behind the justification of cruelty. George Woodcock expresses similar ideas when he describes Orwell's writings as a "testament [of] the haunting and admonitory nightmare of a future dominated by communism" (49): *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a futuristic novel imagining Europe dominated by a repressive, complying and institutionalised totalitarian communism. Woodcock's view that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* deals with the impact of totalitarian communism is restrictive. Instead, it is possible to view *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as dealing with totalitarianism in general: as Meyers's quotation shows the novel can be seen as investigating the impact of Nazism, Communism, and even more subtly the effects of power control and authority in democratic states.

Orwell's publisher, Frederic Warburg, widens the theme of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to cruelty: "For what is *1984* but a picture of man unmanned, of humanity without a heart, of a people without tolerance or civilisation, of a government whose *sole* subject is the maintenance of its absolute totalitarian power by every contrivance of cruelty[?]" (247). He views *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as demonstrating the deprivation of freedom, humanity and altruism, that totalitarianism imposes on the population they rule. These are only a few examples of how Orwell's last novel can be regarded as a "test case, a kind of laboratory experiment designed to determine the survival factor of those values on which liberal democracies rests" (Carter, M. 178). It is a fiction exposing the stakes of losing the values of freedom and equality present in democracies to the perversely domineering force of totalitarianism. All these examples demonstrate how *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is primarily perceived by critics as an assessment of the cruelty and exclusion caused by totalitarianism.[97]

The previous chapter has mentioned the idea that language can be used to manipulate thinking, as noted by Shevek who wanted to destroy the "walls all around his thoughts" (14). The leading motif of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is

[97] Views that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a novel dealing with the consequences of totalitarianism on the individual can be found in S.L. Macey's "Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: The Future that Becomes the Past". For more details on how *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be seen as a proletarian novel, see L. Saunders's *The Unsung Artistry of George Orwell*, where she describes Orwell as a "proletarian writer" (9).

the idea of linguistic determinism and linguistic relativity. John Lucy explains that linguistic relativity denotes that "the particular language we speak influences the way we think about reality" (291), while linguistic determinism denotes the strong correlation between "the identity of language and thought" itself (295).[98] Both concepts express the idea that our experience of reality, our thoughts and views are more or less encoded, influenced or determined by the specific language we speak. In Orwell's novel, the creation of a new language, Newspeak, reflects the attempt to impose a reality through the creation of a new restricted linguistic frame of thought, thus erecting a linguistic wall, creating a linguistic totalitarianism, depriving the speaker or thinker from his freedom of speech or thought. The concept of language barrier often evokes the idea of problems of communication between people who do not speak the same language and therefore underlines the concept of what is alien and foreign and potentially leading to miscommunication and misunderstandings, which are at play in the novel.

This chapter will look at the concept of language and linguistic determinism in the context of the totalitarian propaganda of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and show how Orwell links the idea of linguistic constraints to that of ideological indoctrination. The chapter will analyse linguistic aspects of the language of Newspeak and Oldspeak, the English language contemporary to the characters. The chapter will look at the syntactic, lexical and semantic structure of Newspeak to illustrate how the Party of Oceania envisages restricting thinking via linguistic determinism and show how the aim of Newspeak is to create a divided and divisive society characterised by the exclusion of certain members of society. This will show how Newspeak is ideologically viewed as a positive propaganda tool for governmental control and used to impose the submission to authority enforced by the Party. The chapter will contrast this stance by comparing the propaganda language of the Party and Newspeak to the freer language of Oldspeak. By doing so, the chapter will expose how linguistic determinism becomes a dystopian and totalitarian force and indicate the underlying utopian message of the novel, which lies in one's ability to use language freely.

[98] For more details on the concepts and the research done into linguistic determinism and relativity, see John Lucy's article "Linguistic Relativity", Jane Hill and Bruce Manheim's "Language and World View", or Paul Kay and Willett Kempton's "What Is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?".

I/ Engineering Ideology: Newspeak as Political Control

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the slogan of the society of Oceania is stated at the beginning of the novel: "WAR IS PEACE/ FREEDOM IS SLAVERY/ IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH" (6). This slogan represents the philosophy of Ingsoc, a compound word standing for English Socialism. The slogan denotes the need to have an enemy, the need to obliterate freedom, to control and avoid independent thinking; that is to say to promote ignorance, blindness and submission to control and enforce loyalty and restriction through war. This concept of ignorance and thought control is supported by the construction and implementation of a new language, called Newspeak. The concept of creating a "new" speech is in keeping with the idea of a turning point, of creating and manipulating history; that is to implement control over the population.[99] This section will centre on the relation between language and politics in Orwell's novel, as well as the admitted attempt to control thinking through that very political language. However, to fully make sense of the concept and the satirical value of Newspeak, it is important to first detail Orwell's ideas on language.

To further understand the politicisation of Newspeak in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, one can turn to Orwell's essay "Politics and the English Language" in which he details guidelines on ways to express oneself clearly, without deceiving and in which he exposes the deterioration of political language. He explains: "Now, it is clear that the decline of a language must ultimately have political and economic causes: it is not due simply to the bad influences of this or that individual writer" (348) an adds that "In our times it is broadly true that political writing is bad writing" (355). Orwell separates political and literary languages: the practices of writers do not influence the language of politics, which he views as a corrupt, deceiving, decaying language used to manipulate and conceal the truth about political facts. He attributes this decay of political language to the improper use of language: "political speech and writing are largely in the defence of the indefensible" (356). For Orwell, politicians use language to deceive and manipulate people as well as to justify immoral actions. Orwell draws the parallel between the deceiving politicians and the decay of language further: "The great enemy of clear language is insincerity" (357):

[99] See p. 21; 42-9.

deceiving, insincere language is used to justify illegal or inappropriate political actions. Orwell exemplifies this by quoting the "British rule in India", or executions without trials expressed in "euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness" (356). Instead of getting their message across clearly, politicians hide the truth through ambiguous images to justify imperialism, injustice and other dishonest actions to ensure the system's survival. For Orwell, politicians have to be misleading, to hide the truth of the cruel actions taken by the government.

Orwell states that to make language "an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought" (359); to make language serve the purpose of communication rather than deception, it is necessary to let the "meaning choose the word, and not the other way about" (358).[100] To make meaning clear, one has to carefully choose the appropriate word, thereby empowering oneself through language, instead of being passive by letting bureaucrats, politicians and journalists constrict the meanings that words should have through abstruse or "dying" (350) metaphors, overused clichés, pompous diction or meaningless words.[101] Orwell continues: "Afterwards one can choose—not simply *accept*—the phrases that will best cover the meaning, and then switch round and decide what impression one's words are likely to make on another person" (358-9).[102] Orwell propounds active transparency in meaning to obtain a clearer social, political understanding and achieve linguistic freedom.

Paul Delany, in "Words, Deeds and Things: Orwell's Quarrel with Language" explains that "In some crucial ways, the engineers of Newspeak seem to be faithful disciples of 'Politics and the English Language'" (97). Delany

[100] Orwell, in a letter to Humphry House, states "The thing that frightens me about the modern intelligentsia is their inability to see that human society must be based on common decency" (582) that if a society is to flourish—and its individuals and arts— it needs decency and morals and this would infer not deceiving someone through using deceiving, unclear and misleading language.

[101] Many of Orwell's essays denounce the way journalists, politicians, bureaucrats and totalitarian states influence the way language is shaped by deceiving. See, amongst others: "Politics and the English Language"; "Not Counting Niggers"; "Literature and Totalitarianism".

[102] Orwell says before this statement that it is important to choose the word that will best convey one's meaning, and not the other way about. This applies to concrete words. However, he states that in regards to abstract words, to get one's meaning "as clear as one can through picture and sensations" (358). Paul Delany explains that Orwell "seems to have missed the joke of the Grand Lagado's scheme for 'entirely abolishing all words whatsoever'" (96). Delany understands the ideas of choosing meaning carefully and expressing theme through pictures and sensations too literally, and believes that Orwell wants a language based on showing things rather than expressing them. However, Orwell emphasises that the individual should be in control, notably by avoiding "metaphors, simile or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print" (359).

understands Newspeak as based on Orwell's essay which details the importance of clarity in political language. Newspeak, and the destruction of words, can be taken as an attempt to purposefully over-simplify language to such an extreme that it actually clouds and impedes meaning, thus erecting walls around one's thinking, as opposed to creating ways in which language be clarified. Contrary to Delany's statement that the engineers of Newspeak follow Orwell's guidelines, this section will show how Newspeak is in fact a tool for control and a satire of political, deceiving language and that Orwell propounds clarification and *not* simplification of language.

Newspeak is an openly restrictive, simplified language. Syme, from the Research Department in charge of working on Newspeak, admits to Winston: "It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words" (54). Here, Syme's explanation illustrates that the people working on Newspeak are remorselessly and proudly erasing words from the English vocabulary in order to restrict the citizen's ability to think. This becomes evident when he asks Winston: "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it." (55). Once again, Syme shows that the Party is content to confine language to a very limited vocabulary, restricting and framing thoughts as they will. However, this is presented and perceived as a positive measure since it enables the population to be "orthodox"; that is it enables the population to adhere to the Party's policies, to be subjected to its control and prevents them from rebelling.

The idea that Newspeak becomes a tool for totalitarian control is echoed in the Appendix entitled "The Principles of Newspeak". The narrative scholarly voice of the Appendix explains that "The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible" (312).[103] Newspeak is devised to limit one's ability to think, to facilitate the absorption of the Party's ideology and propaganda and to implement its total control. The attempt to control language is "done partly by the invention of new words, but chiefly by eliminating undesirable words and by stripping such words as remained of unorthodox meanings,

[103] Robert P. Resch, in his essay states that the Appendix "takes the form of a scholarly monograph" (158) and this scholarly voice can be felt through the explanations provided on the linguistic functioning of Newspeak in the Appendix. This will be dealt with further on. See p. 109; 122.

and so far as possible of all secondary meanings whatever" (313). Newspeak reduces this ability by destroying polysemy or shades of meaning which make language a flexible tool to express oneself and by destroying words which could carry concepts of rebellion such as the word "free". Instead, new compounds such as "thoughtcrime" which conveys the Party's idea that independent thinking is punishable, are created. By reducing the range of words and controlling language, the Party claims to be able to prevent subversive thinking. By attempting to make people unable to think outwith Newspeak, the Party hopes to enforce social, cultural and political confinement and isolation.

To illustrate this fact, the Appendix gives the example of the word "free" that loses the political, "intellectual" meaning of the word but retains its concrete sense. The Appendix details:

> The word free still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weed'. It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free', since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless. (313)

This illustrates the policy of Newspeak: the new language will keep concrete words with only fixed referents, but abolish abstract ideas that have contentious and debateable meanings. By erasing the philosophical connotation of the word "free", the Party hopes to eradicate the meaning of "freedom" or "liberty", hence limiting one's political opportunity. This is expressed by Syme during the narrative as he asks: "How could you have a slogan like 'freedom is slavery' when the concept of freedom has been abolished?" (56). Here, Syme demonstrates how the Party believes that by controlling language, it can control thinking: freedom will no longer need to be depicted in a negative light, since the concept will no longer exist. For the Party, destroying the word means destroying the idea, the thought and the wish for that idea; that way, it can destroy the utopian impulse.

This extreme depiction of linguistic determinism is also present in *Babel-17* by Samuel Delany. In this novel, Rydra Wong, a poet and trained linguist, takes charge of a crew of various humans and aliens to try to uncover the mysteries behind the Invaders' code, known as Babel-17. However, Babel-17 is more akin to a language, in fact, the most precise language known to Rydra: "most of its words carry more information about the things they refer to than any four or five languages

[…] put together, and in less space" (60). However, Babel-17 lacks the means to express the concept of self, communicated through pronouns such as "I", "you", or "mine". Babel-17 engineers a selfless mind incapable of resistance, since it has no ego striving to assert or to free itself. The inexistent "I" is dissolved under the control effected by the hypnotic language. Babel-17 is similar to "artificial languages that were used to program a machine" (174), turning the speaker into an automaton. However, Babel-17 is also described as "the most analytically exact language imaginable. But that's because everything is flexible, and ideas come in huge numbers of congruent sets, governed by the same words" (184) and this enables a huge number of paradoxes to be created and proves linguistically confusing (185), and offers the potential for a mind "to burn itself out" (Ibid.) or to "escape to the other side of the brain" (Ibid), the unconscious; a flaw which can be exploited to free the self from the constricting hold of the language. As the subject lies in this state of linguistic hypnosis, Babel-17 works towards entirely taking over the conscious subject, by destroying his unconscious, and programs him to destroy the Alliance. In *Babel-17*, the disappearance of the expression of the self means the disappearance of the individual, his free will and his consciousness altogether, reducing people to mere automatons working to destroy the Alliance.

Rydra highlights the fact that language is intrinsically tied to thinking, and as she states, "language *is* thought" (20). Just as Syme does in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Rydra asserts that outside language, things do not exist: "In the beginning was the word. That's how somebody tried to explain it once. Until something is named, it doesn't exist. And it's something the brain needs to have to exist" (131).[104] Rydra explains that for things to exist in the mind, they have to have a word to support the thing; words reify things. For Rydra, this becomes even truer of ideas, more than

[104] This is a reference to the Book of John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it." (1.1-5). This passage is reminiscent of the opening of the Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." (1.1-3). These two passages, when read together, equate language with light, or man's ability to express himself, to seek out knowledge, as epitomised in Sir Francis Bacon's essay "Of Truth": "The first creature of God, in the works of the days, was the light of the sense; the last was the light of reason; and his Sabbath work ever since, is the illumination of his Spirit". (*The Major Works*, p.342).

concrete words: “If you don’t know the words, you can’t know the idea” (130). Taking Syme’s example of freedom, if one does not know the word “free”, one cannot know of freedom. As a matter of fact, the idea that Babel-17 acts as a program can be transposed onto Newspeak: the destruction of words and the rigidity of the language amounts to a code. Oceanians will only be able to absorb directives, and be programed to follow propaganda.

Syme reinforces this point when he explains that, in the final edition of Newspeak, “every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly *one* word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten.” (55). Newspeak will not be comprised of synonyms, as one word will serve to convey the Party’s orthodoxy. These shades of meaning, available through synonyms and polysemy, are essential for one to be able to convey one’s thoughts accurately, to be able to create the range of images and sensations that Orwell sees as key to the clarity of language. Newspeak is in this sense opposed to the concept of a clear, undeceiving, malleable language exposed in Orwell’s essay. Orwell’s rules to clarify language have been twisted to simplify and constrict language in order to deceive and to control thinking, as opposed to make it clearer. This statement rings even truer when one observes the way in which Syme, a prominent Party member, is shown to express himself eloquently—as demonstrated in the quotation above. This would indicate that the Party is keeping the privilege of the mastery of language to itself, in order to exert the control and enforce barriers over the population. Looking at the construction of Newspeak and the control exerted over the population will allow for further investigation of this claim.

II/ Engineering and Compounding Directives: Degenerative Language and Thinking as a Crime

The idea that language in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is decaying is reinforced by the fact that no new neologisms are created, indicating that society is not advancing, and in fact, since words are being destroyed, language is regressing.[105] Eric Rabkin explains: "words as 'thoughtcrime' are not true neologisms but actually transformed language" (94) and as Roger Fowler points out, they are more often "compounds" (219).[106] Orwell's compounds differs from other science fiction neologism, such as the word "robot" coined by Karel Čapek, the many devices in Larry Niven's *Known Space*, such as "tasp" for the device that gives jolts of pleasure at a distance, or Le Guin's "ansible" in *The Dispossessed*, the device capable of making interstellar communication possible.[107] Neologisms enable science fiction to create new, alternate, unknown worlds and to reflect transformations or innovations, however, this does not occur in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Orwell's novel seems to subvert the potential that science fiction has to create new environments and new words, instead subverting linguistic creativity by reducing language to mere compounds. This reflects the idea expressed by Rabkin: "when the language used as material is that of the reader, the metalinguistic function most forcefully exhibits the possibilities of language transformation; when the language used as material is that of the narrator or of the characters, the metalinguistic function most forcefully exhibits the possibilities of neologism"

---

[105] For more details, see Gary Westfahl's "The Worlds That Could Happen: Science Fiction Neologisms and the Creation of Future Worlds" and Samuel Delany's *Silent Interviews: On Language, Race, Sex, Science Fiction and Some Comics* in which he responds to the question of relation between language and literature that "Science fiction has often taken new areas of conceptual space, then inflated them with language. The very first turning to outer space as a real place to write about, by Leinster, Heinlein, Williamson and Van Vogt, was very much the same verbal strategy" (165). Peter Stockwell, in *The Poetics of Science Fiction*, shows the different types of neoseme and neologism present in science fiction.

[106] Fowler notes that unlike Basic English, a language based on the English Language and composed of 850 words to facilitate international communication, Newspeak is a replacement of English: "Although the general idea of Newspeak can be gleaned from the text of the novel (with also an indication of its essential absurdity […]), it is only through the Appendix that we fully realise that Newspeak is designed to be a self-contained linguistic system replacing, not grafted on, the English language" (220).

[107] Eric Rabkin's essay "Metalinguistics and Science Fiction" provides more examples of neologisms in science fiction as well as a more detailed analysis of their importance to the idea of creation of reality on the genre.

(85).[108] Rabkin explains that when science fiction depicts truly alternate worlds, neologisms are created to support the alien nature of the world. However, when the plot represents the real world, it is language as we know it which might bear the transformations and changes, as is the case in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. So the lack of true neologism in Orwell's novel is linguistically relevant: it serves to reflect the decay of language within the novel as well as to create a convincing picture of the totalitarian linguistic control.

In fact, the creation of neologisms would be contradictory to the destruction of words. This is further highlighted by Syme who explains that as well as destroying synonyms and homonyms, Newspeak serves to destroy antonyms. Syme questions the need for antonyms and a wide array of other words: "After all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other word?" (54). He explains that taking the word and adding prefixes such as "un-" to replace "bad" with "ungood" amounts to the same. However, the negativity expressed by the word "bad" disappears, replaced by the neutral "ungood". Syme's idea that "a word contains its opposite in itself" (Ibid) is untrue, since "ungood" would mean "which does not possess the properties of goodness, devoid of goodness", therefore not carrying the negativity of the word "bad". The Appendix raises similar issues. It details that grammar rules have been simplified to promote the destruction of words: "any word in the language (in principle this applied even to abstract words such as *if* or *when*) could be used as either verb, noun, adjective or adverb" (314). The scholar narrator of the Appendix explains that, for example, the word "cut" could be replaced by the word knife.[109] Prefixes and suffixes are added to the base word to create different meanings. Thus "un-" "plus-" "doubleplus-", "-ful" for adjectives and "-wise" for adverbs (314-5). This grammatical method of word composition enables to destroy scores of words and to purge "all ambiguities and shades of meaning" (ibid), to reduce thinking to one idea, as seen with the example of the word "free" above.

This lack of ability to qualify and systematise things through language is also present in Jack Vance's *The Languages of Pao,* a science fiction narrative set on

[108] Rabkin adds that "treating language as material confronts contemporary values with other contemporary values if the language is the reader's (transformed language) or with alternative values if the language truly belongs to the world of the narrative (neologism)" (95).
[109] See note p. 99 for Resch attribution of the Appendix resembling a scholarly monograph.

another world. The reader is quickly introduced to the social and linguistic structure of the society:

> The Paonese sentence did not so much describe an act as it presented a picture of a situation. There were no verbs, no adjectives; no formal word comparison such as good, better, best. The typical Paonese saw himself as a cork on a sea of a million waves, lofted, lowered, thrust aside by incomprehensible forces—if he thought of himself as a discrete personality at all. He held his ruler in awe, gave unquestioning obedience, and asked in return only dynastic continuity, for on Pao nothing must vary, nothing must change.(6)

Paonese do not offer any sense of comparison, and this can actually be juxtaposed onto Newspeak: the lack of comparatives gives the languages a lack of nuances or hierarchy. It is possible to witness the effects of such a language system: on Pao, the ruler in place is not and cannot be overthrown, as change become inexpressible, thus inconceivable. Paonese become a malleable force, subjected and subdued. If they feel or express any sense of individuality, it is only done in very mild, weak terms: individuality cannot be strongly asserted without the language to do so and in a society described as "homogeneous", with "no great variations" in their physical appearance and "uncomplicated" (5). Paonese is a language expressing and framing docility, a fact which can be transposed onto Newspeak's rigidly defined structure.

In fact, as Syme's illustrates, Newspeak conveys this sense of docility through its vocabulary: compounded words create new concepts such as "doublethink", "sexcrime" and "thoughtcrime", which are meant to support and encode the repressed and repressive linguistic system of Oceania and enforcing the control of the Party.[110] The concept of "thoughtcrime" is the one alluded to the most often in the novel, and best illustrates the way in which new words aim to restrict and control thinking. Craig Carr explains that thoughtcrime means thinking for oneself, independently, with self-determination, as an autonomous agent independent from Big Brother (89-90), stating that "Winston's thought crime is that he thinks he is an independent thinking being" (90). By reflecting on the control exerted by Big Brother, expressing his thoughts and feelings in his diary, Winston communicates his

[110] Fowler points at the fact that that the word "thoughtcrime" becomes "crimethink" in the Appendix as he explains that "similar compounds in the novel seem to be Newspeak but in the Appendix are not: 'thoughtcrime' appears in the text but is replaced by 'crimethink' in the Appendix" (219). However, this discrepancy can be explained by reading the grammatical guidelines illustrated in the Appendix: "the word thought, for example, did not exist in Newspeak. Its place was taken by think, which did duty for both noun and verb" (314) and thus thoughtcrime becomes crimethink.

distrust of the system. Bernard Crick adds that through the idea of "thoughtcrime", "Orwell implies that totalitarianism demands *complete* loyalty, no reservations being allowed, and continuous enthusiasm, not just occasional conformity" (77): the Party does not accept being questioned. Crick indicates that the population is required to take the Party's statements at face value, accept them as the ultimate truth without ever thinking about what they are told.

The idea of following orders without questioning them is reminiscent of the soldier in times of war or of the prison guards, as described by Alexander Solzhenitsyn in *The Gulag Archipelago*. The guards and interrogators' "branch of service does not requires only that they carry out orders exactly and be impervious to suffering", they are "legion, stripped bare of universal human ideals" (145). Solzhenitsyn describes the guards as inhumane, unable to feel compassion, and even more so, "they forced themselves *not to think* (and this is in itself the ruin of a human being), and simply accepted that this was the way it had to be and that the person who gave them orders was always right…" (145). By blindly following orders, the guards strip themselves of their reasoning ability and their humanity, and can be compared to simple automatons following programmed commands. This idea that men are devoid of thinking only follow mere commands is present in Zamyatins' *We*, in which the One State has developed the mathematical formula to infallible happiness. The narrative takes the form of a record: D-503 writes down his thoughts for alien nations as the One State—made up of the entire Earth population—is looking for spatial expansion. The One State will "FORCE [THE ALIENS] TO BE HAPPY" (3), that is compel others to follow its logic, its reason and deny the aliens their individuality and choice. Citizen of the One State themselves do not think independently, as D-503 himself notes that his record symbolises what "we think" (4), that is to say what the totality is of the One State thinks.[111] D-503 awakes to his singularity, his desires and his wish for otherness, as his record show: however, his society rapidly perceives this as irrational, a bout of insane imagination.

[111] John Hoyles, in *The Literary Underground*, explains how the absolute absorption of the individual into the collective constitutes totalitarianism. He explains this by quoting Bakunin's letter in which he says: "I do not want to be I, I want to be We" (36). This statements expresses the tensions between individualism and the collective, but also, to a further extent, between isolation and totalitarianism, the tension at play in Zamyatin's *We*.

The lack of independence of thought is also praised in Alfred Elton Van Vogt's *Tyranopolis* (also known as *Future Glitter*). Youth becomes an important factor in order to lead one's life without fear of execution, especially within the scientific community. As a scientist observes: "What counts is the great mass of the ever young, who don't know anything and don't remember the facts—because they never knew them" (44); there is a "policy which seeks to utilize the ever-young and therefore the ever-ignorant to maintain the tyrant in power" (96). In this tyrannical society, naiveté and ignorance are praised in favour of wisdom and independent thinking. In fact, thinking is admittedly a dangerous practise: "the power of human thought has been given ultimate recognition, specific ideas, no matter whose head they are in, are assigned a death sentence status" (49). The lack of independent thinking attached to totalitarianism creates images of dehumanisation, of loss of individuality and those who seek self-awareness through independent knowledge are often punished and met with repression. This is the case with Winston Smith in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and present in the compounded word "thoughtcrime", which seeks to establish thinking as a crime and simultaneously to prevent the habit of thinking through the evocation of that word alone. The extent of thought control of the Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is observable through its contradictory statements which the population does not notice or question and simply accepts. This occurs when the Party change its enemy from Eurasia to Eastasia during the Hate Week, and when the Party claims to provide plentiful goods when there are in fact shortages. This acceptance of the lies and change of ideology can be understood through the idea of thoughcrime: questioning the Party's lines would show independence of thought and be punished.

The idea of "doublethink" can also serve to account for the submission of the population: it consists in an "unending series of victories over your own memory" (37), in the ability to forget what one knows and to accept what the Party says at face value. The concept of doublethink is

> To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them; to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible but that the Party was the guardian of democracy; to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then draw it back into

> memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. (Ibid)

Doublethink enables the simultaneous belief in contradictory statements: democracy is impossible and the Party defends democracy. However, it is significant to note that these contradictory beliefs can be held by adopting the Party's ideology through doublethink. The Party can be the guardian of democracy and this is positively perceived through the propaganda it creates, however, democracy is to be perceived as negative at the same time, especially since this would imply freedom and choice of government. Through this example, one can understand how the Party's propaganda works: the population is to embrace the Party's stance at all times, even if it is contradictory. The population is also to forget about the contradictory statements and is not to reflect on the contradictions emanating from the propaganda. Believing in contradictory statements is based one's ability to forget what the Party wants one to forget. What is forgotten is not entirely forgotten but can be called upon by the Party when or if needed. Doublethink enables the Party to make any contradictions in their propaganda, without needing to legitimise anything.

The novel indicates that the idea of doublethink is summarised by the Party in Oldspeak as "reality control" (Ibid). William Steinhoff rephrases this idea of "reality control" as "induced schizophrenia" (*The Road to 1984*, 160). This idea of the citizens of Oceania being schizophrenic reflects the process of doublethink as it indicates the individuals are subjected to and creating different realities. However, as Steinhoff rightly demonstrates, this schizophrenia is induced by the leaders (Ibid). The leaders of the Party are in fact willingly making their citizens dysfunctional so that they become easier to control. This idea of illness is in fact reflected in Orwell's own writings when he explains, in "Politics and the English Language", that the state of language is "curable" (357) which underlies the idea that language is sick, metaphorically re-enacted in the Oceanians suffering from schizophrenia.

The language of Babel-17 exposes a similar idea to that of the reality control effected by Newspeak and the concept of induced schizophrenia, but provides more details as to its inner mechanism. Rydra, who has experienced the effects of linguistic schizophrenia, is able to describe its effects: "While thinking in Babel-17 it becomes perfectly logical to try and destroy your own ship and then blot out the fact

with self-hypnosis so you won't discover what you're doing and try and stop yourself. […] It 'programs' a self-contained schizoid personality into the mind of whoever learns it, reinforced by self-hypnosis" (188-9). The speaker enters a hypnotic state which makes him unaware of the changes to his conscious personality. While he is being reprogramed, the speaker is in a dual condition: one the one hand, he can observe his actions, but at the same time ignores them and follows the instructions from the programming Babel-17. This programmed personality "remain[s] hidden from the rest of the consciousness until it's strong enough to take over" and keeps full control of the body of the speaker (189). Newspeak can be compared to Babel-17 on the same terms: the linguistic hypnosis enables a two-sided view of the world, an observer and an agent. In Newspeak, they are interchangeable on order, whilst in Babel-17, it is a transitory step. However, in both languages, the subject is hypnotised into full servitude, his personality supplanted by a fabricated one, supported by a fabricated linguistic system.

The control enforced by the Party also extends to the world of feelings, and this is made visible through the illustration of the difference between "goodsex" and "sexcrime". The narrator details:

> The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and - though the principle was never clearly stated - permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. (68).

The view of the Party on the sexual act is twofold. On the one hand, it is perceived as a positive act as it begets children for the Party and ensures the continuity of life and perpetuates the system. "Goodsex" describes the sexual act as an operation, a formal procedure to be performed for the good of the Party. This is apparent through Winston's estranged wife, who called having sex their "duty to the Party", "making a baby" or "produc[ing] a child" (70). The aim of the Party is to take the pleasure element out of the sexual act: since the Party cannot control love or affinities between people, it can try to regulate and take out the pleasure derived from the

sexual intercourse, which is a motivation for forming partnerships.[112] "Sexcrime" describes the attraction and the search for pleasure with another partner, which could outstrip the needs for Party.[113] Therefore, sex becomes a formality necessary to give children for the Party, ensuring its continuity. Marriage can only be authorised by the Party, as is also the case in Van Vogt's *Tyranopolis*: a couple wanting to have children needs to have authorisation from the authorities if they do not want to face punishment. This idea of a controlled reproduction is reminiscent of the hatcheries created in *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley: reproduction is perceived as a foul, shameful act; instead embryos are grown and created in an artificial environment.[114] This is also the case in Zamyatin's *We*: the One State has generated "child breeding" following ideas of "Maternal and Paternal norms" (14), that is, criteria of reproduction. The reproductive nature of sex becomes regulated or subverted in that it becomes the affair of the state, as opposed to the desire of parents: children are no longer "private possessions" (*We*, 25) but rather a state tool of controlled indoctrination and continuity. Through legislative and linguistic control, the word "sexcrime" implements the idea that love, feelings and emotions between couples, and the creation of private, independent family units are unlawful and punishable.

The destruction of words and the creation of a new vocabulary supporting the regulation exerted by the Party are not the only ways in which it hopes to impose linguistic determinism on the population. Strict categorisation, along with the simplified grammar rules as seen above, means that language becomes less malleable. Newspeak is divided into three rigidly defined vocabularies: A, B and C as detailed in the Appendix. Marry Jo Morris, in her essay "Bentham and Basic English" explains how the A vocabulary "corresponds to the core of vocabulary of Basic English: it consists of 'the words needed for the business of everyday life'. Basic restricts the meaning of words—it is not possible to make puns within the limitations of Basic; similarly, the words of the Newspeak 'A' list are 'rigidly

[112] See Sigmund Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* (p.45-55)

[113] For more details on how the Party wants to destroy the pleasure of sex, see Julia's statement, p. 142.

[114] Paul Ehrlich and Anne Ehrlich use the word "hatchery" (51) when they express the fact that "Had Orwell been more scientifically oriented, he might have predicted that technological advances would make it possible, as indeed they have, to allow eggs to be taken from women and 'hatched' elsewhere" (51). They show the relation's to O'Brien statement: "Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes the eggs from a hen" (280), as this can be taken as an intertextual reference to Huxley's hatchery.

defined'" (111).[115] The A vocabulary parodies that of Basic English—a vocabulary of 850 words selected to cover general needs. Morris illustrates the impossibility to make puns in Basic or in Newspeak, which shows the restrictions on one's ability to think, to be witty, to laugh and to feel. She states that the words chosen were covering everyday *business*, they serve to formulate commands and directive, but do not cover the array of meanings necessary to cover everyday life or feelings.[116]

Propaganda is at the heart of the B vocabulary, knowledge of the principles of Ingsoc are supposedly essential to master it: "Without a full understanding of the principles of Ingsoc it was difficult to use the words correctly" (316) and "Some of the B words had highly subtilised meanings, barely intelligible to anyone who had not mastered the language as a whole" (317). To use the B vocabulary, one needs to master the principles of Ingsoc, which is contradictory to the Party's slogan that "Ignorance is Strength". The B vocabulary has an appearance of importance and elitism: it is only on the surface that the B vocabulary seems to require mastery. This is notably illustrated by the idea, "What was required of a Party member was an outlook similar to that of the ancient Hebrew who knew, without knowing much else, that all nations other than his own worshipped 'false gods'. […] in somewhat the same way, the Party member knew what constituted right conduct" (319). This shows that the expected attitude of a Party member was that he should act as an unthinking follower, not questioning his own passivity, but only acting submissively, blindly following ideological commands.

This sense of the B vocabulary being used to instil a positive, repetitive attitude is enhanced by the fact it resembles a "sort of verbal shorthand, often packing whole ranges of ideas into a few syllables" (314) "welded together in easily pronounceable form" (315). All the words of the B vocabulary were made up of compounds and made up a vocabulary of quickly formed or repeated thoughts,

[115] For more on Orwell and Basic English, see Whitney Bolton, The Language of 1984, where she details the similarities in restrictions of words between Newspeak and Basic English, and how "Newspeak is in origin a parody of Basic. Newspeak has many attributes, including literary history that Basic lacks. Basic and Newspeak are somewhat similar in reduced vocabulary and regularized morphology, but not in the syntax which is normal in Basic" (152-3). Bolton shows that Newspeak is similar to Basic English, in that the vocabulary in use is reduced to its minimum.

[116] Orwell's essays "Politics and the English Language" and "New Words" both convey the idea that language can sometimes be inadequate to convey one's meaning, hence the necessity of clarifying language or, as he states in "New Words", to create new words that would describe one's inner life. Newspeak might be adequate to describe business life, but not thoughts, feelings or sensations.

similar to shorthand, notably the one Winston was using when receiving instructions to change what was written in the *Times*.[117] More interestingly is the mention of the few syllables put together so that they are easy to pronounce, which echoes the discussion that takes place in the canteen of the Department. People are talking, phrases are "jerked out rapidly" and "like a line of type cast solid" (57), similarly to a "quack-quack-quacking" noise (Ibid). This brings the idea of the speaker being an automaton, just repeating propaganda like a machine.[118] This is further exemplified by the idea that "euphony outweighed every consideration other than exactitude of meaning" (321).[119] This shows that making the right sounds, appearing to say what one has to say is more important than understanding the repeated propaganda. The B vocabulary is portrayed as crafty and requiring mastery to use, but amounts to a meaningless quack: people using the B vocabulary are depicted as mechanistic, unthinking automatons, thus undermining the individual's ability to think and denying his political freedom.

The final vocabulary exposed in the Appendix, the C vocabulary, is that of scientific language. The narrator does not linger too long on its uses and functions. Instead, the narrator simply explains that "very few of the C words had any currency either in everyday speech or in political speech" (321-2). The C vocabulary is in fact used only by those who practise their "speciality" (322), but that the scientist or technician "seldom had more than a smattering of the words occurring in the other lists" (Ibid). The C vocabulary is a specialised vocabulary for scientific and technical occupations, which does not permeate the A or B vocabulary. Conversely, the A or B vocabularies cannot be used in the C vocabulary, as it does not serve to express the high technical requirements needed to express the scientific or technical subtleties.

---

[117] The guidelines given—"times 3.12.83 reorting bb dayorder doubleplusungood refs unpersons rewrite fullwise upsub antefiling" (46)—advise Winston that "The reporting of Big Brother's Order for the Day in the Times of December 3rd 1983 is extremely unsatisfactory and makes references to non-existent persons and illustrates the workings of Newspeak". It resembles a code and gives brief instruction—almost as in a coded war message or computer program.

[118] Bolton, in *The Language of 1984*, explains the relation of Orwell and the machine, notably pointing out that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, "the future has only machine that break (Smith's lift), snoop (the Thought Police helicopter, the telescreen), oppress (the speakwrite) or torment (the 'advanced' instrument of torture in the Ministry of Love basement" (157).

[119] This is reminiscent of Zamyatin's expressing that polyphony can generate cacophony, which is better that monophony which leaves no room for questions (in Hoyles, *The Literary Underground*, p.116). Orwell's euphony in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is to be associated to the Party's propaganda, and can therefore be equated to Zamyatin's monophony, that is to say totalitarian propaganda.

Despite the C vocabulary being a scientific vocabulary, the narrator explains that, in Newspeak, "there was no vocabulary expressing the function of Science as a habit of mind" (Ibid). In other terms, Newspeak does not have a word for the idea of Science in any of its vocabularies, following that it suppresses words that enable an individual to think. Newspeak destroys all the positive notions that can come to mind under the expression of "Science": science linked to a thirst for knowledge, the will to improve conditions for mankind and balance social inequities, or scientific research to improve one's quality of life. Thus, Newspeak destroys the notions of philosophical, logical, scientific and rational investigations. The C vocabulary is limited to the more technical or scientific aspect of knowledge. The narrator does not mention any use or creation of C words for subjects in the humanities. This further reflects the impossibility to express feelings, emotions or social exclusion in any of the Newspeak vocabularies. As Morris puts it: "Newspeak achieves linguistic control over the otherwise uncontrolled and potentially subversive emotions" (112). Through the three vocabularies, total control over the personal, "inner world", as Orwell puts it in his essay "New Words", is achieved, thus submitting the population to the ideology of the Party.[120]

The definition of the C vocabulary is very akin to that of "jargon", which signifies the specialised vocabularies specific to a discipline, and which is therefore not common to everyday language. Theodor Adorno explains how jargon can break down communication; this idea reinforces the understanding that Newspeak can be used as a tool to control thinking:

> Whoever is versed in the jargon does not have to say what he thinks, does not even have to think it properly. The jargon takes over this task and devaluates thought. That the whole man should speak is authentic, comes from the core. Thus something occurs which the jargon itself stylises as "to occur". Communication clicks and puts forth as truth what should instead be suspect by virtue of the prompt collective agreement. The tone of jargon has something in it of the seriousness of the augurs, arbitrarily independent from their context or conceptual content, conspiring with whatever is sacred. (p.6).

[120] In "New Words" Orwell explains that the inner world is a world of thoughts and feelings that are expressed without words, but through images, sensations and feelings. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this is shown through the idea of the "mute protest in your own bones, the instinctive feeling that the conditions you lived in were intolerable and that at some other time they must have been different" (76-77). People in Oceania do not word their feeling constrained by the system, which is nonetheless felt through the body.

Adorno explains that when one uses jargon, one surrenders to its power and its meaning and lets oneself be misguided by the apparent importance of jargon. Jargon is not necessarily mastered by the speaker, who instead relies on the expertise of other jargon users, or calls on the principles explained by those who coined the jargon: therefore, the jargon user is dispossessed of his own thoughts and his ability to generate meaning. Using jargon is therefore a passive activity as it means being dictated a meaning. Adorno's point is reminiscent of Orwell's essay "Politics and the English Language", in which he states that it is necessary to "let meaning choose the word, and not the other way about" (358), that is to say that one should not be subjected to jargon, but instead choose words for oneself. Both Adorno and Orwell highlight that jargon can supplant the thinking process.[121] Therefore, the thinking process becomes undermined: jargon provides a quick and instant explanation of facts, a noise uttered, a "euphony" or an occurrence, without necessarily understanding the facts, or being able to explain them, debate or thoughtfully engage with them.

The idea that the C vocabulary functions as jargon, triggers a mindless verbal shorthand, which can be extended to the A and B vocabularies. Adorno's statement is very suited to explain the essence of Newspeak: Newspeak creates a passive utterance of words, of a creation of meaningless statements devoid of critical engagement, accepted at face value, replaced by linguistic propaganda akin to the jargon which "devaluates thought" (Adorno, 6). Through the three vocabularies, total control over the personal, inner world is achieved, thus submitting the population to the ideology of the Party. This control is in part executed by the fact that each single part of the Newspeak vocabularies isolates another section of the population. The A vocabulary is the vocabulary of the everyday business: it does not convey emotions, destroys shades of meaning and is restrained to essential tasks and therefore does not allow for freedom of expression. It is therefore unsuitable for literary or philosophical purposes (314), so emotions cannot be communicated or reflected using this vocabulary. The B vocabulary is a specific political jargon designed for Party members, and the C vocabulary is extremely exclusive due to its required

[121] This is especially relevant when one considers rule (v) of Orwell's "Politics and the English Language": "Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word or a jargon word if can think of an everyday English equivalent" (359).

technical and scientific nature. The Appendix highlights the way in which the segmented construction of Newspeak can be seen as a compilation of jargons which excludes and which prevents adequate communication between Party members, or even the proles and the Party. This lack of communication is a further tool of control: people are walled out from one another, as they cannot communicate, share or debate, leaving the Party in charge and free to dictate its meaning.

