# The Other Space: Heterotopia, Memory and Individuality in Dystopian Novels *The Memory Police* and *The Giver*

**Authors**

Ecem Sarılale[1*]

**Affiliations**

[1]Master's Program in English Language and Literature, Yeditepe University,

Graduate School of Social Sciences, Istanbul, 34755, Turkey

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; Email: ecem.sarilale@std.yeditepe.edu.tr

## Abstract

The aim of this paper is to explore the heterotopic nature of the concept of memory in dystopian fictions *The Memory Police* by Yoko Ogawa and *The Giver* by Lois Lowry comparatively and thereby to discuss that memory is possible to be applied as a means of oppression primarily through the destruction of this heterotopic space and individuality. The protagonists in both novels suffer from memory loss that is schemed by the totalitarian authority in their communities. In order to resist that authority, they are required to hold on to their memory which acts as a counter-site that is analysed through Michel Foucault's variously defined and interpreted concept of heterotopia. The approaches regarding individual and collective memory are presented in relation to identity formation. The paper ultimately discusses that individual memory, in the novels mentioned, besides being a part of collective memory, acts as a heterotopic space for the protagonists since it is a form of the other space created as opposed to the space that is formed by the manipulated collective memory and that the characters are forced to live in.

**Keywords:** Collective memory; dystopia; heterotopia; individual memory; memory; Michel Foucault; oppression; utopia; resistance

## INTRODUCTION

Michel Foucault is an influential philosopher who introduced groundbreaking theories and concepts in the 20ᵗʰ century. One of these concepts is heterotopia, which fundamentally addresses 'real places' but at the same time embraces 'space'. In *Of Other Spaces*, when Foucault first mentions heterotopia, he presents it in relation to utopia, which is in line with his statement in an interview: "What is interesting is always interconnection, not the primacy of this over that" (Rabinow, 1984, p254). In parallel with his quote from the interview,the presence of concepts of utopia and dystopia proposes a link between them rather than separating them.

The idea of the ideal or better place basically springs from the realization or thought that present social conditions should be better.Plato's *Republic* is considered and referred to as a primary work with utopian qualities and most presumably a precursor to many who study antiquity and utopia. During Plato's early years of his life, Athens, a democratic state, was in a prolonged war with Sparta, an oligarchic state, and Athens was defeated in the end. In his book, *A History of Literary Criticism From Plato to the Present,*Rafey Habib (2015) explains that the war between these two states had also ideological grounds and it affected Plato's thoughts. Thus he claims Plato wrote *Republic* as a response to the losing of the Peloponnesian war and it almost sounds like he wants to return to the age of the kingdom, only the kings are to be replaced by philosophers, so *Republic* indeed points to the tenets of the idea of utopia. Plato proposes new regulations regarding the ruler and ruling of the state, the political system, and functions of the classes so it would not be wrong to claim that Plato's ideal city has its roots in the anticipation of a restored/upgraded version of Athens, Athenian democracy and politics - the anticipation that arises from the criticism of the present order.

As well as the ones who appreciate a better version of a society, there are others who believe that the creation of the ideal society occurs by force when a group's ideals are dictated to the other, which turns one's utopia into the other's dystopia. Quite contradictory to the basic notion of betterness constantly referred to while defining utopias, Lyman Tower Sargent (1994), the American scholar on utopian studies, for example, advocates that perfection should not be a defining characteristic of utopia grounding his opinion in the possible reaction of "opponents of utopianism" (p.9). Those opponents "argue that a perfect society can only be achieved by force; thus,