III/ Polysemy and Freedom: Using Irony as an Opening

Part of the chill of reading *Nineteen Eighty-Four* lies in the extent of the repression exerted by the Party. By creating a new language and a new vocabulary, the Party is criminalising thinking and feeling. It quickly becomes apparent that the control the Party is trying to effect on the population is not total: Winton is a dissident guilty of thoughtcrime and the Party spies on the proles to identify and annihilate potential revolutionaries and traitors. Before looking into how resistance is actualised and executed in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, I would like to detail a few paradoxes and flaws in Newspeak which makes it a weak linguistic barrier, susceptible to be broken, thus enabling communication.

Lorraine Saunders's, when talking about the Appendix, gives an indication of the feasibility and durability of a project such as Newspeak. She explains: "when we read, at the end of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that, 'It was expected that Newspeak would have finally superseded Oldspeak ...in the year 2050,' we can only conclude that the writer of the Appendix, just as the reader, is not in a position to *know* with any certainty what the outcome will be" (146). The narrator of the Appendix cannot fully ascertain the replacement of English by Newspeak: this offers the "*potential* for optimism" (145) that Newspeak becomes a failed project.[122]

While Saunders believes that the narrator of the Appendix is writing it before 1984, that is before the time of the main narration and the finalisation of Newspeak, there is ample evidence to substantiate the fact that the Appendix was written afterwards, just for the fact that it is an appendix and not a preface or a prologue. Thomas Pynchon, in his introduction to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, states that the voice of the Appendix is 'consistently in the past tense as if to suggest some later, happier moment in history, post 1984' (3).[123] Pynchon suggests that the Appendix is written after the rest of the novel, after the failure and downfall of the Party and of Newspeak, when they have become "a thing of the past" and when English is

[122] Saunders views the narrator of the Appendix as a sort of time-traveller, who was able to see the state of language in 1984, and then return to his own time, as she speculates, being 1948: the Appendix "could only have been written by someone situated firmly in 1948, a person who had been able to merely glimpse into the future of 1984, like a Wellsian time-traveller" (145-6). She corroborates her point by stating that the narrator of the Appendix uses phrases such as "as we already possess" to describe the fact that Newspeak is based on the already existing Newspeak.

[123] Pynchon wrote "The Road to 1984" as the foreword to the 2003 Penguin Edition of the novel.

reinstated, as seen evidenced by its being used in the Appendix. Fowler furthers the idea of an Appendix free from Newspeak: "the tone of the Newspeak Appendix […] is quite clearly satirical" (211). For Fowler, the tone of the Appendix is mocking, indicating a reflection on the absurdity of Newspeak and showing the freedom of speech that the narrator could enjoy, a further indication that the Party has collapsed. Robert Resch views the Appendix as a "scholarly monograph looking back on Oceania as an extinct and almost incomprehensible civilization" (158): its eloquent and adapt understanding of the workings of Newspeak suggests that it has been written by a free trained linguist. These views indicate that the Appendix is written by an independent, impartial, unrepressed, uncensored narrator free to reflect on the state of Newspeak.

Elizabeth Closs Traugott, in her essay entitled "Newspeak: Could it Really Work?", argues that the project of Newspeak could not work in the reader's world. She explains that language cannot be fixed and is interpreted differently by different generations.[124] Traugott believes that Newspeak could not happen because of the very structure of language: it is malleable and mutable (95-9) and cannot be finalised, as Newspeak is meant to be. Traugott implies that Newspeak as an actual project is absurd, as language cannot be controlled. It is interesting to apply Traugott's point to the world within the novel: if *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a novel using the language of the reader, then, the same rules of manipulation and linguistic evolution apply to it.[125] There is enough ground to see Newspeak as a failing project within the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.[126] This would therefore make Newspeak a propaganda tool, as opposed to a concrete, actual linguistic tool for control used to manipulate and create an alternate present. The reality of Newspeak is dubious: propaganda still needs to be communicated through the medium of Oldspeak.

Within the narrative, Newspeak still has inconsistencies which enable the speaker to use the language freely and ironically. The narrator of the Appendix states that polysemy had been destroyed by Newspeak, its aim being to strip words of

[124] In her essay, Traugott discusses the wider social issues which make it impossible to fix language, or to control its evolution.
[125] See Rabkin's quotation on language in science fiction. See p. 108-9.
[126] Eric Rabkin explains how "any quick glance at the text will reveal that Orwell himself writes in Oldspeak and only uses Newspeak as flavouring" (94), that is Newspeak is also a flavouring in Oceania, and not an actual linguistic tool.

"unorthodox meanings, and so far as possible, of all secondary meanings whatever" (313). This claim is initially supported by Syme, who explains that "every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly *one* word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten." (55). Syme becomes the advocate for the destruction of double meaning, of synonyms and antonyms.

In contrast to these statements, Syme introduces polysemy in the novel. Syme creates a paradox when he explains the definition of the word "duckspeak": "to quack like a duck. It is one of those words that have two contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent it is abuse; applied to someone you agree with, it is praise" (57).[127] Syme gives this definition as, when sitting in the cafeteria with Winston, they eavesdrop on a meaningless, yet noisy, conversation between two Party members. The speaker looks like a "dummy" (57) as he is only repeating propaganda: "It was not the man's brain that was speaking, it was its larynx" (Ibid), as if quacking like a duck. Syme shows that in Newspeak, there still exists a word that can have two different, contradictory meanings, despite the claims of eradication of polysemy. "Duckspeak" enables a speaker to choose the meaning of the word, therefore empowering him and giving him the freedom to say what he means. If one considers a hypothetical Newspeak sentence such as "Big Brother duckspeak", one can interpret it in two ways: it is either means "Big Brother is eloquent" or "Big Brother is unintelligent". However, a speaker can use "duckspeak" ironically: saying "Big Brother duckspeak" with a positive inflection does not mean it is intended this way. The word "duckspeak" opens the door to linguistic empowerment, realisable through

[127] It is also interesting to note other language uses of the words "duck" to describe politicians. The expression "lame duck" is defined by Charles Lindsay, in his short article "More Political Lingo" as "The "lame duck" is the "discredited politician" who has been repudiated and "cast over" by his own constituents, that is, defeated for election or re-election at the polls." (443). *The Safire Political Dictionary* details that the origin of the expression meant a bankrupt businessman and was used in the 1830s to described "bankrupt politicians". (378-9) and this parallel is made through the definition of the noun "quack" taken from the *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture* describing someone who pretends to have knowledge. The idea of the "Duck" is also present in *Animal Farm* and this also in a negative light. The orphan ducklings are rescued by Clover, and embody the young minds ready to be perverted by ideology: "[the ducklings] had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to pieces after confessing to shocking crimes." (2003. p.64) and Napoleon is referred to as "Ducklings Friend" (Ibid. p.67). Therefore, the ducklings are strongly associated with Napoleon, a politician failing to deliver improvements to the population and using the sufferings of others to improve his own image.

private irony, while upholding the appearance of orthodoxy necessary to survive.[128] As I will show later in this chapter, irony becomes the tool enabling personal, private resistance.[129]

The ability to use language as one wants reflects Traugott's idea of the unpredictability of the evolution of language and its potential for multiple interpretations. This is also apparent in *Babel-17*. Linguistic paradoxes can turn the speaker against its country, against the Alliance of worlds fighting off the Invaders, and even turn one against oneself (188). The structure of language and these paradoxes—equated to a program which controls the speaker—alter the speakers thoughts, thinking process and world view in fundamental ways. For example, the English word for "Alliance" does not have an equivalent in Babel-17. Instead, it translates as "one-who-has-invaded" (188), therefore linguistically equating the Alliance with the Invaders: the Alliance is turned into the enemy. The Alliance soldier is therefore its own enemy, and self-destruction becomes acceptable, equal to the destruction of the enemy. Babel-17 is also a "language without the word 'I'" (156), without any concept of the self, which "precludes any self-critical process" (188). One of Rydra's crew member, the Butcher, exemplifies this lack of critical process: using her telepathic abilities, she sees him "commit robbery, murder, mayhem" (158) validated by the fact that no barriers exist in his selfless world to make him realise the wrongs of his actions. However, Rydra, who has an extensive linguistic knowledge of many languages teaches the Butcher the concepts of self and self-awareness. The more she teaches the Butcher, the more she learns about Babel-17. She is able to change the language of Babel-17 so that it becomes more accurate, less deceiving, and includes the lexicon supporting the self-critical process and disables the paradoxes conducive to hypnotising the subject. Babel-17 becomes Babel-18, having evolved according to the expression and the wish for new ideas, new ways of expressing oneself. Incidentally, this occurs whilst Rydra is aboard the ship named *Chronos*, representing the flow of time and perhaps suggesting that language, no matter how accurate, perfect or definite, will be subject to change and

[128] The necessity to input meaning into language, as opposed to having it the other way around, is also expressed by Richard Rorty, who, in *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*, explains the purpose of irony is to place meaning into words as one pleases, even if this creates a tension due to the fact that other speakers might not share the same values of meaning (p.73-8).
[129] See p. 147-53

evolution.[130] In the case of *Babel-17*, these changes have been effected by man, corrected to "introduce the missing elements and compensate for the ambiguities" (189), and compensate for the self-hypnotic, schizoid effect of the language. Irony performs that function in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s Newspeak. In both novels, the speakers give themselves the ability to shake off linguistic control by using language in a free manner, and effect the necessary change opening up communication. Thus, the tight, controlling nature of Babel-17 is disrupted by the ability of the speaker to control and mould language to one's needs; and Newspeak can be used ironically therefore offering flexibility to the speaker.

[130] In fact, comparing the idea of the names of the ships can relate to the idea of the journey as is the case with Shevek in *The Dispossessed*: the names of the ship were symbols for his state of mind as he left and returned to his home world. See p. 92-4.

IV/ Contrasted Voices: The Proles and the Parsons

The previous sections have exposed a differentiation between the representations of Newspeak: it is depicted as a tool of for repression as well as well as a failing project. The "proles" play an important part in the failures of that project; they are described by Winston as the source of "hope" (72) for the liberation of Oceania. Since they use Oldspeak, it is important to compare the language to Newspeak as represented in the novel. Doing so will further the understanding of Newspeak and its eventual downfall.

Oldspeak is a language intrinsically associated with the proles. As Winston and Syme discuss the evolution of language in Oceania and the sovereignty of Newspeak, they come to discuss the disappearance of Oldspeak. Syme asks Winston: "Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050, at the very latest, not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?" (55). Winston objects by saying "Except…" (Ibid) but stops himself as he could be found guilty of thoughtcrime. Syme guesses what Winston has in mind and shows this by answering "The proles are not human beings" (56). Syme shows he is able to read Winston's thoughts, that he is objecting to the actuality of Newspeak as he believes Oldspeak will still be used by the proles. Syme denotes the Party's stance; since the proles do not belong to the Party, they are not human and therefore not part of society or the Party. Syme does not dismiss Winston's idea that the proles will still be speaking Oldspeak, only reinstating that Party members will not be speaking Oldspeak.

This reinforces Winston's aphorism "If there is hope, it lies in the proles" (72): if there is hope, it lies in Oldspeak. An Ingsoc slogan states "Proles and animals are free" (75), which echoes the other negative view of freedom: "freedom is slavery". The proles are seen as the truly free characters of the novel; however the Party depicts this in a negative light. Zamyatin's *We* also portrays a system in which freedom is perceived as negative.[131] D-503, the main character, writes to inhabitants

[131] The importance of language in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has been attributed to Zamyatin's novel. For more details, see Isaac Deutscher's "*1984*—The Mysticism of Cruelty", where he states that "The assertion that Orwell borrowed the main elements of 1984 from Zamyatin is not the guess of a critic with a foible for tracing literary influences. Orwell knew Zamyatin's novel and was fascinated by it. He wrote an essay about it, which appeared in the left-socialist Tribune" (121).

of other galaxies to show them that their societies built on freedom are fallible. The aim of his writings is to inform the aliens of "mathematically infallible happiness" (3), but more importantly, to make them understand that they might be subjugated by "the savage state of freedom" (Ibid), this perception of freedom as primitive is echoed in Orwell's novel in the relation between animals and freedom. *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* both depict societies whose political systems undermine freedom and reject it as nothing more than a backwards or savage system preventing personal happiness.

However, it is the proles' use of Oldspeak, which makes the proles a symbol of freedom from the slavery of the Party and Newspeak. Winston can see through the Party's line, that is, through the ideological totality of Newspeak as only propaganda and he expresses that the proles hold the key to freedom: "Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious" (74). The proles hold the key to freeing Oceania, however, they cannot do so until they free themselves from the Party's hold. This also shows through the fact that the Party spies on the proles: "A few agents of the Thought Police moved always among them, spreading false rumours and marking them down and eliminating the few individuals who were judged capable of becoming dangerous; but no effort was made to indoctrinate them with the ideology of the Party". (74) The proles represent a real threat since the Thought Police infiltrates them to eliminate the possible dissents that live amongst them.[132]

Saunders illustrates that the proles symbolise hope: they "are far likelier to be symbolic of an innately decent *type* of human than representative of a real class; and their role in the novel being, by way of contrast, to expose the learned inhumanity of the upper or ruling classes" (13). For Saunders, the proles are an effective symbol to contrast human goodness and hope to the cruelty of the Party. The proles are vibrant,

[132] Beatrix Campbell criticised Orwell's depiction of the proles: "[Orwell] does not conceive of the working class itself as a thinking class. The result is a class which is thoughtless and leaderless, a class in its natural state… 'I think, therefore I am' apparently does not apply to the proles; to think is to become middle class" (Qtd in Saunders. 13). However, there is enough evidence to contradict Campbell's view. As Saunders suggests, the proles in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* "are far likelier to be symbolic of an innately decent type of human than representative of a real class; and their role in the novel being, by way of contrast, to expose the learned inhumanity of the upper or ruling classes" (13). This statement echoes Orwell's essays: in "Politics and the English Language", Orwell criticises the language used by the ruling groups—politicians, journalists and bureaucrats, who purposely keep language unclear in order to deceive.

colourful, lively, free and individualistic; they use Oldspeak, the language of sincerity and humanity. and this contrasts with the uniformity created by the propaganda of the Party.[133] Saunders's statement is corroborated by Arnold M. Tibbetts who explains that "In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, only the proles—as ignorant, dirty, and unruly as they are—are still human. The only hope for the future of mankind, as Winston often reminds himself, lies in the proles, who have a certain amount of personal freedom and can still be different from one another ("What Did Orwell Think About the English Language?", 164)". Despite their apparent ignorance, the fact that they live in dirty suburbs or slums and their poor lifestyle, the proles are the characters who succeed in retaining their humanity.

The distinct accent of the proles is a mark of their freedom from linguistic rules, of their regional individuality and of the authenticity of their characters. This is achieved through the transcribing of the cockney accents, which is given life through the omitted "h" and occasional "t", the use of "ain't" and the use of slang. This gives life to the proles and provides a dynamism contrasting to the "duckspeak" of the Party members, who sound similar to a monotone scratched disk repeating itself endlessly. The accent made prominent when Winston crosses the slums to "the north and east of what had once been St Pancras Station" (85-6). There he observes women arguing, the slang of a man warning a "steamer"—a bomb—was about to hit the surroundings, men arguing over the lottery and an old man in a pub struggling to explain what a pint is, which is also reminiscent of a bygone age. As the old man explains "We didn't 'ave these bleeding litres when I was a young man" (91) to which the barman replies "When you were a young man we were all living in the treetops" (Ibid) which triggers the other customers to laugh. This scene of triviality is humorous; the reply from the barman is ridiculous, but witty. This joke constitutes a typical pub banter, which symbolises life and enjoyment through laughter, which cannot be experienced in the very composed atmosphere of the Party, where a twitch of the face can indicate facecrime.[134] In the background, men *play* darts and there are no telescreens, the proles are free to spend their time as they please.[135]

[133] For more details, see Harold J. Harris's "Orwell's Essays and *1984*", Robert Resch's "Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" and Fowler's *The Language of George Orwell*.

[134] Harris explains of the pub scene: "This barroom scene is a brief one which gives too much the impression of having been planted in the novel in order to bring the proles in. Nevertheless on its own

In the pub, Winston approaches the old man and offers him a drink to try to get information from him on ages past. However, as Harold Harris points out, "As for the old man, he is unable to satisfy Winston's curiosity in regards to the past because while Winston thinks and talks in terms of freedom and economic opportunity, his own muddled thoughts turn to such particulars as top hats and eccentric speakers in Hyde Park" (160). Winston uses economical terms such as "capitalists", "workers—were their slaves" (94). Winston employs the ideological language the Party uses to describe history, while the old man picks up on the practical and pragmatic features of the past society, such as his inability to buy top hats, "hiring them instead" (93), and mentioning the "Lackeys" (94). Winston asks the man: "What I am asking is, were these people able to treat you as an inferior, simply because they were rich and you were poor? Is it a fact, for instance, that you had to call them "Sir" and take off your cap when you passed them?" (94), to which the old man simply answers "yes" (95). The old man continues with an anecdote from his own life: "They liked you to touch your cap to 'em." (95). Winston imagines the reality to be much more complex than it was experienced by the old working class man, for whom a simple "yes" embodies the whole repression and submission he had to endure. This scene shows people's difficulty in communicating with one another. The barrier does not necessarily lies within the old man, as Harris has it, but with Winston, who does not allow himself room for freedom of communication with another person, as he is clouded by the restrictive principles of Newspeak and the Party's anti-capitalist propaganda.

Another scene showing a prole woman also constitutes an important episode in demonstrating how their language and mode of expression convey humanity and aesthetics. Winston observes a washerwoman from his room in the prole quarter. He describes her as a "monstrous woman, solid as a Norman pillar, with brawny red forearms" (147), and on the second occasion when he looks at her notices her "thick arms" and her "mare-like buttocks portrud[ing]" (228). Her description is by no

terms it succeeds quite well. The dropped h's, the heavy-handed sarcasm, the complete absence of party jargon or of slogans of any kind, the dart game and the talk of the lottery-all these things testify to the very real and very solid presence in Oceanian society of the proles, the collective embodiment of the non-puritanical and earthy" (160).

[135] For the relation between telescreens and control, see Martin Esslin's "Television and Telescreen", and John Lyons "George Orwell's Opaque Glass in *1984*".

means flattering. However, Winston provides a contrasted view: "It had never before occurred to him that the body of a woman of fifty, blown up to monstrous dimensions by childbearing, then hardened, roughened by work till it was coarse in the grain like an over-ripe turnip, could be beautiful" (228). In spite of being physically unattractive, she holds a certain beauty, which lies in what she does and what she represents: joy, care and family. She cares for her children and grandchildren: this care for her descendants symbolises life, nurture, continuity and the circle of life—which is contrasted to the concept of the Party family embodied in the Parsons. Despite having what could seem a tough life, she symbolises humanity, as she keeps on singing despite her hardship. This bustle is reinforced, as Winston can hear "the cries of children in the street" (145), presumably playing, but reinforcing this idea of the prole quarter bursting with life.

The prole woman singing is remarkable: Winston is struck by the fact that he has never heard a member of the Party singing alone and spontaneously. Winston realises that it would come across as "unorthodox, a dangerous eccentricity, like talking to oneself" (148). The Party members do not sing alone, spontaneously, as it would come across as thoughcrime and as a sign of emotions. In contrast, the washerwoman works hard, but "At the end of it she was still singing" (229). She shows signs of happiness, which is not tolerated among the Party members. She sings a song made by a versificator, that is a computer generated popular, artless song and sings in "a powerful contralto" (144) and "so tunefully as to turn the dreadful rubbish into an almost pleasant sound" (145).[136] Her voice is one of the rarest types of voice, which makes her turn the awful lyrics into a special occurrence and a pleasant sound. This creates an artistic contrast between the low quality music produced by the Party, and the life and freedom of expression that a prole can input into the nonsense created by the Party, creating a contrast between the monotony of Newspeak and the musicality of Oldspeak.

[136] Bolton, in his study *The Language of 1984*, explains how in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the machines break and how it takes on a negative impact in Orwell's other writings. This negativity invades art, as seen in *The Road to Wigan Pier*: "The machine would even encroach upon activities we now class as "art"; it is doing so already via the camera and the radio." (p.198). This shows a negative view of machine, especially when they are concerned with producing Art and shows through in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* through the versificator.

The proles, from the people in the pub to the washerwoman, show signs of life: they play, they sing, they laugh and care for their children. They are a symbol of life and this is supported by the noisy world of the slums: from people laughing in a pub, to children crying in the streets and people reciting childhood lyrics and singing songs, which contrasts with the Party's indoctrination of children such as the Parsons' siblings. The episode when Winston enters the Parson's flat to fix their broken sink could seem anecdotal but illustrates the brainwashing of the Parsons' children. This passage serves to illustrate the reversal of order and mostly the perversion that the nucleus of society—the family—is subjected to as children become figures of authority. Controlling the next generation of Party members is essential for the Party to ensure the passing down of ideology. Therefore, the Party takes children under its wings, and the various agencies created to indoctrinate them ensure that their education will instate their compliance with the Ingsoc ideology. This contrasts with the children playing outside; the children of the Party are imprisoned and conditioned to support it dutifully.

This idea of conditioning children is a recurrent theme of the dystopian genre. In *The Dispossessed*, the PDC is teaching children to fear invasion from their former enemy and learn to despise foreign words such as "money", or "prison".[137] This reflects the Anarresti hatred of the Urrasti system, but also the indoctrination that they endure. In *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, children are grown in hatcheries and embryos are grown being "conditioned" according to the purpose they will fulfil. For example "the lower the caste, the shorter the oxygen" (24), so the less oxygen the embryo is going to get, the lower his social status. Schools serve as a state agency not educating the children, but indoctrinating them: in Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, children learn to become passive automaton watching TV and kill one another through irresponsible driving or gun ownership. In Zamyatin's *We*, they learn of the "infallibility" of maths, disregard their own feelings and do not use their creative, imaginative powers. In John Wyndham's *The Chrysalids*, they learn to fear and hate mutated people, the "deviations". Children become a way to sustain and perpetuate the social structure in place as epitomised in the naïve, uneducated youth of A. E. Van Vogt's *Tyranopolis*. When the group of scientists is asked if they remember the

[137] See p. 46, 86.

previous dictator, they answer "No, the son had everybody who ever knew the father, killed" (111). They continue explaining that the system in place is an hereditary dictatorship put in place to ensure that there "was no struggle for leadership" (112). This results in Dictator Liglin having ruled for over one hundred and ninety years: erasing memory of the past and teaching select, propagandist history to children, whilst executing adults who remember, ensures that the system does not change and that the reins of power are kept in exclusive hands.

This idea of conditioning children to perpetuate the system is reflected in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by O'Brien: "Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes the eggs from a hen" (280) and will be conditioned using Newspeak. Mrs Parsons illustrates the distance between the mother figure and the woman as the breeder, the hen begetting the eggs. The narrator indicates that "'Mrs' was a word somewhat depreciated by the Party as "you were supposed to call everyone 'comrade'—but with some women one used it instinctively" (22). It feels natural to refer to Mrs Parsons by her name, not by the epithet "comrade". In this sense, Mrs Parsons is humanised: the function of breeder she is meant to fulfil is undermined by the fact that she remains a married woman and a mother figure. She represents the housewife, responsible for the education of her children. However, this last task is taken on by Big Brother and she is left with time, to reflect on and observe what the Party does to her children.

Mrs Parsons considers her children with dread, which quickly becomes obvious to Winston: "With those children, he thought, that wretched woman must lead a life of terror. Another year, two years, and they would be watching her day and night for symptoms of unorthodoxy" (26). In fact, they later denounce their father, who is sent to the Ministry of Love for thoughtcrime, for crying out: "Down with Big Brother!" at night in his sleep (245). Mrs Parsons shows sign of unorthodoxy, in the sense that she "had a habit of breaking off her sentences in the middle" (23), showing that she does not want to say what she means, as is the case when Winston asks for a spanner to unblock the sink, she says: "I don't know, I'm sure. Perhaps the children—" (23), indicating that she believes her children could be in possession of the spanner in order to harm her. This shows that children become the figures of authority inflicting punishment onto the parents.

The parental figures have been supplanted by that of the brotherly figure. Anne Mellor, in her essay "'You're Only a Rebel from the Waist Downwards': Orwell's view of Women" details why Big Brother could not be "Big Father", for example. Big Brother, Mellor explains, "has no wife whom a man can desire; and his relationship to his female comrades is entirely chaste, protective and 'brotherly'. The domination of the brother over the father destroys the younger man's fantasies both of political power and sexual virility. Every man is forever emasculated by his elder and more powerful brother". (116-7). A father figure would age and die, and a totalitarian figure cannot be supplanted as it would constitute a break in the propaganda. Big Brother becomes the perfect tyrant: he is the powerful brother who cannot be challenged. His relation to his "sisters" is protective, and therefore under totalitarianism, they return to the protective niche of the household. The brother, more than the father, has the power to destroy his younger brothers' desire for political or sexual activity.[138] The figure of the brother grows with its siblings, and dies with them, regenerating itself with each new generation. Parenthood becomes unnecessary: children have their brother to bring them up and parents can be discarded as mere hatcheries.

[138] J. F. Sulloway states about sibling relations: "Firstborns tend to occupy the niche of a surrogate parent. Acting as a surrogate parent-that is, assisting with child-rearing duties-is a great way to curry favor with parents.[…] The niche of the responsible achiever is particularly likely to be open for an eldest child. Once this niche is taken, it is difficult for a younger sibling to compete effectively for the same niche, although they often try. The typical strategy of younger siblings is to see whether they can compete successfully in a niche already occupied by an elder sibling. If they cannot, then the best strategy is for the younger sibling to branch out—to become more open to experience—and to try to find some alternative niche where they will not be directly compared with their elder siblings". Elder siblings taking a parental role and helping to raise their brothers and sisters is a great way to gain favour from one's parent. Sulloway explains that once the role of sibling-parent is taken, it becomes hard for the younger siblings to take on that role.

V/ Conflicting Writings: Winston's Diary and The Theory

The language battle in Oceania is not just a spoken one, it is also a written conflict. There are two opposed written works in Oceania which illustrate how language in the novel is used as a tool for deception, repression and oppression, but also a tool for expressing and achieving freedom. This is embodied in the contrast created between Winston's diary, which symbolises his search for knowledge, awareness, freedom and individuality; and the supposedly underground work entitled *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*, a work written by the Party to attract and imprison dissidents.[139] This section will analyse the opposition between the two written works and look at how they constitute the battleground between Winston and O'Brien, which ultimately results in Winston's imprisonment in Room 101 and his being tortured by O'Brien.

Winston is able to shake off the hold of the Party through his writing in his diary, which enables him to feel alive and to express hope and utopia. Erika Gottlieb asserts this very will to live:

> Winston is made to lose his battle neither because he is lacking in political judgment, nor because he is a personally flawed, neurotic human being. Throughout the book, he is fighting for self-awareness, understanding, for an ability to detect and act upon the Truth. Purchasing the diary, buying the glass paperweight, renting the room which will become his shelter with Julia—these acts should not be seen as expressions of a death wish. On the contrary, these are the only means by which he can assert his will to live. It is only in a deadly, unnatural society that expressions of basic human instincts lead to death; in Oceania the wish to live is judged to be a deathwish. (57).[140]

Gottlieb asserts that Winston is arrested by the Party not because of his wish to get caught, tortured and punished. Instead, Winston is captured as a result of a game for assertion of totalitarian power, exerted by O'Brien. His imprisonment does not reside first and foremost in his lack of political judgment, his inability to assess the political situation, or because he lacks intelligence, because he is neurotic, or even paranoid. Throughout the book he is seen battling for his humanity, through all the actions he

[139] I will now refer to *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* simply as "*The Theory*".
[140] Gottlieb here breaks away from some critics who have tried "to come to terms with the reason's defeat" (57). She talks about how Edward M. Thomas defines Winston's utopian goals as unrealistic and that this influences his perception of reality (qtd in Gottlieb 57). She also talks about Gerald Fiderer, who views Winston as ruthless as Big Brother himself, as willing to lose himself for his political act.

takes to preserve it: reflecting in his diary, buying the paperweight symbol of his privacy, renting the room, which symbolises his love affair, and the wish for a family and privacy.[141] His capture is mainly due to his will to live: his actions demonstrate that he is fighting for understanding, for hope and love, and for self-awareness. Gottlieb views that Winston's actions can only be interpreted as a death wish in light of the Party's repression and from the Party's point of view, contrasting with Winston's use of his diary as his tool to express his wish to feel free and alive.

In fact, Winston's diary is a key element of the novel, as it constitutes the only piece of free writing observable by the reader. Since it is a diary, it follows a series of chronological entries, and therefore symbolises the evolution of Winston's thoughts, his increasing ability to dispel the Party's propaganda and his being in tune with his feelings. The first passage that he writes in his diary is an account of what he saw at the cinema:

> there was a middle aged woman might have been a jewess sitting up in the bow with a little boy about three years old in her arms. little boy screaming with fright and hiding his head between her breasts as if he was trying to burrow right into her and the woman putting her arms round him and comforting him although she was blue with fright herself, all the time covering him up as much as possible as if she thought her arms could keep the bullets off him. then the helicopter planted a 20 kilo bomb in among them terrific flash and the boat went all to matchwood. (10)

Winston writes in a childish manner, mirrored in his "childish handwriting" (10). His sentences have no grammatical structure and appropriate punctuation. Winston's writings show a sense of panic, urgency and hysteria; the structure becomes erratic and loses logic and meaning. The vocabulary used is also childish, as exemplified by the use of "matchwood". This indicates that Winston is not able to express himself in an adult manner or reflect independently, since he is only retelling what he has seen without commenting or critically assessing it, as he is imbued with propaganda.

This childish way of expressing oneself is fully recreated in Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, in which the main protagonist and narrator, the teenager Alex, speaks using "nadsat", the argot used by youths. Nadsat is the

[141] Satyabrata Das explains that Mr Charrington is proven to be an agent of the Thought Police, as he "encouraged Winston to keep up his spirit and integrity" (91) and that when the police agents breaks the glass coral is symbolic of the breaking of "the integrated man of the old order, the last man of Europe, his scruples and his sanity" (Ibid). The breaking of the glass symbolises the breaking of an old order and the shattering of the glass symbolises the shattering of privacy, of the bond between the couple and foretells of their betrayal.

borrowed Russian word which means "teenage" and the language itself is not that of a fully grown, eloquent adult and displays many childish characteristics. For example, Alex and his *droogs*, his fellow gang members Dim, Pete and Grogie, use onomatopoeias such as "crack crack" (21) to imitate the noise of the bones cracking under Dim's fists or as "haw haw haw" (21) to convey their victim's whimpering. The youths also use childish pronunciations of certain words, such as "appy polly loggies" for "apologies" or "jammiwam" and "eggiwegs" (35) for jam and eggs. Alex uses such a way of speaking when he is aged between fifteen and eighteen, and one would expect a teenager to be able to express himself more maturely.

After being caught and imprisoned for murder, Alex chooses the option to undergo a form of psychiatric rehabilitation. As he speaks, he is questioned by the two psychiatrists, Dr Brodsky and Dr Branom, in charge of his rehabilitation, who ponder on the origins of nadsat: "most of the roots are Slav. Propaganda. Subliminal penetration" (91). The two doctors attribute nadsat to the brainwashing propaganda coming from the Eastern European Bloc, suggesting that the United Kingdom has been taken over or at least strongly influenced by the totalitarian Soviet State. The government of the narrative is referred as "State" indicating a totalitarian government in place, through the supremacist capitalisation and denomination of the word. However, since the English State is conquered by the Soviet State, it is possible to think that its own propaganda is borrowing words from its Slav master, making nadsat a potential home-grown language, just as Newspeak is or the principles of Ingsoc—English Socialism—are in Oceania. Nadsat becomes a tool to control the youths: busy with the violence conditioned by the language, they do not rebel, question the system or educate themselves. They are programmed just as Babel-17 programs individuals in Delany's novel. Alex's conditioning is reinforced by the fact that the two doctors do not give Alex grammatical or lexical lessons, they make him undergo a stimulus conditioning: his rehabilitation consists in inducing feelings of sickness when having thoughts of harming people or when listening to the classical music he loved so much, instead he is only able to listen to the childish popular songs. Alex is never cured of the Slav or governmental propaganda, as he still continues to use nadsat and feels the urge to harm others around him. Alex is not cured of his language or his thoughts of "ultra-violence", of his linguistic

determinism, but instead stripped off his human enjoyment of art. This is a conscious effort of the totalitarian state not to develop its citizens and to keep its population in a childish frame of mind: hence, Alex is not able to outgrow his childish manner of speech within the duration of the novel, or his desire for ultra-violence, a norm among the teenagers of the State.

Only at the end, he feels the need for something "soft" (144) but wonders if it is as the result of some "disease" or a consequence of what they had "done to [him] that time upsetting [his] gulliver (*brain*)" (Ibid.). Despite his need for something new, Alex still uses nadsat. This foreshadows the linguistic conditioning of youths will be applied onto the next generations. Alex himself knows that the cycle of nadsat violence will be perpetuated by his son: Alex "would not be able to stop him. And nor would he be able to stop his own sons" (148). The continuation of violence and of the teenage slang is unavoidable, but maintained through generations "turning and turning and turning a vonny grahzny orange in his gigantic rookers" (148), that is holding and turning a dirty, smelly man in its hand.[142] The programming present in the argot is not changed or prevented by the state; instead, it constitutes a likely fabrication of the totalitarian machine to repress, punish and control, to finally place its subject in a loyal, contented and painless condition, only too preoccupied with by the evils caused by his offspring.

This remorseful attitude is an indication that Alex in *Clockwork Orange* is able and willing to grow and change, although the reader never witnesses this transformation. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this change occurs when Winston expresses his humanity and his compassion as he describes the death of a woman and children in a war: his writing style conveys his panic and trauma at observing such violence. He realises that his way of writing is childish and "rubbish" (10), unstructured and confused. However, the process of writing enables him to reflect on his past and to unlock a memory which "had clarified itself in his mind, to the point where he almost felt equal to writing it down" (11). While he describes the pictures of war he has seen at the cinema, a more distinct memory starts to form, that of the Two

[142] Brian Lennon, in *In Babel's Shadow: Multilingual Literatures, Monolingual States*, explains that the origin of the title can partly be attributed to Malay, in which orang means "man": therefore the title of the novel stands for "a clockwork man" inferring the automated nature of man under a totalitarian government.

Minute Hate and his initial "naked glance" (Lyons, 42) with O'Brien, which will later prove him guilty of thoughtcrime.[143] The description of the encounter between O'Brien and Winston is very vivid and precise, describing O'Brien's "formidable" (11) appearance, which contrasts with his drivelling account of the propaganda pictures. Writing in the diary has enabled Winston to unlock his memory, to take the control of his past away from the Party and therefore to regain his individuality.

This therapeutic process of unlocking his memory is on a par with his regaining linguistic freedom, as demonstrated by his ability to use language more clearly and fluidly. This change in him is also symbolised by his shift in his handwriting, which turns from "childish" (10) to "voluptuously" sliding over the paper (20) as he writes "Down with Big Brother" (20). His actions become more controlled, more adult, and this demonstrates his ability to reflect on the society he lives in, and his ability to express himself honestly and sincerely, without omitting details, as is the case when he retells his encounter with a prostitute. He writes:

> It was three years ago. It was on a dark evening, in a narrow side-street near one of the railway stations. She was standing near a doorway in the wall, under a street lamp that hardly gave any light. She had a young face, painted very thick. It was really the paint that appealed to me, the whiteness of it, like a mask, and the bright red lips. Party woman never paint their faces. There was nobody else in the street, and no telescreens. She said two dollars. I— (Ibid. p.66)

Winston can vividly remember his meeting with the prostitute despite the encounter having taken place three years previous to his writing in the diary. He can remember the location, where he found the woman, the price she asked and what she looked like. More strikingly, he can remember his feelings at the time: it was the contrast to the tame Party women which Winston finds attractive. Winston writes honestly,

[143] Eugene August interestingly highlights that thoughtcrime can be interpreted as Winston's original sin. August purports: "In the novel Big Brother is a grotesque substitute for God. Winston Smith is a pathetic Everyman who initially "falls" by committing the original sin of "thoughtcrime," thereby causing a breach between himself and the totalitarian god. The story concludes with Winston's jubilant realization that he loves Big Brother. His "thoughtcrime" is a parody of original sin, his ordeal in the Ministry of Love teaches him a perverted form of humility, and his final reconciliation with Big Brother brings death, not renewed life". (96) The interpretation of Big Brother as a God is also supported by Philip Goldstein, who states: "Julia and Winston come to occupy an edenic world which permits love, privacy, and femininity, but, tempted by Julia, Winston bites the apple of knowledge and destroys their Eden. The resistance of Winston, whom Reilly considers a "holy fool," amounts to a self-defeating pride enabling O'Brien to destroy him and Julia easily" (50). Winston commits the capital sin against God, Big Brother, that of searching for knowledge, in the shape *The Theory*.

more clearly and more calmly, which denotes his ability to think more reflectively and critically.

More importantly, Winston himself sees the process as important. As he writes about his difficult encounter with the prostitute, he reflects: "It had got to be written, it had got to be confessed" (71). Even what is hard to admit has to be said.[144] He does not erase the "rubbish" he writes in the diary, but instead leaves it as a reminder of his desire for sincerity, as a reminder of the repression effected by Big Brother. This sincerity is reminiscent of the one upheld by D-503 in *We*, when he states that the purpose of his record is to be honest with himself: "I have charged myself to write this without hiding a thing" (23), thus displaying individualism. Gary Morson, in *Boundaries of Genre*, explains that D-503's way to open his eyes to the repression and to begin his rebellion in his society is through laughter (155). When D-503 is confronted to I-330's compliments, he is "embarrassed and, fumbling, began to justify [his] laughter to her with logic" (8). The "records" (4) he his writing soon turn into a diary (4): "This text is me" (4). The records are a text without which D-503 could never have experienced human emotions, rebellion and freedom. The first person confessionary record of Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* also enables Alex to turn a page, revealing that the reader has "been everywhere" (148) with him. He asks for forgiveness and understanding as he justifies his deeds by confessing: "all it was was that [he] was young" (148). His justification is that he was a teenager, that he was programmed by nadsat: his language and his behaviour were intertwined. However, writing enabled him to get "a new like chapter beginning" (145). The diary becomes a strong way for one to preserve oneself, to experience the emotional, the laughter, the embarrassment and confess in order to survive the crushing powers. This need to preserve oneself through the use of a record becomes even more symbolic in *Babel-17* when Rydra's only means to survive is to transpose her findings, her understanding of the all-consuming and programming Babel-17 onto a tape. The recording of her findings on the tape enables her friend to dispel the programmed schizoid personality and the linguistic hold of Babel-17. In this sense, the diary functions as a way to preserve oneself, to preserve one's humanity, even if it is tainted by crimes and violence.

[144] This also bears a double meaning: that of the diary as a confession of Winston's crimes, dealt with on p. 147.

As Winston is able to understand and analyse his memories, his reflection skills improve, and he is able to transpose his new-found critical abilities onto the structure of Oceania. Testimony of Winston's improving state of mind is his aptitude to use figures of speech, such as a parallelism illustrating his desire to find a reasoning to the repressing of the people of Oceania: "I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY" (83). Winston also uses an inversion to demonstrate the deadlock and standstill of Oceanian society. He writes about the proles: "Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious" (74), showing Winston's views of the situation as an impasse. He can use language as a tool, in order to express his ideas. This, in comparison to his first entry in his diary, shows a shift in the ability to express himself and, according to Orwell's views on language, a shift in his ability to think and reflect.[145]

Although the diary is a helpful tool for Winston to unlock his memory and jot down his thoughts, it is not enough for him to recall all of his memories. As he writes, he can remember that something happened to his mother and his sister, but cannot remember more details. It will take more than just writing in his diary: it will take a loving relationship for him to unlock his innermost memories. The second part of the novel does not deal with the diary; it deals with Winston's relationship with Julia. His love affair with Julia enables him to unveil new feelings and new thoughts, Julia thus supplants the diary, as she becomes Winston's confidant, friend and lover. Paralleling the diary, Julia is also writing a confession to Winston, which takes the shape of the note she hands in to him. Her words are simple, but yet powerful: "I love you" (113). The effects on Winston are instant. It is the first occasion on which he feels pleasant emotions. He is stunned and even takes the chance to look at the note for a second time, to certify of its actuality. Once he realises that it is real, he feels "as though a fire were burning in his belly" (114) and that "at the sight of the words *I love you* the desire to stay alive had welled up in him" (115). In this confession of love, Winston discovers the will to stay alive, which was not expressed

[145] Orwell exposes in "Politics and the English Language" the relation between thinking and explains that a clear language makes for clear thinking. On the contrary, if language is unclear and deceiving, thinking will become harder (349, 357).

when he is searching for an answer in his diary.[146] Through Julia, Winston discovers a world of love and warmth, but more importantly, slowly recovers his memory and therefore, his self.[147] On their first date, she offers him "unusual" chocolate (127). This chocolate is "real"—as opposed to the manufactured substitute given to the Party members—and this reality symbolises the genuine, actual and intense nature of the desire between Winston and Julia.[148] The chocolate melts in Winston's mouth, which symbolises the burning desire between the two lovers, fulfilled as they have intercourse.