utopianism is said to lead to totalitarianism and the use of force and violence against people" (p.9). Sargent's point might also be associated with dystopias and be claimed to undermine the so-called opposition between dystopia and utopia by implying dystopia is an inevitable result of utopia when associated with perfectionism. As a subsequently emerging term, dystopia is defined as "a modern term invented as the opposite of Utopia" and is used to describe "any alarmingly unpleasant imaginary world, usually of the projected future" (Baldick, 2021, p.74). Despite the dictionary writing "modern term", it is also known that the word was coined in 1747and was first used, with the meaning of "diseased, bad, faulty or unfavourable place" (Claeys, 2017, p.4), in 1868 by John Stuart Mill in a parliament speech as an antonym for utopia. The view that dystopia is the opposite of utopia might be claimed to have its roots in "disastrous current trends" (Booker, 1994, p.5) in the twentieth century, such as totalitarian and oppressive regimes, and scientific advancements. Such tremendous and, at times detrimental changes in society are hard to neglect, so these changes or phenomena manifest themselves in dystopias as a way of warning and make dystopias, for many, function as the opposite of utopias. The emergence of dystopian works might also be interpreted as a response to these changes in the society which require an unavoidable transition from utopias to dystopias in the end. Despite the prevalent conviction of dystopia being the negation of utopia, that dystopia and utopia are intertwined is a widely shared view by scholars. Gordin (2010), to begin with, defines dystopia as "utopia's twentieth-century doppelganger" and clearly states that "dystopia is not simply the opposite of utopia" (p.1). A dystopia either is born of a dysfunctional utopia, or it is actually a utopia that promises betterment only for a group that can monopolize the system (Gordin, 2010).

The twentieth century abounds with dysfunctional or, as Sargent (2005) puts it, 'defeated' utopias. Sargent claims that dystopias in the twentieth century are essentially failed "utopian aspirations". What turns these aspirations into dystopias comes from the very desire to build a perfect society. However, although starting with 'good' intentions, the desire for perfection in society requires full control over the people to the point of limiting them or depriving them of their freedom.

> ...the utopian impulse was itself inherently dystopian. That is to say, the
>
> desire to create a much improved society in which human behaviour was
>
> dramatically superior to the norm implies an intrinsic drift towards

punitive methods of controlling behaviour which inexorably results in

some form of police state (Claeys, 2010, p.108).

Likewise, Claeys treats dystopia as the primary element, the 'essence' of utopia instead of separating them from each other or naming dystopia as the negation of utopia. According to him, what one calls utopia might be the other's dystopia or vice versa depending on what side to take with these concepts.

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

On the comparison between utopia and dystopia, Jameson (1994) further notes that dystopias tell stories of disasters, which are mainly human-related, awaiting the people in the future. Resonating with Jameson, Sargent (2013) points out that dystopias are stories of the outcomes of people's doings or, more precisely, of their "messing up" (p.12). The examples of these outcomes are visible in the twentieth-century dystopias, especially in the ones that are called totalitarian political dystopias where people "mess up" with the idea of forming a perfect society and end up with a hegemonic order. As for utopias, on the other hand, Jameson claims that instead of telling stories, utopias construct a "mechanism" or a "machine" that serves to imagine "a stable well-nigh permanent kind of lives" (p.56). The mechanism mentioned here organizes the life and society in the way they are supposed to be in a utopian society, and the narrative is set to feature the structure of this mechanism rather than focusing on a protagonist's perspective. Arguably in most dystopian narratives, on the other hand, a version of the mechanism or the machine which fails to serve is applied. Instead of utopian text

without a subject position, there is a subject that realizes the defects in the mechanism and thus dystopian narrative begins to be constructed. Dystopian narrative requires this dysfunctional mechanism.

To sum up, various definitions of dystopia, "dysfunctional" or "defeated" utopia just being some of them, obviously connect dystopia and utopia instead of positioning them as opposites. Accordingly, it can be claimed that many dystopian narratives tell the stories of a society that was planned to be perfect but failed. A dystopian society is very much like a version of a utopian one whose mechanism or machine (Jameson, 1994) that organizes the life in it actually fails to operate. The fact that the characters in a dystopian narrative become aware of the flaws (and totalitarian control) in the society and decide to take action at some point results in the emergence of heterotopias that gives them a space for resistance. Common themes of dystopian fiction such as surveillance societies, loss of individuality, oppression require heterotopias to appear for the individuals since heterotopia is the space where individuals stand up against the dominant power in society, and where a better future alternative is signalled.

**Heterotopia and Memory**

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

- Michel Foucault, 1984

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

thinking" (Soja, 1996, p.154) and in Foucault's understanding, space is "an instrument of resistance and change" (Wicomb, 2015, p.49).