More importantly, the chocolate ultimately triggers Winston's remembering what happened to his mother and sister. When he first eats the chocolate, he has the sensation that a memory is blocked: "The first whiff of its scent had stirred up some memory which he could not pin down, but which was powerful and troubling" (128). It is throughout this event and his subsequent relation with Julia that he remembers that he had run away from his mother and sister after stealing his sibling's chocolate, and was handed over to the Party. Through Julia and his diary, Winston takes control of his past, to be able to take control of his present and his future, in the same manner as Shevek had to bridge past, present and future for his, his society's and humanity's welfare, or that Alex had to confess his crimes in *A Clockwork Orange* to build a new future.[149]

However, Winston fails to live entirely in the present and in the pleasure of the realisation of the instant. This is seen through his viewing sex, as "a blow struck

---

[146] This quotation does illustrate the point made by Gottlieb on p. 134 of this chapter, whereby she expresses that what can be interpreted as Winston's deathwish is not his going against the totalitarian machine, but wanting to stay alive.

[147] This idea of warmth associated with Julia is highlighted in Langdon Elsbree's "The Structured Nightmare of *1984*" where he explains that Julia is associated with warmth through the Golden Country. The landscape where Winston and Julia meet the first time is the fulfilment of Winston's dream: the Golden Country, which, as its name indicates, is a place bathed in sunlight, symbol of knowledge, pleasure and humanity (137-9).

[148] A parallel example of food restriction enabling total control of the deprived is to be found in Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* where the narrator states: "The thoughts of a prisoner—they're not free either. They keep returning to the same things. A single idea keeps stirring. Would they feel that piece of bread in the mattress? Would he have any luck at the sick-bay that evening?" (p.36). In the case of Ivan, lack of food shapes his thoughts, his words and his concerns. Similarly, Winston's thoughts focus on what he lacks: "he was aware that there was no food in the kitchen except a hunk of dark-coloured bread which had got to be saved for tomorrow's breakfast" (p.7). In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, keeping the population worried about essential supplies is used to distract the population from more important socio-political issues, and therefore serves to increase control.

[149] See p. 136-7

against the Party. It was a political act" (133), an act of resistance, more than an act of self-assertion, of reinforcement of his humanity. [150] He views his ability to feel as a political act, not simply as a way of being, existing. This is unlike Julia, who confesses having had sex with hundreds of Party members, which makes her more desirable to Winston. Philip Goldstein, in "Orwell as a (Neo)conservative: The Reception of *1984*" details Winston's attitude towards Julia's carelessness: "A pretentious theorist, Winston dismisses the pragmatism of Julia, whom he terms 'a rebel from the waist down' and reveals their secret resistance to O'Brien" (46). [151] Winston, who is obsessed with the political side of his rebellion, later betrays his relationship with Julia as he views it as a political symbol of resistance.[152] Winston degrades Julia by reducing her to a sexual rebel, concerned with her own pleasure. [153] She also openly admits that she is not interested in politics but affirms: "I'm interested in *us*" (163). A pragmatist, she is interested in her present: having accepted her past, she is able to enjoy her life, understanding that her relationship can perpetuate itself in the future if she cares for it. She does not want to be separated from Winston, as she knows it can compromise her future, a fact that will be used by O'Brein to destroy the couple.

O'Brien in fact exploits the progress that Winston achieves and the knowledge that he seeks out. Daphne Patai illustrates how the Party's "displays of power" (160) constitute a game, in which O'Brien is in power and Winston a slave:

> O'Brien's part in all this is clear and rather easy to understand. In the dialectic of power, as Hegel indicates, every master must have a slave. The master's hidden need to have his superiority recognized by the slave creates the peculiar emotional intimacy of their situation. The game of

[150] Graham Good points out, Winston starts to view Julia as "a piece to be taken" (51). Seeing and being with Julia becomes akin to a game.

[151] A. M. Tibbetts, in "What Did Orwell Think about the English Language?", stresses this difference by pointing at the fact that Julia falls asleep every time Winston talks about politics (164). However, the way to retain her humanity is "to maintain her differentness", and she wants to achieve this by getting hold of a dress, heels and makeup (Ibid). In this distinction, one can further observe the pragmatism of Julia.

[152] See p. 144; 150.

[153] Paul Robinson explains that Julia's logic would be seen by a Freudian as "'economic theory', since it is placed on displaced libido" (152). The state of Oceania uses sexuality to achieve their purpose. Robinson also explains that "The notion of subversive naturalness of sex is associated with Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents*, which maintains that culture is based on sexual repression and hence that sex in the raw, so to speak, undermines social order" (151). Robinson explains that the idea of controlling the population, through controlling their sexual habits recalls that which was expressed by Freud. For a detailed study of the various creations of simulacra in the society of Oceania, see Vita Fortunati's "'It Makes No Difference': A Utopia of Stimulation and Transparency".

> power cannot be played alone: O'Brien has to want Winston Smith and call him into being as a suitable opponent. Hence, he waits; he waits while Winston's health improves, as a result of the affair with Julia; he waits until Winston has read some of Goldstein's book. It is easy to see why: the book fortifies Winston's commitment to objective reality and truth. It affirms that Winston is not insane. Above all, it gives him hope. He is at a sufficient height, now, from which to fall. And the harder the fall, the greater will be O'Brien's enjoyment of the game and the more intense his awareness of his own power. (860)

Power needs to find its recognition in the suffering of another, so the Party needs to crush dissidents and O'Brien needs to torture Winston. O'Brien plays a game of cat and mouse with Winston: he waits until Winston's health improves, until his life becomes perfected through his relation with Julia and until his knowledge of the system is better. He tricks Winston into believing that the Brotherhood is real and that he is part of that very resistance group. A better opponent would make O'Brien's victory more gratifying and reinforce his power. O'Brien does not need to wait until Winston reads *The Theory* to arrest him, as he would have enough evidence of thoughtcrime through his renting a room outside the Party's quarters for example. Instead, he waits until Winston reads the book, so that he feels even more committed to freedom, to free himself from the insanity of the Party.

This idea that is also conveyed by Jean Jacques Courtine who views language in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as the true battleground. In his essay "A Brave New Language: Orwell's Invention of 'Newspeak' in *1984*", Courtine shows the intrinsic relation between power and language:

> Power must thus become master of language since language is the living memory of man and offers him a space for inner resistance. Language constitutes a screen between the totalitarian gaze and the human body, it offers the shelter of his shadow, it veils the harsh light needed to read bodies. Language threatens the totalitarian enterprise. It is in fact the zone of obscurity where the gaze is lost. People must therefore be cured of their language: old and obscure terms must be eliminated, areas that escape definition, and zones of indertermination-ambiguity, equivocation, polysemy wiped out. Signs must be purged and purified of their meaning and bodies of their substance. And they must be refilled: "You will be hollow", promises O'Brien. "We shall squeeze you empty, and then shall fill you with ourselves. (70)

For Courtine, language is the tool enabling the of subversion of power, to resist the authoritarian sway of power, and only by conquering man's language can the totalitarian enterprise be successful. Language enables one to retreat to oneself:

through one's thoughts, one can resist privately. Courtine explains that language can act as a barrier against the totalitarian attempt; it offers shelter and a retreat from oppression. Therefore, for power to become total, it must win over language. That is to say, language must convey and carry within itself the very tools of repression, just as words such as "thoughtcrime" and "sexcrime" convey the totality of power, shattering the idea that language is a tool for freedom and resistance, which is to be seen as criminal. Power attempts to eliminate the possibility for personal and private irony and sarcasm, which allow for resistance. This stance is perfectly exemplified by O'Brien who threatens Winston to destroy his feelings, thoughts and personality, to turn him into a simple automaton repeating the Party's propaganda. Vita Fortunati makes a point which can be seen to summarise Courtine's and Patai's ideas: "It is power which no longer has as its 'telos' the organization of society but which is now simply an end in itself, a game played purely for its own sake". (110) Power becomes a self-driven machine; its sole aim is the maintenance of itself. The welfare and the organisation of society become secondary: they only matter insofar that they permit the perpetuation of power.

This game of assertion of power takes the shape of seduction and deception, as embodied by O'Brien and *The Theory*. He waits for Winston's linguistic ability to become more precise, which enables him to define himself through his diary and through others, most notably Julia. Winston is happy to trust O'Brien, which demonstrates his inability to understand the Party's deception. He is willing and ready to enter O'Brien's house—the lion's den—to retrieve *The Theory*. O'Brien asks the couple a series of questions, to know how far they will be going to overthrow to Party. O'Brien asks him: "You are prepared to give your lives?", Winston answers "Yes" (179). O'Brien's last question is "You are prepared, the two of you, to separate and never see one another again?", to which Julia replies "No!" (180). O'Brien was in fact interrogating the couple to find their weakness, to ensure that his torture methods will be effective. Julia is unwilling to be separated from Winston. However, Winston forfeits his fate to O'Brien, by declaring that "We want to put ourselves at your mercy" (177). Winston is willing to give himself to O'Brien, to the Brotherhood, and even to forsake his relationship for it, since he prioritises the political, and unknowingly, the deceit associated with it. Winston does not know that

in doing so, he gives himself up to his torturer, and this is symbolically done as he enters his den and takes the bait that is *The Theory*.

The Theory is a bait, a tempting lure, insofar that Winston does not learn anything new out of it.[154] As Winston reads it, the narrator explains:

> The book fascinated him, or more exactly, it reassured him. In a sense, it told him nothing that was new, but that was part of the attraction. It said what he would have said, if it had been possible for him to set his scattered thoughts in order. It was the product of a mind similar to his own, but enormously more powerful, more systematic, less fear-ridden. The best books, he perceived, are the ones that tell you what you know already. (208)

Winston is only looking for reassurance, to make sure that his knowledge is well founded. Winston wants to assert the power of his own deductions and intellect and reaffirm that he is not insane: the book tells him what he has already found out on his own. Here, the irony resides in the fact that he seeks the truth within the book, and can only find emptiness. He has to fight the words of *The Theory*, inadvertently, since they are the words of the Party, shrouding his understanding of Oceania. The words do not give him anything, knowledge or transcendence, and only betray his expectations.

Winston feels that the book has been written by a mind similar to his, but more powerful. Although Winston believes that the author of *The Theory* is more skilful than he is, the author is in fact more cunning. Winston has been tricked into believing that *The Theory* was the only free writing in Oceania as well as being tricked into believing that O'Brien—the very person who wrote *The Theory*—is on his side (19). O'Brien reveals his deception: "I wrote it. That is to say, I collaborated in writing it" (274), confirming the Party's use of the book as a bait to attract and deceive dissidents. Winston asks if the description of Oceania made in *The Theory* is accurate, to which O'Brien replies: "As a description, yes. The programme it sets forth is nonsense. The secret accumulation of knowledge—a gradual spread of enlightenment—ultimately a proletarian rebellion—the overthrow of the Party. You foresaw yourself that was what it would say. It is all nonsense" (274). O'Brien explains that the agenda exposed in *The Theory* is nonsense and unrealistic, however,

[154] See ft. 144 p.138 in which Eugene August explains that Winston looking for O'Brien's complicity constitutes his original sin, his temptation for knowledge, and *The Theory* would therefore represent the apple.

in light of Winston's diary, his desires and his relationship with Julia, it only seems absurd in the totalitarian environment of Oceania.[155]

All in all, Winston failed to see that he has been deceived: he was tricked by O'Brien's glance to reveal his thoughtcrime, to reveal his wish for freedom and his looking for an accomplice. O'Brien toys with Winston throughout the novel: he wants Winston to become more assertive, stronger, more romantically involved. Winston's becoming more unyielding only makes him a more suitable, fitter opponent, therefore enabling O'Brien to fully assert his own power. O'Brien's first incentive occurred during their looking at each other: his "naked glance" offered temptation and pushed Winston to seek out *The Theory*, another deceiving work. Instead of being simply cast out, or imprisoned, Winston is tortured, and made to believe in the system, in the propaganda lies. However, Winston's sin is only a sin insofar that the Party views being human, thinking and feeling as such. Winston's failure lies in his not giving enough credit to private resistance, through his diary, a fact further illustrated in Room 101.

[155] In fact, as Hannah Arendt explains in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, "totalitarian regimes establish a functioning world of no-sense" (458), that is to say that their logic and their language is remote from utilitarian reality.

VI/ Room 101: Walls, Darkness and Hope

Winston's original sin of thoughtcrime has been caught by O'Brien from the outset of the novel through their glancing at each other. Winston mistakes O'Brien's glance for that of understanding and friendship and believes he has found someone to confide in, someone to share his thoughts with, and decides to write the diary for O'Brien: "He was writing the diary for O'Brien—*to* O'Brien" (84). Winston writes for someone whom he believes is on his side. Winston writes his diary as he is in search of company, a friend, and writes to combat the isolation created in Oceania. However, the irony resides in the fact that Winston writes the diary as a confession to O'Brien, but not in the sharing way that he intends; his diary, as is revealed at the end of the novel, is a signed confession of his will to live and hatred of the Party, a confession of his thoughtcrime *to* the Party.

Graham Good, in "'Ingsoc in Relation to Chess': Reversible Opposites in Orwell's *1984*", exposes the strong relation between the diary and O'Brien's prophetic enigma, "We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness" (27). Good explains that Winston is inspired by O'Brien to write and that "The process begins with the insertion of a particular phrase into a dream" (Good, 55). Winston's process of writing begins with O'Brien whispering to Winston as he is sleeping. O'Brien says a sentence that will be the litany throughout Part I: "We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness" (27), which will become Winston's driving force throughout: it becomes the leading thread for the search of light and freedom (Good, 62).[156]

Winston is motivated to write his diary by this prophetic promise. However, "Winston did not know what it meant, only that in some way, it would become true" (27), instead hoping that it held the possibility of a brighter future. The promise of meeting has, "*in some way*", become true; it has occurred in an ironic way, O'Brien's

[156] Good explains that the search of freedom is on the surface level: to create suspense and surprise. However, it is the deeper theme of totalitarian control that drives the plot, through leitmotiv. The novel describes a series of events that, in retrospect, have been closed from the beginning. And it is only in retrospect that the superficial reading of the novel—that of Winston's quest for freedom—becomes obvious and supplanted by the reading of the driving force of totalitarianism (62-3). This should not undermine the reading of Winston's own hope of a world without the darkness of totalitarianism.

way. Winston has clearly mistaken the intended meaning of the sentence and has instead interpreted it, giving it the meaning that he finds appropriate, revealing feelings and hopes, using his ability to reflect and think. His interpretation of the idea of "no darkness" demonstrates his will to live, his will to be human, and his ability to interpret and analyse meaning the way he wants to. He puts meaning onto words, and does not let words choose meaning for him. Even if Winston is misled by the Party, he shows signs of strength and intelligence. He remains sincere to his hopes of freedom. He only thinks he knows what the promise means, however, his belief in "the imagined future" (107), free from the Party, cannot be coerced.[157]

The "place where there is no darkness" becomes a refrain associated with O'Brien and this invocation is first mentioned when Winston remembers seeing him. Winston "could not remember whether it was before or after having the dream that he had seen O'Brien for the first time; nor could he remember when he had first identified the voice as O'Brien's, but at any rate, the identification existed. It was "O'Brien who had spoken to him out of the dark" (27) which is later confirmed by O'Brien stating at the end of the novel: "'I told you,' said O'Brien, 'that if we met again it would be here.'" (256). In the Ministry of Love, in Room 101, O'Brien tells Winston that he had warned him, that they would meet in the place where "the lights would never be turned out" (241), in the place where there is no corner for the self to hide, where the Party can access any part of the soul through torture.

Room 101 is a symbolic location for the confrontation between O'Brien and Winston. It is a numeral transcription of "one on one", of the ultimate endgame of the "game of power" (Patai, 860). Winston's feeling that the author of *The Theory*, O'Brien, has a "mind similar to his own" (208) means that throughout the novel, they were compared and unknowingly mirrored. However, Winston should have remembered that the mirror distorts, therefore making O'Brien his opposite. Winston has to face O'Brien, has to face his opposed reflection in Room 101, in the place where there is no darkness, where the self can no longer retreat within itself, which is

[157] While the diary is a conscious, awaken expression of Winston's desires and fears, the dream of the "Golden Country" is in fact a more unconscious expression of his desire. For more details, see Erika Gottlieb's "Room 101 Revisited: The Reconciliation of Political and Psychological Dimensions in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" (62-74); "The Structured Nightmare of *1984*" by Langdon Elsbree (137-9); Graham Good's "'Ingsoc in Relation to Chess': Reversible Opposites in Orwell's *1984*" (52-9); Paul Roazen's "Orwell, Freud and *1984*" and Frank H. Thompson (Jr)'s "Orwell's Image of the Man of Good Will" (236-7)

achieved through torture and through the breaking down of language into a meaningless tool, thus destroying the last barrier enabling resistance.

This is confirmed by O'Brien's description of Room 101: "The thing that is in Room 101 is the worst thing in the world" (296). O'Brien does not explicitly lay out what this means, instead, we are left to read into this power game. Fortunati explains: "The connection with historical reality no longer exists, the possible project exists and is moved by a single energy source, *Power*" (110). The end of history signifies the end of change, the end of human evolution, the end of choice brought by totalitarianism. Power only seeks to renew itself, caring about the social structure only insofar as it enables its regeneration. This can be seen as the definition of dystopia: the prevention of change, the ultimate repression of others, the excision and destruction of the self through the ultimate abuse of power and the denial of hope constitute the ultimate nightmare, which can all be found in Room 101.

O'Brien views Winston as insane for rebelling. He tells Winston: "You must humble yourself before you can become sane" (261), "It is not easy to become sane" (263), "you happen to be insane" (271). [158] O'Brien views Winston as insane, which he uses to justify his torturing him, as he confesses he wants "To make [him] sane!" (265). Erika Gottlieb makes the interesting differentiation between the sanity of Winston and the sanity of Oceania: "By juxtaposing the single individual's sanity and humanity with the insanity and inhumanity of an entire state, [Orwell] proposes that in certain societies the exclusive norm of sanity may indeed reside in the 'minority of one'"(53). Gottlieb's point emphasises the idea that in a totalitarian society, the wish to live, to be free and to the openly rebel are considered insane, abnormal and are therefore repressed; whereas they should be viewed as a longing for being humane and balanced. This point is also made in Burgess's *A Clockwork*

[158] Graham Good, in "'Ingsoc in Relation to Chess': Reversible Opposites in Orwell's *1984*" interestingly puts the climax of Part III and Room 101 in comparison to Part II, notably to the room Winston rents in the prole quarters: "Julia leads Winston from the darkness into the light, from hiding into the open, from filth to cleanliness. The room over the shop is usually taken as the antithesis of Room 101, but actually it is an antechamber which prepares for Room 101: Winston's bed of love with Julia prepares for his bed of pain with O'Brien"(52). The bed of the lover is compared to the bed of pain Winston will have to confront in Room 101. This opens up a comparison to Winston's own room. In his room, Winston tries to discover his self, while in Room 101, he is made to confront his self, to repress his self. In this sense, Part I is also an antechamber that prepares Winston for Room 101.

Orange. As Alex is tortured as part of his "Reclamation Treatment", the doctors tell him "you are being made sane, you are being made healthy" (86) in a world where

> Badness is of the self, the one, the you or me on our oddies knockies (*our own*), and that self is made by old Bog or God and is his great pride and radosty (*joy*). But the not-self cannot have the bad, meaning they of the government and the judges and the schools cannot allow the bad because they cannot allow the self. And is it not our modern history, my brothers, the story of brave malenky (*little*) selves fighting these big machines? (34)

The totalitarian government wants to eradicate sanity, that is the process of choice, search for knowledge, trial and error, experience and use of free will that are innate to man. Alex views the ability to behave badly, to have free choice as the ability to rebel, to trigger revolutions, as an ability to connect to and change historical reality.

For Winston, as is the case for Alex, this being made sane takes the shape of his being physically and psychologically tortured, to become "the not-self", that is an empty selfless shell. Pushed to fight for self-preservation, he betrays Julia. "Do it to Julia!" (300), he screams begging for mercy. Through this Winston betrays the person who was closest to him, relinquishes everything that he has endured to earn some happiness. O'Brien's cruelty in pushing Winston to betray his lover is his strongest blow. As Hannah Arendt explains in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, in a totalitarian society, loneliness constitutes the loss of self which results in the obliteration of the individual: "Self and world, capacity for thought and experience are lost at the same time." (477). However, from Julia and Winston's embarrassment when they meet, it is possible to understand that Julia has done the same to Winston, therefore making his betrayal inescapable.

It is nonetheless possible to read O'Brien as not so victorious in his battle for the possession of Winston's soul. After being able to understand and read into language in a better way, through writing in his diary, exchanging thoughts with his lover and reading *The Theory*, Winston has a deeper understanding of his ability to use language; Winston understands the power of words. The final linguistic fight occurs when O'Brien is trying to get Winston to admit defeat. O'Brien holds up four fingers to Winston, asking him how many fingers Winston sees. Winston repeatedly answers that he sees four fingers, until the needle gives him several shots of pain. Winston answers the mathematically true answer, showing his attachment to truth, accuracy and sincerity, reality and individuality, which is what O'Brien wants to

destroy. O'Brien asks Winston: "And if the Party says that it is not four but five—then how many?" Winston still answers that he sees four fingers, until the pain becomes unbearable and starts shouting "Five! Five! Five!" (262). However, O'Brien understands that Winston is just complying with the wish of the Party by saying he sees five fingers. So O'Brien tortures Winston again, until Winston states: "I don't know. I don't know. You will kill me if you do that again. Four, five, six—in all honesty I don't know." (264). What matters for O'Brien is that Winston abdicates and forsakes his knowledge. Winston does not any longer know how many fingers O'Brien holds up to him. Nothing matters: any words are correct when pain becomes so intense that he can only "intermittently remember why the pain was happening" (264). O'Brien destroys Winston's will through torture.

Winston realises that words no longer matter because he understands Syme's gift of irony, of sarcasm, through the idea of "duckspeak" which can impart positive or negative meanings depending on the intention of the speaker. Therefore, as he explains that he does "not know", he gives O'Brien what he wants, what he requires; while remaining the master his own thoughts. He understands that there is no truth as such; rather, there are multiple truths supported by multiple languages. He does not relinquish his knowledge, he only does so symbolically, through the use of words, the malleable symbols. The irony lies in the fact that Winston knows that O'Brien shows four fingers, but has to say that he does not know how many he sees, that is, he is only manipulating symbols. Winston understands pragmatism after being tortured: feeling, acting differently and being in a relationship are not a crime. Winston crossed the line when he actively looks to overthrow the system, which was done through his attempt to create an alliance with O'Brien and searching for *The Theory*.

Winston has embraced the concept of irony, the tool for resistance which was given to him by Syme. Winston is seen frequenting the Chestnut Tree Café, where Syme used to go and for which he is vaporized, Winston believes. The Café is "haunt of painters and musicians" (58), and although there was no strict written law against frequenting the place, it was "somehow ill-omen": the Café symbolises a place of

resistance, creativity and knowledge, and as O'Brien's has it, insanity.[159] Winston is seen, sitting at his "usual corner" (300): as a regular customer, he symbolises resistance, knowledge gained though irony, through mastering words. At the end of the novel, Winston,

> sitting in a blissful dream, paid no attention as his glass was filled up. He was not running or cheering any longer. He was back in the Ministry of Love, with everything forgiven, his soul white as snow. He was in the public dock, confessing everything, implicating everybody. He was walking down the white-tiled corridor, with the feeling of walking in sunlight, and an armed guard at his back. The long-hoped-for bullet was entering his brain. (311) [160]

Winston dreamingly remembers the events in Room 101, his denouncing everyone, his betraying Julia, his betraying himself. He lets the Party destroy part of his soul: he can no longer hide his feelings under the pressure of torture; there is no longer any shadow in which to hide. However, the Party has not entirely taken his feelings, his personality or his irony away from him. Even in his drunk stupor, he can imagine himself walking in a corridor, towards the sunlight and his idyllic Golden Country to be shot and executed. The Party has taken his lover, his ability to share; but has not taken his deathwish, just as Alex too, wants to "blast off for ever out of this wicked and cruel world" (*A Clockwork Orange,* 131). Only after his betrayal in Room 101 does he feel like dying: only in death can he feel alive. Winston's suicidal thoughts reveal that, through his ordeal in the Ministry of Love, he has finally understood where death lies in Oceania: in the will to live, in resisting the totalitarian impulse.

As he fantasises about death, Winston comes to one last realisation. He thinks: "Forty years it had taken him to learn what kind of smile was hidden beneath the dark moustache. O cruel, needless misunderstanding! O stubborn, self-willed exile from the loving breast" (311) Winston finally understands that he did not fully comprehend the workings of Oceania. He did not understand that a degree of private irony was tolerated as long as the façade of obedience was maintained. Winston has

[159] The fact that there is a Café in Oceania where artists and musicians can gather indicate that the process of restricting thinking is not yet complete. It is in fact possible to extrapolate the idea of artistry with that of resistance when put in light of Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*, Cafés are mentioned as a place to avoid, as the police frequently looks for Communists dissents there.

[160] For a detailed analysis of the dreams in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, see Erika Gottlieb's "Room 101 Revisited: The Reconciliation of Political and Psychological Dimensions in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". She details the function of the Golden Country as Winston's ideal of freedom and happiness, which is contrasted by the nightmares Winston has about his mother, or the rats, or even the events in Room 101. See also "The Structured Nightmare of *1984*" by Langdon Elsbree.

nonetheless been defeated for his visible sin of thoughtcrime. However, after the torture in Room 101, he "had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother" (311). His stubborn will to defeat the Party has been crushed. He understands that his rebellious political stance led to his being captured and imprisoned, and a more pragmatic approach to life would have constituted self-preservation. He loves Big Brother, literally only insofar that it enabled Winston to adopt a more pragmatic stance to the Party, and to his life. His love for Big Brother is also ironic: only a sign of what he has to say, when he is in fact traumatised by the suffering caused by the Party, rendered an alcoholic to numb the feeling of pain and the desire for death, still hating the society he has to live in and awaiting the end of the nightmare.

Room 101 constitutes the climax of the novel. O'Brien's prophecy is realised in this room. He tortures Winston, pushing him to the ultimate self-preservation instinct. By inflicting extreme physical pain, O'Brien pushes Winston to betray the person he loved the most. Through his betraying Julia, he renounces his achievements, gives up on his quest to put an end to the Party, and turns to the only thing he has left: irony. Irony enables him to tell the Party what it wants to hear, but can still think what he wants, as long as it does not destroy the façade of unity of the Party. It took torture for him to understand this. Even after his ordeal in Room 101, Winston is still defiant, by visiting the café frequented by artists, potentially understanding that through his diary, he was one of them. He can only await execution, the last element of life he can experience, since he has been stripped of human contact.

VII/ Conclusions

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, language is used as a tool to create barriers between people and groups of people, which is further used as a tool for control. The Party of Oceania creates a new language, called Newspeak, a symbolic name used to break away from the former, past order. This new language is only based on a few words; it has a minimalist vocabulary that is only useful insofar as it can describe everyday business. Linguists strip language of synonyms, antonyms and polysemy; linguistic determinism is here rendered in the most simplistic form, and the subject a pre-programmed automaton. Double meaning is no longer possible, therefore puns can no longer be created. Political, philosophical and contended meanings are obliterated from the new language, in an attempt to make reflection impossible, all in the aim to created empty shells incapable of reflecting, of being aware or of rebelling. This transpires in the idea that language is boxed into three categories of vocabulary: these classes of language do not overlap one another, and can therefore be seen as extreme forms of jargon, creating seclusion of classes within society, therefore shutting off the possibility of an open, flowing communication. New compounds words are created: they illustrate the extent of repression and illustrate the attempt to prevent the population from thinking. "Thoughtcrime" carries the meaning that thinking is a crime, a negative thing to do, therefore pushing the speaker to repress his thoughts. "Doublethink" enables the Party to force the population to believe in two contradictory statements. Newspeak therefore enables the Party to enforce its power onto the population, making communication between them difficult. People stop reflecting on what they say, and just absorb and repeat propaganda as automatons.

The most striking example lies in the exclusion of the proles: the proles are seen as non-human by the Party, and therefore communication with them is seen as non-essential, as they perform menial tasks for the society of Oceania. They are excluded from society, and regarded as savage animals. However, the novel depicts them as lively characters bursting with life, all different from one another. Winston, who tries to recover his own humanity, demonstrates the importance of being open and to communicate with different people. Through his contact with the proles, he understands the expression and the meaning of happiness, sadness, nostalgia, love and family, but most of all, privacy. He finds a love niche in the prole quarter, where

his love affair with Julia is made possible. His wish to express his humanity is also embodied in his diary; he is free to write about his thoughts and feelings.

Winston's sociable side leads to his downfall: his trying to open up to O'Brien, the proles and Julia leads to his demise. In his diary, he clearly expresses his hatred for the system, his frustration with being made an introvert. His punishment is to discover the full force of the repression. In Room 101, he is made to negate all that he gained throughout his life, that is his past, his sincerity, his freedom and his lover. Winston still has one weapon left: irony. Irony slipped through a word, "duckspeak" which introduced polysemy in the very controlled and confined language of Newspeak. Irony empowers a speaker, gives him the freedom to say one thing whilst meaning another, and therefore offers an opportunity to reach out in such a controlled environment. The Appendix shows that Newspeak was a failed project, and talks about the Party in the past tense, indicative of its undoing. The tone is ironic and sarcastic, indicative that if there is hope, it lies in irony, in one's ability to communicate freely and openly.

Despite the torture and the apparent abdication of reason, there is still a retreat where the totalitarian impulse cannot reach. This place is irony: as one learns about language, its flexibility and its potential for openness and creativity, one can realise of its arbitrariness and therefore give meaning where and how one wishes. Winston is able to resist and retain his humanity through his ability to control language, and take hold of his destiny, of his individuality. Taking charge of his language, he opens the path of his choice, to enable utopia. Language is not a barrier: it is a door opener, a key to new worlds, new environments, and new opportunities. Irony and free communication are much more than this: they are the key to utopia, to wish fulfilment, as Red, in *Roadside Picnic* will have to discover as he journeys through the mystical, undefined space that is "the Zone".

CHAPTER 3. Walling Relations: Landscapes of Greed in *Roadside Picnic*.

The first chapter has looked at how the metaphor of the wall in *The Dispossessed* is a meaningful leitmotif in the novel and introduces the concept of duality. The wall serves to mark a contrast, and in the novel, it serves to delimitate past and future, continuity and simultaneity, freedom and indoctrination. The novel is also constructed around the allegory of the wall, with chapters alternating between current events and Shevek's childhood and the events of his life leading to his departure from his home planet. The novel uses its atypical structure and the allegory of the wall to draw attention to the theme of historicity, in order to engage with how history, memory and perceptions of time can be ideologically tainted. However, the wall is more traditionally a spatial symbol: it is used to mark the difference between one space and another, and to shield oneself from someone or something else. This can apply to walls dividing rooms, buildings or fences, frontiers and parties, as was the case with ideological walls such as the Berlin Wall.

I will now look at the allegory of the wall as a spatial image and analyse how it becomes an ideological symbol restricting movement, mobility and access to wealth and opportunities in the Strugatsky brothers' novel *Roadside Picnic*, which was made into a movie by Andrei Tarkovsky entitled *Stalker*. As I will detail throughout the chapter, the image of the wall becomes ideologically connoted, and raises issues of containment, exclusion and isolation. This becomes apparent when the Zone of the Visitation, the residual space left by aliens during their visit to Earth, is walled off and guarded by the military in order to keep the alien, unknown artefacts from being stolen by other parties. The artefacts are studied by the Institute, in the hope of generating new weapons or other exclusive goods. However, it is not easy to obtain these items, as the Zone is a barren, inhospitable and dangerous space where many alien dangers, toxic fumes and gases, wraithlike entities prowl on those who enter the Zone. The stalkers, the men such as Red, the main character of the novel, illegally enter the Zone without a permit from the military and risk their lives to obtain the artefacts on behalf of those, such as gangs or middlemen working for the institute, who are willing to pay huge sums of money for them. The artefacts,

being of an alien nature, are sought after for the potential that they possess: if their powers and promise of progress can be harvested, they would ensure wealth to those who possess them. The wall surrounding the Zone symbolises inclusion and exclusion, but also wealth and poverty.

It becomes apparent from these images that the Zone is a complex symbolic space. This chapter will open by looking at the association of the Zone to that of an outside space of rejection, embodying the ghettos. However, through the wealth generated by the artefacts, the Zone can also be associated to the Central Business District, where wealth is generated, and thus associated to the city centre. The Zone embodies two opposite symbols. It becomes a powerful allegory creating and exhibiting the tensions between wealth and poverty, inclusion and rejection, centre and outside or ghetto, leisure and exploitation, and finally between despair and hope, tensions on which the chapter will focus.

As the Zone becomes a secluded, exclusive area, it is exploited by those who have the means to do so, creating a sense of inescapability: social mobility is made impossible and immigration becomes restricted, due to the ill-effects of the Zone on health. This generates a sense of claustrophobia, as is the case with Red; he is kept in poverty, even imprisoned for entering the Zone, and he is subsequently unable to leave Harmont because of his mutant daughter. His anxiety is heightened by his sense of failure: to sustain his family, he cannot do anything but stalk in the Zone and buy into the promise of wealth. The artefacts increasingly symbolise greed and therefore do not provide a substantial, long lasting happiness. As the novel progresses, it transpires that the artefacts are not studied for progress or for the better of mankind, but to derive profit for the few. The artefacts become highly coveted, and the promise of progress is tainted by people's rapacity as they are blinded by the promise of a materialist, financial, false happiness. The chapter will analyse how this picture is becoming dystopian: the greed generated and created through the exploitation of the Zone becomes a supplicating desire that cannot be ignored. As the chapter will illustrate, the only way for the characters to find happiness and to provide a utopian escape is to look for something deeper or magical, in the shape of the wish fulfilling Golden Ball. This enables the breaking of the wall through

intrusion of the fairy tale element in the narrative, which, as will be detailed, offers the chance of utopia.

I/ Making Sense of the Zone: Etymology and Invading Exteriority

George Slusser, in his essay "Structures of Apprehensions: Lem, Heinlein and the Stugatskys", explains that the Zone is a complex space, in which "we find antithetical opposites that are at the same time complementary systems" (20-1): sharply contrasted and even opposed images are created by the allegory of the Zone. However, as this chapter will show, it does not mean that they are contradictory, or even mutually exclusive: solving the oppositions, the paradoxes created by the complex allegory of the Zone yields a profound utopian message. This paradoxical duality of the Zone is illustrated within the novel by Dr Pilman, a scientist working for the Institute which conducts the research into the artefacts of the Zone. He states that "in our Euclidian world every stick has two ends" (106), meaning that the Zone and its artefacts are both beneficial and harmful. Daniel Klueger, in his essay "Fables of Desire", explains that the Zone is "dangerous, mysterious, and yet with a distinct fairy-tale flavor." (417). The Zone has a dual aspect: one can die in the Zone, but one can also fulfil one's wish there. The same antithetical paradigm is valid for the artefacts of the Zone. Elana Gomel, in "Gods Like Men" states that the Zone is a "place of horrors, whose alien artifacts seem to have no other function than mutilating the human body in a variety of highly imaginative ways" (370). In contrast, Simonetta Salvestroni views the potential of the artefacts: the Zone appears "as a magic space, from which the stalkers return loaded with treasures" (298). The artefacts are the extension of the Zone: they too depict the polarised images of destruction and creation or restoration.

This antithetical allegory can be difficult to understand: as critics have shown, the Zone becomes a space devoid of meaning. Istvan Csicsery-Ronay explains that the Zone is viewed by the characters as an "incomprehensible reality" (21). Elana Gomel makes a similar statement: the Zone is "an empty signifier, corresponding to nothing in consensus reality; but precisely by virtue of its emptiness, it throws into sharp relief the provisional, unstable nature of this reality,

delineating its borders as drawn by science, culture, and common sense and broaching a possibility of change" ("The Poetics of Censorship", 103). Although the Zone appears to be a misunderstood, meaningless entity, defying rules of empirical reality, experienced as nothingness, its paradoxical nature challenges the accepted reality of the characters and questions their values. Only by freeing themselves from the existing preconceptions of the Zone and their existing ideologies can the characters liberate themselves and find utopia.

Gomel continues her argument: "the Zone undermines the structural basis of allegory which rests on their fixedness" (103). The Zone is an unfixed, and as explained, empty signifier, which can be interpreted in many ways, notably as it changes over the course of the narrative.[161] However, to understand and affix meaning onto this changing signifier, one can analyse the origins and significance of the word "zone", as Gomel suggests. She states that the word "zone" is "one of the most loaded ones in the Soviet vocabulary, a slang name for the Gulag universe. The alien Zone is the locus of history that turns unruly and perverse, delivering concentration camps instead of the promise of paradise" ("Gods Like Men", 370). Gomel explains that the word "zone" is a slang word for Gulag, and that therefore the alien Zone in *Roadside Picnic* can be associated with a very inhumane form of imprisonment: the incomprehensibility of the Zone therefore resides in its inconceivable cruelty.[162] The Gulags were concentration and forced labour camps in the Soviet Union, and the main tool of repression to which criminals, political dissidents were sent and forced to work in harsh conditions.[163] Gomel explains that

[161] Elana Gomel explains that the Zone "breaks up the cozy circuit of mutual approbation between the reader and the writer in which the process of allegoresis produces textual knowledge that essentially confirms what the reader has already known." (103), meaning that the reader has to constantly re-identify what the allegory means and adapt to a constantly changing signifier, which is unlike the traditional, fixed allegory.

[162] Elana Gomel refers to the concept of the inhuman as detailed by Jean Francois Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* and in *The Inhuman*. She explains that "Jean-Francois Lyotard distinguishes between 'two sorts of inhuman' of history and of the psyche, the 'inhumanity of the system' and 'the infinitely secret one of which the soul is hostage'. Sf often uses these two interchangeably, as metaphors for each other" ("Gods Like Men", 369). Lyotard denotes the duality of the inhuman, to be found in the cruelty of history and the psyche; that is, through the processes which have a claim to human progress—when they can be in fact seen as dehumanising; and the cultural, psychological processes which involve thinking of what it is to be human. Science fiction interchanges the two to create metaphors about the effect of the inhuman: sufferings illustrated by the characters' inabilities to cope with the system highlight the cruelty of history and vice versa.

[163] For information on the economic, administrative and production roles of the Gulag in the Soviet Union, see Paul Gregory's *The Economics of Forced Labor: The Soviet Gulag*, notably p.7, where the

the Zone is littered with mutilating artefacts, an allegory mirroring the torture that took place in the Gulags. Gomel's point is very relevant in that it introduces spatial connotations to the word "zone", that of a prison. This assertion means that the Zone in *Roadside Picnic* needs to be understood in terms of political and social oppression, and even, by extension, of financial restriction: the Zone becomes related to Red's feelings of imprisonment, oppression and poverty from which he cannot escape.

In fact the Russian word "zone" does not only serve to connote the camps, but also the outside world. This is made obvious through the distinction between *bolshaya zona*, meaning the "big zone", and *malaya zona*, "the little zone". The "little zone" was used by Gulag prisoners as the slang for the Gulag themselves, whilst they used the "big zone" to refer to the wider society. Nancy Adler, in *The Gulag Survivor: Beyond the Soviet System*, suggests that Gulag prisoners, after their release from the "little zone", continued to think themselves as "inhabitants of a zone" showing "how deeply ingrained their prisoner status was" (36). The prisoners were facing physical, psychological, professional and social barriers after their release and found it difficult to adapt to the world outside the camp.[164] Their language suggests that they view the world as a "zone", a camp, a place of restriction, repression and torture, a fit description of the Soviet totalitarian system. In the "little zone", this takes the shape of control from the guards. In the larger world, this is enforced by the totalitarian government, the secret police, the rejection by free individuals who may fear to be associated with former prisoners. This language introduces an interesting dichotomy: that of the differentiation between the inside and the outside, the small and the large, the microcosm and macrocosm of the repressive system, between centre and outskirt, even city centre and ghetto, as the chapter will show later on.

It is necessary to look further into the etymology of the word "zone", since it harbours more connotations of exclusion and rejection. The word "zone" stems from

---

diagram shows how the administration of the Gulag were following orders from the NKVD (the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Secret Police) and had to report back to ministries.

[164] For more details, see Alder's *The Gulag Survivor: Beyond the Soviet System*, p.36. This feeling of rejection stems from the negative depiction and the distrusts of prisoners by other free member. See *Remembering the Darkness: Women in Soviet Prisons* by Veronica Shapovalov, in which she writes that a female prisoner, Olga Viktorovna Iafa-Sinakevich, was allowed out of the camp to get food, but did not escape, as the outside world did not help her escape, as they were indifferent to her case (p.206). Stephen Cohen, in *The Victims Return: Survivors of the Gulag After Stalin*, explains how that slang was "prohibited in public discourse under Stalin" (85).

the Latin *zona*, which means "belt", "celestial zone" or "an encircling band". [165] The Latin meaning of the word serves to designate something outside or surrounding the centre. The word has evolved and has become applicable to urban planning, referring to an area of land that is subject to restrictions concerning its use and development. The Latin word "zone" stands for exteriority, but also for something encircling something else, therefore giving connotations of constrictions and imprisonment.

These notions are also transparent in the French urban planning jargon and slang and are interesting to extrapolate to the reading of the Zone of *Roadside Picnic*. In the French language, the word "zone" took on a different meaning in the mid-nineteenth century. Adolphe Thiers, a French politician, published his *Rapport sur le Projet de Loi Relatif aux Fortifications de Paris* in 1841, in which he explains that it was forbidden to build certain types of inhabitations on the "*zone de servitude*" (65), that is the military areas immediately surrounding the Parisian, or Thiers, fortifications, also referred to as *fortifs*.[166] The erecting of fortifications around Paris had an impact on the social landscape of Paris. As a result of the modernisation of central Paris, workers and small artisans were pushed outside, pushed to the industrial outskirts, to the *zone de servitudes*.[167] The *zone* then referred to this area of Paris, which became associated to ill-famed "shanty towns".[168] Since then, the word "*zone*" has evolved: it extends to any ill-famed, poverty and crime stricken outskirts and has taken on connotations of danger. The zones are areas high in crime, drug dealing, poverty and illiteracy, and can be equated to the English word "ghetto", but

[165] The Russian word for "zone", зóна, also comes from the Latin.

[166] Janet Regina Horne explains the building of the fortifications in the 1840's "served to delineate the new post-Haussmannian boundaries of the city" (423). Haussmann was a civic planner in charge of redesigning Paris, allowing for better traffic, a better sanitary system, modernising the city, and the planning was meant to improve the needs of the upper class of the time.

[167] "Zone de servitudes" translates as "Restricted Area". Elizabeth Wilson details how Haussmann can be criticised for increasing the tension between classes by creating such a spatial divide: "Whether or not there was a deliberate attempt to banish artisans and workers to the industrial suburbs, the classes in the city began to be more segregated." (423). The idea that the word "zone" was used with working class connotations is further illustrated by Janet Horne (op. cit). She states that the nineteenth century French zone was a "wasteland notorious for its ramshackle shanty towns inhabited by poor workers" (251). Gil Doron makes a similar point, when stating "This no man's land of Paris fortification became populated by thousands of people whose home had been demolished by Haussmann's neo-classical restructuring of Paris and by farmers who were drawn to employment in the redeveloping city but could not afford to live inside it. […]. This population mainly of rag pickers were known as *zoniers*" (206).

[168] See the Larousse Dictionnaire de L'Argot et du Français Populaire, 2010. The dictionary is also the basis for the contemporary definitions of the word that follow.

for the fact that *zones* are strictly on the outskirts of the city.[169] For the purpose of this chapter, I would like to use the French word "*zone*" to describe the ghetto-like areas surrounding the Zone in *Roadside Picnic*, as it serves to connote the concept of exteriority, rejection, control, poverty, danger and brings in the historical connotations of exclusion. The chapter will now look at how the Zone evokes these concepts of exteriority and poverty associated with the *zone*, and also mirroring the Soviet Gulag environment. The chapter will also show how these images are then transposed onto its opposite, the city centre, the seat of power to show how the centre becomes an oppressive, tyrannical space of containment. By comparing the two opposed images, the chapter will now show how the "little zone" expands to the "big zone", how the images pertaining to one space can be transposed onto the other, becoming interchangeable to create a bleak, uniform image of greyness and despair.

[169]The word "*zone*" and its derivative "*zonier*" were used as the slang to describe a working class area and its inhabitants. The zone was mainly inhabited by workers, farmers in search of work, smaller artisans who could not afford to stay in the centre, that is to say, it was inhabited by those dispossessed by Haussmann's new Paris. The word is now used to describe areas high in crime, drug dealing and taking and lawlessness.

II/ The Zone *and the Centre: Unfixed Allegory of Struggle and Greed.*

The Zone in *Roadside Picnic* is a space embodying the concept of *zone*, for the fact that it is set in the outskirts of the town of Harmont and represents an area of underground and criminal activities, images that will now be exposed. Red, the stalker venturing into the Zone to retrieve artefacts, initially works for the Institute, but subsequently resorts to stalking, which is seen by the military and police authorities of Harmont as stealing. This equates the Zone to an area of criminal activity, as we will shortly see. However, before seeing the extent to which the Zone is reminiscent of the *zone*, it is important to analyse the location of the Zone of the Visitation. The Zone is situated on the site of what was a mining plant before the Visitation, which would be located outside the centre of the town.[170] The novel reads: "Yellow ore plied up in cone-shaped mounds, blast furnaces gleaming in the sun, rails, rails and more rails, a locomotive with flatcars on the rails. In other words, an industry town." (15). Harmont is initially described as a bustling industry and mining town; the only street mentioned in the novel is called "Miner Street" (81; 82). The town benefits from the mining of ore and exchanging with other towns through the railways, creating a network with the rest of the world.

This also introduces the idea that *Roadside Picnic* is a proletarian novel, as the miner is seen as the epitome of the working class, as explained by Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, in their work entitled *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*:

> The image of the militant, class conscious coal miner has played a powerful role in constituting knowledge of "the working class" and "working class struggle". And the remote mining town has been painted as home to the archetypal working class community. [...] In studies old and new, coal miners are portrayed as committed working class warriors. (208)

The coal miner is the ideal example embodying the working class struggles. This passage is reminiscent of Alexei Stakhanov, the Soviet miner, who personified the

[170] Traditionally, western cities place the industrial centres at the east of the city, as the westerly winds blow the smoke of factories outside the city and the wealthier residential area. The city of Harmont, in *Roadside Picnic* follows that traditional layout: "The village stretched along the western part of the city. There once had been summer houses, gardens, orchards and the summer villas of the city fathers and plant directors" (53). In contrast to this, "In the east the mountains looked black and over them the familiar green wash of colour billowed and shone iridescently—the Zone's green dawn" (127).

concept of the "New Soviet Man".[171] Whilst using the themes of the miner serve to anchor *Roadside Picnic* in the movement of Socialist Realism, the official aesthetic movement of the Soviet state, which had to be followed if wanting to avoid repression, it also reinforces the idea that the Zone is an outskirt of a poor and remote town.[172] This idea of seclusion and industrialisation is also perfectly encapsulated in Tarkovsky's *Stalker* in which the Zone is placed outside of the town: as the Stalker walks with his family through the Zone to get home, we can observe an industrial development in the background, with smokestacks spewing fumes.

However, the Visitation disrupted the mining industry and its community: the Zone is situated next to what is known as the "Plague Quarter" (18), the residential neighbourhood affected by the Visitation. Red's use of the word "neighborhood" (19) is relevant insofar that it further indicates that the Zone is situated away from the centre of the city. The word "neighbourhood" is associated with the residential areas outside the centre, and can also be the metonymy for its inhabitants. The word also suggests an idea of proximity and closeness. Red knew some people who lived in the Plague Quarters, such as his former math teacher nicknamed "The Comma" (19). Red recalls: "It was terrifying. Everyone who lived there got sick. And people in three neighborhoods went blind" (19). This vivid description retells the extent of the destruction the Visitation had on the outskirts of Harmont, where everyone knew everyone, thus dismantling the close-knit communities.

This sense of isolation is furthered by the fact that "the suburbs are being emptied" (85), because of loss of work and the fear of the mutation caused by the Zone. This is apparent through the fact that Red inhabits the poorer part of the city; his "house looked uninhabited. Almost all the windows were dark, there was nobody in the park, and even the lights in the park were out" (110), which indicates a lifeless, unkempt environment. Red's building can also be associated to the dilapidated buildings. The park outside Red's lodgings does not have any outdoor toys, and Red is left to build them for his daughter. Red also wants to repaint the terrace (57-8). The superintendent is against Red's taking initiative to improve the building, as seen from his question "who gave you permission" (58): Red is not allowed to make

[171] For more details, see J Hoberman's *The Red Atlantis: Communist Culture in the Absence of Communism*, p.27.
[172] The previous chapter further deals with the concept of Socialist Realism. See. p 63-9.

improvements, and when caught doing some, he fears being "forced to move" (85), expelled for attempting to improve his living conditions, to escape his appalling situation. The superintendent is reluctant to let Red do any alterations, imposing restrictions on Red's living environment, thus becoming a restricted, controlled space, kept insalubrious. The dark windows, the empty park and the dilapidated terrace, and the "damp and dusty" (111) smell coming from the apartments give the image of a crumbling ghetto. Tarkovsky, in his film adaption *Stalker*, recreates this scene: the viewer enters the Stalker's bedroom which is dark, the walls look irregular and damp, the floor is wet and the water can be heard dripping in indoor puddles. *Stalker* recreates the sense that Red lives in poverty. This is diametrically opposed to the images of the growing city through the building of skyscrapers and luxurious complexes, which will be detailed shortly.

The aliens have not destroyed just the community and the suburbs, but also the livelihood of the inhabitants of Harmont. The aliens have turned the refineries and the mines into the Zone, the dangerous, mutilating and misunderstood space. However, a new industry develops in the shape of research, services and of the black market trade of the artefacts of the Zone, which becomes the hub of economic activity and becomes central to the town of Harmont. The economy changes from being based on the secondary sector activities, to being based on the tertiary and quaternary sectors, which the miners decide to flee or adapt to by stalking. Regardless of their choice, the monopoly of wealth is kept by those in power or those who were previously rich and can afford investing in the artefacts. Red, is one of those who has chosen to stay and stalk.

Red resents his situation and this can be observed when he expresses his frustration at the end of the novel: "But how can I give up stalking when I have a family to feed? Get a job? I don't want to work for you, your work makes me puke, do you understand? This is the way I figure it: if a man works with you, he is always working for one of you, he is a slave and nothing else" (144-5). Here Red illustrates the idea that the working class feels used as slaves by the propertied class. The wage Red earns by working for someone else is not enough to sustain his family, as his employers do not pay him enough. Red considers his situation after receiving money and a bonus after taking the researcher Kirill in the Zone. Red reflects "I can live on

my salary, and I'll booze it up on the bonuses. Then I got really depressed. Penny-pinching again: I can afford this, I can't afford that. I'd have to save up to buy Guta the crummiest rag, no more bars, just cheap movies" (39); he despairs of the fact that he does not earn enough to sustain his family and to enjoy himself. Red feels diminished and rejected, and therefore decides to live outside the norms of waged work by stalking.[173] The Zone therefore becomes Red's workplace and Red can be seen preparing himself for his shift in the Zone: "he knew also that when the sun came up and the fog settled into dew, he would see the downed helicopter somewhere on the left and the ore flatcars up ahead. And then the real work would begin" (120). Red is about to go and stalk in the Zone and is mentally preparing himself for the task ahead, for his shift in the Zone. A further link can be established between the Zone and the past industry of Harmont: Harmont used to be a mining town and stalking can be associated to mining in a broader sense, as Red retrieves artefacts from the Zone. Red is well aware that going into the Zone to stalk means to work: his disdain for waged-work is also reflected in his contempt for the Zone as he calls it the "bitch" (28, 36), as it is a dangerous, lethal and treacherous space. The Zone is thus associated to the mining suburb, in that it constitutes a workplace in which the working class earns a living.

[173] Lyotard, in his work on the French zone exposed in *Postmodern Fables*, further associates the zone with the feeling of rejection. He states: "These margins of the big city are not something recent. Rome, Alexandria were also girded by suburbs of dubious distinction, where being orphaned and being out of work were what was sung. After all, Jesus [...] is cathected by the lament of those who live in the zone, of those who count for nothing" (18). Lyotard refers to the interest Baudelaire, Apollinaire and Jacob took in Jesus. Apollinaire wrote a poem entitled "Zone". The poem was written in 1912, more than a decade after the French government introduced the law on the Separation of the Church and the State. In the poem, the narrator addresses Christianity, and points out that it has not been forgotten despite the modernisation of life in the suburbs, that is, in the zones. Life is no longer regulated by the Church bells, but by the factory horns. Despite a certain sense of decay—of literature, of standards of life, Christianity remains a force offering hope and salvation. This image is particularly powerful in Tarkovsky's *Stalker*; the Writer wears a crown of thorns and explains during his soliloquy: "I wanted to change them, but it's they who changed me. Making me in their own image", perhaps showing a perversion of God's ability to create man in his own image (Genesis; 1:27), man has fallen for materialism and is beyond redemption. As the Writer explains to the Stalker: "I am not going to forgive you". Man can no longer be saved, he has become too greedy, proud and sinful to be redeemed. *Stalker* and *Roadside Picnic* use religious images to convey their images of sin, greed and redemption notably the linking the Golden Ball to the "Grail" (Jameson, *AOTF* p. 295); (see p. 213 and 222 of the thesis). These images will be analysed as a wider symbol of hope and utopian possibility, as focusing on religion specifically would outstrip the limits of this thesis. For information on religion in Tarkovsky's films, see John Moore's "Vagabond Desire: Aliens, Alienation and Human Regeneration in Arkady and Boris Strugatsky's Roadside Picnic and Andrey Tarkovsky's Stalker" and Vida Johnson's *The Films of Andrei Tarkovsky: A Visual Fugue*.

In contrast, the Zone is also a symbol of wealth, materialism and greed: the Zone can be mined for its highly sought-after artefacts that are studied by the institute and the military, and smuggled and sold on the black market by the stalkers. As Harmont becomes a city, the materialism pertaining to the Zone generates trade and research, the domain of activities of the central business district of larger cities, which constitutes a reminder of their luxurious shopping centres, reminiscent of consumerism.[174] The materialistic nature of the Zone is exposed in the very beginning of the novel during the interview of Dr Pilman, one of the scientists representing the international researcher community in the United Nation. The journalist asks Dr Pilman what was the most important discovery made since the Visitation. Dr Pilman answers that the most important discovery is "The fact of the Visitation itself" (5). The journalist's answer conveys horror and shock at such a statement being made, as he answers, "I beg your pardon? (5). Dr Pilman feels compelled to further his point: he explains that there cannot be any bigger discovery than the fact that humans "are not alone in the universe" (5). The journalist is still mortified by the idea that the cultural discovery of the existence of aliens could be more important than "discoveries of a technological nature" (5), which could be used by "earth scientists and engineers" (5) to change "the course of history"(5). The novel therefore opens on two contrasting views. Dr Pilman symbolises empirical knowledge, the truth that aliens exist—the most important discovery of history. However, the journalist's view is more materialistic and greedy, as he places the importance of the Visitation on the artefacts, and speculates about potential discoveries, benefits and profits. The journalist views the importance of the Visitation within man himself, his ability to exploit and absorb the alien, turning it into the known human greed, but closing the door to the alien, the foreign, the other.

The journalist's view is reminiscent of the idea that man is unable and unwilling to understand an alien race, were it to come into contact with us, which reflects the recurrent motif in science fiction that man cannot overcome his greed. George Slusser in "The Martians Among Us: Wells and the Strugatskys" (68) states that "the focus of the novel is squarely on the inadequacy of human reactions to an alien event. Because we do not understand these things, we [humans] misuse them.

[174] See Musick's *An Introduction to the Sociology of Juvenile Delinquency* (120-8) or John Allen and Doreen Massey's in *Geography Matters!: A Reader* (51-2)

[...] Because of fundamental flaws in human nature, we use the objects for ends of greed, vanity, or power". (68) Slusser explains that humans are unable to open up to and to react appropriately to an alien creature or alien artefacts. In *Roadside Picnic*, this transpires through the fact that man's greed takes over; man tries to exploit the artefacts to construct paradigms of power. The journalist's attaching the significance of the Visitation to the discoveries made by Earthlings and within the human use of the artefacts is indicative of man's greed: the journalist, who represents the rest of the population, cannot think outside of the frame of commodity fetishism.

George Slusser indicates that Dr Pilman puts forward the technological advances made by the study and uses of artefacts, but "because of fundamental flaws in human nature, we use the objects for ends of greed, vanity, or power" ("The Martians Among Us"; 68). The walling off the Zone reinforces the idea that man is greedy and only using the artefacts to improve his own condition, as opposed to reaching out to the other, the alien. Slusser highlights the fact that Pilman lists the "beneficial objects" (*Roadside Picnic*, 106) which man will "know how to make" (106). Dr Pilman shows that there are many objects that can be used, and which eventually will be reproduced and manufactured by humans.[175] Slusser states that this exemplifies human greed in the novel, and this shows "the human inability to understand the nature of the event" (68). Slusser shows how human beings do not understand the impact of the Visitation: they are not alone in the universe.[176] Even Dr Pilman, who at the beginning of the novel, places the importance of the Visitation in the Visitation itself, has succumbed to greed. Greed is an all-consuming force, since even the open Dr Pilman has succumbed to it. It is however a constricting force which pushes man to shut himself off from the alien event, surrendering hope.

Stanislaw Lem also conveys the inadequacy of human attitudes towards the alien and total otherness. In *Solaris*, the main character, Kelvin, is sent to study the oceanic alien that covers and engulfs the planet known as Solaris. He reflects on the usefulness of the experiments conducted there and the human attempt to

[175]This brings to mind the idea of reproduction, notably in Walter Benjamin's *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. For Benjamin, the idea of reproduction of a work of art takes away the "here and now of the work of art—its unique existence in the place where it is at this moment". This relates to the idea of *wu* in *The Man in the High Castle* by Philip K. Dick, in which a work of art is seen as transcending time. See p.81, 168.

[176] This point relates to Stainslaw Lem's view that aliens cannot be understood by mankind, as his perception is limited. See p. 169.

communicate with a seemingly incomprehensible alien: "We are only seeking Man. We have no need of other worlds. We need mirrors" (75), suggesting that man is wrapped up in his own world, engulfed into his own narcissism and unable to open up and comprehend the truly alien.[177] Kelvin realises that man only seeks out the alien as a means to improve mankind, not as a means to open up to difference. This attitude of seeking man within the alien, to humanise and de-alienise the extra-terrestrial beings, is to be transposed onto the treatment of aliens in *Roadside Picnic*. The artefacts can only be understood according to the human paradigms of greed, thus satisfying a materialistic need and a thirst for power by exploiting the artefacts as they are "extremely valuable commodities" (97), as Brooks Landon has it. Presumably, it is man's very inability to comprehend the alien which makes him unable to operate and perceive how the artefacts work. Man does not understand the Visitation in its alien terms: instead of opening to the true otherness of the alien, as Dr Pilman initially tries to do, it re-absorbs the alien, thus humanising the Visitation, reinforcing man's self-absorption, pride and avarice.

The short story "Cinderella Story", written by Allen Kim Lang", also portrays the concept of human greed in relation to the alien. In the story, aliens are attempting to invade the Earth by buying it, by exploiting human greed. Kraft, one of the purple-eared alien planning to buy the world, explains to Orison, an undercover agent working for him that he has enough of each of the world's currencies, affirming that he is "ready to purchase the planet from its owners. No violence, you see. Just subterfuge" (85), to "subvert Earth by pandering to Earth's greed" (96). Orison questions that buying the Earth without explaining the motives behind the purchase is violence, but never questions the fact that the Earth has "owners". This imagery perfectly highlights the fact that mankind is consumed by greed and the most efficient way to subdue the planet is to simply buy its loyalty. On another level, the short story also functions as a satire of alien humanisation. The story ends with Kraft being found out by the Elders of the purpled-ear race, who condemn his deceitful ploy. In retribution, the purple-eared aliens are willing to "prepare the Golden

[177] Stephen Potts explains that man has "the tendency to see the human face reflected throughout the cosmos" (82). Lem also deals with the concept of man's inability to understand the alien in his essay "About the Strugatsky's *Roadside Picnic*" (320), in which he states that man "cannot comprehend their alien proceedings", their motives for getting in touch with man, because of man's intellectual limitations.

Worlds to accept Coca-Cola" (95), which means that the confederation of aliens are ready to accept a corporation symbolic of mass consumerism into its intergalactic consortium, making of the universe a mass market. This is a satire on man's inability to imagine the alien without thinking of consumerism, materialism or profit.

In *Roadside Picnic*, this humanisation of the alien takes the shape of the materialisation and the commodification of the alien artefacts, which become invaluable only insofar as they are integrated within the paradigm of human greed, and is demonstrated by the behaviour of several characters, such as the "Butcher", the surgeons of injured stalkers. Red and Burbridge, a fellow stalker, venture into the Zone. Their trip does not end well for Burbridge as he is injured. Red takes him to the Butcher. The description of the Butcher reveals his motivations in taking care of injured stalkers; he is a good surgeon

> influential in both city and state medical circles. He had gotten mixed up with the stalkers not for the money, of course. He collected from the Zone: he took various types of swag, which he used to research in his practice; he took knowledge, since he studied stricken stalkers and the various diseases, mutilations and traumas of the human body that had never been known before, and he took glory, becoming the first doctor on the planet to be a specialist in nonhuman diseases of man. He was also not adverse to taking money, and in great amounts. (55-6)

The Butcher is a respected doctor and appreciated for his research into alien human disease. He is depicted as someone who almost inadvertently got enmeshed with the stalkers. His interest in the artefacts is also initially portrayed as intellectual curiosity, as a hobby serving to research into the diseases stemming from the Zone, making him the only specialised doctor and surgeon. At first, it would appear that he is not involved with the stalkers for money, a fact that is disproved at the end of this passage by showing that in fact his services come at a hefty price, and showing that he is using his specialism for his own, personal benefit.

The Zone and its artefacts are further associated with greed when Red is seen doing "business" (67, 70) with an underground gang. Red goes to the Metropole hotel to sell items to the "Metropole gang" (87), composed of Throaty and Bones, two individuals who pay a handsome sum of money to Red.[178] Throaty entails Red

[178] The word "Metropole" is reminiscent of the idea of centrality, as for example Great Britain was the Metropole of the British Empire, that is to say the nerve centre of authority. We are to understand that the Metropole gang is central in the black market trade of artefacts. What is more the word

by asking him to find a way to refill an empty, so that he "will never have to go into the Zone again" (72). Throaty's gang is looking for new ways to exploit the artefacts and are promising Red financial security in exchange for the perpetuum mobile, a hoop that once triggered never stops moving. Throaty tells Red that he will only get a vast amount of money on the "condition that no one but [Red] and [him] know about it" (72). Throaty coerces Red not to tell anyone about the unknown item to reserve the exclusivity of the new artefact. This gives the sense that the Metropole gang is one of the most powerful on the black market as they have the power to purchase Red's rare items, knowing they are the highest bidder. This particular passage reinforces the idea that the artefacts are highly sought-after, luxurious and exclusive items.

The idea of wealth is reinforced through the description of the hotel where Red meets Throaty. Red describes a luxurious environment and people who can afford high-priced, luxurious inessential items, such as a "fat man breathing asthmatically, a heavily perfumed woman" who we later know wears a "large necklace made of large black sprays set in silver" and whose "grumpy little boy was eating chocolate" (68). Red also describes the eighth floor, the landing from where the gang operates: it "smelled of expensive tobacco, French perfumes, the soft natural leather of stuffed wallets, expensive ladies of the night, and solid cigarette cases" (68), a sign that wealthy people reside comfortably in the hotel, not lacking anything and are able to afford high-end items. This picture of luxury is quickly tainted as Red exposes how this level of wealth was achieved. Red immediately contrasts this picture by saying that:

> It reeked of everything, of the lousy fungus that was growing on the Zone, drinking on the Zone, eating, exploiting and growing fat on the Zone and that didn't give a damn about any of it, especially about what would happen later, when it had eaten its full and gotten power, and when everything that was once in the Zone was outside the Zone. (68)

To Red, the floor does not smell pleasant. The smell is reminiscent of that of mould, which develops in the Zone: this parallel gives the sense that the Zone invades and permeates the central hotel, and by extension, the city centre. This sense of invasion

---

Metropole" is reminiscent of the word Metropolis, which designates a large city. The fact that the hotel is named the "Metropole Hotel" gives the sense that Harmont is a large city, in which crimes thrives.

of the Zone to the city centre is enhanced by using the exact same words to describe the Zone and the eighth floor. Red details that the swamp to the right of the embankment "reeked of decay" (120) just as the eighth floor reeks. This similarity is also drawn by the repetitive use of the word "lousy" to describe the smell of fungus on the stair landing and to describe hills in the Zone, the "lousy mothers" (134) standing in Red's way. The contempt Red has for the Zone thus reflects the animosity he feels towards the gang. The corridor where Throaty's office lies is highly evocative of the Zone, giving Red the feeling that he is in the Zone, that the Zone is "outside the Zone" (68) and saturating the city centre.

It is unclear as to where the smell emanates from: it could come from Throaty's office or from the luxury and wealth that was gained through the exploitation of the Zone and the stalkers. In both cases, this mouldy smell becomes associated to the idea of a "rotten" business: exploiting the Zone and the stalkers is not without consequences, as the stalkers feel chained to their condition. It also highlights the idea that the gang's wealth is the result of unreasonable and indifferent exploitation of the Zone and the exclusion of stalkers such as Red. Red points at the absolute carelessness of the gang as they have no remorse taking artefacts whose effects are unknown to man, therefore taking the Zone outside itself, enabling it to permeate and contaminate everything.

Brooks Landon's states that the eighth floor and "the corridors of power and plenty which [Red] can visit only to sell his swag are already taking on an alien quality" (99). Firstly, this demonstrates that Red is only able to access the eighth floor when doing business with the gang, and if it was not for his stalking, he would not be able to do so, which reflects the mechanism of exploitation and exclusivity that can be associated with the commodification of the artefacts. Furthermore, Landon also highlights the parallel alienating effects of the Zone: Red is entering an unknown world of wealth and privilege, reinforcing the sense that man is alien to himself, as he creates divisions and exclusions within his own species and societies.

However, the very possibility of "power and plenty" attracts newcomers to the town of Harmont, inflating it into a developing city, epitomising human greed. New inhabitants "poured into Harmont in the last few years to look for exciting adventures, untold riches, world fame, or some special religion" (73) but end up as

taxi drivers or construction workers. Despite the economy of Harmont offering the possibility of wealth through the Zone, people mostly end up in subordinated jobs and in poverty. However, the city centre grows and becomes luxurious as the economy feeds on the mining, selling and exploiting of the artefacts of the Zone, attracting wealthy visitors. This is exemplified by the description of the city centre that is under construction given by Richard Noonan. He

> suddenly thought how the city had grown over the past few years. Huge skyscrapers. There're building another one over there. What will it be? Oh, the Luna Complex—the world's best jazz, and a variety show, and so on. Everything for our glorious troops and our brave tourists, especially the elderly ones, and for the noble knights of science. And the suburbs are being emptied. (85)

The city centre of Harmont develops and large and luxurious complexes are built for the benefits of those who can afford it: the military, serving abroad or serving to protect the Zone from stalkers, rich scientists researching into the Zone, tourists and retired people enjoying the luxuries of Harmont. The elite who enriched themselves by protecting, studying and exploiting the Zone and wealthy tourists can enjoy the comforts provided by the new skyscrapers, while the majority lives to serve, mine and work for the wealthy. In contrast, the dilapidated outskirts are neglected and crumbling.

A final and very relevant example of how trade is changing and how the Zone can be associated with city centre activities—that is trade and business—is to be found in Richard Noonan. Brooks Landon details his role:

> Ostensibly responsible for supplying equipment to the institute studying the Zone, Noonan is actually playing both the legal and illegal sides of the Zone-driven economies. In his unofficial and often illegal capacity he has been working to gain control of the stalker economy by breaking up the gangs of stalkers who do not deal only with him and by trying to corner the market of swag from the Zone. Noonan also has darker ties either to the powerful organised crime or to the corporate structure of the military-industrial complex, which wants Zone discoveries for its own research and profit. A self-described 'practical person', an organizer and administrator—the consummate bureaucrat—Noonan is an affable and enough individual, but he is ready to make almost any compromise to prosper in safety as a middleman in transaction pertaining to the Zone. (101)

Brooks Landon's point succinctly summarises the dual aspect of the Zone: it generates different trades, some seen as legitimate, such as the study of the artefacts,

and some made illegitimate since they are not regulated by the institute. Thus the Zone has a dual influence on the economic structure of Harmont, generating legal and illegal trades, tying to the idea that the Zone is both a central economic hub, and a ghetto, underground marketplace. The new economic system has generated new jobs and professions, such as Noonan's, who is a trade administrator. Landon sees Noonan's job as reflective of the duality of the trades generated by the Zone, thus accentuating its ambiguous spatial functions. Noonan is a manipulative character: he is playing the gangs of stalkers and the institute to further his career. Landon points to the fact that Noonan is a type of individual that emerged with the Zone: his greed pushes him to do anything to become the main outsourcer of quality artefacts.[179] Noonan's character is extremely valuable in illustrating the effects and the duality of the Zone. Noonan exploits the poverty attached to the Zone: he uses the stalkers' need for money and greed to obtain quality goods that he himself distributes as the main middleman. He states that if it were not for him, "the good stuff would be much rarer" (84), which shows his attempt to get the exclusivity of the unobtainable artefacts. Noonan and Red become enslaved by the commodity fetishism: relations in Harmont are based on the finding and trading of artefacts. Stalkers can be associated to workers, mining the goods and being paid lowly amounts for their work, while higher tradesmen, such as Throaty or Noonan reap better fruits and can control what the destitute do. The Zone becomes a workplace, but it is also the source of trade and in this sense embodies two contrasting spaces; the suburbs and the city centre.

The dual and infiltrating and oppressive nature of the Zone can be further understood by looking at China Miéville's *Perdido Street Station*. In Miéville's novel, the multiplicity of space, the heterotopia that is the city of New Crobuzon, finds itself dissolved under the action of a common agent: the moth-like spiders, known as slake-moths. New Crobuzon is a heterotopia, insofar as it is composed, much like Harmont in *Roadside Picnic*, of many different ghettos, business and

[179] Landon's point is also structurally relevant, since he has a chapter dedicated to him. He becomes the centre of action during Red's incarceration. This episode takes place between Red's first entrance in the Zone as a stalker with Burbridge, and his final excursion as an agent of hope, a hero wanting to understand the concept of happiness. Therefore Noonan is wedged between two worlds: the illegitimate world of the artefacts, the greed, and the world of knowledge and hope. Noonan serves to show the greed associated with the Zone and the artefacts, but also provides a neutral point of view on the changes in Harmont.

wealthy districts and also composed of an elusive city centre, reified in the towering Perdido Street Station. New Crobuzon, much like Harmont, is a space engendering inequality, exclusion, repression, but also wealth and innovation. In *Perdido Street Station*, the multiplicity of space is nullified, just as is the case in *Roadside Picnic* with the Zone pervading the entire city of Harmont.

New Crobuzon is a state city, inhabited by humans and various other sentient extra-terrestrial bug-like and bird-like beings. Isaac, a human researcher, dates Lin, a khepri, a humanoid scarab beetle artist. Isaac is charged by Yagharek, a garuda, to find a way to make him fly again, as his wings were amputated by his community as part of his punishment and exile. In his search for winged beings, Isaac takes the reader through the dark alleys and the isolated ghettos, such as the Garuda ghetto named "Spatters", a "ghost sector, beyond Parliament's ken, where taxes and laws were as rare as sewage system" (175). The Garuda ghetto is a lawless place, isolated and separate from the rest of the city, so much so that it does not have a sewage system and that the government cannot implement its tax policy there, due to the high lawlessness of this ghetto. In contrast, the central area of the city, notably the central Perdido Street Station, where all the train lines converge is "an industrial castle, bristling with random parapets. The westernmost tower of the station was the militia's Spike; that loomed over the other turrets, dwarfing them, tugged in seven directions by seven taut skyrails." (79), a feat of magnificent and overpowering architecture. The Parliament is also described in an authoritarian, kingly and grandiose way: the Mayor is depicted as sitting in his "throne" (119) in the "vaulted chamber" where "little tunnels and stairs of polished marbled bristled". The common use of the word "bristle" shows the centrality of power of the station: the rule of the Parliament and its militia are symbolised by their privileged, pivotal position. In *Perdido Street Station*, the city centre also becomes the seat of wealth and power, while the rest of the city lives in squalor.

However, just like in *Roadside Picnic*, the duality of space is undermined and conquered: just as the Zone embodies the ghettos and invades the centre, permeating the whole city of Harmont and create a unified picture of decay and greed, forces in New Crobuzon also conquer and invade space, absolving its plurality. Isaac, in his search for winged beings, gets a creature brought to him, an elusive caterpillar which

feeds on the hallucinogenic drug named "dreamshit". The caterpillar metamorphoses into a slake-moth, which feeds off the consciousness and soul of its prey, leaving them in a vegetative state, thus wreaking havoc on the city. The slake-moth prowls on all types of beings it can find, therefore putting an emphasis on the human made social, economic, xienian segregation.[180] It hunts "in the unlit alleys" where a prostitute fulfils her contractual duty to her client (312) and it hovers "seeking the centre of the city, turning, drawn to the enormous sprawl of Perdido Street Station" (313).

After delivering five of its comrades, smaller but stronger, the slake-moths "drifted as the first to fly had done, north towards Perdido Street Station" (319). They journey to the central station: "Everywhere they were, every part of the city, every dark bridge, every five-hundred old mansion, every twisting bazaar, every grotesque concrete warehouse and tower and houseboat and squalid slum and manicured park, thronged with food" (319). The slake-moths do not discriminate, the whole city is their "hunting ground" (319), just as the Zone "doesn't ask who the good guys are and who the bad ones are" (*Roadside Picnic*, 22). In the same manner as the Zone permeates the whole town of Harmont, thus drawing attention to the overwhelming greed, exclusion and oppression engendered through the consumerist mode of production, the slake-moths' threatening the whole population and invading the whole of New Crobuzon draws attention to the many forms of segregation created in the city, turning the multiple ghettos and wealthy areas into one unified hunting ground.

Joan Gordon explains of the novel that "The city itself is a hybrid" (460), "a collection of neighborhoods" (460). Taking her definition from Brian Stross's article "The Hybrid Metaphor: From Biology to Metaphor", Gordon conceptualises the hybrid as a blending of "something heterogeneous in origin or composition" (457). However, as Motley, an underground drug lord, who commissioned a work from Lin,

[180] It is to be noted that *Perdido Street Station* uses the word "xenian", derived from the root "xeno" to mean extraterrestrial species. It is derived from the root "xeno-", which means "stanger", "foreigner" and used to compound words such as "xenophobia". For the purpose of this thesis, the use of the word "xenian" and other derivatives, serves to define extraterrestrial being, as opposed to its common use meaning of a different nationality or culture. *Roadside Picnic* also uses the word to the same effect: "xenology" (100) means the study of extraterrestrial psychology using human methods, a fact that Dr Pilman deems as a "false premise" (100), which related to Lem's proposition that the alien cannot be understood using human empiricism.

remarks of the city: "I believe this to be the fundamental dynamic. Transition. The point where one thing becomes another. It is what makes you, the city, the world, what they are. And that is the theme I'm interested in. the zone where the disparate become part of the whole. The hybrid zone" (51). New Crobuzon, and the misery associated with its ghettos, the oppression of its centralised military and parliamentary forced, are to be seen as one ever changing element: "New Crobuzon's architecture moves from the industrial to the residential to the opulent to the slum to the underground to the airborne to the modern to the ancient to the colourful to the drab to the fecund to the barren…" (Gordon, 51). The city is made up of many transitions: the transitions between the different areas of the city, the transition between its ghettos and its centre, between its different xenian groups, classes and ages. However, this multiplicity is absolved under the common threat represented by the slake-moths, who do not discriminate their prey.

New Crobuzon is a hybrid space of exclusion, repression and segregation: but the transition that Motley comments on is only superficial and geographical. The transition is not social: the government is "policing by decentralized fear" (324). When faced with a major strike, the mayor's advisor states that "This is by far the most serious strike to threaten the city for… over a century" (329). The dystopian government does not allow for dissention. Isaac explains that he has "no stomach for the law in this city" (60), presumably for fear of what happens in the Parliament's "rooms used for uncertain purposes" (55), which evokes Winston's torture in Room 101 in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The slake-moths can be seen as annihilating agents, as the locusts of Judgement day (Revelation 9), mocking this superficial transition by destroying the city inhabitants. In a world where change is denied, they become the agents of apocalypse that even the other dimensional dæmons of Hellkin of New Crobuzon fear; the only way out is redemption, social change and true otherness which Isaac deeply seeks and finds when he flees the city.

Interestingly, both *Roadside Picnic* and *Perdido Street Station* create cities which are turned into uniform spaces of restraint. In *Roadside Picnic*, the Zone permeates the entire city and invades the city centre. The Zone becomes central to the novel—although ironically situated on the outskirts of the city of Harmont. However, it becomes so important that it infiltrates the centre as it provides the basis

for the economy of Harmont. The Zone is associated with the suburbs through its image of the workplace and through its echoing the struggle of the working class and the grim, grey industrial landscape. However, it is dual and also embodies the greed and mass consumerism associated with the city centre by permeating it. As for Miéville's novel, it creates a geographically, socially, economically, xenially fragmented society, only unified by the inescapable threat posed by the undiscriminating slake-moths. However, in both novels, the city becoming a dystopian place is not only achieve by the means of extending the ghettos to the centre, it is also done through creating a unified colour scheme of dullness, greyness and monotony, creating images of decaying cities.

III/ Monotonous Greyness and the Green Ideal of Greed: the Dual Colour Scheme of the Zone

Looking at the colour scheme in *Roadside Picnic* is an important part of understanding the dual nature of the Zone, as it contributes to the allegory of the Zone representing both the *zone* and the city centre of economic power. The darkness and bleak environment of the Zone permeates the centre. In turn, the omnipresent images of grey and dark ghettos and of the growing, polluted, inescapable city raise the question of the destruction of the country: if the Zone has invaded the city and, as the next section will show, the world, the space that was the country has been engulfed and disappears. Traditionally, the country has utopian connotation: its absence suggests the totality of the dystopia, reflected by the ubiquity of the polluted city. However, the concept of the country and the associated idea of greenery are still present in the novel, although completely distorted. The greenery is contrasted to the grimness and greyness of the landscape; but it is also present through the "greenbacks", the money that all stalkers strive to gain, and through the desire to escape and find the country. The grey and green colour contrast is also present in Andrei Tarkovsky's movie adaptation of the novel, *Stalker*, in which the Zone becomes a green, luscious, forestial landscape, through which the Stalker guides the Writer and the Professor. The world outside the Zone is depicted as a bleak environment. However, as this section will show, the colour green only provides an illusionary contrast, a temporary, fake relief from the dystopian greyness.