**The Concept of Heterotopia**

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

When Foucault uses the term 'heterotopia' for the first time in the Preface to *The Order of Things* (1966), he refers to textual heterotopia rather than physical locations. He explains what inspires him to write *The Order of Things* is a passage about the classification of animals which is presented in the fictional Chinese Encyclopaedia in Jorge Luis Borges' essay "The Analytical Language of John Wilkins" (1942) and "shattered ... all the familiar landmarks of [his] thought" (Foucault, 20. Textual heterotopias, as Foucault defines, "secretly undermine language ... destroy 'syntax' in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to 'hold together' (Foucault, 2005, p.xix). In "Of Other Spaces" (1967), which is based on a lecture given by himself to architecture students, Foucault defines heterotopiaas physical locations - real spaces that exist in society - in contrast to utopias, which are unreal spaces presenting a perfected form.According to Foucault, utopias are unreal spaces although they are in relation to "the real space of society". Utopias do not exist in real life; they are just the spaces that present society in a perfected form - probably "too perfect or too imperfect to be real" (Putthoff, 2020, p.5). Heterotopias, however, are real spaces that exist in almost every culture in various forms. Foucault defines intrinsic characteristics of heterotopias as follows:

> ... a sort of counter-emplacements, a sort of effectively realized utopias in
> which the real emplacements, all the other real emplacements that can be

found within culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted; a kind of places that are outside all places, even though they are actually localizable. Since these places are absolutely other than all the emplacements that they reflect, and of which they speak, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias (Foucault, 1967, p.17).

As an insightful example, or rather a metaphor, Foucault chooses the mirror through which he explains the relation between the conflicting emplacements utopia and heterotopia. He believes the mirror embraces the real and unreal space simultaneously (Bairagya,2020). The mirror is a utopia because "it is a place without place" (Foucault, 1967, p.15). The images or the subjects reflected in the mirror exist in an unreal space at that moment. In other words they seem to exist in a place where they are not actually present. The mirror is also a heterotopia since, first of all, it is a real object existing in reality, and it is through the mirror the subject realizes that he is in fact absent in the place where he observes himself to be existing. In addition, the reflection "on the other side of the looking glass" makes it possible for the subject to establish himself in the place where he exists. Foucault lists six principles to provide "a sort of systematic description", which he also calls 'heterotopology', of heterotopias. Each one of these principles explains a different quality of heterotopia. First one is that every "single culture in the world" (Foucault 1967,4) has heterotopias. Second, "a society can make an existing heterotopia function in a very different fashion". Third principle is that the heterotopia can bring various sites, which are conflicting, together. Fourth principle explains how heterotopias are linked with time. Heterotopias like museums and libraries, which Foucault calls heterochronies, compile everything from different time periods in one place. Fifth principle is about the entry to heterotopias, which is either a compulsory entry or requires rites and purifications. Sixth principle of heterotopias is that the function of heterotopia is related to the space around. They function either by creating "a space of illusion" or by creating "the other space" that is completely opposite the existing one. Accordingly, for Hetherington, the most important thing to consider about heterotopia is not "the spaces themselves but what they perform in relation to other sites" of order. (Hetherington 1997, 49).

Although "Of Other Spaces" was originally lecture notes that were not initially planned to be published, it might be claimed that it is the most thorough outline of the concept of heterotopia. Yet, there are diverse views regarding the concept as well. E.W.

Soja, a political geographer and a professor of urban planning who introduced the concept of 'Thirdspace', finds Foucault's heterotopology "frustratingly incomplete, inconsistent, incoherent" (Soja, 1996, p.162) while M. Dehaene a professor in urbanism, and L. De Cauter, a philosopher and art historian, claim that Foucault's work "has been a source of inspiration in urban and architectural theory" though it might be "too encompassing" and causes confusion (2008, p.4). On the other hand, H. Sohn states that after it was translated into English, "Of Other Spaces" seemed to be a "groundwork" for spatial disciplines (Sohn,43). P. Johnson, an influential author and researcher of heterotopia studies, expands the extent of disciplines by adding art, literary studies and sociology, and he notes that it is "the elusive quality" of the concept of heterotopia that provokes "conflicting interpretations" (Johnson, 2013, p.790) in various disciplines. The next part will focus on the associations of the concept of heterotopia with resistance and counter-site among multiple interpretations and views.