The association of the Zone to the industrial workplace, and therefore the ghetto and the working class condition is reinforced through the depiction of a grey landscape, reminiscent of industrial environments. The Zone is a grey and dark area, reflecting the decay the Visitation caused to the city of Harmont, but also reflecting the grey smoke and atmosphere of the Industrial Revolution, as documented by Friedrich Engels and portrayed by Charles Dickens. Engels describes the working class areas of Manchester in *The Condition of the working Class in England in 1844*:

> At the bottom the Irk flows, or rather stagnates. It is a narrow, coal-black stinking river full of filth and rubbish which it deposits on the more low-lying right bank. In dry weather this bank presents the spectacle of a series of the most revolting blackish-green puddles of slime from the depth of which bubbles of miasmatic gases constantly rises and create a stench which is unbearable

> even to those standing on the bridge forty or fifty feet above the level of the water. […The houses] have been blackened by soot, all of them are crumbling with age and have all broken window-panes and window frames. (63-4)

Engels here reports on the horrendous, unsanitary, polluted conditions that workers living nears the factories have to face. A similar description of the working class living area is made by Charles Dickens, in *Hard Times*, which was published in 1854. He describes the imaginary Coketown:

> It was a town of red brick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes had allowed it; but as matters stood, it was a town of unnatural red and black like the painted face of a savage. It was a town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which interminable serpents of smoke trailed themselves for ever and ever, and never got uncoiled. It had a black canal in it, and a river that ran purple with ill-smelling dye, and vast piles of building full of windows where there was a rattling and a trembling all day long, and where the piston of the steam-engine worked monotonously up and down, like the head of an elephant in a state of melancholy madness. It contained several large streets all very like one another, and many small streets still more like one another, inhabited by people equally like one another, who all went in and out at the same hours, with the same sound upon the same pavements, to do the same work, and to whom every day was the same as yesterday and to-morrow, and every year the counterpart of the last and the next. (26)

Both Dickens and Engels put forward the dirtying aspects of the industry, polluting and contaminating nature and creating toxic environments.

The Zone of *Roadside Picnic* engages with this tradition of dark, dull and filthy environments. As Ursula K. Le Guin notes, the Zone "pollutes" ("A New Book by the Strugatskys", 157). Furthermore, the Zone becomes an allegory for the suffering of the population of Harmont. Elena Gomel expresses the parallel between the colour scheme used in the Strugatsky's *Hard to be a God* and the living condition of the characters: "Grey is the color of self-satisfied mediocrity, while black is the color of terror and repression" ("Poetics of Censorship", 95). The symbolic of the dark colour scheme serves to describe a polluting environment creating a sense of oppression and conveying a sense of failure and inescapability, as well as to evoke the nineteenth century images of working class crumbling ghettos of *Roadside Picnic*.

The Zone has a "dark gray spot" (127) with a mound of "gray rags" (131), presumably decomposing clothes from a dead stalker, guided by greed, killed by the repressive, cruel nature of the Zone. The greyness is intensified by the "thick "fog"

(120) lying on the Zone. The Zone is also "a dead swamp" (129) with "rusty water" (129), imparting a sense of decay on the Zone. Nature is perverted: there is "dry grass" (131) which is also described as "black bramble" (18). These characteristics are far from a verdant description, and are rather indicative of decay, and pollution. This image is then transposed onto the city: "Heavy clouds hung low over the city. It was muggy and the first hesitant drops of rain were scattering on the sidewalk like little black stars" (85). This passage describes the city as grey, notably because of the rain and the clouds. The clouds are not very high in the sky, and it is very humid: the atmosphere is oppressive, and could be described as claustrophobic as no opening or light offer any escape route, guidance or hope. More striking is the rain that falls black, indicating that nature is tainted by pollution. These depictions show that the Zone, the suburbs and the city centre are all associated under the colour scheme of greyness and blackness, conferring on Harmont a sense of mediocrity, repression, pollution and decay.

Tarkovsky's *Stalker* also relies on the use of the grey colour. It uses black and white shots to show the events taking place in the real world, the world that the Stalker defines as "outside the barbed wire" surrounding the Zone. People are not allowed to enter the Zone; conversely, this conveys the idea that people are not allowed to enter the Zone because they are not allowed to leave the real world, turning it into a prison camp. This sense of imprisonment within the black and white reality is reinforced by the thick fog present around the Zone. There is fog throughout the city: in the far distance, the viewer can see the industrial estate made up of large chimneys throwing smoke in the sky which seem to blend and merge with the greyness of the sky, descending into a fog obscuring the world. The fog is much thicker around the Zone, so much so that one cannot see the Zone through it, which symbolises people's inability to see past their everyday grind, their greed and materialism. As the Stalker notes: people "have got empty eyes. The only thing they can think about is how to sell themselves not too cheap! How to get as much as possible for their every emotional movement!". He understands that people have confined themselves within the paradigm of use-value, of commodity fetishism, and their greed pushes them to try to get as much as they can for their work, their time, or even their art.

Interestingly, Tarkovsky's Zone is not a uniformly grey space, as is the case in *Roadside Picnic*, but it is verdant and fertile. While I will be dealing with the green imagery of the Zone shortly, it is necessary to note that there are also some grey and black symbols in Tarkovsky's Zone, in the shape of the burned down "bunkers", also referred to as "settlement". [181] The bunkers are presumably a military settlements or warehouses for nuclear weapon development. The bunkers look destroyed and bear burn marks, giving the sense that they has exploded or have been bombed. This notably suggests that the Zone is the site of a nuclear blast, especially since, just like in *Roadside Picnic* with Red's mutated daughter Monkey, the Stalker's daughter is seen suffering the effects of radiation: she cannot walk or talk and has telekinetic powers.

Similarly, *Perdido Street Station* shows bleak depictions of a decaying, polluted city: "Fat chimneys retch dirt into the sky even now in the deep night" (1-2), "The gates to the Old City, once grandiose, now psoriatic and ruined." (2), "The city reeked" (9), "Smokestacks punctured the membrane between the land the air and disgorged tons of poisonous smog into that upper world as if out of spite" (78). These images are epitomised in the Dickensian idea of soot tainted bricks: "The bricks of the warehouse had once been red and were now black with grime" (248). The city is depicted as a heavily industrialised environment, fouled and degraded beyond repair, through the images of contamination, poisoning and disintegration. This becomes a geographical stigmata: rivers are named the "Canker and the Tar" (29), reminiscent of smoke of the chimney and asphalt, and indicative of the destruction of pine trees used in the manufacturing of tar. Even more so, they have strong association with the smoking of cigarettes, which contain tar and are found to contribute to lung cancer: the city becomes carcinogenic to its inhabitants and to nature.

Magdalena Maczynska explains how Miéville intertwines his socio-economic and environmental messages and sets his fiction against London's time of paired growth and social unrest of the 1980s and 1990s (58-61). She explains that the rise of

[181] Tarkovsky's Zone is said to be inspired by the nuclear disasters such as those of Arzamas-16 and Chelyabinsk-65, the areas of nuclear weapon testing, that were covered up by the Soviet government. For more details, see David Victor's *The Implementation and Effectiveness of International Environmental Commitments* p. 489.

the City as a world-leading economic centre contributed to generate "an insular culture of consumerism and affluence" (60), that is created great disparity between the poorest—even homeless—part of the population, and the privileged few. She continues:

> The social inequalities of the period lend an ironic dimension to the Thatcherite nostalgia for "Victorian" values, suggesting a series of dark parallels—the growing culture of discipline and policing, the reemergence of sweatshops in the wake of relaxed labor laws, and the dramatic growth of the city's displaced populations—between late-nineteenth- and late-twentieth-century London absent from official government rhetoric. This destabilization of the capital's social order contributed to a pervasive mood of anxiety, compounded by the widespread fears provoked by growing environmental damage and nuclear proliferation.[182]

Britain of the 1980s and 1990s saw a resurgence of Victorian values, with lax labour laws, which enabled to the reinstating of harsh working conditions and high policing, resulting in the rise of poverty, which was starkly contrasted to the wealth of the City of London. This resulted in a fragmented society, as depicted by Miéville, but also present in a wider scale in the Stugrastsky brothers' works and implicit in Tarkovsky's film. These social and economic fragmentations were heightened by the growing environmental concerns and the fear of nuclear Armageddon. *Perdido Street Station*, *Roadside Picnic* and *Stalker* address the serious inequalities arising with heavy urbanisation that emerged during industrialisation. The urban city is to be seen as an inflated space of materialism, greed, repression, oppression and exclusion, about to burst and doom humanity, in a similar way to a worldwide nuclear holocaust would. The images of apocalypse and urbanisation are therefore intrinsically linked; man creates the conditions of his destruction as the cities keep on expanding, obliterating everything in their wake. This calls to mind the imagery of worlds devastated by nuclear technology, a recurrent imagery in science fiction. In *On the Beach* by Nevil Shute, humans are doomed to perish due to the global spread of nuclear fallout. In *The Chrysalids* by John Wyndham, mankind is mutating, a punishment known as "deviation" supposedly inflicted from the way of truth, a fundamentalist ideology. However, it soon transpires that the "Old People" had

[182] This background of disparity, although heightened by the setting of the City in London as a world banking leader, is not a new phenonmena. As previously explained, Keith Booker explained that this disparity between the rich and the poor is a breach of the utopian capitalist enterprise which occurred in the 1950s and continued during the Cold War, through to today. See p. 32 of this thesis.

advanced technology and are believed to have been punished for it: it is implied that mankind has been wiped out by a nuclear holocaust which causes the mutations. Roger Zelazny's *Damnation Alley* exemplifies the harsh environment caused by a nuclear blast: hurling winds, unstable clouds and atmosphere make travelling nearly impossible. These post-apocalyptic images of a dying, barren and devastated Earth due to technological misuse are all evoked in the images of the barren Zone, in the greed for the artefacts, and the putrid city.

These images of greyness do not only convey the idea of a polluted, decaying and doomed landscape, they also reflect the characters' mood. Red expresses his despair using the metaphorical colour: "Every day was gray, and every evening, and every night" (39). The greyness of the landscape reflects Red's economic and social situation, his working class status and the despair of his restricted and immutable position, the mediocrity of his life and the restrictions he has to contend with on a daily basis in the shape of his struggle to earn a living. This mirrors Dickens's themes of sameness and routine: "every day was the same as yesterday and to-morrow, and every year the counterpart of the last and the next" (*Hard Times,* 26). Red comments on the difficult choice that he feels compelled to make: the choice between slavery and crime—in the shape of stalking. He feels forced to resort to stalking, and this idea of containment reifies the Russian slang for Gulag, the forced labour camp, his feelings of being pushed out of society and the French word "*zone*" connoting the idea of poverty. The Zone is the space for those left out by society, those caged by their social condition, as reflected by Tarkovsky's Stalker: "for me it's prison everywhere!", exemplifying the ideas of the "little zone" and the "big zone", suggesting that the world is an inescapable injustice.

In *Roadside Picnic*, the greenery has been destroyed by the Zone and the city, but it does not prevent Red from remembering it as an ideal, better space. Red remembers the verdure that was once surrounding the city:

> There once had been summer houses, gardens, orchards, and the summer villas of the city fathers and plant directors. Green, pleasant places with small lakes and clean sandy beaches, translucent birch groves, and ponds stocked with carp. The stink and pollution from the plant never reached this verdant glade—nor did the city plumbing system. But now everything was abandoned..." (53)

This demonstrates the effects of the Zone on nature. The village that surrounds what used to be the Zone used to be teaming with life. Despite the industrialisation of the city, through ore mining, this part of Harmont was not affected by the pollution from the Industrial Revolution or the developing sewer system. This beautiful landscape remained intact until the Visitation. This lengthy description of the village is quickly interrupted by a short, yet striking enunciation: the verdant, idyllic village is abandoned. The description of the village can be seen as an ideal: nature is left unspoilt. However, people left the village, which is opposed to the fact that outsiders are attempting to enter the cities: as Noonan demonstrates, the suburbs are being emptied, the centre is crowded and the villages abandoned. It is possible to see the villagers' move as an attempt to flee the evils of the Zone, to flee the stress and misleading promises of mass consumerism, which are depicted as unnatural. In contrast to this, the city attracts people, who fall prey to the lies and expectations of wealth generated by the artefacts.

The opposition between nature and city, organic and artefact, natural and artificial is reinforced by Red's craving for "the greenbacks". The name refers to the U.S dollar, to the piece of paper printed with green ink. The banknote was created during the American Civil War and was to revolutionise economics with such an innovation.[183] As Henry Brands points out in his work *Greenback Planet: How the Dollar Conquered the World and Threatened Civilization as We Know It*, the dollar was to become the dominating currency in the world. It is interesting to note the use of an American word in Canada, which has its own currency. This draws attention to the use of the word "greenback", which could strike one as out of place in the novel. This further reinforces the idea of globalism: the Zone has engulfed the world. It also draws attention to the opposition between the materialism in the novel and the greenery which can be viewed as utopian. The utopian ideal of the green countryside has been replaced and drawn out in green ink. Its value has been ascribed and dictated by outsiders, confined to the ideals and standards of those in power and replaced by currency.

This greenery being perverted by greed in the shape of note bills is exposed as Red and Kirill discuss the prospects of retrieving a full empty from the Zone, an

[183]See *Greenback Planet: How the Dollar Conquered the World and Threatened Civilization as We Know It* by Henry W. Brands.

artefact that had never been found up to that point. Red is unwilling to go into the Zone as the head of the military in the Institute found out about his stalking past, and he fears being punished for going there once again. Kirill, saddened by Red's unwillingness to go in the Zone asks Red what a full empty would cost. Red is disappointed, as he wanted to give Kirill something that would advance his own research; he wanted to gift the full empty to Kirill. He then resolves himself to being taken for the greedy stalker that he is. He reflects: "a stalker is a stalker. The more green stuff the better. He trades his life for the greenbacks" (13). The tautology Red uses indicates the totality of the stalker's greed: a stalker would risk his life for the wealth he can gain from selling the artefacts and cannot escape his nature. Life becomes valueless in the face of the money fetishism: the innate sense of self-preservation is perverted by man-made greed, which becomes second nature.

Red cannot think in other terms than those of exchange value of commodities, especially when involving money. After Red's second incursion into the Zone, after its being walled off, Red is sent to prison and he shifts his focus from money onto his family. His time in jail was never narrated, a sign that he was kept outside of the action and of the main narrative frame, giving the sense that Red had time to reflect on his condition. This shows through the fact that after his release, Red is resolved to changing his life: "Jail will never see me again. If you only knew how good it is to be home; I have the dough and I've picked out a new little cottage for myself, with a garden—as good as Buzzard's place" (116-7). Red wants to go back to nature, as he wants to get a cottage with a garden, reflecting the orchards and the idyllic country mentioned earlier on. However, the irony lies in the fact that Red wants to use money, the "greenbacks"; he wants to buy his happiness. Red wants to use dystopian means to fulfil his wish: Red has bought into the consumerist ideology into the very materialistic force which make the city grow, which in turn pervert nature.

The greenbacks therefore serve a very useful purpose in the novel: they wear the mask of hope, through their connection to the idea of greenery, but are the very tool of ideological oppression. Red believes the money will buy happiness, doing so reinforces the ideological consumerism. Red's wish for the cottage is not fulfilled: by the end of the novel, he is not any closer to getting it. This can be interpreted as Red making the wrong wish. Instead of wishing for something profound, he is greedy and

makes a selfish request, to "get a cottage for [*him*]*self*" (116-7, my italics). This is contrasted with the altruistic impulse at the end of the novel, when Red wishes for happiness for everyone. However, Red had to journey in order to understand this fact, a journey reminiscent of the fairy tale, but before doing so, he has to escape the man-made walls surrounding him, as detailed in the subsequent section.

Stalker and *Perdido Street Station* expose the reader and viewer to luscious forests and green lands. In *Perdido Street Station*, the interlude chapters placed between every part of the novel show Yagharek's journey from exile to reaching New Crobruzon. Doing so, he has to go through areas of vegetation. Yagharek describes the forest: "in secret places amongst its thick trees jutted vast, obscure, forgotten machines, pistons and gears, iron trunks among the wood, rust their bark" (242). This description conveys the idea that nature has reclaimed a former industrial parking garage of a warehouse, and that the outer layer of the trucks are rusting, while the forest is growing. This description recalls the landscape of Tarkovsky's *Stalker*: amongst the lush forest and grassy clearings are remnants of industrial buildings, of damp, rotting wooden electrical poles and rusting train tracks. These two works show that with time, nature can reclaim the fouled environments and develop a green, clean and natural atmosphere. The Zone is a "quiet", "beautiful" place, which the Stalker also calls "home": his respectful reverence to the Edenic Zone indicate the potential for redemption. However, just as the idea of greenery in *Roadside Picnic* is tainted by the materialistic greed, nature's recovery is undermined in *Stalker*, as the film shows the human potential to destroy and impede. The Stalker believes that the Zone's peacefulness and wholesomeness to be sustainable, stating that "Three men can't spoil the place in one day" to which the Writer retorts "They can". The ensuing silence is only broken by a remark that the flowers are not releasing any smell: the men's presence is in itself intrusive and destructive. This indicates that man cannot help but perpetuate his endless cycle of fall and destruction, thus affirming his inability to learn, effect lasting change and to look beyond the materialist and the consumerist greed. This message is encapsulated by Yagharek, as he experiences the city of New Crobuzon for the first time: he sees all the "sharp divides and fences, lines that separate this from that and yours from mine"(373). These ideas of segregation enacted through property and possession,

exclusion and exploitation, when added to the concept that "the industry had exploded in New Crobuzon" (381), indicate than man is too materialistic and superficial to see or find his path to utopia.

The colour green could be seen as an obvious colour to counteract the greyness and darkness that are associated to the polluting, poisonous industrialised city, symptomatic of man's greed. However, as *Roadside Picnic*, *Stalker* and *Perdido Street Station* illustrate, nature itself is under threat: the greenery is tainted by human's materialistic nature, and even captured and turned into a contaminating dystopian force. In *Roadside Picnic*, this takes the shape of the colour green symbolising money, excluding the country from the frame of the novel. In *Stalker* and *Perdido Street Station*, nature has only temporarily recovered from its injuries, but is under constant threat from man's onslaught. However, hope and utopia can be found in these works; the protagonists have first to find a way out from these constricted, restricted and restrictive spaces.

IV/ Inhibiting Movement: Agoraphobia, Claustrophobia and Anxieties

Roadside Picnic depicts a confined atmosphere and therefore gives a sense of claustrophobia to the novel. Instead of focusing on the trade that the development of the town of Harmont generates through the Zone and opening up the novel to other territories or other worlds, the novel confines itself to Harmont and its Zone. Just as in Isaac Asimov's *The Caves of Steel*, *Roadside Picnic* displays the claustrophobic tendencies of the characters. David Broderick explains that the setting of *The Caves of Steel* is an "overcrowded, claustrophobic Earth (those famous caves of steel)" (44). In *The Caves of Steel*, the action takes place in an expanded New-York, epitomic for its tall steel framed skyscrapers, such as the Empire State Building and the Chrysler Building, the world's tallest skyscrapers during the thirties. In the *Caves of Steel*, New-York becomes the symbol of urban overcrowding, overpopulation and lack of personal space: the lack of horizontal space means that man has to build upwards. While the novel feels claustrophobic and contained, New-Yorkers face another disorder: they fear the outside and open spaces. Their agoraphobia, their fear of the outdoors, means that they barely leave the city of New-York, which contributes to the sense of containment created in the novel. I want to show in this chapter that *Roadside Picnic* uses the Zone and the developing city of Harmont as symptomatic of the characters' agoraphobia and claustrophobia. This section will look at how the imagery of the wall serves to create feelings of containment and spatial anxieties for the characters, while showing how the unifying and constricting greed contributes to reinforce that feeling.

Jenny Wolmark has noted that "As a genre that is closely associated with temporal and spatial dislocation, science fiction has provided peculiarly apposite metaphors through which these anxieties can be articulated" (220).[184] Wolmark expresses that science fiction relates to and describes disorders, apprehensions and irrational fears that the concepts of space or time can generate, such as claustrophobia and agoraphobia. In *Roadside Picnic*, this is expressed through the depiction of Harmont as a space generating a sense of protection and a sense of

[184]Wolmark also notes that the cyberpunk subgenre is particularly focused on those themes of dislocation, which are common to the broader spectrum of postmodernity (p.220).

containment. This impacts on the way the characters perceive the space they inhabit: the spatial engineering and manipulation effect the characters ability to cope in their environment. A wall being erected around the Zone has consequences on the aspirations and hopes of the people of Harmont, and becomes detrimental to the possibility of utopia, since it needs to remain open. Since the horizontal plane is closed, space can only be manipulated vertically.

Before looking into the expressions of spatial anxieties in *Roadside Picnic*, it is essential to show the differences and similarities between agoraphobia and claustrophobia. Agoraphobia is broadly defined as the fear of open spaces, while claustrophobia is described as the fear of enclosed spaces. However, the difference between the two disorders is not that clear-cut. Vladan Starcevic explains that agoraphobia is in fact the fear and avoidance of situations in which escape might be difficult or embarrassing (27). Starcevic's statement shows the complexity of agoraphobia, as it includes feelings of containment and fear of others. The presence of other people becomes a source of anxiety, itself reinforced by the fear that these people might perceive and realise the discomfort and anxiety raised by being within a crowd, also engendering fears of not being able to escape the crowd or the perceived embarrassment. Agoraphobics also avoid places such as trains, where crowds would block the ways out, and leaving the train whilst in motion is not possible. Feeling anxious in an enclosed space such as a train is reminiscent of the fear of enclosed spaces, that is claustrophobia.

As Vladan Starcevic notes, the difference between agoraphobia and claustrophobia is not so definite: "an important relationship exists between claustrophobia and agoraphobia. The situation feared and avoided by patients with claustrophobia and agoraphobia (e.g., elevators, tunnels, planes, other enclosed places) are often very similar and pertain to confinement" (209). Sufferers of either of these two spatial disorders fear and attempt to avoid the situations of confinement in which they might be placed, whether these are indoors or outdoors situations, social or spatial. Starcevic explains that claustrophobia sufferers tend to avoid constricted, enclosed spaces for fear of chocking, while agoraphobia sufferers avoid wider (social) spaces, in which they may feel dizzy or an unsteadiness towards the wide openness they have to face. The two disorders can be differentiated by the

various symptoms that they display: the claustrophobic feels constrained and chocked, the agoraphobic overwhelmed by the vast open fields or the vast crowds of unexplored otherness, feels dizzy or faint. (Ibid.). Starcevic pursues by explaining that claustrophobic fears can be viewed as being part of the broader spatial anxieties that agoraphobia covers, and even that claustrophobia can be a trigger for agoraphobia (209). As Deborah Wilde shows: "agoraphobia and claustrophobia may exist in a dynamic relationship. The agoraphobic, by retreating from the world, may become claustrophobic and, in breaking out of his retreat, he risks re-encountering agoraphobic anxieties" (150-1). There is a strong connection between claustrophobia and agoraphobia which can contribute to further the understanding of the dynamic relations between the wall and spatial anxieties in *Roadside Picnic*.

In *The Dispossessed*, the wall embodies the idea of containment, or even worse, of imprisonment: it becomes associated with claustrophobia when Shevek, on board the *Mindful*, felt "a dry and wretched void without past or future. The walls stood tight about him" (8). Shevek, alone and cast away in his room and unable to escape is quickly angered by his imprisonment. His sense of claustrophobia pushes him to anger: unable to leave, Shevek hits the intercom of the room which can be read as his will to fight his containment (9). Laurence Davis explains that, in *The Dispossessed*, the walls are a symbol of "mutual isolation" (13) between Anarres and Urras. These images of confinement and isolation are reminiscent of Red's struggle in *Roadside Picnic*.

Roadside Picnic creates a confined atmosphere by locating the action only to the town of Harmont, thus creating a sense of isolation, seclusion and exclusion.[185] The novel opens with an interview of Dr Pilman, the doctor who has studied the location pattern of the six Zones on Earth (p.1). This informs the reader that there are other Zones and that the Harmonite Visitation is not an isolated incident. However, instead of introducing the idea of international collaboration between the various Zones, the narrative confines the action to the Zone located in Harmont. This is made

[185] Richard Stites explains that the Soviet writers were writing images of a "unified globe" (180): "The global unity of science fiction was not a Russanized world, but a cosmopolitan one where the capital was more often London or Paris than Moscow, where Russia was part of a United States of Socialist Europe or Eurasia—or simply an undifferentiated sector of the planet. Implicit is the hoped for acceptance of the Russians into an egalitarian world order" (180). Soviet utopias depicted a world in which the USSR is no longer rejected, but instead part of an egalitarian system, engaging with the rest of the world on an equal footing.

obvious through the chapter titles which locate the action in the "Harmont Radio" (3), "the Harmont branch of the International Institute for the Extraterrestrial Cultures" (7) and "the Harmont branch of the IIEC" (83). As for the chapters which do not mention where the action takes place, the title clearly indicates that the focus of the chapter is Redrick Schuhart, who is confined to Harmont. The chapter titles give a snapshot of the enclosed location and of the confinement of the narrative.[186]

Harmont is the only place of action—despite other Zones existing; this gives the sense that the Harmonite Zone is unique, different, and even more so, sheltered. This is accentuated by the walls surrounding the Zone itself. Early on in the novel, the institute, the body in charge of studying artefacts from the Zone, is attempting to wall off the Zone. The institute wants to make the Zone inaccessible to thieves—or stalkers as they are known in Harmont. Red is in the local bar when he receives the piece of information. Dick, his drinking partner, explains: "They're starting a lot of construction. The institute is putting up three new buildings and besides that they're planning to wall off the Zone from the cemetery to the old ranch. The good times are over for the stalkers" (39). Sealing off the Zone suggests that the stalkers will find it difficult to enter and retrieve the precious artefacts and reinforces the themes of confinement.

This confinement is created by the erection of a wall around the Zone: it shield the Zone from the outside world and outsiders such as Red who want to exploit it. The desire for authorities to protect the Zone from the outside becomes more apparent when Red, who is sitting in the Borscht, enjoys a drink after a visit in the Zone. There, he meets Aloysius Macnaught, the "Agent Plenipotentiary of the Emigration Bureau" (35), or as Red has it, the person who "bugs people to leave the

[186] It is possible to read the concept of confinement and isolation as dystopian. As Fredric Jameson notes: "in Thomas More, the imagining of Utopia is constitutively related to the possibility of establishing some spatial closure (the digging of the great trench which turns "Utopia" into a self-contained island). The lonely oceanographic station and the penal island thus mark the return of devices of spatial closure and separation which, formally required for the establishment of some "pure" and positive utopian space, thus always tend to betray the ultimate contradictions in the production of utopian figures and narratives. (*AOTF*, p.291). Richard Stites makes a similar point when he quotes Jerome Gilison: "utopians need a unified globe because islands of utopia can be corrupted or invaded" (180). Isolated utopias can be attacked, invaded and destroyed by outsiders, and are therefore required to protect themselves. The walling off the island from the rest of the world is precisely, in Jameson's view, what enables a dystopian reading of *Utopia* as it constitutes the "essential and determinate absence or 'other'" ("Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalization and the Production of Utopian Discourse", p.9). Isolation and confinement are what prevent people from experiencing otherness and difference, which can be seen as the opening to utopia.

city" (Ibid). Red declines his offer for reasons that Salvestroni Simonetta clarifies: comfort can be found in "the security of the small town and its meeting places" (299). Red knows his home town which provides familiarity and safety: "My dream is to die in my home town" (Ibid) and explains his attachment to the city of Harmont: "Fond memories of childhood. My first kiss in the municipal park. My mommy and daddy. My first time drunk, right here in this bar. The police station to my heart... [...] No, I can't leave for any amount" (Ibid). For Red, the outside world is not an attractive prospect, especially since the town he is familiar with provides him with comfort and security from the perceived dangers of the vastness of the world and he does not want to give up on the security provided by the familiarity of the town. Red is telling Macnaught that he is not ready to leave, that is, until he dies. This invocation of death can be seen as an extreme form of his agoraphobic fears.

Red's refusal to leave Harmont can be linked to agoraphobic fears on another level. As explained previously, Red is proud of Harmont, of the "hole into the future" (36), of all the technological possibilities offered by the artefacts. Red defends the name of Harmont from the offensive and abusive Macnaught, who calls it a "hick town" (Ibid.). Red's defensive attitude is quickly dismissed by Macnaught who asks whether Red really believes in his vision of a prosperous and fair future for Harmont. Red refines his point: "It is none of your business what I really believe. I was speaking for the city. As for myself, what do you have in Europe that I haven't seen? I know about your boredom. You knock yourself out all day and watch TV all night" (36). Red's statement is heavily connoted. Red reaffirms that there is truth in the idea that Harmont is a small enclosed space with no links to the outside world but which will one day open itself up to it through discoveries. Red's stance is different. He denies the need to leave the city, to reach the openness of Europe, stating that it is a space providing the same characteristics as any other space. His unwillingness to go to Europe is a reaffirmation of Harmont making him feel comfortable and an assertion of his agoraphobic fears. Red becomes very defensive and aggressive when confronted with the prospects of going out of Harmont: his defensive attitude should be read as the result of panic arising from his having to face the idea of being sent to a vast, unknown space, to be displaced out of his comfort Zone. His reaction can be read as the result of the "fight or flight" response: Red does not want to flee—or

fears the idea of fleeing—so he fights Macnaught, attacking his proposition, defending and maintaining his comfortable position.

Red's statement highlights another point of contention which he resents: he does not want to go to Europe as it is plagued by boredom. The word "boredom" relates to the French word *ennui*, a reference to the concept introduced by Charles Baudelaire in *Les Fleurs du Mal*, in which he associates *ennui* to crime, debauchery, evil, vice, the modern greed and materialism.[187] In the opening poem of *Les Fleurs du Mal*, entitled "Au Lecteur", Baudelaire writes "Aux objets répugnants nous trouvons des appas" (l.14) (In most repugnant objects we find charms), showing that one of the sins that Baudelaire talks about in the collection of poems is greed.[188] Brooks Landon views the idea of *ennui* as central to *Roadside Picnic*. Landon states that the Strugatsky brothers' work was concerned "not with specific political conditions so much as with 'the convergence of Eastern and Western *ennui*, the fruit of global acquiescence to purely material satisfactions and the abdication of all higher moral purposes—the victory of 'realism' over utopian idealism'" (97). Here, Landon highlights the importance of the idea of *ennui* in the novel: *Roadside Picnic* is about the political constraints of consumerism in an industrialised society. Even more so: the novel is about a certain globalisation of *ennui* associated with the growing urban landscapes, with cities filled with meaninglessness, sin and, in the case of *Roadside Picnic*, with the utmost consumerist greed and materialism, thus becoming the very obstacle to utopia.

Leo Bersani exposes a particular aspect of the Baudelairian *ennui*: "Unlike these other evils mentioned in the poem, *Ennui* is a state in which *any* evil might be committed. Its peculiarity is to be empty; it is precisely because there is nothing in boredom itself that it accommodates anything. […]. It is a vacuum; it would destroy the world merely by sucking it into its own void" (27). Bersani expresses the idea of consuming emptiness associated with boredom, which can interestingly apply to *Roadside Picnic*. The idea of boredom as a feeling of emptiness is reminiscent of the "empties" in the novel; those mysterious containers filled with nothingness.

[187] Leo Bersani describes Baudelaire's concept of ennui as a "vacuum" (27) which can be easily filled with evil or crime, which is also associated with consumerism. Elisabeth Goodstein, in her work entitled *Experience Without Qualities: Boredom and Modernity*, details how this sense of ennui is very much associated with the urban landscape, as opposed to the idyllic country (101-28).
[188] Translation obtained in the Oxford University Press edition of 1993. Trans. By James Mc Gowan.

Scientists and the military-industrial complex look for empties to study them, and Red strives to find a full empty for Kirill at the beginning of the novel. The oxymoron present in "full-empty" shows that people are attempting to place meaning in something devoid of it: people fill the void with meaningless dreams of greed. The empties are one of the most often mentioned artefacts, and the main signifier of greed. Through the artefact of the full-empty, the emptiness of space becomes associated to greed. *Ennui* is an all-consuming force, an invading void, which, according to Red, has conquered Europe. To Red, the European soul is therefore like an empty, an exposed landscape causing fear to the agoraphobic.

Red relates the concept of boredom to watching television, which can be a passive activity. In Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, the characters are fed images and information at such speed that they do not have time to engage, think, or digest what is shown. The characters are subjected to constant advertising, which drives their greed and thoughts; they continually look for the latest models of television, listen to the radio while sleeping and are brainwashed by omnipresent advertising. With that in mind, we can see that Red views watching TV as a, controlling and materialistic hobby, perfectly embodying the concept of *ennui.* Red wants to stay in Harmont, where he naively believes he can rectify the woes of the world and put an end to the dystopian *ennui*.

The idea of *ennui* can be further linked to the idea of urban planning: Camillo Sitte, an Austrian architect and theoretician, exposes the relation between the size of a city, *ennui* and agoraphobia. The growth of the city can trigger a sense of loss of human scale. Sitte states relates agoraphobia to large squares: "On our modern gigantic plazas, with their yawning emptiness and oppressive *ennui*, the inhabitants of snug old towns suffer attacks of this fashionable agoraphobia" (in Vidler, p.27). As cities grow, and become more populated, the plaza, that is the open square, becomes a space of anxiety: in the emptiness of the plaza, one becomes exposed and becomes the target and focus of the other's attention. The comfort of the small town where people know one another is dismantled by the growth of the city: the plaza, former meeting place, has become a zone of discomfort and one needs to retreat to the

shelter offered by the tall buildings and the shops to find solace from agoraphobia and the oppressive *ennui*.[189]

Red's refusal to move to Europe can be read on Sitte's terms: Red feels comfortable in his snug "hometown" (35), in the neighbourhoods where he and his family know everyone. He fears the outside, the overcrowded European cities, the unknown other citizens. Red's agoraphobia is therefore social. He fears the gathering of people, created through industrialisation and he resents the political, social structure that this engenders. Red's point of view and aspirations become apparent at this point of the novel. He says to Macnaught that: "We're going to dump so much through this hole into your lousy world that everything will change in it" (36). This indicates that, at this stage, he hopes that Harmont will change the rest of the world, put an end to power structures present in the city and instil a fairer system; Red is here stating his utopian wish.

Despite his agoraphobia, Red reaches out to the world. Red's action could seem contradictory: if Red fears the outside and public spaces, it seems contradictory for him to reach out, as fear could prevent him from doing so. Paul Carter, who has worked on the relation between space and agoraphobia, explains this apparent contradiction. Carter states that "Agoraphobia is a movement inhibition. […] it is not the inhibition of *any* movement, but the arrest of a double impulse, a movement out of oneself towards the other, and a movement away from the other towards oneself. These conclusions may still be general. They insist, though, that agoraphobia is an ailment specific to the other, or allegorical, space of public places and their discontents." (179-80).[190] Agoraphobia prevents one from moving towards the other, despite one's desire to do so. Hence the subject is affected on two levels: his desire to reach for otherness is stopped by his incapacity to move. However, this very inhibition is brought about by one's dissatisfaction with the other, with society and the way it is disorganised. Carter's statement embodies Red's predicament: Red wants to rescue Europe and the world from the widespread *ennui* and mass consumerism and, by doing so, he hopes to cure his own disorder. However, it is this very mass

[189] Philip Strick states that "Science fiction writers like Simak, Bradbury and Kuttner, with varying degrees of irony, have frequently recognised ... the ideal city contains no citizens whatever" (qtd in Sobchack, 131). Science fiction has a solution to agoraphobia in the shape of a depopulated city.
[190] See also Starcevic, quoted p. 190-1 of this work.

consumerism and obsession with commodity which strikes fear and prevents him from reaching out. His claim that Harmont will flood the world with wealth and progress is the expression of his utopian wish for a fairer and better world.

At this stage of the novel, it seems that possibilities are open, that Utopia is possible, as Red believes Harmont is going to be the site of change. However, this rapidly changes. Red notices a "lot of new faces around" (39) and Dick points out that the Institute is starting the construction of the wall around the Zone (Ibid). As Harmont attracts more and more people, thus growing into a city, the institute and the industrial-military complex feel the need to wall off the Zone and to protect the artefacts within. The building of the wall symbolises the exclusion and confinement of people and artefacts: Harmont is not to flood the world with discoveries. The wall symbolises constrictions and restrictions, which will confer on the novel a sense of claustrophobia. It also announces a shift: the utopian impulse is impeded, giving way to a dystopian constricting world.

The shift from agoraphobia to claustrophobia can mainly be seen through the fact that Red tries to leave the city of Harmont after being jailed, but is prevented from doing so because "emigration has been forbidden" (117), which is starkly opposed to Red's being offered to leave the town. Red's being jailed is on a par with Harmont being quarantined: a sense of imprisonment is created reinforcing Red's being confined to his current social condition. The government's decision to prevent people from leaving Harmont was sparked by the fact that catastrophes occurred round the world: Harmonites who had lived through the Visitation were causing accidents in the cities in which they relocated, as if cursed by the Visitation, as Dr Pilman explains (108), or rather, as if they were spreading the curse of greed. The symbol of the boundary here shifts: the wall changes from a protective, sheltering symbol, to an oppressive, consuming symbol, epitomised in Red's being quarantined within his own city.

By walling off the Zone, Harmont, and more specifically the institute and military-industrial complex, have shut the door to the event of the Visitation, to the otherness of the artefacts, and thus to the aliens. Gregory Benford exposes how science fiction normally depicts humans as needing the alien. He explains that humanity "cannot stand emptiness, the flip side of infinity" (276). He continues:

"Nearly all science fiction attempts to answer this supreme agoraphobia by populating the yawning abyss. The longing for alien contact seems to fulfil a parallel need" (Ibid) and concludes that "aliens give us companionship, making the infinities comfy" (Ibid).[191] For Benford, science fiction is a genre that reaches out to the other, to the alien, to the exploration of new possibilities, change and utopia. This very fact has been turned on itself in *Roadside Picnic*: the door has been shut to the alien as man retreats to himself and his materialistic desires, causing his claustrophobia. Pilman points out that by turning the alien artefacts into commodities, by using them differently to "the way the visitors use them" (106), Harmonites close the door to otherness, change and the possibility of progress.

Another association between the city and claustrophobia can be found in the opening of Clifford Simak's *City*, which describes the metropolis as a negative entity.[192] *City* depicts a world in which cities have become the target of attacks and which have been depopulated as people fled to protect their lives. Mankind ultimately leaves Earth as the cities have crumbled and as it cannot cope with its agoraphobia. Dogs have taken over the world; they are capable of speech and of structuring their society. *City* is an animal fable, a compilation of the dogs' tales about the downfall of humanity. Each tale opens with a cultural, informative background of the notions that are debated by the dogs. The first tale introduces their disputes over the idea of "city". The narrator explains that the canine authorities regard the city as an impossible structure, from the economical, sociological and mostly from a psychological standpoint, stating that "No creature of the highly nervous structure necessary to develop a culture […] would be able to survive within such restricted limits" (7), and if they managed, it would result in "neuroticism" (Ibid).[193] The narrator expresses the dystopian vision of the cities: no creature

[191] This recalls Carl G. Jung's idea that the alien, and most notably UFOs, are a psychic projection of man's desire to escape the condition of exclusion, war and feeling of imprisonment (*Flying Saucers,* 14-7).

[192] Zamyatin stated that "life in big cities is like that in factories: it de-individualizes, makes people somehow all the same, machine like" (in Stites, p.187). Richard Stites points out that this statement is reflected in *We*, where the world is made up of one city, where everyone is the same. This statement draws the attention to the de-individualisation of people in *Roadside Picnic*.

[193]Asimov's Robots series is probably one of the most quoted examples of the depiction of the claustrophobic city, with the mostly quoted *Caves of Steel*. Pascal Thomas highlights the "dystopian and oppressive environment" (178) of New-York City created in the novel, by the fact that children are playing with the pedestrian conveyor belts. This is re-iterated by Scott Bukatman: the city is "claustrophobic and isolating, an outsized monadic structure sealed off from its surrounds" (125).

civilised and clever enough would cope with the claustrophobic conditions created within a city. The point expressed by the narrator is that cities are not a favourable environment for the flourishing of culture or society as a socially friendly environment. The city devalues culture, causes stress and anxiety, and this again relates to the idea of *ennui* explored earlier.[194] However, what shows through the quotation is the idea of the city as a restricted space: despite being an extended vast space, its crowded nature results in claustrophobia.

In *Roadside Picnic*, the effects of this claustrophobia caused by the oppressive space can be observed on Red, notably through his feeling of containment and anxiety, observable in his panic attacks, notably when he is confined and imprisoned inside the Zone, unable to leave as the police are waiting for him outside. Red is in the cemetery part of the Zone, near the "wall that broke off on the left" (47). The only exit, the only breach in the wall is blocked and guarded by the patrol guards. It is symbolic of the fact that Red's only means of wealth and of social ascension is guarded by oppressive figures of authority. He is thus confined to the Zone, the area of poverty, the suburb, as if caged to his condition. While he waits for the patrol guard to leave, Red can hear and barely distinguish someone moving in the cemetery. Red is not sure of the details of the apparition, as he did not have much time to wait and observe what the shape was, but he "filled the details with his imagination" (47). This statement clearly shows that Red is not rational: his mind wanders and constructs erroneous statements instead of resorting to logic. Subsequently, Red is seen reaching for his flask and pulling it, and holding "its warm metal against his cheek for a while" (47). Red reaches out for his alcohol as a way to relieve his anxiety, which emanates from the Zone.[195]This episode is mirrored at the end of the novel, when Red offers Arthur, the son of the former stalker Burbridge who lost his legs in the Zone, a sip from his flask for "courage" (122).