## Heterotopia as the Site of Resistance

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

the space we live in" by mirroring it, and it reveals the defects in the order and raises the possibility of the existence of different and alternative spaces in the minds of people. Heterotopia is "thus a disruptive force, a way to think about things differently" (Bairagya, 2020, p.1). A parental bed, for example, which Foucault refers to on a radio broadcast, is a part of real space and it "mirrors what is around" (Johnson, 2006, p.76) and creates many whimsical alternative spaces when it becomes a playground for children:

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

Since heterotopias allow one to approach what is around - either a system or another space - in a different way, they consequently offer a new ordering that contrasts the existing one. Although heterotopic space is different from the spaces of mainstream society, it is connected to the other spaces around. It poses a challenge to the system conductedby that mainstream society or to "the way we think, especially the way our thinking is ordered" (Hetherington, 2003, p.42) via those spaces. Instead of complying with the order, heterotopia stands up against it. Heterotopia resists, however, the controlling order not by rebelling or criticizing but by indicating the possibility of alternative spaces. According to Topinka, contrary to utopias, heterotopias are not completely outside of the order and because they are connected to real spaces, they challenge and "hold up an alternate order to the dominant order, providing glimpses of the governing principles of order" (Topinka, 2010, p.60). Similarly, Hetherington, too, suggests that it is necessary to bear in mind that heterotopia is not just a space in itself but it "perform(s) in relation to other sites" (Hetherington, 2003, p.49). Thanks to their relations and connections to other real spaces, heterotopias are able to make the flaws in the prevalent order visible, "reveal … the contradictions" that a society is unable to overcome, and defy the order and offer alternatives (Dehaene& De Cauter, 2008, p.25). The alternatives they provide help heterotopias cast a doubt on the conviction that the existing order which people are a part of is the only one. They reveal the possibility that "ours is not the only order, that there are other ways" (Dennis, 2017, p.169). Thus, by showing the likelihood of generating alternative orders, heterotopias intrinsically challenge and resist the existing orders. As Hetherington argues the spaces of

alternative ordering, heterotopias, pave the way for "resistance to hegemony" (Topinka, 2010, p.59) and to "the taken-for-granted mundane idea of social order that exists within society" (Hetherington, 2003, p.40). Besides enabling alternative ordering to show "resistance towards the normalizing rationales of government" (Beckett & Campbell, 2017, p.172), heterotopias also "provide an escape route from power" (Johnson, 2006, p.86). Considering Foucault's statement that reads "Where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, 1978, p.95), it is arguably possible to relate the concept of heterotopia to Foucault's understanding of power in terms of resistance. In Foucault's reasoning power creates "resistant bodies" (Beckett & Campbell, 2017, p.173). Foucault's idea of power focuses on the relationship that includes "individuals, groups, institutions and structures" and "shifting and changing relations among and between" (Taylor, 2014, p.3) these variables.In his understanding, power is not in a repressive form. Instead, Foucault argues that power can only be exercised over free subjects who are able to respond to the one who acts upon them. In the case of slavery, for example, there is no relationship of power because the slave is in chains and unable to react (Foucault, 1982, p.790). In the context of power and resistance, heterotopia arguably takes its place by emerging as the place where the free subjects can react in the relationships of power. When heterotopia is combined with resistance, individual subjects respond to and resist the oppression they face in a relationship of power by acting in and through heterotopic spaces. Heterotopic spaces allow them to resist the restricting order which requires the individuals to adopt the expected set of behaviours and way of thinking enforced upon them by the dominant order. Individuals who fulfil this requirement help the order achieve its goal - the sameness among the members of the society. However, "Heterotopia opens up pathways for the deconstruction of sameness and its subversion" and is "both a result of such oppression as well as a response to it" (Palladino, 2015, p.72).

**The Concept of Memory**

In dystopian fiction that describes surveillance societies and totalitarian governments, the concept of memory, either individual or collective, has always been an important theme since it is used to create individuals and societies that act in accordance with the demands and interests of the governing order. Memory is deployed to rewrite the past, re-construct the present and control the future. While it is a tool of manipulation for the

government, for the individuals it is a tool of preserving identity and "independence of thought and action" (Opreanu, 2013, p.17). Definitions of memory and the treatment of the concept have varied according to the contexts and the disciplines it is used in. In his "Memoires for Paul de Man", for example, Derrida refers to altering meanings of the word mémoire in French depending on its "generic determination (masculine / feminine) or its number (singular / plural)" and concludes that memory is "hardly translatable" (Derrida, 1989, p.16). Yet, memory has become a topic of discussion starting from classical antiquity.Aristotle starts defining memory by distinguishing it from expectation and perception, the concepts which he associates with future and with present respectively. In *On Memory*, he explains that one perceives the thing the moment they see it, which occurs in the present, and since memory requires a time-lapse to remember what is experienced, only after some time passes "one remembers now what one saw or otherwise experienced formerly"(451a31). For Aristotle, in order to remember, one "must say within himself that he formerly heard or perceived or thought of that"(449b22-23). In "Aristotle on Memory and the Self", Julia Annas claims that Aristotle's definition of memory fits personal memory and she concludes what is stored in the memory is the "image [that] represent[s] something in the past [and] one's past experiences of the object"(Annas, 1986,p.108). In the seventeenth century, although it has some drawbacks and faced rejections, a different and new treatment of memory was introduced by John Locke. When he presents memory as a key factor in forming personal identity, he offers a novel understanding of the concept which focuses on "self-knowledge" instead of "knowledge acquisition" provided earlier by the ancient philosophy (Clucas 2015, p.174). In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Locke's theory of personal identity is based on consciousness and memory. He claims that an individual's past experiences that are stored in memory are brought into consciousness by remembrance and "as far as consciousness can be extended backwards to any past action or thought, so far reaches the identity of that person"(Locke 1690,319 ed.). "For Locke, ... personal identity is identical with remembering one's own actions ... [and] with consciousness" (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). Locke does not exclude forgetting from his theory, though. He recognizes that individuals might fail to recall or lose "the memory of certain parts of his life" (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). In such cases, he concludes, the individual is not the same man as the performer of the actions since "his consciousness does not extend to that period of his life (Whitehead, 2008, p.57). In sum, as long as one can remember a past

experience, this experience is a part of the identity and it is what makes this person in the present the same as the person in the past. Therefore, it would not be wrong to associate what is referred to as memory in Locke's theory with 'individual memory' because of its connection to personal identity and consciousness.The awareness of being "the same person as someone in the past" is raised through memories and helps constitute personal identity. Collective memory is another important term regarding memory and identity. It was coined by French philosopher and sociologist Maurice Halbwachs and refers to memories that are common to and shared by a group. Although individual memory and collective memory seem to be in conflict with each other, for Halbwachs, they are associated in that individual memory is like a component of collective memory. "[I]t is in society that people normally acquire their memories [and] [i]t is also in society that they recall, recognize, and localize their memories" (Halbwachs, 1992, p.38). Individuals recall their memories in the group, of which they are a member, through interaction and with the help of other members i.e. meeting a friend after a long time evokes memories and "past events stand out more sharply" (Halbwachs, 1980, p.22-23). Halbwachs does not put the individual memory completely aside but he believes that what is stored in the individual's memory "is connected with the thoughts that come to us from the social milieu"(1992, p.53) and is recalled as long as they are associated with the group. After all, by being a part of a group, an individual identifies himself with the group's concerns and thoughts (Whitehead, 2008, p.126). Accordingly, Halbwachs also claims that memories are 'reconstructed' by the present society. "[A]s our conceptions of the past are affected by the mental images we employ to solve present problems, so that collective memory is essentially a reconstruction of the past in the light of the present" (Coser, 1992, p.372). The relationship between memory and identity makes memory one of the key concepts like the idea of totalitarian control in dystopian narratives. The constant control and collective mentality of the state in dystopias target individual identity and make it cease to exist so that individuals, who are no different from a machine lacking any control over their minds, can serve the state's interests. Since individual memory and collective memory can be said to be fundamental to identity and society respectively, practices of the totalitarian state on memory allow it to re(shape) or exterminate individuals and create a new society with a tailor-made collective memory. The practices of the state are manipulative. When a manipulative attempt, which is intended to idealize the society, is initially directed towards the individual memory and