The imagery of entrapment is also reflected and paralleled in this last section of the novel. Red and Arthur are looking for the Golden Ball, when Red feels a warm

[194]See p. 194-6. For more information on how science fiction depicts cities as dystopian, see Pascal Thomas "Avenues of Power: Cities as the Mindscapes of Politics", Scott Bukataman's *Terminal Identity: The Virtual Subject in Postmodern Science Fiction*, or Annette Kuhn's *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science Fiction Cinema*.

[195]It is well documented that anxiety sufferers sometimes use alcohol as an instant relief from anxiety. However, using alcohol can increase anxiety in the long term, or lead to dependence. See Ronald Doctor and Ada Kahn's *The Encyclopaedia of Phobias, Fears, and Anxieties*.

current which he describes as “death” (133), an exaggerated statement illustrating his inability to reason in a moment of panic. All the signs that Red fears death, and in fact panics, are present during his avoidance of the heat wave caused by the burning fluff, the devil's spit or the witches jelly. As he feels the first signs of the burning sensation, Red tries “not to move, still hoping that it would blow over, even though he realized that they were trapped” (131). As Red and Arthur are assailed by the burning fluff, Red shows signs of anxiety and is paralysed by fear. The heat, equalling to the symptoms of claustrophobia, increase: “The heat was increasing, overwhelming him, enveloping his body like a sheet soaked in boiling water. Sweat poured into his eye” (131-2). Red feels uncomfortably warm and has difficulty breathing. This is confirmed at the end of the incident, Red “did not remember when it all ended. He understood only that he could breathe again, that the air was air again, and not steam that burned his throat” (132). Red feels like he was choking and air was burning, all signs, as Starcevic points out, of a claustrophobic panic attack.

Another instance of Red’s feeling claustrophobic occurs in close proximity to the city centre of Harmont, which incidentally further serves to link the Zone to the city centre. Red is about to see Throaty and his gang to sell them the goods that he has brought back from his trip to the Zone with Burbridge, when another claustrophobic attack occurs, however, this is the first time that it happens to him outside of the Zone. Red feels a “burning sensation under his eyelids” (67). Red comes to a realisation, as the narrator indicates: “And then it hit him” (67). Red “had never experienced anything like this before outside the Zone” (Ibid). Red's sense of smell becomes acute,

> It was as though he was were in a different world. A million odors cascaded in on him at once [...] The air became hard, it developed edges, surfaces, and corners, like space was filled with huge, stiff balloons, slippery pyramids, gigantic prickly crystals, and he had to push his way through it all (Ibid.).

Red feels very confined so that he has difficulty in breathing. He is feeling displaced and cornered, as if he were in an alien environment, as if he were in the Zone. The feeling of restraint that he felt in the Zone, this clearly defined claustrophobic space, is felt in the centre again, near the Metropole Hotel. Red rationalises his feeling by explaining that “It hadn't been a different world—it was this world turning a new,

unknown side to him" (67). The Zone invades and permeates the centre, alienating all that is. Red is failing to adapt to this new, alienating and de-humanizing urban world that he does not understand, that cages him.

Red's inability to fit in society is metaphorically expressed in spatial and social terms. His agoraphobia demonstrates a fear of the other and an inability to open himself to difference and to explore new, unknown spaces. His agoraphobia expresses a fear of progress, as it can be seen through his view of *ennui* as a negative, subversive and vicious force. The city of Harmont develops into a metropolis: people are attracted to the city by the promise of wealth and the city grows; a sign of the outside invading the inside. The Zone—symbol of the outskirts, the suburbs and the outside—has invaded the inside, resulting in an overcrowding and causing Red's claustrophobia. Space become homogeneous, as neutralised, dissolving difference, openness and change.

V/ Going Upwards: Spatialisation of Hierarchy

Red hoped that his ideal little town would help relieve the world from its consumerist greed and materialist nature, from its anxieties and *ennui*, and provide utopia. However, the Zone is a complex and dual space, a neutralising space, as Roland Boer demonstrates:

> The Zone is also an empty signifier that throws into question the reality it invades. The Zone […] is the most developed form of neutralization, for within and outside the zone all physical and social patterns are altered in unrecognizable ways. Not only is there a negation of present social and economic relations but also of conventional expectations of what utopia might be; in this very neutralization, in allowing a play of contradictions that are normally repressed, they provide a taste of utopia. At the same time, such neutralisation opens up the possibility for dystopia. (121)

Boer explains that the Zone invades the town of Harmont; which results in the total alteration of social and physical relations. At the beginning of the novel, the Zone yields the promise of utopia, through the artefacts. However, as the Zone expands, as the inside invades the outside, this promise of utopia is denied, notably through man's attitude of shutting off otherness. This results in the negation or neutralisation of space: Harmont becomes a meaningless void, a vacuum, which can be associated with *ennui,* a hollow and shallow greed.

Greed and materialism have flooded the town of Harmont. Harmont has not reached out to the world, but the world has invaded Harmont.[196] This shows through the fact that more and more people immigrate to Harmont, as Red indicates: he takes a taxi after his meeting with Throaty and notices that he does not know the driver, that he was

> One of the hundreds that had poured into Harmont in the last few years to look for exciting adventures, untold riches, world fame, or some special religion. They poured in and ended up as chauffeurs, construction workers, or thugs– thirsting, wretched, tortured by vague desires, profoundly disillusioned, and certain that they had been tricked once again. Half of them, after hanging around for a month or two, returned to their homes, cursing, and spreading the word of their disillusionment to all the countries of the world. (73)

[196]Roland Boer explains that "the zone is a place to which people are drawn, since they hope for something great from it. The zone produces in people greed and hope, destruction and salvation" (120-1). The Zone attracts more people, hoping to enrich themselves on the artefacts of the Zone. Boer's point stresses again the duality of the Zone: it can offer promises and destruction alike. Boer also hints at the fact the population of Harmont has grown.

Firstly, this indicates that the city has grown: Red used to know all the drivers, as it could be the case in a small village where everyone knows one another, but the growing city creates anonymity. The driver is one of the many strangers and foreigners who have come to Harmont, attracted by the promise of wealth, fame and excitement that the Zone has to offer. Red, who hoped that Harmont would flood the world with progress, witnesses his town turn progressively into a crowded city populated by greedy hopefuls. Reality proves to be different from what Red had hoped: the artefacts are carefully protected and the wealth generated is not equally distributed, is not shared with the world. As a consequence, the city implodes: the immigrants fleeing the injustice of Harmont spread their disillusionment, frustrations and shattered dreams with the world. Harmont becomes an urban centre, attracting worldwide recognition, becoming in the process a worldwide centre of frustration spreading disappointment and distress.

In the same manner as it becomes an allegory of the ghettos and the city centre, the Zone reflects the Harmonite and the world's woes. This duality can be read in light of Scott Bukatman's idea of the new city in science fiction, whereby the city is both "micro- and macro-cosm" (126).[197] Bukatman indicates that the city is "characterized by its boundlessness" (126): it has no longer any borders, it engulfs the world, as is the case with Harmont's dynamic relation with the rest of the world. Since there are no more boundaries, there is no differentiation between inside and outside. Bukatman pursues: this very boundlessness is "reconciling the irreconcilable differences between public and private, or inside and outside" (Ibid.). Since there are no boundaries, the private and the public, the inside and the outside intermingle.[198] Some striking examples of the outside being brought into the private sphere can be found in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* through the telescreens which make privacy

[197] The theme of Earth being one city is common in science fiction and reflects this duality very well as in Huxley's *Brave New World*, where the World State rules; Zamyatin's *We* and the One State, where the world is reduced to one giant city. The underlying idea of one world government is close to the unification of a united world, as in H.G Well's *The Shape of Things to Come*, Joe Haldeman's *Forever War*. The space opera subgenre of science fiction also shows a unified Earth or Terran federation working with other planets to preserve freedom and humanity. This echoes Bukatman's point that the city is both "monumental and without scale" (126): science fiction cities are so large that they lose any human proportion. See also Richard Stites *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*, in which he talks about Yakov Okunev's *The Coming World*, which depicts the world as one mega-city where the only rule is to be free.

[198] I have already touched on this subject in the chapter focusing on *The Dispossessed*. See p. 27 for more details.

impossible; the security cameras invading each and every flat in *The Towers of Utopia* by Mark Reynolds; or the lack of opaque walls in *We*, with the all-powerful One State engulfing the world. In the case of *Roadside Picnic*, this is expressed through the suburb and the centre becoming the same neutralised space and figures of authorities such as the institute or the black market gangs ruling over the neutralised space.

A question arises: if the city does not have boundaries, where does this leave the image of the wall? Bukatman answers this for us: "the walls are no longer so solid, nor so impermeable—'the appearance of surfaces hides a secret of transparency'" (126), but this is only an optical illusion. The wall becomes translucent, aerial. This is reminiscent of the Zone in which "The air became hard, it developed edges, surfaces"(67).[199] The air has texture and becomes palpable: it is rigid, rough and unmovable, like a wall, giving the impression that Red is in a glass cage, trapped by a transparent, seemingly inconsistent wall. This is also reminiscent of the glass buildings so central in Zamyatin's *We*: the One State is surrounded by a wall made of glass. The wall in *We* is a good example metaphorically illustrating how it becomes transparent, illusionary and yet not abolished. It gives the illusion of openness, as it is see-through and allows people to gaze outside, however, the wall is still there and impeding movement. A contradiction arises: the wall still exists, and seems no longer solid. In *Roadside Picnic*, this symbolic wall begets ideological connotations: the wall around the Zone, around the promise of wealth and progress held by the artefacts is ideologically dissolved, making people believe that they can obtain prosperity. However, the wall is very real: the artefacts are secretly guarded by the institute and the military. While the wall is a symbol of transparency, a make-belief of access to opportunities provided by the Zone, it is also admittedly a means to prevent stalkers from entering the Zone. This discourse has a two-fold purpose: one the one hand, it serves to create social exclusion. On the other hand, this justification of the erection of the wall serves to reinforce this ideological transparency: it is only by protecting the artefacts and the Zone from criminals and the underachievers that prosperity can be gained by all. The open admission of the need of the wall, the transparency and the justification that artefacts need to be

[199] See p. 200.

protected from stalkers can serve to diminish and undermine the ideological wall, making it seemingly disappear, offering an illusion of accessibility, ensuring faith from the population. The protective barricade nonetheless remains, excluding and pushing stalkers and the poorest away.

The wall remains, despite space becoming homogeneous, absorbed and seemingly unified. This creates an excess of inside, as Žižek would have it.[200] In the case of *Roadside Picnic*, the wall is a transparent, all-encompassing symbol, denying exteriority—since it has been dissolved by the excess of inside. For Bukatman, since there are no longer any boundaries, since emptiness has been conquered and the city remains, the only direction that one can take is vertical. He states: "The new urban space is directionless—coordinates are literally *valueless* when all directions lead to more or less the same" (126). Values—latitude and longitude—do not matter. Throughout the world, the same "values" prevail: the *ennui* that Red describes at the beginning of the novel and the Harmonite greed have conquered all inhabitable space. It does not mean, though, that science fiction entirely loses a sense of movement. Instead of the traditional horizontal directionality, "it is becoming increasingly common to find oneself *suspended* in a massive space, rather than trapped at its bottom" (Bukatman, 126). City skyscrapers therefore perform that function of suspending characters in space. This can be seen as a direct consequence of the ideological connotations of the wall: the fear of the outside, of the other, and the resulting overcrowding oppresses, traps and chokes the individual. To escape this oppression, only one way remains: upwards.

The idea of verticality introduces the concept of hierarchy. Bukatman continues:

> The notion of the buried city where the privileged strata are those closest to the surface is axiomatic of the confused space (the "total space") of the metropolis, public but enclosed, expansive but claustrophobic. The street, once the central site of circulation and exchange, and around which urban space was once conceived, can now be located (only with difficulty) at the nearly invisible bottom of a narratively and spatially decentered environment. (128)

Bukatman indicates that despite the possibility of movement offered by the city on a vertical level, it remains a claustrophobic environment. The totality of the city—its

[200] See footnote 17 p. 27, and Scott Bukatman' *Terminal Identity*, p.164

boundlessness—is what makes the city claustrophobic: it can no longer expand and therefore implodes within its own barriers, upwards and/or downwards. The shift in movement is marked by the abandonment of the streets, which were the main avenues for people to circulate. In the ascending city, they are replaced with the apparent boundlessness of the air, a total freedom of movement; that is, for those who can get to the top. However, as Bukatman demonstrates, other types of boundaries are put in place: the literal verticality becomes a metaphor for the social strata of the society depicted. The dichotomy of inside/outside is replaced with that of high/low; however the claustrophobic totality is reinforced by the totality of ideological strata.

This is a theme very well exploited and analysed in Asimov's *The Caves of Steel*, in which humans are kept in the lower spheres of Earth. They are regimented by the Spacers, former human beings who have colonised other worlds, regulating them to avoid overpopulation and pollution and to keep them rich. This creates a dichotomy of high and low: the Spacers live in luxury, while struggling City-dwellers rely on the Spacers for food and other necessities. The Spacers also regulate movement, so that the City-dwellers cannot leave Earth and contaminate the Spacer worlds. The same axiomatic dichotomy is present in Alistair Reynold's *Terminal World*, in which individuals cannot cross vertical Zones. The city of Spearpoint is built on several planes, or zones. The lower the zone, the lower the technology. The highest zone is that of the angels', who die if they fall in the lower zones. In the angels Celestial Levels, the highest technological advances are made. People living in the lowest zone, Horsetown, a world technologically similar to the pre-industrial age, wore hats, as they do not want to be "permanently reminded of a place of swift machines and electric marvels" (78). Those who reside in the highest sphere are therefore figures of power and oppression, while lower spheres live in the shadow of the top; the people living on the surface remain defeated by those living above.[201]

These images of hierarchy being associated with wealth are present in *Roadside Picnic.* Red's meeting with Throaty takes place in the Metropole hotel, a

[201]This idea of the shadowy bottom has become predominant in science fiction imagery, and as Pascal Thomas details, during the reconstruction of cities after the Second World War, "much of the nineteenth century's dystopian view of cities (à la Dickens) was still prevalent" (177). The idea of the city as a negative space still remains: Dickens images of a grey, submissive and unfair city prevails in science fiction and dystopia.

tall, at least eight-storey building. The elevator scene serves to illustrate that the Metropole hotel is a place for wealthy people to stay and also reinforces the sense of claustrophobia in the novel, as elevators are the epitome of a confined space feared by claustrophobia sufferers.[202] Red takes the elevator, which is empty at first: "He didn't manage to close the door in time and others crowded in" (68) and "Redrick was pushed into the corner" (Ibid). Red attempts to be alone in the lift, to enjoy some space and comfort, literally and figuratively, and to recover from his panic attack when he was pushed against the wall of the Metropole hotel. Instead, a symbolic thing happens: Red is cornered, making any escape impossible, therefore attracting attention to the importance of the elevator. Red's ascension is made difficult and controlled by those who are wealthy.[203]

The elevator is also intrinsically linked with tall building, and skyscrapers, therefore becoming emblematic of the dichotomy of high and low. The lift is directionless, has only one set of coordinates and can only go up and down; it is valueless since it is like any other lift in Harmont or in the world. The lift takes Red to the eighth floor, to an area reminiscent of the Zone, demonstrating how omnipresent the Zone really is, and further associating it with greed and power. The eighth floor could either be indicative of prosperity, as in Chinese numerology, it is the symbol of wealth. It also looks like the symbol for infinity, an idea of an everlasting greed, especially in light of the fact that Red can only access "the corridors of power and plenty" (Landon, 99) of the eighth floor to sell his artefacts. There, Red is patronized by Throaty who calls him "son" (70; 72), and although this can be seen as affectionate, it is also a demeaning term carrying Throaty's sense of superiority. Red is kept subdued, indicating that Red is dependent on him. When Red presents him with the perpetuum mobile, Throaty indicates that he wants the exclusivity of those items, and tells him, almost as a warning "You're lucky, son" (72). Red is here once again cornered: he has to obey Throaty, as he is the highest payer and could resort to violence if his orders are not followed. Red is once again cornered: he has no escape but to stalk and sell his goods on the black market, and specifically to the Metropole gang. Even on a vertical level, there is no social

[202] See Starcevic p. 151-2.
[203] In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the lift do not work, which also illustrates Winston's inability to move up socially. See p.117.

mobility. Red is kept outside and at the bottom of society—furthering the sense of imprisonment and claustrophobia.

However, not all verticality is negative. Red reaches the elusive artefact known as the wish-fulfilling Golden Ball: the wish he formulates was learnt from a position of height, from the fantastic thirteenth floor.[204] To show how the idea of fantasy relates to the thirteenth floor, one must first look at Robert Heinlein's "The Unpleasant Profession of Jonathan Hoag". In this short story, the action is confined to the city of Chicago. Cynthia and Teddy Randall are investigating the case of Hoag, who does not know what he does during the day, but regains consciousness at night and finds red grime under his nails. He fears that he is a murderer and asks the couple to follow him during the day. Doing so leads them to the thirteenth floor of the Acme building, where Hoag is making jewellery. When they try to go onto the thirteenth floor the next day, they find that it has disappeared. This seems strange to them, but the Randalls keep investigating Hoag's case as they need the money he has paid. Cynthia smoothes out the bills, calling them "pretty little ticket", "pretty green bills" (146), indicative of a greedy attitude. However, stranger events unfold: Teddy Randall is abducted from time to time by the Committee and he is taken to the thirteenth floor to be warned to stop following Hoag and to be beaten up. The Committee kidnaps Teddy at night, whilst he is sleeping. He is taken through the mirrors in his house, which function as the portal to the thirteenth floor. The bedroom mirror makes Cynthia Randall feel "as if she could climb through it, like *Alice Through the Looking Glass*." (156). By making a reference to Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures Through the Looking Glass*, the narrator realises the fantastic ability to cross an interdimensional portal, to the unconscious and the real of the desires, and allows for the fantastic to occur when encountering the evil Committee, enabling the dream world, the fantasy, desires and games of power to permeate the story.

[204]Many buildings in the United States do not have a thirteenth floor, because of superstitious beliefs. The count jumps from the twelfth floor to the fourteenth, the fourteenth floor really being the thirteenth. The thirteenth floor becomes a non-existent space, another scene, a dream-like space where truth can be uttered. See *The Žižek Reader* and *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan Through Popular Culture* by Žižek (26-7). See also Bulent Somay's "From Ambiguity to Self-Reflexitivity: Revolutionising Fantasy Space", p.241-2

The thirteenth floor in the story is also a space in which the dream-like nature of the events taking place allow for simulation. However the bruises that Teddy sees when awaken after being beaten up on the thirteenth floor are very real, permanent, making the point that the simulation taking place on the fantastic thirteenth floor is in fact very real. At the end of the story, Teddy and Cynthia are both captured by the Committee and are threatened to be separated and killed. They express how they are ready to forsake their money and beg not be separated and killed: they forsake the fake reality of wealth and of the alienating greed to adopt the more profound and real desire to be together, alive and well. The thirteenth floor of the Acme building also acts as a place in suspension: not in the city, not outside the city, suspended in the awakened world of dreams, but spawning from a real, concrete wish, in the case of Teddy and of Cynthia, the wish to be happy together.

The realisation of real desires is obtained through the simulation of events taking place on the fantastic thirteenth floor, which occurs in *Roadside Picnic*. When facing the Golden Ball, Red realises that he is not a very good thinker and finds it difficult to think of and to formulate his wish. He has to remember Kirill, the scientist who tried to help him improve his situation. Red had admiration for Kirill, but "he had not left words behind" for Red to utter (144). However, Kirill gave Red something more than words: hope, which was simulated, experience and generated from the thirteenth floor of the institute. Despite being simulated, it is a real hope emanating from the core of Red's desires. At the beginning of the novel, Red and Kirill are exploring the possibility of going into the Zone. They are both working in the institute and looking at the Zone: "From the thirteenth floor it looks like it could fit in the palm of your hand" (14). From higher up, a position of elevated enlightenment, it looks like one can entirely own the Zone: it is from the thirteenth floor that Red and Kirill think of the prospects of generating "a new world, a changed world" (45). The true fantasy space serves to ignite the hope expressed by Kirill for a better and fairer world; this was only achievable from the thirteenth floor, the fantasy space for hopes to be realised, the floor from which one holds one's destiny.

Red faces spatial anxieties: he is torn between a vast openness and mostly an oppressive confinement. This confinement is reinforced by the fact that there is

nowhere to go: the urban landscape has invaded the world. Having shut off the suburbs, otherness and the alien, space has conquered the world, which becomes a uniform, conformist and greedy space. The introduction of verticality erases the theme of horizontality. This further reinforces the sense of claustrophobia in the novel: the city of Harmont cannot open itself up, it has engulfed the world, becoming symptomatic of its woes. Despite the appearance of openness on a vertical level, the city of Harmont remains a confined and restrictive space, in which social mobility is denied. The appearance of mobility, as seen through Red's going on the eighth floor or striving to get rich, is only superficial. The destitute are kept in chains at the bottom and outside society: the transparency of the wall provides false hopes and only reinstates social exclusion. It is only from a distance, from the thirteenth floor, that Red can understand where to find utopia. The thirteenth floor is non-existent, fantastic and dream-like, but suspended; it holds the key to Red's inner and real understanding of hope. Having realised the superficiality of his greed, of the "greenbacks", the materialism and oppression associated with it, creating confinement and hierarchies of power, taking shape within the geography and urbanisation of the city, Red can go on his journey to find the Golden Ball.

VI/ Science Fiction, the Fairy Tale and Reaching the Golden Ball

Despite being confined to his role as a stalker and to the city of Harmont, Red succeeds in freeing himself of his shackles and fulfils a wish using the Golden Ball, which, as many critics have shown, introduces the fairy tale element in the novel.[205] Stanislaw Lem viewed the intrusion of the fairy-tale element as a flaw in the work of the Strugatsky brothers: it constitutes a failure of the credibility of the science fiction elements, of the existence of the alien. The magical elements of the fairy-tale dismantle the verisimilitude of science fiction: they disrupt the rules of logic supplementing it with a "naïve" (329) belief in a wonderful artefact. Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, in his essay "Towards the Last Fairy Tale: On the Fairy-Tale Paradigm in the Strugatskys' Science Fiction, 1963-72" details how the fairy-tale becomes intrinsic to *Roadside Picnic*, becoming an essential part of the creation of utopia. Csicsery-Ronay explains that he uses the term "fairy-tale" in a broad way, and that for him, it refers to the "magical tales" (2) of the tale-telling cultures: the Strugatskys have constructed their work according to the long tradition of the Russian fairy-tale culture.[206] I will show how four of the constituents of the fairy-tale, as illustrated by Csicsery-Ronay, are enacted in *Roadside Picnic*: the mundane aspect, the disruption of the mundane life by evil forces, the summoning of the hero by a higher agent, and the receiving of help from supernatural beings (2-3).[207] These four elements enable the possibility of utopia, because, as Csicsery-Ronay has it, utopia is implicit in the fairy tale.[208]

Csicsery-Ronay first explains that the fairy tale is characterised by its mundane aspect, and its ordinary community. The word "mundane" is here very interesting, as it denotes both the earthly, human concerns, as opposed to the divine

[205] See Stainslaw Lem's "About the Strugatsky's Roadside Picnic", Steven Potts's *The Second Marxian Invasion*, p.53-4; 81 and Daniel Klueger "Fables of Desire" (416-7).
[206] See also Vladimir Propp's *The Morphology of the Fairy Tale*, or Steven Potts's *The Second Marxian Invasion*, p.53-4; 81.
[207] Csicsery-Ronay exposes six main constituents of the fairy-tale: the mortal hero, the mundane aspect of the narration, the inevitability of the happy ending, the worldly character of the happy-ending, the mutual aid of supernatural beings, a lack-conflict-resolution phased story (p.2-3).
[208] Joseph Campbell, in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, breaks down the mythical and fairy-tale journey in three parts: the departure, the initiation and the return of the hero. As for the departure, it is broken down into the call to adventure, the refusal of the call and the offer of supernatural aid, which is reminiscent of Csicsery-Ronay's structuring of the fairy tale.

or, in the case of *Roadside Picnic*, the alien; and also describes the everyday, dull, petty and common aspects of life. Harmont starts off as a small mundane town, where life takes its course peacefully in comparison to the events taking place after the Visitation.[209] The description of the Plaque Quarter, as seen earlier, gives the sense that any typical small town could have been affected by the Visitation. The normalcy and universality of the novel is also exemplified by showing Red's routine, which is illustrated at the beginning of the novel: he works, gets drunk at the bar and meets with his girlfriend.

This mundane and peaceful life is disrupted by evil agents and evil forces—Greed being the villain in the novel—and is directly opposed to the higher, almost divine forces that will lead the agent to his goal. The disruptive nature of Greed can be highlighted by looking into the tale patterns of J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings.*[210] The peaceful life in Hobbiton is interrupted when Bilbo finds and wears the One Ring that he found in Golum's cave. The shadow of the evil Sauron that was looming over Middle Earth is awakened, and dark forces assemble to topple and conquer the world. The One Ring becomes coveted by all, because it contains an incredible power, and turns good into evil, Saruman's becoming evil is a good example of this. The One Ring becomes a symbol of evil thirst for power and greed; the greed for the Golden Ball felt and expressed by the stalkers and the military-industrial complex can be read on the same terms.

Similarly, in *Roadside Picnic*, the threat posed by greed was looming for a long time: the Industrial Revolution witnessed in Harmont is creating the foundation for a class system and power structures. The Visitation is simply the agent awakening a latent Greed and triggering the race for wealth—just like the wearing of the One Ring awakens Sauron in *The Lord of the Rings*. Interestingly, the Visitation creates a new routine, as the Zone becomes assimilated into the everyday, mundane

[209] Salvestroni Simonetta explains that comfort can be found in "the security of the small town and its meeting places" (299). See p. 193.

[210] For details on how *The Lord of the Rings* can be read as a fairy tale, see Verlyn Flieger's essay "Frodo and Aragorn: The Concept of Hero". Much could be said of the similarities between *Roadside Picnic* and *The Lord of the Rings*: the evil, misunderstood power of the Zone raises the dead, whilst the evil Orcs and Uruk-hai, "came out of Isengard" (Tolkien, 805), and this can be taken as the literal soil of Isengard, since Orcs are "bred of the subterranean heats and slime" (Garth, p. 220), born from the evil power of Mordor. Evil and greed can be seen as unnatural as they have the ability to raise the dead.

life. The Zone becomes part of Red's normality, as it constitutes his workplace, part of his everyday life:

> He was the last of the old stalkers who had started hunting for treasure right after the Visitation, when the Zone wasn't called the Zone, when there were no institutes, or walls, or UN forces, when the city was paralysed with fear and the world was snickering over the newspaper hoax. Redrick was ten years old then. (57)

The Zone has been part of Red's life since his childhood; the evil, cruelty and materialism have become part of his normality, and by extension through the themes of micro- and macro-cosm, symbolise how it is part of man's nature. Life and daily routine revolve around the Zone and all it symbolises.[211]

Red has been employed by Kirill to work for the Institute to help him unveil the mysteries of the Zone. Kirill becomes the summoning agent, and his death triggers Red's journey to find the Golden Ball. Csicsery-Ronay details that, in the fairy tale, the empowering agents of good belong to the mundane side and are unlike the hieratic tone of myths (2). These forces can be of a supernatural order, but as Csicsery-Ronay states, never of a religious one. However, it is possible to see some elements of the transcendental, magical and almost divine in *Roadside Picnic*, despite the tale remaining distant from the myth. Frederic Jameson parallels the emergence of the Golden Ball to "the Grail itself" (*AOTF*, 295): this serves to elevate the utopian wish, transcending it from the mundane, debased human greed to the more profound force of hope, but also serving to echo the Last Supper and Christ's power of redemption. Kirill therefore becomes an envoy, allowing Red to seek salvation for himself and for mankind.

Csicsery-Ronay states that, in the fairy-tale, the hero has to be summoned by an agent and receives the "aid of magical-supernatural beings" (3), who can be found in Kirill, who has both mundane and divine properties. Red is inspired by Kirill, a "bright" and a "fine fellow" (41), explaining that he "lured [him] into working for the institute" (32), which is a positive step as it keeps Red out of the troubles he caused himself by stalking. Kirill works for the Institute and therefore is grounded in the mundane working life. He also represents science, a search for knowledge, since he is a researcher, and therefore embodies a higher order. Kirill is unaffected by greed:

[211] See p. 27, 34, 51 for further details on the implementation of tradition and its ideological implications in science fiction.

he wants to get the full empty, the first one of its kind, to study it, to understand it and open up to something alien, as opposed to deriving profit from it. Kirill fantasises about "the eternal peace and harmony that will come out of the Zone" (41) and paints vistas of "a new world, a changed world" (45), where everyone would benefit from knowledge; Red's later expression of the wish for a fairer world echoes Kirill's statements. Kirill wants to change the world through his research, a practical and human aspiration.

Kirill's wish for eternal peace ties him with the divine: it is an ideal echoing beliefs in heaven and eternal life.[212] Kirill's wish could be construed as naïve, however, his pure desire for infinite bliss makes him an agent of good. Further evidence of Kirill's godliness is found in his name: it stems from the Greek *kyrios*, which means "lord", and was widely used in its Romanised form "Cyril".[213] His ties to science echoe Zamyatin's statement that "the religion of the modern city is exact science" (in Stites, 188). Kirill thus becomes the Lord of Science, knowledge and progress, offering hope, salvation and utopia, as opposed to materialistic technologies. He inspires Red, who, at the end of the novel, summons him for help to make and formulate his wish. Kirill foresaw the source of utopia. He is a super-natural clairvoyant: his desire for common peace and harmony is repeated by Red who states: "HAPPINESS FOR EVERYBODY, FREE, AND NO ONE WILL GO AWAY UNSATISFIED" (145), confirming that Kirill has picked the right hero, the one who would be able to overcome his own greed for the sake of humanity.

Csicsery-Ronay adds that "the hero is aided by the supernatural being as a reward for the hero's service to the supernatural being" (3).[214] Only after the hero can demonstrate his altruistic nature by performing a service for the supernatural being can this one offer his help. In *Roadside Picnic*, the service done by Red and the help he receives occur with Kirill's death. Red wanted to give the full empty to Kirill for him to study it, to derive knowledge from it and to cure him of "his melancholy" (13). They venture into the Zone, and more specifically into the dark corner of the garage to retrieve the artefact. Red is not used to stalking with other people and

[212]The idea of "Eternal Peace" is also present in the eternal peace treaty signed between Russia and Poland in 1686. For more details, see Ariel Cohen's *Russian Imperialism: Development and Crisis*.
[213]See Hanks' *A Dictionary of First Names*, entry "Cyril".
[214] See also John Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, p. 49-58

leaves Kirill to his own devices; he comes into contact with a silver web, ultimately leading him to die of a heart attack. Red views his rash action as his "mistake" (26), and feels guilty and responsible for Kirill's death. Red does not realise that he fulfils Kirill's wish for eternal peace and enables him to reach a higher realm, heaven. This event does not spark Red's journey: he sees Kirill's death as the disappearance of hope and progress, as the end of the promise of utopia, and not as a motivation to seek out the Golden Ball.

Red does not understand that he has liberated Kirill straight away: he views Kirill as being wrong to place his hopes in the Zone. Addressing the spirit of the dead scientist, Red says: "you were wrong and Gutalin was right. This was no place for humans. The Zone was evil" (44-45). Red is at first resistant to start his quest, which could constitute the "refusal of the call" (Campbell, 59). Red feels an "icy hatred" (44), after being told of Kirill's death. After this, Red's behaviour starts to change, his cheek is twitching, a nervous sign that he has never felt before (Ibid.). Red decides to quit stalking: "It's over. There is no more stalker named Red. I've had enough. Enough of risking my own life and teaching other fools how to risk theirs" (44). Red gets his first symptom of anxiety: without someone showing him through the openness of utopia, he panics. Red refuses to enter the Zone again as he cannot bear to face the open utopian expanse on his own.

However, Red will receive further help enabling him to start on his quest for the Golden Ball. Csicsery-Ronay explains that the Visitation has been caused by man himself, from a point in the future, which therefore means that the evils of the Zone are man-made: "The Visitation is the catastrophic intervention of humanity's own image of the future into the present: it is 'what we will be like'" (29). For Csicsery-Ronay, the aliens represent the future mankind. This creates a predestination paradox, a time loop similar to Robert Heinlein's "All You Zombies": a man who went through a sex change impregnates his former female who becomes pregnant with the girl who went through the sex change: the man is therefore the mother, the father and the child. Viewing the aliens of *Roadside Picnic* as mankind from the future creates a predestination paradox. It also means that the aliens, or mankind itself, becomes the hindering and the helping agent. It is deliberately toying with its lesser evolved, younger self, in order to enable it to become more evolved and

improved by gifting it the tools that are necessary to better itself, in order to avoid some future catastrophe.

This idea of time travel is exposed during the conversation between Red and Ernst, as they discuss the Visitation. Red enters the Borscht where Ernest is polishing glasses and comments: "Leave the poor thing alone. You will rub a hole through it" (34). Red pursues the discussion:

> "You know, one guy rubbed [the glasses] until he got a genie. Ended up on easy street."
> "Who was that?" Ernest ask suspiciously.
> "It was another bartender here. Before your time"
> "What happened?"
> "Nothing. Why do you think the Visitation happened. It was all his rubbing. Who do you think the Visitors were" (34).

The idea that Ernst will make a hole into the glass by rubbing it reflects the idea that Harmont is a (worm-) "hole into the future" (36). Red attributes the Visitation to genies, man's spirit from the future. Rubbing the glass calls upon a genie, a spirit trapped in an object—lamps or rings, maybe a ball—which stands the test of time as they are forever trapped in the device. Such a time paradox is also present in Tarkovsky's film: as the three men rest in the Zone, black and white scenes are inserted. They could be interpreted as dreams, however, they are more visions of the past or the future. One of the cuts shows the Stalker lying down in the Zone and the black dog, the spirit of the Zone, lying next to him, guarding him. This foretells the fact that the dog will come out of the Zone and stay with the family, and illustrates the past occasions when the Stalker entered and left the Zone successfully, protected by the dog. These inserted scenes function as time loops: man holds his destiny, no-one but himself can implement the appropriate changes to save himself from "experiments" such as the Zone, as the Writer has it.

The Visitation is therefore not an alien event: it is man-made. In *Roadside Picnic*, Red does not struggle against aliens, who have been entirely shut off from the novel. Red struggles with his own human nature, as highlighted by Csicsery-Ronay:

> The obstacles the hero faces are often alienated versions of the hero himself, such as false heroes, brothers, deceivers, not to mention the symmetrically opposed villain. Other obstacles are created by the hero's improper means, usually to acquire personal power that does not lead to the proper goal. (4)

Red does not struggle against aliens, monsters or gods, but rather he battles against human nature. The Visitation has alienated him from his own self: the greed that takes over dehumanises him and makes him forget who he is. Red's difficulty in understanding what he has to do emanates from the fact that he has to fight off greed, his own alienated self, his own villainy and greed, which he dissolves by using the Golden Ball, to save humanity from the alienating materialism and to free Utopia. In *Roadside Picnic*, the hero is his own obstacle, dystopia is self-inflicted, and man can only turn inwards for a solution.

Red's finding the Golden Ball is made possible through the help of another supernatural being, Burbridge. Burbridge, while stalking in the Zone with Red, has fallen into the jelly; his legs are ruined and have become rubbery and he can therefore be associated with a snake or a worm. Burbridge, in exchange for Red helping him to get out of the Zone, makes a revelation concerning the Golden Ball: "I found it. There were so many tales about it. I spun a few myself. That it would grant your every wish. Any wish, hah! If that were true, I sure wouldn't be here. I'd be living high on the hog in Europe. Swimming in dough." (49).[215] Burbridge admits that he is guilty for having spread rumours about the Golden Ball, thus increasing the general frenzy and craze to find it. His own attempt to use it to grant his wish has failed, since he is not in Europe nor very wealthy; his greed is reminiscent of the European *ennui*. His tone of voice also hints at his lack of belief in the magical object, especially in light of his wish not being granted. However, this is due to the fact that Burbridge, when formulating his wish, is only concerned with his personal, private agenda, and is punished for it.

As Red reaches the Golden Ball, it becomes apparent that it is very different from what it was made out to be. Red notices that "It was not golden, it was more a copper color, reddish, and completely smooth, and it shone dully in the sun" (142). The Golden Ball seems to lose its appeal and brightness: it is not golden, does not

[215] Csicsery-Ronay explains that one of Burbridge's wishes was to have a stunning daughter. His wish was slightly distorted: although physically beautiful, she is hateful (24).

shine and the sun does not really light it up. Red thinks that "It obviously did not glow with its own light and it obviously was incapable of floating and dancing in the air, the way so many of the tales had it" (142). This breaks the image of a glorious, awe-blinding artefact, undermines the childish tales created about it and dissolves the concept of naiveté attached to it.[216]

Instead, it remains firmly on the ground, "heavy and massive" (142). This gives the sense that the Golden Ball cannot be moved, that it is transcendental, humble and immutable. However, instead of giving the sense of a claustrophobic atmosphere due to the lack of movement, the Golden Ball becomes comforting. Red can see "how solidly it lay in its place" (Ibid.), which gives a sense of resolution: the Golden Ball is not to be moved and will not move. This is non-oppressive: the Golden Ball had nothing "doubt-inspiring about it, but there was nothing to inspire hope either" (Ibid.). The Golden Ball is neutral, reflected in the dull light it gives off. As it does not float in the air, it does not introduce the concept of verticality and hierarchy: the Golden Ball is not a device to subdue. The dichotomy of high and low, which represents the dichotomy of rich and poor, of exploiter and exploited, are all disembodied with the stillness and firm aspect of the Golden Ball.

The coppery nature of the artefact is notable: it has retained its reddish colour, and has not oxidised, despite lying there for over two decades. This reflects the immutability of the Golden Ball: it has to offer consistency, stability and endurance. The Golden Ball lies "at the foot of the quarry's far wall" (142), in the same quarry where ore was mined before the Visitation, once again dissolving verticality. The redness of the ball and the concept of mining are brought together: the Ball becomes associated with Marxism, and its proclaiming the need to abolish classes. The association between the copper nature of the Golden Ball and the ore mined in Harmont evokes the nostalgia for a time when greed did not create social shackles and when gardens were still green. The reddish colour of the Golden Ball is further associated with Red, reflecting that he has a connection with the artefact: he was the right hero and was predestined to fulfil the quest to free mankind, chosen by Kirill, the "sainted man" (140).

[216] Stainslaw Lem stated that the Golden Ball was to be associated to naiveté: "a naïve belief, one of those popular legends which rose up in the wake of the visit" (329).

As Red approaches the Golden Ball to make his wish, he is left "speechless" (144), showing that he is a victim of having his thoughts constricted, as in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*, in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or Delany's *Babel-17*. Red reflects and considers that he does not know how to think, an "unaccustomed exercise", and that he had never had "a thought in [his] entire life!" (Ibid.). It is at this stage of the novel that Red realises that he has been caught in the constricting thought processes of greed of the Harmonite society: by stalking, he adheres to the fake utopian dream of wealth. Red has not found happiness as he is chained, financially, socially and linguistically. Red feels compelled to stalk as waged work does not pay enough to maintain a family comfortably. He states his inability to express himself: "I don't have the words, they didn't teach me the words. I don't know how to think, the bastards didn't let me learn how to think." (145). Red feels that he had the inclination, the impulse to think, but that the people in power did not let him learn how to construct his own thoughts. In an Orwellian fashion, Red was not given the means and the words to think; instead he was thrown into an immediate, instantaneous system of perception, in which the quick pace of reaction does not give time to reason.