ultimately collective memory, the so called ideal society turns into a dystopian one in the novels *The Memory Police* and *The Giver*. In such societies, what citizens need to remember and forget is determined through the effects of manipulation, and thus citizens cease to be individual beings and become a part of the totality which favours sameness. However, the manipulation of memory might not have the same effect on every individual and these individuals notice the flaws in the imposed order. It is then that they focus on the existence of alternative orders. As the subjects that face the oppression, they are also able to retreat into their memory to withstand the manipulation and oppression. Everything they struggle to remember and resist forgetting takes place in their memory. As long as they hold onto their memory, they succeed in preserving their identity and resisting oppression because "[c]ulture [or an individual] absent of memory ceases to exist, or rather, never forms in the first place" (Hanson, 2020, p.2).

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

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

## RESULTS

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

memory and other real and textual heterotopias related to memory exist in the presence of a dominant, restricting power structure, which exploits the memory of its subjects to continue to rule. The determination and motivation to build a perfect society cause extreme control over people and turn a utopia into a dystopia, where oppressive societies conduct a hegemonic order. Both the unnamed protagonist, who is also the narrator, of *The Memory Police* and Jonas of *The Giver* are inhabitants in such dystopian societies, and the members of these societies have been restrained from reaching their memories. In the novels, how the governments manage to manipulate the citizens' memories and make them forget is not explained. Instead, the novels focus more on implying how societies function while people do not remember and on main characters' reactions to oppressive methods of the governments. Dystopian aspects of society in *The Memory Police* are presented through forced disappearances of objects and concepts from the memories of the people. Most of the inhabitants of the island helplessly forget their memories while The Memory Police hunt people who are immune to forgetting. People have no control over their lives, their personal experiences against the restricting order. In *The Giver*, although citizens believe they live in a utopian society, the practices of the state prove otherwise. People's lives - careers, spouses, the number of children they have, the house they live in - have already been organized by the state. In this community, people have no memories of the past and therefore no feelings, like pain or fear. By depriving people of their memories and emotions, and by predetermining everything for them, the government demonstrates that a policy of sameness is pursued. Methods of the ruling authorities in the novels lead up to main characters' resistance shown by heterotopias.

## DISCUSSION

### Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Memory Police*

In the dystopian novel *The Memory Police* (2019), Yoko Ogawa tells the story of a struggling woman who resides on an island where the government group called the Memory Police forces the disappearance of things from the island and citizens' memory. While the novel deals with many universal themes of dystopian fiction such as trauma, surveillance society, authoritarianism, (loss of) memory and resistance, memory will be the main focus of this study. Memory, both individual and collective,

is the space where memories and experiences of the past are stored. Depending on what is kept there, individuals create meanings and at the same time build their identities. Therefore, in a dystopian setting, memory is the target of power structures that aim to control individuals and create a collective memory later which coincides with the power structures' ideals. When the memory is suppressed by the authority for manipulative purposes, individuals do not manage to refer to the experiences they had in the past to interpret the situation they face in the present. For them, oppression continues but they do not act against the authority. However, if they can recall memories, people in this dystopian setting possibly discover that the past is better than the present and an alternative order might exist in the present as it did in the past, and they end up resisting what is enforced upon them. When it faces the oppression of authority, memory becomes a heterotopic space where individuals feel the urge to preserve and retain their memories. As a heterotopia, it provides the chance to stand up against the power structure and an "escape route from power" (Johnson, 2006, p.86) because retaining memories despite the attempts of the authority is an act of resistance against its goals. In the novel *The Memory Police,* it is observed that the protagonist fails to preserve/remember her memories and identity from the authority of The Memory Police and consequently, she cannot resist the oppression without a heterotopic space of memory while the editor R keeps his memories intact in the heterotopic space and survives the oppression.