Because of this, Red feels like an animal (145), deprived of his humanity.[217] He explains that "Man is born in order to think" (144). He becomes aware of man's need to think. This evocation of animality is a reminder of Monkey, Red's mutated daughter. Her mutation worsens throughout the novel: she becomes unable to speak, she grows a "golden fleece" (63), and looks increasingly like an ape. Monkey symbolises devolution, since she turns from a human into a monkey. Her father's inability to phrase his thought parallels her inability to speak: being caged by greed is detrimental to man's evolution and progress. Despite associating his thinking self to that of an animal, Red reclaims his humanity, and in the same gesture, reclaims Monkey's: "I never sold my soul to anyone! It's mine, it's human!" (145) he shouts to the Golden Ball. Throughout the novel Red struggles. Despite the containment, the shackles, the claustrophobia and the repression, Red remains true to himself, to his view of a fair world. Red realises that life is "just one long brawl"(144), that he had

[217] This echoes the idea in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that only the "proles and animals are free" (75). The proles are seen as the rejects of the Oceanian society, and are therefore excluded from it and are reduced to the status of animals. Red's statement echoes this. See p. 126.

to fight countless of people, such as Burbridge, the police or Ernest: Red learns that surviving is struggling. Progress is not materialistic; rather, it lies in the ability to avoid the animalistic brutality, the cruelty and the repression Red has been subjected to. Even if Red cannot phrase exactly what is in his head, he can feel and desire things; and he strives to preserve the integrity of his soul. This strong attachment to his humanity, which has been denied to him throughout the novel, is what makes him the suitable spokesman to formulate the wish for man's salvation.

At the end of the novel, Red is in front of the Golden Ball and realises his opportunity: "The road is open" (144), he is no longer cornered, Red reclaims his humanity. This constitutes a cry for freedom and fairness, formulated in Red's wish: "HAPPINESS, FOR EVERYBODY, FREE AND NO ONE WILL GO AWAY UNSATISFIED" (145). Before thinking about this, Red is aware that an entirely new paradigm needs to be created: Red "knew that it all had to be destroyed, and he wanted to destroy it, but he guessed that if it all disappeared there would be nothing left but the flat bare earth" (145). The wish for utter destruction, to start afresh would mean that life on earth would disappear and nothing would be rebuilt. This impulse is the final unleashing of Red's rage towards imprisonment. George Slusser, in his essay "The Martians Among Us: Wells and the Strugatskys" states: "Red knows this vision is folly and is a license for social anarchy. Red, however, reflecting on the human disasters wrought by selfish incursions into the zone, also sees a possibility for a collective social consciousness emerging from this alien invasion" (68). Slusser views Red's initial wish for destruction as folly, however, a more collective anarchy could emerge from his second wish for freedom and happiness. John Moore also views Red actions as a desire for anarchy (127) as a means to obtain redemption from "the world of coercion and control" (127). Moore views Red's phrasing of the wish as an improvement on the folly of his first impulse, as it can provide a more satisfying and egalitarian system.

John Moore views Red's looking for anarchy as enabling man's redemption. Red's wish is not folly, as it was directly inspired by the young Arthur, his fellow stalker on that day, who, when he saw the ball, started to run and shout enthusiastically "There's enough for everybody! Nobody will leave unsatisfied!... Free!...Happiness!...Free!" (143). Red re-iterates someone else's wish, which clearly

demonstrates that other people than Red desire change. In this respect, Slusser is right to state that Red sees society as ready for a social change: the marketed happiness, the chains brought by materialism and the *ennui* that it caused have left people unsatisfied. Anarchy is not folly: when understood and managed properly, that is to say by everyone, it can bring happiness, as it did for Shevek on Anarres in *The Dispossessed*.

Arthur's incantation is the last help Red was to receive. Red is given the words that he did not possess. But this is not done so simplistically, as Red has to sacrifice Arthur by letting him run to his death. Different critics have viewed this in different manners. The utopian impulse is left tainted, the fairy tale is interrupted by the very brutality of the murder: Red has rescued Arthur on previous occasions, but this time, he lets him die. The very brutality of the murder reflects the brutality of the artefacts and of the Zone itself: a maiming, killing and indifferent entity, demanding execution for a wish. Brooks Landon views Red's inaction to prevent the boy from running towards his death as murder. Landon highlights the fact that Red sacrifices Burbridge's child "in order to save his own" (103). Red initially has selfish motives: he wants to sacrifice Arthur so that he can save Monkey and, as Jameson also indicates, to have revenge on Burbridge (*AOTF*, 76).[218] Landon indicates that it is precisely this murder that taints the wish. By sacrificing his integrity, through the murder of a young innocent child, Red relinquishes the promise of a bright future: the next generation has been sacrificed. Csicsery-Ronay echoes this statement: Red is "killing the future to make the present liveable" (32). Red kills a child, the symbol of the next generation, in order to change his present, his life and the state of his society.

Csicsery-Ronay still indicates that Red, by letting Arthur die, also makes a sacrifice: he taints his integrity, but for the sake of his family, for the sake of others, whom he wanted to help at the very beginning, when the Zone was not walled off and possibilities were open. By sacrificing Arthur, a young man, he saves his own child; hence the next generation is not compromised. Red rescues his daughter: if

[218] Jameson views Arthur's death as "the substitution for his own debt payment (genetic damage in return for valuable discoveries in the Zone) of the payment of another life" (*AOTF*, 75). Red finds himself having to borrow Arthur's life, in order to fulfil his wish, and potentially save his daughter. For Jameson, this constitutes murder (76), a "short-circuiting by the SF text of the Utopian impulse" (76)

rescued, she will evolve from an innocent, young ape into a new species, bearing the children of a new era, capable of generating utopia. Red decides to bear the blood of murder himself, so that the next generation does not have to do it. Arthur's sacrifice is indeed necessary: it is through this tragedy that Red understands the depth of his wish. He has to observe the boy's candour to learn his words, to borrow the incantation of innocence, of pure naiveté—the very one enabling Utopia. Utopia cannot be built on the previous paradigm of greed and exploitation. Red initially mocked Arthur's wish: it takes his dying for Red to realise the seriousness of the situation. Arthur's death echoes Kirill's: the solemnity of death makes Red reflect on innocence and enables him to shake off materialism and the cruelty of history.

Roland Boer questions whether the wish is an actual utopian request or a "cruel joke" (121). However, it is clear that Red is attempting to put an end to "Meanness and treachery" (*Roadside Picnic*,144). He wants to end the cruelties brought on the subdued by the figures of authority. Jameson explains that Red's formulation of the wish expresses the intention to realise utopia and put an end to cruelty. In "Progress vs Utopia; or, Can We Imagine the Future?", Jameson states:

> what we must cherish in this text—a formally ingenious collage of documents, an enigmatic cross-cutting between unrelated characters in social and temporal space, a desolate reconfirmation of the inextricable relationship of the utopian quest to crime and suffering, with its climax in the simultaneous revenge-murder of an idealistic and guiltless youth and the apparition of the Grail itself—is the unexpected emergence, as it were, beyond "the nightmare of History" and from out of the most archaic longings of the human race, of the impossible and inexpressible Utopian impulse. (295)

Jameson explains that despite the very grim atmosphere, the anger and resentment felt by Red, the myriad of characters intricately related and the complications arising throughout the novel, something wonderful and magical happens. This is embodied in the appearance of the Grail-like object, the Golden Ball. Jameson explains that the Golden Ball becomes the unifying factor of the complex and truncated narrative. Similarly, in Samuel Delany's *Nova* exposes a Grail-like quest for the material Ilyrium, essential for terraforming and fuel. The imagery of the Grail serves to unite people, despite their differences. Remarkably, Lorq Von Ray, the heroic knight

guiding others to the nova where the Ilyrium can be found, is a "mulatto" (Lupak, 115), symbolising that man's salvation lies in freedom and in unity.[219]

Jameson highlights the fact that the characters are socially and temporally intertwined in *Roadside Picnic*, through the unifying power of the Grail-like Golden ball, which constitutes the end of the "nightmare of History" (*AOTF*, 295). The nightmare of History refers to a statement made in James Joyce's *Ulysses* by Stephen Dedalus, who wants to awaken from it. This statement stresses the violence of history: man has inflicted upon himself wars, crime and cruelty—very well paralleled in the violent, mutilating artefacts.[220] The expression implies that the horrors committed throughout history can only relate to the nightmare: a fully conscious being could not commit the atrocities that have been experienced. David Jenemann states that "the challenge of modernity is to awaken not *from* the nightmare of history but *to* it"(41). Jenemann bases his statement on Adorno's concept of anamnesis, the memory of forgetting (Ibid.). For Jenemann, one has to recollect and to remember, to wake from a slumber created, in order to fully realise what constitutes the nightmare of history—instead of seemingly ignoring it. Jameson states that the concept of capitalism and its mechanism of self-preservation are the latest expression of the nightmare of history (*AOTF*, 174). Capitalism creates a slumber-like state; enthralled and ushered, we are unable to perceive the cruelty of a divisive and intricate slavery—through waged work—due to the fast pace of consumerism and the flooding and surplus of ideological images.

Red wishes to rest by the Golden Ball, to embrace its steadiness and immutability as opposed to struggle with reality, within the nightmare of history. Red thinks that it would be good to "sit down next to it, or even to lean back against it, close his eyes, and think, reminisce, and maybe just dream and drowse and rest..."(142). Red wants to turn his back to the ball, to lean against it and sleep, indicating a total passivity, a need or wish to rest, as opposed to facing the facts. Red wants to turn his back onto the opportunities offered by the Ball, and turn his back to the nightmare of history, forget about everything. However, Red has to wake up to it:

[219] For more details, see Barbara Tepa Lupak's "King Arthur and Black American Popular Culture" p.112.
[220] See Eric Simon "The Strugatsky in Political Context" sees no other function to the artefacts but to mutilate the human body (370).

Arthur's running towards the Ball results in his death. Red has to confront the brutal reality and recognise the submission and the imprisonment, the need to sacrifice the young man's life to ensure a future for mankind.

Red finally faces the Golden Ball, Greed and cruelty. His attitude changes when he invokes the help of Kirill and remembers his legacy. Red initially thinks that "Kirill had not left words behind" (144). Red is unable to remember what Kirill had left him, until he recalls that "man is born in order to think (there he is, old Kirill at last)" (144), he exclaims, having remembered the words. However, Red finds that these words are not suited to the Golden Ball. Red finds it difficult to express himself and understands his verbal unworthiness. He offers an excuse to the Golden Ball: "the bastards didn't let me think" (145). Red talks to the Ball, begging it to "look into [his] heart" (145), stating that everything that the ball needs is in there. The Golden Ball can phrase the utopian wish by looking into Red's feelings: Kirill's true legacy, hope, is to be found there. Red expresses the idea that words are unnecessary: there is a world of dream and images, the utopian impulse, which can be conceived and felt, which can be betrayed by words, as indicated by Orwell through his concept of the wordless sensations of the "inner world".[221] Red explains to the ball that he could not want something bad, therefore locating utopia in his heart. Red appeals to the purity of his intentions, of his wishes.

Red does not want anything bad, as he himself states (145). This is true throughout the novel: although he is ideologically conditioned by greed, he demonstrates a genuine will to improve the lives of those he loves, to feed his family and to help Monkey. Red is naturally altruistic, which is reflected in his wish. Red's wish for freedom and happiness can be seen as universal notions that we all strive to obtain. Red uses simple, uncomplicated words: meaning is therefore not impeded, and everyone can understand and fulfil the potential released in the wish. Red has not wished for anything materialist and one could say quite paradoxically, not for pleasure or fulfilment. Red does not wish for the intensity of pleasure, for example the one obtained by the purchase of goods, or a cottage. Instead, he wishes for a more transcendent happiness, one obtained through being satisfied, through avoiding constrictions or the lies of materialistic and shallow things and the disappointment of

[221] See p. 118-9.

reality. He wants no one to *go* unsatisfied: he wishes for people's freedom, movement and happiness and for the fall of the wall, for unity and change.

VII/ Conclusions

Roadside Picnic is the perfect illustration of the effects of spatial confinements. In the novel, the Zone becomes the focal point: there is no escaping it. The story centres so much on that mysterious space that it shuts off the outside world and creates a heightened sense of confinement. The Zone becomes the centre of attention and the symbol for a worldwide wide array of elements and ailments. The Zone is walled off by those trying to control the artefacts that lie within, thus introducing the theme of duality through the symbol of the wall. The Zone therefore becomes the embodiment of the utopian and dystopian tensions in the novel.

The most striking contrast created is present in the differentiation between greed and altruism, so much so that it is present in all the other dichotomies created by the Zone. This is embodied through the fact that the wealth generated through the mining of the artefacts enables the city to grow out of proportion: the urban landscape engulfs all and becomes omnipresent. However, the outcasts of society, the exploited, are kept outside of its centre of power; that is, outside the Zone or the city centre. In this sense, the Zone becomes associated with the city centre, as it has permeated its landscape, its structure and its social and financial foundations, thus alienating the country and the suburbs that it has polluted.

This omnipresence of urbanisation causes Red's claustrophobia: he is confined to the same overall paradigm of thinking: a selfish, greedy wish for profit. Although this thinking process takes on many shapes, it displays the same features. The *ennui*, boredom and materialism that Red feared at the beginning has invaded the world, making it a uniform prison. The difference between outside and inside is annihilated, however re-instated in the vertical form. The past paradigm of exclusion is reinstated through the difference between dominated and dominating, embodied in the vertical hierarchy. Going and building upwards is therefore not the solution to confinement and repression, as it only reinforces the previous confining status—despite giving it the appearance of change.

The novel exposes an over-urbanisation of the landscape that annihilates difference and otherness. It echoes the dystopian post-apocalyptic idea that over-urbanisation and technological advances have destroyed the world. This can also be seen through the fact that man causes the Visitation: it sends itself the means for redemption in the shape of the Golden Ball. Even when considering the Visitation, this interpretation shuts out the alien, also indicating that man has become alien to himself. The novel restricts itself to the paradigms of science fiction in order to highlight the ideological and spatial restrictions; it therefore has to use and turn to another genre in order to enable utopia. Using elements pertaining to the fairy tale enables the novel to open up to new concepts and ideas. Red's need to journey becomes clear: his formative, introspective quest enables him to understand the essence of humanity. Hope should not be undermined by greed, as is the case throughout the novel. As Red explores his feelings and the universality of happiness, he is able to open up the door to movement, to otherness and freedom, that is, to utopia.

CONCLUSION

The thesis has hinted at the shift in the meaning of the metaphor of the wall and its impact on utopian literature. The wall used to be seen as a protective symbol, sheltering, preserving society from the outside, plague-ridden world and warding off its evils. However, these positive connotations expose complications within the modern and postmodern utopia: the idea of enclosure and self-containment are a denial of the chance of contact, communication and progress through exchanging and benefiting from other perspectives. This shift indicates the idea that the wall has turned into a negative symbol, carrying the ideological potential of dystopia. This shift in meaning of the image of the wall highlights a duality, which is also present in the narratives that make use of it.

The plot of *The Dispossessed* by Ursula K. Le Guin revolves around the allegory of the wall and its associated metaphors. From the outset, the reader is directed towards its dual, ambiguous nature. The reader is told of the Anarresti wall that "Like all walls it was ambiguous, two-faced. What was inside it and what was outside it depended upon which side of it you were on" (1). This quotation introduces complex, paradoxical and dual notions which directly engage with the concept of perspective. It illustrates that the characters' perspectives are affected by which side of the wall they are on. Their views of themselves, their society and others are tainted by the fact that they live on a defined, constricted side. In *The Dispossessed,* the wall becomes an image intrinsically linked to ideology as it generates connotations of differentiation, enmity, and otherness. This duality is reiterated by Shevek who explains as he is imprisoned in his room: "To lock out, to lock in, in the same act" (10). This statement denotes the duality, the two-fold nature of the wall. Shevek highlights another aspect of the wall: it creates the means to exclude, contain and reject. Shevek goes to the enemy planet to try to solve the deadlock between the two planets, to tear down the walls that prevent each side from reaching out to the other. *The Dispossessed* exemplifies the wide range of metaphors the image of the wall can create, and illustrates their implications on the utopian genre.

For the wall to be maintained, the people in power need to justify and create images supporting the need for the wall, but also to control and repress the population's need to rebel and in the process create a uniform identity which the

population adopts. Thus, the worlds created in the utopian narratives create discourses that justify and promote the necessity of the wall. In *The Dispossessed*, Anarres justifies the necessity of the wall as Odonians need protection from the supposedly invading Urrasti. In *Roadside Picnic*, the wall is built to protect the artefacts from the thieving stalkers, who harness the goods for money and not for science. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, a wall is created around the citizens' thoughts to prevent them from thinking and rebelling against the Party, which states it has provided a better social structure to the society of Oceania. These examples illustrate how the various powers in place justify their erecting a wall: doing so enables them to preserve the system they have created, a system depicted as better and fairer. This justification is based on the previous paradigm of the creation of utopia: the discourses highlight the deceptive idea that, to preserve the ideal system, one needs to protect it from outside influences, from the alien, the foreign or any outside opportunities which could spark the desire for change.

It becomes apparent that these discourses are highly ideological in nature. The ideological discourses highlight and justify the need for the walls, even when they are being challenged. The wall is used to protect the system from an outside threat: this threat can be an enemy, as is the case with Urras on Anarres or even Oceania and its constantly switching enemies, or it can be the threat of a system based on equal sharing of wealth in Harmont, or the concept of freedom and thinking abilities in Oceania. These ideological discourses in turn create exclusion and inequalities within the system that they propound to be utopian. In *The Dispossessed,* power is kept by the bureaucracy, at the expense of the freedom of the population. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, citizens are made to relinquish the ability to think critically and independently. In *Roadside Picnic*, citizens are exploited so that a wealthy minority can enjoy the fruits of the labour of the exploited.

The ideological discourses highlight a flaw in the system, a distance between the ideological façade and the reality experienced by the characters who are subdued by the system. Shevek realises that the system he lives in bears the face of Odonism, insofar that it pretends to strike the balance between individual freedom—a notion very often upheld by the PDC—and altruism. The PDC in fact generates conformism: the population on Anarres no longer questions the power structures and

instead follows the guidelines generated by the PDC, who effectively controls the population. The dream of wealth in Harmont is shattered by the exploitation of the poor, on which the wealth is founded. In Oceania, the ruling Party members can use language at their leisure to enforce control and impoverish the thoughts of those who they want to control.

These examples illustrate the consequences of creating repressive ideologies and erecting a wall. Doing so generates the exclusion of the exploited, the oppression of the weak, and the imprisonment of the free. Interestingly, all the novels used in this thesis place the application of repression and oppression within power: power itself is the driving force, the motivation and the end goal which pushes the controlling structures to use extreme forms of ideology to coerce and deceive the population into maintaining the system. Power is therefore the means and the ends of power; its dual nature echoes that of the wall. These images perfectly exemplify how the wall has shifted from a utopian to a dystopian symbol.

The political systems depicted in the novels have authoritarian and dystopian tendencies. On Anarres, in Harmont and in Oceania, characters have to part with their freedom and comply with the rules set by the governing bodies. Reading these novels together enables us to view and understand that the wall is a symbol of repression and oppression, which makes the characters suffer. This enables us to read the depicted systems as authoritarian: if the characters stray from the hard lines of the rules and laws implemented, they will be punished. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this is epitomised by Winston's being tortured by O'Brien. In *Roadside Picnic*, Red is imprisoned for having stolen the artefacts essential to his livelihood. In *The Dispossessed*, Shevek is cast out from the social body and treated as a pariah, which, on Anarres, a society based on the principles of altruism within the community, constitutes the main form of punishment.

The discourses and the repression exerted on the characters and the population of the novels are justified by the depicted systems by their manipulating and emphasising ideologically chosen historical and geographical reasons. On Anarres, the PDC legitimises the construction of the wall and its shielding itself from the universe by evoking historical reasons: centuries before the time of the narration, Urrasti repressed workers and Odonians who rebelled in their strife for freedom.

Their exodus is seen as the turning point, the start of a new history. This attitude serves to justify the wall: Urras has done wrong in the past, and it could still do harm. This attitude serves to shut off the past: Anarresti society views its past as horrific and cannot forgive the Urrasti, who are in turn described and perceived as a threat. Anarres denies its history, and manipulates it to create a new identity for itself, which is ingrained and creates an alternate present. Utopia is depicted as having been finally achieved and this puts time at a standstill, by denying the need for change. By denying its past, Anarres denies its future, maintaining the present through the control it effects by justifying itself using historical events. The same can be observed in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in which the Party's slogan, "who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past", openly enables ideology to taint the past in order to control or deny the future. Progress is an apparent concern in *Roadside Picnic*: it is denied when people use the artefacts to satisfy their meaningless greed, adhering to the ideology of commodity fetishism. These novels portray societies that refuse to acknowledge and embrace their past, therefore denying their own selves and their own history. They forsake the possibility of change by embracing the multiplicity of historical events; instead they focus their attention onto one specific, supposedly defining moment that enables the people in power to justify and evidence their actions.

The three works that are the focus of this study all display the same authoritarian tendencies and the same forms of imprisonment. Winston, Shevek and Red are all confined and caged where they live, almost imprisoned within the worlds they inhabit. Red cannot leave Harmont, or the Zone, his source of livelihood. The Zone has invaded the town and the world, furthering the sense of confinement: difference has been annihilated. Winston is confined to Oceania, to the city of London and its surroundings, and even more to his room where he is spied on by the telescreen. Shevek's departure is made almost impossible by the PDC, who threatens him with the impossibility of return. This creates an image of inescapability and confinement: the characters cannot flee the oppressive system. This causes the characters to feel uncomfortable in the space they inhabit, as is seen with Red's claustrophobia. The same can be said for Shevek who eventually manages to leave Urras and who also wants to commit suicide, which means he wants to leave his own

body. Winston attempts to find privacy and freedom outside the Party's quarters, but to no avail, since he is captured and imprisoned. The totality of the repression means that the characters find it hard or impossible to escape the oppressive control.

The novels create another version of confinement: the authoritarian systems attempt to control the linguistic abilities of the population and the characters. Newspeak is the endeavour to control and contain language, to use language to portray thinking and inquisitive inquiry as a negative practise and to make the expression and the formulation of rebellion impossible. This is also present in *The Dispossessed*: Pravic, the Odonian language, makes the expression and the thinking of property impossible. In *Roadside Picnic*, the inability to express oneself is also associated with imprisonment: Red is kept in poverty and in chains as he is not taught the words or the ways to think effectively. Without the ability to communicate, to phrase thoughts, the characters are depicted as unable to free themselves, to express their wishes, their hopes and their feelings; this inability to linguistically free themselves intensifies their struggles for freedom. They are also unable to communicate with others, share their views on, their feelings of and their frustration with the system that represses them.

By controlling history, confining and imprisoning the population and stripping it off its ability to think, the dystopian systems depicted in the novels impede communication, restrict knowledge, limit the understanding of others and inhibit subjectivity. Fear, enclosure, oppression and deception enable the system to control the population and create patterns of compliance with the ideology and rules created, inducing conformity from which straying is dangerous. This conformity constitutes the obliteration of difference, of otherness, which is necessary for one to open oneself up to new ideas, new concepts and implement change. Instead, conformism is implemented. On Anarres, it is present in the idea of public opinion. In Oceania, the march, rallies and parades showing love for the Party and hatred for otherness attended by all Party members engender the idea that people comply and conform to the roles they have to adopt. In *Roadside Picnic*, the characters are all caught up in the search for wealth: earning money and items means conforming to consumerist greed. In turn, conformism means it becomes harder to find difference and otherness from which improvements can be derived. Dystopia is a vicious

deadlock: the authoritarian governments create conformism, which obliterates otherness and thus reinforces this conformism and shatters the possibility of change.

These depictions of extreme uses of ideology to deceive, manipulate and repress are perfectly embodied in the image of the wall: the dystopian society is a prison from which there is no escape, where no compromise can be made and where one cannot express oneself freely. However, what enables these three novels to be called or viewed as utopian lies in the private resistance of the main characters. The plots of these utopian novels are based on the narrating of the realisation of the character that the system is oppressive, the realisation of the distance between the ideological discourse and the experienced reality of the system, and of course, in resisting. The characters' creating a breach in the wall, therefore unlocking the possibility for confrontation, for contact with otherness and communication constitutes the climax of the novels. It constitutes the shift from dystopia to utopia, the dismantling and the opening of the dystopian wall.

This is done through understanding the need to tear down the walls, as expressed by Shevek. Shevek leaves his home planet, travels to his past to gain an understanding and knowledge of his society, and finally takes this knowledge back home and shares it with his fellow Anarresti, through the accompanying Ketho onto Anarres. The wall around the Zone has a metaphorical breach that is guarded by the police, but Red nonetheless finds a way to go in and out of the Zone, that is, he finds a way to challenge the oppressive authority, to find the Golden Ball and to share his wish. Winston can break the language barriers and open up communication as a way to disable the dystopian control. The characters have all demonstrated that utopia is a journey: it is a journey of self-exploration, of the reconnaissance and of the study of the historical and personal past, an exploration of one's and others' environments and the learning and mastering of one's language. Only when the characters understand how these elements are interlinked can they unlock utopia. It is only when the characters empower themselves through language that they can express their understanding, their views and their knowledge of the past, their hopes for the future and their experiences in space and through other lands. Their journeys have taught them cynicism, irony, sarcasm and distrust. At first, these are used to angrily target the systems that oppress them. However, the characters learn how to use those

elements as a deconstructive force: by dismantling the ideological discourses, they can free themselves from its powerful hold.

These texts provide an answer to the key question posed in Jameson's essay "Progress Versus Utopia; or, Can We Imagine the Future?". These novels, when read together, demonstrate that we can indeed imagine the future. We can first and foremost imagine the complications that arise from imagining the future; that is, we can imagine dystopia. However, imagining the future is not a conflict between utopia and progress, or a choice between them. Utopia does not imply relinquishing progress; utopia is progress. It is not necessarily progress of the technological kind, but a progress in our understanding of our modes of perceptions and our communications of our ideologies. The novels portray the characters re-evaluating the presented concepts of ideology, dystopia and utopia. They illustrate that ideology is strongly associated with the wall, indicating control and repression. However, the struggles that the characters undergo help them to understand the true nature of ideology: it is a key opening up the future, new lands and new ideas. Ideology should not be used as a caging force, rather it should be viewed as progress, communication. With ideology, one can debate, engage with and open up to new ideas in order to move forward. Utopia is therefore intrinsically linked to ideology. However, unlike dystopia, in which ideology is set, portrayed as undeniable and unquestionable, utopia is ideology in the making, in progress, remaining open to opportunities and driven by the wish for happiness and by hope.

This thesis has established the temporal, linguistic and spatial effects of the ideological walls. However, the thesis has hinted at the fact that there are other walls to be broken down, other themes of exclusion that dystopian fictions exploit. Other ideological discourses impact on the way minorities—in its broader sense covering gender, race, religion and sexuality—are able to live their lives. This was touched upon in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in which women were seen as fulfilling their duties to the state by having children, or by forsaking their femininity by wearing the oppressive, genderless uniform of the Party. Similarly, the issue of race was present through the differentiation between different types of people. The wars between continents in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* imply that the wars are also cultural and racial. This concept is also represented in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*: the same species of

people view themselves as different because they construe their societies differently and live on different planets, therefore engaging with the idea that discrimination is ideologically constructed. This concept of ideological discrimination is recognised in Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness*: Gethenians are androgynous, yet gendered. As Gethenians enter their fertile cycle, "kemmer", we are told that "Gender, and potency, are not attained in isolation" (82) and that "You cannot think of a Gethenian as 'it'. They are not neuters. They are potentials, or integrals" (83), showing that gender is a dynamic, changing and interdependent notion, which, just as language, history and space, can be constricted or moulded to fit a purpose. Looking into works such as Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* or Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* would provide the ground to conduct further research into the idea of gender as an ideological wall. Similarly, the idea of race is ideologically construed. Octavia Butler's *Kindred* is set against the backgrounds of slavery in the 1800s and the aftermath of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s in the U.S. The narrator, Dana, an African American women, lives in the 1970s with her white husband. When she feels dizzy, she time-travels back to the times of slavery. She feels like "an alien in a dangerous place"(190), at a time when the slave owner was "Just an ordinary man who sometimes did the monstrous things his society said were legal and proper" (134). Therefore, the novel exploits the idea that people can be alienated by authorities purely because of who they are. Other works which would enable further exploration of these issues are Steven Barnes' *Lion's Blood* and Samuel Delany's *Nova*, as mentioned earlier. Looking into the themes of hybridity would enable to show how the ideological construction of gender, race, religion and sexual discrimination can be dismantled; difference and the perceived alien, the other would be accepted for who they are, thus offering the prospects of peace, openness and hope.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Ed. Summers, Della. 2nd ed. Harlow: Longman, 1998. Print.

Adler, Nancy. *The Gulag Survivor: Beyond the Soviet System*. New Brunswick, N.J. ; London: Transaction Publishers, 2002. Print.

Adorno, T. *The Jargon of Authenticity*. London: Routeledge, 2003. Print.

Annas, Pamela J. "New Worlds, New Words: Androgyny in Feminist Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.5 (1978): 143-56. Print.

Apollinaire, Guillaume, and Anthony Edward Pilkington. *Alcools*. Blackwell's French Texts. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970. Print.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Deutsch, 1986. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill; Griffiths, Gareth; Tiffin, Helen. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Asimov, Isaac. *The Caves of Steel*. New York: Pyramid Books, 1968. Print.
---. *The Complete Robot*. London: Voyager, 1995. Print.

Atkins, John. *George Orwell*. Ditchling: John Calder Publishers, 1954. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. London: Vintage Books, 1996. Print.

August, Eugene. "The Only Happy Ending: Divine Comedies in Western Literature." *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association* Vol. 14 No. 1 ((Spring) 1981): 85-99. Print.

Baccolini, Raffaella. "Finding Utopia in Dystopia: Feminism, Memory, Nostalgia, and Hope." *Utopia Method Vision: The Use Value of Social Dreaming*. Ed. Moylan, Tom; Baccolini, Raffaella. Bern; New York: Peter Lang, 2007. 159-90. Print.

Bacon, Francis. *The Advancement of Learning; and, New Atlantis*. The World's Classics. London: Oxford University Press, 1951. Print.
---. "Of Truth." *The Major Words*. Ed. Vickers, Brian. Oxford: Oxford Classics, 2002. 341-2. Print.

Barnes, Steven. *Lion's Blood*. New York: Warner Books, 2002. Print.

Bates, Harry. *Farewell to the Master*. Rio Rancho, US: Sterling Publications, 2012. Print.

Baudelaire, Charles. *The Flowers of Evil*. Trans. Mc Gowan, J. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.

Baudrillard, J. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2006. Print.

Benford, Gregory. "Pascal's Terror." *Mindscapes: The Geographies of Imagined Worlds*. Ed. Slusser, George E.; Rabkin, Eric S.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989. 271-77. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illumination*. London: Fontana Press, 1992. Print.

Benjamin, Walter; Underwood, J. A. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Penguin Great Ideas. London: Penguin, 2008. Print.

Ben-Tov, S. *The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality*. Studies in Literature and Science. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995. Print.

Bersani, Leo. *Baudelaire and Freud*. A Quantum Book. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977. Print.

Bewes, Timothy. *Cynicism and Postmodernity*. London: Verso, 1997. Print.

Bittner, James W. *Approaches to the Fiction of Ursula K. Le Guin*. Epping: Bowker, 1984. Print.

---. "Chronosophy, Aesthetics, and Ethics in Le Guin's *the Dispossessed: An Ambiguous Utopia*." *No Place Else: Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction*. Ed. Rabkin, Eric; Greenberg, Martin; Olander, Joseph. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Souther Illinois University Press, 1983. 244-70. Print.

Bloom, Harold. *George Orwell's 1984*. Modern Critical Interpretations. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. Print.

Boer, Roland. *Knockin' on Heaven's Door : The Bible and Popular Culture*. Biblical Limits. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Boer, S. P. de, et al. *Biographical Dictionary of Dissidents in the Soviet Union, 1956-1975*. The Hague ; Boston, Hingham, MA: M. Nijhoff ;, Kluwer Boston, 1982. Print.

Bolton, Whitney. *The Language of Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Knoxville: The University of Tennesse Press, 1984. Print.

Booker, Keith; Thomas, Anne-Marie. *The Science Fiction Handbook*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Print.

Booker, M. Keith. *The Post-Utopian Imagination: American Culture in the Long 1950s*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002. Print.

Borges, Jorge Luis. "The Cruel Redeemer Lazarus Morell." Trans. Hurley, A. *A Universal History of Iniquity*. London, New York: Penguin, 2004. Print.

Bould, Mark, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Oxon: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Bradbury, Ray. "The Concrete Mixer." *The Illustrated Man*. New York: Avon Books, 2001. Print.
---. *Fahrenheit 451*. London: Haper and Collins, 1996. Print.

Brands, Henry. W. *Greenback Planet: How the Dollar Conquered the World and Threatened Civilization as We Know It*. Discovering America Series. 1st ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011. Print.

Brennan, John; Downs, Michael C. "Anarchism and Utopian Tradition in *the Dispossessed*." *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Ed. Olander, Joseph D. Greenberg, Martin Harry. Edinburgh: P. Harris, 1979. 116-52. Print.

Broderick, Damien. *X,Y,Z,T: Dimensions of Science Fiction*. Holicong: Borgo Press, 2004. Print.

Brown, Malcolm Hamrick. *A Shostakovich Casebook*. Russian Music Studies. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. Print.

Bukatman, Scott. *Terminal Identity: The Virtual Subject in Postmodern Science Fiction*. Durham ; London: Duke University Press, 1993. Print.

Bulwer-Lytton, Edward. *The Coming Race*. Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2008. Print.

Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. Film Classics. Ed. Times, The. London: Penguin, nd. Print.

Burns, Tony. *Political Theory, Science Fiction, and Utopian Literature: Ursula K. Le Guin and the Dispossessed*. Lanham, Md.; Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2008. Print.

Butler, Judith. "Giving an Account of Oneself." *Diacritics* 31 No. 4 (Winter 2001): 22-40. Print.

Butler, Octavia. "Amnesty." *Year's Best Sf 9*. Ed. Hartwell, David G.; Cramer, Kathryn. New York: Harper and Collins; EOS, 2004. 1-31. Print.
---. *Kindred*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988. Print.

Calder, Jenni. *Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1987. Print.

Call, Lewis. "Postmodern Anarchism in the Novels of Ursula K. Le Guin." *SubStance* 36 (2) (2007): 87-105. Print.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. London: Fontana Press, 1993. Print.

Carpenter, J. (Dir). *The Thing*. Perf: Russell, Kurt; Brimley, Wilford; David, Keith. U.S, Universal Studios, 1982.

Carr, Craig L. *Orwell, Politics, and Power*. New York: Continuum, 2010. Print.

Carter, Michael. *George Orwell and the Problem of Authentic Existence*. London: Croom Helm, 1985. Print.

Carter, Paul. *Repressed Spaces: The Poetics of Agoraphobia*. London: Reaktion, 2002. Print.

Carter, Ronald, and Stockwell, Peter. *The Language and Literature Reader*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Claeys, Gregory, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.

Clarke, Arthur C. *Childhood's End*. Basingstoke and Oxford: Pan Macmillan, 2010. Print.

Closs Traugott, Elizabeth. "Newspeak: Could It Really Work?" *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Standford Alumni Association, 1983. 92-102. Print.

Cohen, Ariel. *Russian Imperialism: Development and Crisis*. Westport, Conn.; London: Praeger, 1998. Print.

Cohen, Stephen F. *The Victims Return: Survivors of the Gulag after Stalin*. New pbk. ed. London ; New York: I.B. Taurus, 2012. Print.

Courtine, J.J and Willett, L. "A Brave New Language: Orwell's Invention Of "Newspeak" in *1984*." *SubStance* Vol. 15 No.2 Issue 50 (1986): 69-74. Print.

Crick, Bernard. "Bernard Crick on the Novel as Satire." *Bloom's Guides: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Bloom, Harold. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004. 75-82. Print.

Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan. "Towards the Last Fairy Tale: On the Fairy-Tale Paradigm in the Strugatskys' Science Fiction, 1963-72". *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.13. 1 (March 1986): 1-41. Print.

Cummins, Elizabeth. *Understanding Ursula K. Le Guin*. Understanding Contemporary American Literature. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1990. Print.

Curtis, Claire P. "Ambiguous Choice: Skepticism as a Grounding for Utopia." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 265-82. Print.

D'Ammassa, Don. *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. N.Y.: Facts On File, 2004. Print.

Das, Satyabrata *George Orwell: The Man Who Saw Tomorrow*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 1998. Print.

Davidson, Basil. *The African Slave Trade*. A rev. and expanded ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980. Print.

Davis, Laurence. "The Dynamic and Revolutionary Utopia of Ursula K. Le Guin." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L. Davis. Oxford Lexigton Books, 2005. 3-36. Print.

De Graft, J.C. "Roots in African Drama and Theatre." *Black Theatre: Ritual Performance in the African Diaspora*. Ed. Harrison, Paul Carter; Walker, Victor Leo; Edwards, Gus. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002. 18-38. Print.

Delany, Paul. "Words, Deeds and Things: Orwell's Quarrel with Language." *George Orwell, a Reassessment*. Ed. Buitenhuis, Peter and Nadel, Ira B. London: Macmillan Press, 1988. 93-101. Print.

Delany, Samuel R. *Babel-17*. London: Gollancz, 2009. Print.
---. *Nova*. London: Gollancz, 2001. Print.
---. *Silent Interviews: On Language, Race, Sex, Science Fiction, and Some Comics: A Collection of Written Interviews*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1994. Print.

Deutscher, Isaac. "*1984*: The Mysticism of Cruelty." *George Orwell: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Williams, Raymond. London: Prentice-Hall, 1974. 119-32. Print.

Dick, Philip K. *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* [1st ed] ed. Garden City, N.Y.,: Doubleday, 1968. Print.
---. . *The Man in the High Castle*. London: Penguin, 1965. Print.

Dickens, Charles, and Paul Schlicke. *Hard Times*. Oxford World's Classics. Rev. [ed.] ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Doctor, Ronald M., Ada P. Kahn, and Christine A. Adamec. *The Encyclopaedia of Phobias, Fears, and Anxieties*. Facts on File Library of Health and Living. 3rd ed. New York: Facts On File, 2008. Print.

Doron, Gil. ""...Those Marvelous Empty Zones on the Edge of Our Cities": Heterotopia and The "Dead Zone"." *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. Ed. Dehaene, Michiel; Cauter, Lieven de. London: Routledge, 2008. 203-14. Print.

Duncan, Andy. "Alternate History." *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. James, Edward; Mendlesohn, Farah. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 209-18. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

Easterbrook, Neil. "Ethics and Alterity." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Bould, Mark; Butler, Andrew M; Roberts Adam; Vint, Sherryl. London: Routledge, 2009. 382-92. Print.

Ehrlich, Paul and Anne. "*1984*: Population and Environment." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Standford Alumni Association, 1983.49-55. Print.

Ehrlich, Paul R. and Anne H. "Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne H. Ehrlich: On Population." *George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Bloom, Harold. New York: Infobase Punblishing, 2004. Print.

Elliott, Winter. "Breaching Invisible Walls: Individual Anarchy in *the Dispossessed*." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. Stillman, Peter; Davis, Laurence. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 149-68. Print.

Elsbree, Langdon. "The Structured Nightmare of *1984*." *Twentieth Century Literature*. Vol. 5 No.3 (Oct 1959): 135-41. Print.

Emerson, Caryl. "Back to the Future: Shostakovich's Revision of Leskov's 'Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District'." *Cambridge Opera Journal*. Vol.1 No.1 (1989): 59-78. Print.

Engels, Friedrich. "From *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*." *The Portable Victorian Reader*. Ed. Haight, Gordon. London: Penguin, 1972. 60-7. Print.

Erhman, Jacques; Caplan, Jay. "The Tragic/Utopian Meaning of History." *Yale French Studies*. No.58 In Memory of Jacques Ehrmann: Inside Play OutsideGame (1979): 15-30. Print.

Erlich, Victor. "The Dead Hand of the Future: The Predicament of Vladimir Mayakovsky." *Slavic Review*. Vol. 21 No.3 (Sep. 1962): 433-40. Print.

Ermolaev, Herman. *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917-1991*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997. Print.

Esslin, Martin. "Television and Telescreen." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983. 126-38. Print.

Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Evans, Margery, A. *Baudelaire and Intertextuality: Poetry at the Crossroads*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.

Ferns, Chris. "*Future Conditional or Future Perfect? The Dispossessed and the Permanent Revolution*." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 249-63. Print.

Ferns, Christopher S. *Narrating Utopia: Ideology, Gender, Form in Utopian Literature*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999. Print.

Flieger, Verlyn. "Frodo and Aragorn: The Concept of Hero." *Understanding the Lord of the Rings: The Best of Tolkien Criticism*. Ed. Zimbardo, Rose A; Isaacs, Neil David. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004. 122-45. Print.

Fortunati, Vita. "'It Makes No Difference': A Utopia of Stimulation and Transparency." *George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Bloom, Harold. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 109-20. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.

Foucault, Michel; Miskowiec, Jay. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics.* Vol.16 No.1 (1986): 22-27. Print.

Fowler, R. *The Language of George Orwell*. Basingtoke: Macmillan Press, 1995. Print.

Franco, Jean. "The Utopia of a Tired Man: Jorge Luis Borges." *Social Text.* Vol.4. (Autumn 1981): 52-78. Print.

Frédéric, Louis, and K. Roth. *Japan Encyclopaedia*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002. Print.

Freedman, Carl Howard. *Critical Theory and Science Fiction*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press : University Press of New England, 2000. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle and Other Writings*. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.

---. *Civilisation and Its Discontents*. London: Penguin Books, 2002. Print.

Frye, N. *The Critical Path: An Essay on the Social Context of Literary Criticism*. London: Idiana University Press, 1971. Print.

Garth, John. *Tolkien and the Great War: The Threshold of Middle-Earth*. London: HarperCollins, 2003. Print.

Geraghty, Lincoln. *Channeling the Future: Essays on Science Fiction and Fantasy Television*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009. Print.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge, Mass.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1996. Print.

Gleckner, Robert. "1984 or 1948?" *College English.* Vol. 18 No. 2 (Nov. 1956): 95-9. Print.

Goldstein, Philip. "Orwell as a (Neo)Conservative: The Reception of *1984*." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* Vol. 33 No. 1 (Winter 2000): 44-57. Print.

Gomel, Elana. "Gods Like Men: Soviet Science Fiction and the Utopian Self." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.31 No.3 (2004): 358-77. Print.

---. "The Poetics of Censorship: Allegory as Form and Ideology in the Novels of Arkady and Boris Strugatsky." *Science Fiction Studies* 22 1 (March) (1995): 87-105. Print.

---. *Postmodern Science Fiction and Temporal Imagination*. Continuum Literary Studies. London: Continuum, 2010. Print.

Good, Graham. "'Ingsoc in Relation to Chess': Reversible Opposites in Orwell's *1984*." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction.* Vol. 18 No. 1 (Aut. 1984): 50-63. Print.

Goodstein, Elizabeth S. *Experience without Qualities: Boredom and Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005. Print.

Gordon, Joan. "Hybridity, Heterotopia, and Mateship in China Miéville's *Perdido Street Station*". *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.30 No.3 (2003): 456-76. Print.

Gottlieb, Erika. "Room 101 Revisited: The Reconciliation of Political and Psychological Dimensions in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *George Orwell, a Reassessment* Ed. Buitenhuis, Peter and Nadel, Ira B. London: Macmillan Press, 1988. 51-76. Print.

Gregory, Paul R., and V. V. Lazarev. *The Economics of Forced Labor: The Soviet Gulag*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2003. Print.

Gunn, James and Candelaria, Matthew. *Speculations on Speculation: Theories of Science Fiction*. Oxford; Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press. Print.

Habermas, J. *Justification and Application: Remarks on Discourse Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995. Print.

---. *Legitimation Crisis*. London: Heinemann Educational, 1976. Print.

---. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol.2 Lifeworld and the System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. Print.

Haldeman, Joe. *The Forever War*. London: Gollancz, 2006. Print.

Hanks, Patrick, Kate Hardcastle, and Flavia Hodges. *A Dictionary of First Names*. 2nd ed. Patrick Hanks, Kate Hardcastle and Flavia Hodges. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.

Harris, Harold J. "Orwell's Essays and *1984*." *Twentieth century Literature* Vol. 4 No. 4 (Jan 1959): 154-61. Print.

Hawking, S. W. *A Brief History of Time*. 20th anniversary ed. 1 vols. London: Bantam, 2008. Print.

Hayles, N.B. "Androgyny, Ambivalence and Assimilation in *The Left Hand of Darkness*." *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Ed. Olander, Joseph D.; Greenberg, Martin H. Edinburgh: Paul Harris, 1979. 97-115. Print.

Heinlein, Robert A. *The Fantasies of Robert A. Heinlein*. 1st ed. New York: Tor, 1999. Print.

---. *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress*. London: Gollancz, 2001. Print.

---. *The Puppet Master*. Three by Heinlein. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1951. Print.

---. "The Unpleasant Profession of Jonathan Hoag." *The Best of Robert Heinlein 1939-1942*. Ed. Wells, Angus. London: Sphere, 1973. Print.

Hill, Jane; Mannheim, Bruce. "Language and World View." *Annual Review of Anthropology.* Vol.21 (1992): 381-406. Print.

Hoberman, J. *The Red Atlantis: Communist Culture in the Absence of Communism*. Culture and the Moving Image. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998. Print.

Hochman, Stanley, and McGraw-Hill inc. *Mcgraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama: An International Reference Work in 5 Volumes*. 2nd ed. 5 vols. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1984. Print.

Horne, Janet R. *A Social Laboratory for Modern France: The Musée Social & the Rise of the Welfare State*. Durham ; London: Duke University Press, 2002. Print.

Howe, Irvine. "*1984*: History as Nightmare." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984*. Ed. Hynes, Samuel. London: Prentice-Hall, 1971. 41-53. Print.

Hoyles, John. *The Literary Underground: Writers and the Totalitarian Experience, 1900-1950*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. Print.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. London: Harper, 2005. Print.

Jakaitis, Jake. "The Idea of the Asian in Philip K. Dick's the Man in the High Castle." *World Weavers: Globalization, Science Fiction, and the Cybernetic Revolution*

Ed. Wong, Kin-yuen; Westfahl, Gary; Chan, Amy Kit-sze. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005. 157-66. Print.

James, Edward; Mendlesohn, Farah, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. *Archaeologies of the Future : The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. London: Verso, 2005. Print.
---. "Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalization and the Production of Utopian Discourse." *Diacritics.* Vol.7 No.2 (1977): 2-21. Print.
---. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. New York: Cornell Universtity Press, 1982. Print.
---. *The Ideologies of Theory: Essays 1971-1986*. London: Routledge, 1988. Print.
---. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Post-Contemporary Interventions. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991. Print.
---. "Progress Versus Utopia; or, Can We Imagine the Future." *Science Fiction Studies* 9.27 (1982). Feb 2012
---. "World Reduction in Le Guin." *Archaeologies of the Future : The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. Ed. Jameson, Fredric. London: Verso, 2005. Print.

Jancovich, Mark; Johnston, Dereck. "Film and Television, the 1950s." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Bould, Mark; Butler, Andrew M; Roberts Adam; Vint, Sherryl. London: Routledge, 2009. 71-9. Print.

Jenemann, David. *Adorno in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. Print.

Johnson, Vida T., and Graham Petrie. *The Films of Andrei Tarkovsky: A Visual Fugue*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994. Print.

Joyce, James, and Declan Kiberd. *Ulysses*. Penguin Classics. Annotated student ed. London: Penguin, 2000. Print.

Jung, Carl. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Ed. Read, Herbert. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966. Print.
---. *Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1987. Print.

Kay, Paul; Kempton, Willett. "What Is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?" *American Anthropologist.* Vol.86, New Series 1 (1984): 65-79. Print.

Keefer, Lubov. "Opera in the Soviet." *Notes.*Vol.2 No.2 (1945): 110-8. Print.

Kincaid, Paul. *What It Is We Do When We Read Science Fiction*. 1st ed. Harold Wood: Beccon Publications, 2008. Print.

Klein, Herbert S. *The Atlantic Slave Trade*. New Approaches to the Americas. 2nd ed. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.

Kluger, Daniel. "Fables of Desire." *Science Fiction Studies* 31 3 (November) (2004). Print.

Knepper, B. G.. "*The Coming Race*: Hell? Or Paradise Foretasted?" *No Place Else: Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction*. Ed. Rabkin, Eric; Greenberg,

Martin; Olander, Joseph. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Souther Illinois University Press, 1983. 11-31. Print.

Kolakowski, Leszek. *Main Currents of Marxism*. Trans. Falla, P.S. New York: Norton, 2005. Print.

Kuhn, Annette. *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*. Verso, 1990. Print.
---. *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. London: Verso, 1999. Print.

Kunz, George. *The Paradox of Power and Weakness: Levinas and an Alternative Paradigm for Psychology*. Suny Series, Alternatives in Psychology. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998. Print.

Landon, Brooks. *Science Fiction after 1900: From the Steam Man to the Stars*. Studies in Literary Themes and Genres No. 12. New York; London: Twayne Publishers;Prentice Hall International, 1997. Print.

Lang, Andrew K. "Cinderella Story." *The Frozen Planet and Other Science Fiction Novellas*. New York: Macfadden -Bartell Corporation, 1970. Print.

Le Guin, Ursula K. "American Sf and the Other." *The Language of the Night: Essays on Fantasy and Science Fiction.* Ed. Wood, Susan; Le Guin, Ursula K. London: The Women's Press, 1989. 83-5. Print.
---. *The Dispossessed*. London: Gollancz, 2006. Print.
---. "Is Gender Necessary? Redux." *The Language of the Night: Essays on Fantasy and Science Fiction.* Ed. Wood, Susan; Le Guin, Ursula K. London: The Women's Press, 1989. 135-47. Print.
---. *The Lathe of Heaven*. London: Gollancz 2003. Print.
---. *The Left Hand of Darkness*. Orbit Book. 1st Futura ed ed. Lond,, 1981. Print.
---. "A New Book by the Strugatskys." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.4 No.2 (July 1977). Print.

Lem, Stanislaw. "About the Strugatskys' *Roadside Picnic*." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.10 No.3 (Nov. 1983): 317-22. Print.
---. *Solaris*. London: Faber and Faber, 2003. Print.

Lennon, Brian. *In Babel's Shadow: Multilingual Literatures, Monolingual States*. Minneapolis: University of Minesota, 2010. Print.

Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*. Bern: Peter Lang AC, 2010. Print.
---. "The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society: Utopia as Method." *Utopia Method Vision : The Use Value of Social Dreaming*. Ed. Moylan, Tom; Baccolini, Raffaella. Bern ; New York: Peter Lang, 2007. 47-68. Print.

Lindsay, Charles. "More Political Lingo." *American Speech* Vol. 2 No. 10 (Jul 1927): 443. Print.

Lucy, John A. "Linguistic Relativity." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol.26 (1997): 291-312. Print.

Lupak, Barbara, T. "King Arthur and Black American Black Culture." *New Directions in Arthurian Studies*. Ed. Lupack, Alan. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002. 103-24. Print.

Lyons, John and Orwell, gGeorge. "George Orwell's Opaque Glass in *1984*." *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature* Vol.2 No.3 (1961): 39-40. Print.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Inhuman: Reflections on Time*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991. Print.

---. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Theory and History of Literature V. 10. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. Print.

---. *The Postmodern Explained: Correspondence 1982-1985*. London: University of Minesota Press, 1997. Print.

---. *Postmodern Fables*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. Print.

Macey, Samuel L. "Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: The Future That Becomes the Past." *George Orwell, a Reassessment* Ed. Buitenhuis, Peter and Nadel, Ira B. London: Macmillan Press, 1988. 23-31. Print.

Maczynska, Magdalena. "This Monstrous City: Urban Visionary Satire in the Fiction of Martin Amis, Will Self, China Miéville, and Maggie Gee." *Contemporary Literature*. Vol.51 No.1 (2010): 58-86. Print.

Manheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*. London, New-York: Routeledge, 2002. Print.

Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels, and C. J. Arthur. *The German Ideology*. 2d ed. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1974. Print.

Marx, Karl, and Ernest Mandel. *Capital : Volume 1*. Penguin, 1976. Print.

Massey, Doreen B., and John Allen. *Geography Matters! : A Reader*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press in association with the Open University, 1984. Print.

Mayakovsky, Vladimir. *The Bedbug [a Play] and Selected Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 160. Print.

---. *The Complete Plays of Vladimir Mayakovsky*. New York,: Washington Square Press, 1968. Print.

Mayakovsky, Vladimir, Guy Daniels, and Robert Payne. *Mayakovsky--Plays*. European Drama Classics. Northwestern University Press ed. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1995. Print.

Medhurst, Martin, J. "Rhetoric and Cold War: A Strategic Approach." *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor and Ideology*. Ed. al., Medhurst and. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan University Press, 1997. 19-28. Print.

Meiners, Roger. "Dialectics at a Standstill: Orwell, Benjamin, and the Difficulties of Poetry." *Boundary 2* Vol. 20 No. 2 ((Summer) 1993): 116-39. Print.

Mellor, Ann. "'You're Only a Rebel from the Waist Downwards': Orwell's View of Women." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983. 115-25. Print.

Mendlesohn, Farah. "Fiction, 1926-1949." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Bould, Mark; Butler, Andrew M; Roberts Adam; Vint, Sherryl. London: Routledge, 2009. 52-61. Print.

---. "Introduction: Reading Science Fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. James, Edward; Mendlesohn, Farah. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.

Mével, Jean-Pierre; Colin, Jean-Paul, Leclère Christian "Dictionnaire De L'argot Et Du Francais Populaire." *Larousse*. Ed. Larousse. Paris, 2010. Print.

Meyers, Valerie. *George Orwell*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991. Print.

Miéville, China. *Perdido Street Station*. London: Pan Books, Macmillan, 2000. Print.

Mikhailov, Alexander; Tittler, Nancy. "At the Feet of a Giant (Arguments Surrounding Mayakovsky)." *New Literary History*. Vol.23 No.1 (Winter, 1992): 113-32. Print.

Moore, John. "Vagabond Desire: Aliens, Alienation and Human Regeneration in Arkady and Boris Strugatsky's Roadside Picnic and Andrey Tarkovsky's Stalker." *Alien Identities: Exploring Difference in Film and Fiction*. Ed. Cartmell, Deborah. London: Pluto Press, 1999. 121-40. Print.

Moore, Ward. *Bring the Jubilee*. London: Gollancz, 2001. Print.

More, Thomas. *Utopia*. Ware: Wordswoth Classics, 1997. Print.

Morris, Marry Jo. "Bentham and Basic English." *George Orwell, a Reassessment*. Ed. Buitenhuis, Peter and Nadel, Ira B. London: Macimillan Press, 1988. 102-13. Print.

Morson, G.S. *The Boundaries of Genre*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Moylan, Tom. "The Locus of Hope: Utopia Versus Ideology." *Science Fiction Studies*. Vol.9 No.2 (Jul 1982): 159-66. Print.

Mulcahy, Kevin V. "Official Culture and Cultural Repression: The Case of Dmitri Shostakovich." *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Vol.18 No.3 (1984): 69-83. Print.

Musick, David. *An Introduction to the Sociology of Juvenile Delinquency*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995. Print.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Birth to Presence*. Meridian. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993. Print.

Nikolskaya, Irina. "Shostakovich Remembered: Interviews with His Soviet Colleagues." *A Shostakovich Casebook*. Ed. Brown, Malcolm Hamrick. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. 150-89. Print.

Niven, Larry. *Tales of Known Space*. London: Little, Brown Book, 1992. Print.

Nudelman, Rafail. "An Approach to the Structure of Le Guin's Sf." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.2 No.3 (Nov 1975). Print.

Olander, Joseph D., and Martin Harry Greenberg. *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Edinburgh: P. Harris, 1979. Print.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.
---. "Books Vs Cigarettes." *George Orwell: Essays*. London: Penguin, 2000. 341-44. Print.
---. *Down and out in Paris and London*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1997. Print.
---. "Letter to Humphrey House." *The Collected Essay, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940*. Ed. Orwell, S. and Angus, I. Vol. Vol. 1. London: Penguin, 1968. Print.
---. "Letter to Leonard Moore." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: In Front of Your Nose, 1945-1950*. Vol. Vol. 4. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. 483. Print.
---. "Literature and Totalitarianism." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. Ed. Orwell, S. and Angus, I. Vol. Volume II: My Country Right or Left, 1940-1943. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. 134-37. Print.
---. "London Letter to *Partisan Review*." *The Collected Essay, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My Country Right or Left, 1940-1943*. Ed. Orwell, Sonia and Angus, Ian. Vol. Vol. 2. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. 175. Print.
---. "New Words." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. Ed. Orwell, S. and Angus, I. Vol. Volume II: My Country Right or Left, 1940-1943. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. 3-12. Print.
---. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin, 1990. Print.
---. "Not Counting Niggers." *The Collected Essay, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. 434-41. Print.
---. "Politics and the English Language." *George Orwell: Essays*. London: Penguin, 2000. 348-60. Print.
---. "The Prevention of Literature." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: In Front of Your Nose, 1945-1950.* Ed. Orwell, S. and Angus, I. Vol. Vol. 4. London: Secker & Warburg, 1968. 59-71. Print.
---. *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Brace: Harcourt, 1958. Print.
---. "Why I Write." *George Orwell: Essays*. London: Penguin, 2000. 1-7. Print.

Orwell, George, and P. H. Davison. “The Road to Wigan Pier”. *The Complete Works of George Orwell; V.5*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1997. Print.

Orwell, George, et al. *Two Wasted Years: 1943*. *The Complete Works of George Orwell ; V.15*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1998. Print.

Patai, Daphne. "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in Orwell's *1984*." *PMLA* Vol. 97 No. 5 (Oct 1982): 856-70. Print.

Philmus, Robert M. *Visions and Re-Visions: (Re)Constructing Science Fiction*. Liverpool Science Fiction Texts and Studies. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005. Print.

Piercy, Marge. *Woman on the Edge of Time*. London: TheWomen's Press, 1995. Print.

Plaw, Avery. "Empty Hands: Communication, Pluralism, and Community in Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 283-303. Print.

Potts, Stephen W. *The Second Marxian Invasion: The Fiction of the Strugatsky Brothers*. The Milford Series. Popular Writers of Today,. 1st ed. San Bernardino, Calif.: Borgo Press, 1991. Print.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folk-Tale*. Austin: Texas UP., 1968. Print.

Publishers, Hendrickson. *The Holy Bible: King James Version*. Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, LLC, 2004. Print.

Pynchon, Thomas. "The Road to *1984*." *The Guardian.* Saturday. May, 3rd 2003. Print.

Rabkin, Eric S. "Metalinguistics and Science Fiction." *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 6 No. 1 (Aut 1979): 79-97. Print.

Resch, Robert P. "Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Boundary 2.* Vol. 24 No. 1 (Spring 1997): 137-76. Print.

Reynolds, Alastair. *Terminal World*. Ed. Gollancz. London, 2010. Print.

Reynolds, Andrew. "Ursula K. Le Guin, Herbert Marcuse, and the Fate of the Utopia in the Postmodern." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. Stillman, Peter; Davis, Laurence. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 75-94. Print.

Reynolds, Mack. *Towers of Utopia*. New York: Bantam books, 1975. Print.

Rigsby, Ellen M. "Time and the Measure of the Political Animal." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 167-80. Print.

Roazen, Paul. "Orwell, Freud and *1984*." *George Orwell's* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Bloom , Harold. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. Print.

Roberts, Adam C. *Science Fiction*. London, New-York: Routeledge, 2006. Print.
---. *Yellow Blue Tibia*. London: Gollancz, 2009. Print.

Robinson, Paul. "For the Love of Big Brother: The Sexual Politics of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983. 148-58. Print.

Rochelle, Warren G. *Communities of the Heart: Rhetoric of Myth in the Fiction of Ursula K. Le Guin*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001. Print.

Rodgers, Jennifer. "Fulfillment as a Function of Time, or the Ambiguous Process of Utopia." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. Davis, Laurence; Stillman, Peter. . Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 181-94. Print.

Rogan, Alcena M. D. "Utopian Studies." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Bould, Mark; Butler, Andrew M; Roberts Adam; Vint, Sherryl. London: Routledge, 2009. 308-17. Print.

Rorty, Richard. *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. New-York: Cambridge University Press, 1989. Print.

Safire, William. "Safire Political Dictionary." *Safire Political Dictionary*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Said, Edward W. "Invention, Memory, and Place." *Critical Inquiry* 26 2 (2000): 175-92. Print.
---. *Orientalism*. A Peregrine Book. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985. Print.

Salvestroni, Simonetta. "The Ambiguous Miracle in Three Novels by the Strugatsky." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.11 (1984): 3 (Nov). Print.

Saunders, Lorraine. *The Unsung Artistry of George Orwell*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008. Print.

Sawyer, Andrew. "Backward, Turn Backward": Narratives of Reversed Time in Science-Fiction." *Worlds Enough and Time: Explorations of Time in Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Ed. Westfahl, Gary; Slusser, George; Leiby, Gary. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002. 45-68. Print.

Sawyer, Andy, and David Seed. *Speaking Science Fiction: Dialogues and Interpretations*. Liverpool Science Fiction Texts and Studies. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000. Print.

Schmidt, Paul. "A Director Works with a Playwright: Meyerhold and Mayakovsky." *Educational Theatre Journal.* Vol.29 No.2 (May 1977): 214-20. Print.

Seed, David. *American Science Fiction and the Cold War: Literature and Film*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999. Print.

Selinger, Bernard. *Le Guin and Identity in Contemporary Fiction*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1988. Print.

Shapovalov, Veronica. *Remembering the Darkness: Women in Soviet Prisons*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001. Print.

Shute, Nevil. *On the Beach*. London: Vintage, 2009. Print.

Siegelbaum, Lewis H. *Stakhanovism and the Politics of Productivity in the USSR, 1935-1941*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Print.

Simak, Clifford. *City*. London: Four Squares, 1965. Print.

Simirenko, Alex, and C. A. Kern-Simirenko. *Professionalization of Soviet Society*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1982. Print.

Simon, Eric. "The Strugatskys in Political Context." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.31 No.3 (2004): 378-406. Print.

Simpson, J.A., and E.S.C. Weiner. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Clarendon Press, 1989. Print.

Sloterdijk, Peter, Michael Eldred, and Andreas Hyssen. *Critique of Cynical Reason*. London: Verso, 1988. Print.

Slusser, George E. "The Martians among Us: Wells and the Strugatskys." *Visions of Mars: Essays on the Red Planet in Fiction and Science*. Ed. Slusser, George E.; Rabkin, Eric S. Jefferson: McFarland, 2011. Print.

Slusser, George E.; Rabkin, Eric S., ed. *Mindscapes: The Geographies of Imagined Worlds*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1989. Print.

---. "Structures of Apprehension: Lem, Heinlein, and the Strugatskys." *Science Fiction Studies.* Vol.16 No.1 (1989): 1-37. Print.

Smith, Philip E. . "Unbuilding Walls: Human Nature and the Nature of Evolutionary and Political Theory in *the Dispossessed*." *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Ed. Olander, Joseph D.; Greenberg, Martin H. . Edinburgh: Paul Harris Publishing, 1979. Print.

Sobchack, Vivian. "Cities on the Edge of Time; the Urban Science-Fiction Film." *Alien Zone II: The Spaces of Science-Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Kuhn, Annette. London: Verso, 1999. 308 p. Print.

Sokolowski, S. Wojciech. "Beneath the Veil of Market Rationality: Cognitive Lumping and Splitting in Narratives of Economic Development." *Ideology and the Social Sciences*. Ed. Kinloch, Graham C.; Mohan, Raj P. Westport: Greenwoos Publishing, 2000. 63-86. Print.

Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. *The Gulag Archipelago*. Glasgow: Collins/Harvill Press and Fontana, 1974. Print.
---. *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. Trans. Parker, R. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973. Print.

Somay, Bülent "From Ambiguity to Self-Reflexitivity: Revolutionising Fantasy Space." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. Stillman, Peter; Davis, Laurence. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 233-48. Print.

Spencer, Douglas "The Alien Comes Home: Getting Past the Twin Planets of Possession and Auterity in Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 95-108. Print.

Spivack, Charlotte. *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Twayne's United States Authors Series. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984. Print.

Starcevic, Vladan. *Anxiety Disorders in Adult : A Clinical Guide*. 2nd ed. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.

Steinbeck, John. *The Grapes of Wrath*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973. Print.

Steinhoff, William. "Afterword: The Inner Heart." *The Future of* Nineteen Eighty-Fou*r*. Ed. Jensen, Ejner J. Ann Harbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1984. Print.
---. *The Road to* 1984. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975. Print.

Steinhoff, William R. *George Orwell and the Origins of* 1984. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1975. Print.

Stillman, Peter. "*The Dispossessed* as Ecological Political Theory." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 55-74. Print.

Stillman, Peter; Davis, Laurence, ed. *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. Print.

Stites, Richard. *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. Print.

Stockwell, Peter. *The Poetics of Science Fiction*. Textual Explorations. Harlow, England ; New York: Longman, 2000. Print.

Stow, Simon. "Worlds Apart: Ursula K. Le Guin and the Possibility of Method." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. P.Stillman, L.Davis. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 37-53. Print.

Strugatsky, Arkady; Strugatsky Boris. *Prisoners of Power*. London: Gollancz, 1978. Print.
---. *Hard to Be a God*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1975. Print.

---. *Roadside Picnic*. London: Gollancz, 2007. Print.

Sulloway, F.J. "Birth Order and Evolutionary Psychology: A Meta-Analytic Overview." *Psychological Inquiry* Vol.6. No. 1. (1995): 75-80. Print.
---. "How Is Personality Formed: A Talk with F.J. Sulloway". 1998. *The Third Culture*. Ed. Edge. 02/01/2009. <http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/sulloway/index.html>.

Suvin, Darko. *Defined by a Hollow: Essays on Utopia, Science Fiction and Political Epistemology*. Bern: Peter Lang AC, 2010. Print.
---. *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988. Print.

Tarkovsky, Andrei. *Stalker*. Perf: Kaidanovsky, Alexander; Solonitsyn, Anatoli; Grinko, Nikolai; Freindlich, Alisa. Prod.: Demidova, Aleksandra. RUSCICO, 1979

Tarsis, Valeri i. *The Bluebottle*. 1st American ed. New York,: Knopf, 1963. Print.
---. *Ward 7: An Autobiographical Novel*. [1st ed. New York,: Dutton, 1965. Print.

Tentler, Leslie. "I'm Not Literary, Dear': George Orwell on Women and the Family." *The Future of* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Jensen, Ejner J. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984. 47-64. Print.

Thiers, Adolphe. *Rapport Sur Le Projet De Loi Relatif Aux Fortifications De Paris* Paris: Librairie d'Auguste Leneveu, 1841. Print.

Thomas, Pascal, J. "Avenues of Power: Cities as the Mindscapes of Politics." *Mindscapes: The Geographies of Imagined Worlds*. Ed. Slusser, George E.; Rabkin, Eric S. Illinois: Souther Illinois University Press, 1989. 174-84. Print.

Thompson, Frank H. Jr. "Orwell's Image of the Man of Good Will." *College English.* Vol. 22 No. 4 ((Jan) 1961): 235-40. Print.

Tibbetts, Arnold M. "A Case of Confusion: The NCTE Committee on Public Doublespeak." *College English* Vol. 40 No. 4 ((Dec.) 1978): 407-12. Print.
---. "What Did Orwell Think About the English Language?" *College Composition and Communication.* Vol. 29 No. 2 ((May) 1978): 162-66. Print.

Tolkien, J. R. R. *The Hobbit, or, There and Back Again*. 4th ed. London: Unwin Hyman, 1981. Print.
---. "The Lord of the Rings." London: Harper Collins., 1993. Print.

Tunik, Mark. "The Need for Walls: Privacy, Communityand Freedom in *The Dispossessed*." *The New Utopian Politics of Ursula K. Le Guin's* The Dispossessed. Ed. Stillman, Peter; Davis, Laurence. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2005. 129-48. Print.

Urbanowicz, Victor. "Personal and Political in *The Dispossessed*." *Ursula K. Le Guin*. Ed. Bloom , Harold. New York: Chelsea House, 1978. 145-54. Print.

Van Vogt, Alfred Elton. *Tyranopolis*. Manchester: Sphere Books, 1977. Print.

Vance, Jack. *The Languages of Pao*. New York: Daw Books, 1980. Print.

Victor, David G., Kal Raustiala, and Eugene B. Skolnikoff. *The Implementation and Effectiveness of International Environmental Commitments: Theory and Practice*. Global Environmental Accord. Laxenburg, Austria, Cambridge, Mass.: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis;MIT Press, 1998. Print.

Vidler, Anthony. *Wraped Space: Art, Architechture, and Anxiety in Modern Culture*. Massachussetts: The MIT Press, 2001. Print.

Vieira, Fatima. "The Concept of Utopia." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Claeys, Gregory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 3-27. Print.

Vogt, Henri. *Between Utopia and Disillusionment: A Narrative of the Political Transformation in Eastern Europe*. Studies in Contemporary European History 1. New York ; Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005. Print.

Vonnegut, Kurt. *The Sirens of Titan*. St Ives: Gollancz, 2004. Print.

Warburg, Frederick. "Publisher's Report, 1948." *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. Meyers, Jeffrey. London: Routledge, 1975. 247-50. Print.

Warrick, Patricia S. "Taoism and Fascism in *the Man in the High Castle*." *Philip K. Dick*. Ed. Greenberg, Martin H; Olander, Joseph D. . New York: Taplinger, 1983. 27-52. Print.

Wells, Elizabeth, A. "'The New Woman': Lady Macbeth and Sexual Politics in the Stalinist Era." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 13 2 (2001): 163-89. Print.

Wells, H. G. "*A Modern Utopia*." *Tono-Bungay and a Modern Utopia*. Ed. n.d. London: Odhams Press, n.d. 307-504. Print.

---. *The Shape of Things to Come*. London: Corgi, 1984. Print.

---. *The War of the Worlds*. The Science Fiction. Vol. 1. St Ives: Phoenix, 1995. Print.

Westfahl, Gary. "The Worlds That Could Happen: Science Fiction Neologisms and the Creation of Future Worlds." *Extrapolation* (1994): 290-304. Print.

Wilde, Deborah. "Phobias and Primitive Psychotic Anxieties." *Phobia: A Reassessment*. Ed. Morgan, Siân. London: Karnac Press, 2003. xii, 236 p. Print.

Wilson, Elizabeth. "The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder and Women." *The Blackwell City Reader*. Ed. Bridge, Gary; Watson, Sophie. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. 419-29. Print.

Wilson, Neil. “Punching out the Enlightenment: A Discussion of Peter Sloterdijk's *Kritik Der Zynischen Vernunft.*” *New German Critique*. Special Issue on the Critiques of the Enlightement No. 41 (Spring Summer 1987): 53-70. Print.

Wolin, Sheldon S. *Democracy Incorporated : Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism*. Princeton, N.J. ; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008. Print.

Wolmark, Jenny. "Cyberculture." *A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory*. Ed. Eagleton, Mary. Oxford ; Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003. 215-35. Print.

Woodcock, George. *The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell*. London: Fourth Estate, 1984. Print.

Wyndham, John. *The Chrysalids*. London: M. Joseph, 1955. Print.

Yaszek, Lisa. "Cultural History " *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Bould, Mark; Butler, Andrew M; Roberts Adam; Vint, Sherryl. London: Routledge, 2009. 194-203. Print.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We*. London: Vintage Books, 2007. Print.

Zelazny, Roger. *Damnation Alley*. London: Gollancz, 2003. Print.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States: From 1492 to the Present*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1996. Print.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge, Mass ; London: MIT, 1997. Print.

---. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1999. Print.

Žižek, Slavoj; Wright, Elizabeth; Wright, Edmond Leo. *The Žižek Reader*. Blackwell Readers. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. Print.

OTHER WORKS CONSULTED AND INFLUENCIAL READING

Althusser, L. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*. Ed. J. Storey. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2006. 336-46.

Arnold, M. *Culture and Anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Agathocleous, Tanya. *Urban Realism and the Cosmopolitan Imagination: Visible City, Invisible World.* Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.

Barthes, R. *Essais Critiques*. Paris: Edition du Seuil, 1967. Print.

---. *Le Degré ZéRo De L'ecriture*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1953. Print.

Bakhtin, M.M. *Speech Genres and Other Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. Print.

Brown, Edward J. "Zamyatin's *We* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983. 159-69. Print.

Burgess, Ernest. "The Growth of the City." *The Blackwell City Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. Print. 339-44

Carroll, David. *The States of 'Theory': History, Art, and Critical Discourse*. Irvine Studies in the Humanities. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990. Print.

Chatelain, Danièle; Slusser, George. "Narrator, Narratee, and Visual Reader in Science Fiction." *Speaking Science Fiction: Dialogues and Interpretations*. Ed. Sawyer, Andy; Seed, David. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000. 158-77. Print.

Chekov, Anton. "Ward No.6." Trans. Garnett, C. *The Horse Stealer and Other Stories*. New York: Macmillan, 2010. 29-112. Print.

Chomsky, N. *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*. London: Pluto Press, 1989. Print.

Clark, G.L and Dear, M. *State Apparatus: Structures and Language of Legitimacy*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1984. Print.

Conley, Tim; Cain, Stephen. *Encyclopaedia of Fictional and Fantastic Languages*. Wesport: Greenwood Press, 2006. Print.

Cullen, Francis, T; Cullen, John, B. "The Soviet Model of Soviet Deviance." *Pacific Sociological Association.* Vol. 20 No.3 (1977 Jul): 389-410. Print.

Curran, J. *Media and Power*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Crystal, D. "Basic English". *The Penguin Dictionary of Language*. 2nd Edition. ed. London: Penguin, 1999. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. London: Athlone Press, 1994. Print.

Derrida, J. *Acts of Literature*. New-York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
---. *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Desser, David. "Race, Space and Class: The Politics of Cityscapes in Science Fiction Films." *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Kuhn, Annette. Vol. 2. London: Verso, 1990. 80-96. Print.

Dewey, Jospeh. *In a Dark Time: The Apocoalyptic Temper in the American Novel of the Nuclear Age*. West Lafayette: Purdue, 1990. Print.

Elster, Jon, ed. *Karl Marx: A Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.

Emerson, C. "The Outer World and Inner Speech: Bakhtin, Vygotsky, and the Internalization of Language." *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 10 No.2 (1983): 245-64. Print.

Fairclough, Pauline, and David Fanning. *The Cambridge Companion to Shostakovich*. Cambridge Companions to Music. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

Fay, Laurel E. *Shostakovich: A Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

Field, Mark G. "Dissidence as Disability: The Medicalization of Dissidence in Soviet Russia." *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*. Ed. McCagg, William O.; Siegelbaum, Lewis H. Vol. 253-75. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. Print.

Freeman, M. *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.

Frye, Northrop. "Myth, Fiction, and Displacement." *Daedalus* 90 3 (1961): 587-605. Print.

Gordon, MacLeod, and Kevin Ward. "Spaces of Utopia and Dystopia: Landscaping the Contemporary City." *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 84 3/4 (2002): 153-70. Print.

Gunn, James E. *Inside Science Fiction: Essays on Fantastic Literature*. I.O. Evans Studies in the Philosophy and Criticism of Literature. San Bernardino, Calif.: Borgo Press, 1992. Print.

Gorlinski, Gini. *The 100 Most Influential Musicians of All Time*. Britannica Guide to the World's Most Influential People. 1st ed. New York: Britannica Educational Pub., 2010. Print.

Gutkin, Irina. *The Cultural Origins of the Socialist Realist Aesthetic, 1890-1934*. Studies in Russian Literature and Theory. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1999. Print.

Haase, Donald. *The Greenwood Encyclopaedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales*. 3 vols. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2008. Print.

Heiserman, A. R. "Satire in the Utopia." *PMLA* 78 3 (1963): 163-74. Print

Hellekson, Karen. *The Alternate History : Refiguring Historical Time*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2001. Print.

House, John William. *France: An Applied Geography*. London: Routledge, 1978. Print.

Hudson, Wayne. *The Reform of Utopia*. Alershot: Ashgate 2003. Print

Jameson, Fredric. "On Jargon". *The Jameson Reader*. Ed. Weeks, M. Hardt and K. Oxford 2000: Blackwell Publishing. 117-18. Print.

Jones, Polly. "Memories of Terror or Terrorizing Memories: Terror, Trauma and Survival in Soviet Culture of the Thaw." *The Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol.82 No.2 The Relaunch of the Soviet Project, 1945-64 (Apr 2008): 346-71. Print.

Malpas, S., ed. *Postmodern Debates*. Bakinstoke: Palgrave, 2001. Print.

Marsh, Rosalind J. *Literature, History and Identity in Post-Soviet Russia, 1991-2006*. Oxford ; New York: Peter Lang, 2007. Print.

---. *Soviet Fiction since Stalin: Science, Politics and Literature*. Totowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble, 1986. Print.

McCagg, William O., and Lewis H. Siegelbaum. *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*. Series in Russian and East European Studies No. 12. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. Print.

Meyers, Walter Earl. *Aliens and Linguists: Language Study and Science Fiction*. South Atlantic Modern Language Association Award Study. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980. Print.

Mitchinson, Paul. "The Shostakovich Variations." *A Shostakovich Casebook*. Ed. Brown, Malcolm Hamrick. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. 303-24. Print.

Moore, John, and Karen Sayer. *Science Fiction, Critical Frontiers*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000. Print.

Mühlbauer, Peter Josef. "Frontiers and Dystopia: Libertarian Ideology in Science-Fiction." *Neoliberal Hegemony: A Global Critique*. Ed. Plewhwe, Dieter; Walpen, Bernard and Neunöffer. Oxon: Routledge, 2006. Print. 156-70.

Pearce, Joseph. *Solzhenitsyn: A Soul in Exile*. London: HarperCollins, 1999. Print.

Penley, Constance. "Time Travel, Primal Scene and the Critical Dystopia." *Alien Zone: Cultural Theory and Contemporary Science Fiction Cinema*. Ed. Kuhn, Annette. Vol. 1. London: Verso, 1990. 116-27. Print.

Pomeroy, Ralph. "'To Push the World': Orwell and the Rhetoric of Pamphleteering." *Rhetoric Society Quaterly* Vol. 17 No. 4 (Aut 1987): 365-412. Print.

Rabkin, Eric S. "The Unconscious City." *Hard Science Fiction*. Ed. Slusser, George E.; Rabkin, Eric S. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986. Print. 24-44

Rancière, J. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. London: Continuum, 2004. Print.

Redmond, Sean. *Liquid Metal: The Science Fiction Film Reader*. London: Wallflower, 2004. Print.

Richards, I.A. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1967. Print.

Ricoeur, Paul, and Denis Savage. *Freud and Philosophy an Essay on Interpretation*. The Terry Lectures. New Haven London: Yale U.P, 1970. Print.

Rosenfeld, Aaron. "The 'Scanty Plot': Orwell, Pynchon, and the Poetics of Paranoia." *Twentieth century Literature.* Vol. 50 No. 4 (Winter 2004): 337-67. Print.

Sandison, Alan. *The Last Man in Europe: An Essay on George Orwell*. London: Macmillan Press, 1974. Print.

Sartre, J-P. *What Is Literature*. London: Methuen, 1978. Print.

Slusser, George Edgar, Eric S. Rabkin, and Robert E. Scholes. *Coordinates : Placing Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Alternatives. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983. Print.

Suvin, D. "The Utopian Tradition of Russian Science Fiction." *The Modern Language Review* 66 1 (1971): 139-59. Print.

---. "On the Poetics of the Science Fiction Genre." *College English* 34 3 (1972): 372-82. Print.

---. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction : On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven ; London: Yale University Press, 1979. Print.

---. *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988. Print.

Stansky, Peter. "Orwell: The Man." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Standford Alumni Association, 1983. 2-13. Print.

Szasz, Thomas. *The Age of Madness; the History of Involuntary Mental Hospitalization, Presented in Selected Texts*. New York,: J. Aronson, 1974. Print.

---. *Ideology and Insanity; Essays on the Psychiatric Dehumanization of Man*. Garden City, N.Y.,: Anchor Books, 1970. Print.

Tarsis, Valeri i. *Ward 7: An Autobiographical Novel*. [1st ed. New York,: Dutton, 1965. Print.

Vinz, Ruth. ""1984": Intricate Corridors within a Barren World." *The English Journal.* Vol. 72 No. 6 (Oct 1983): 39-41. Print.

Vološinov, V. N.. *Marxism and Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: 1986.

Watt, Ian. "Winston Smith: The Last Humanist." *On* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ed. Stansky, P. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association, 1983. 103-14. Print.

Whittington, William. *Sound Design & Science Fiction*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 2007. Print.

Zinoviev, Aleksandr. *The Yawning Heights*. 1st Vintage Books ed. New York: Random House, 1980. Print.