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

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

before she was born. She has published three novels that are clearly influenced by her living conditions. Each one of her novels was about "something that had been disappeared" (Ogawa, 2019, p. 15). While struggling to continue her life on the island, she is accompanied by the Old Man, who is a dear friend to the narrator and who has known her since she was a little girl, and her editor, R, who is not affected by the disappearances unlike the narrator and the Old Man.

The society of the island is structured by the totalitarian regime, represented by the Memory Police, through repeated and forced interventions in the memory of the citizens with the purpose of preventing them from imagining or dreaming a better or different present and future compared to the one they established. The reason is that memory is the space where past experiences are stored and it has an important role in configuring the present and future thanks to past experiences. Relying on these experiences, memory "interpret[s] and integrat[es] new information" (Foong&Chadran, 2020, p.101), which in the end helps individuals to compare the past with the present. By ".. discovering through memory that life in the past was better than in the present, dystopian dissidents, ... find a focal point in the past that channels their resistance" (Hanson, 2020, p.10). In the context of the dystopian setting of *The Memory Police*, individuals' ability to make comparison, which is provided by memory, turns memory into a heterotopic space because as long as they keep their memories safe there and remember their past experiences, the discovery and resistance Hanson mentions are realized. Then, they are able to compare past and present situations of the society, see the "brutal methods" (Ogawa, 2019) of the government, notice the effects of disappearances on the island and the inhabitants, and show resistance against the system conducted by this government.

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

On the other hand, to prevent the possible resistance, the Memory Police repress and try to control the people's memories through disappearances leaving them no chance for comparison. Since there is no limitation for the disappearances on the island, anything might vanish at any moment: birds, roses, hats, ribbons, calendars, maps, perfume, music boxes, and even words and body parts. Along with the objects, all memories vanish too. When hats disappear, for example, people neither remember hats nor their memories of hats. If a disappearance affects people's jobs, they find "some other line of work quickly" (Ogawa, 2019, p.9) and the man who makes hats, for example, starts making umbrellas, or "a mechanic on the ferryboat, [becomes] a security guard at a warehouse" (Ogawa, 2019, p.9). After the disappearance of hats, the narrator states that people who made hats earlier "seemed to have no regrets about losing the old one" (Ogawa, 2019, p.10) even if now they cannot make as much money as they did in their previous job. As people have no information or memory to recall, they are not able to compare then and now and resist doing the new job in a worse condition. Without the heterotopic space of the memory, for them, the act of resistance is not initiated.

Besides thinking about past and present thanks to memories, retaining memories against the will of the Memory Police is itself an act of resistance that starts in the heterotopic space since it is where the memories related to the lost objects and concepts are kept. Forgetting which prevails in the society indicates the power of the authority over the subjects and it is required to be performed by all in the society. As the only authority on the island, the Memory Police consider the resistance to forgetting as a violation of its authority. As a result, they hunt down the people whose memories cannot be erased. That some people are immune to forgetting enforced by the Memory Police is revealed in the first chapter of the novel when the narrator tells a memory she has with her mother. Her mother - a sculptor - is not affected by forgetting and she feels bitter about how "people who live here haven't been able to hold such marvellous things in their hearts and minds" (Ogawa, 2019, p.3). Since she can remember, she does not discard the objects that are supposed to vanish. The mother is the first person introduced whose memory functions as a heterotopic space and who fights against the Memory Police by not forgetting. While she hides objects in her old cabinet, in a real place, she keeps what she experienced due to these objects in her memory, in an abstract place. Without her memories of these objects, there is no meaning to hide them from the Memory Police because it is not the objects that trigger resistance, but the memories of them. Therefore,

it might be claimed that in order to resist, the characters need that heterotopic space of memory and keep remembering.

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

Aside from prompting the idea of a different but better order, the heterotopic space of memory also ensures people's awareness of identity. By not following the instruction of the Memory Police to forget, they basically resist giving up their identities and becoming like the others, who are used to "the methods ... by the Memory Police [which] were becoming more and more brutal" (Ogawa, 2019, p.64). In other words, they refuse to be a part of a group of identical individuals shaped by the Memory Police leaving them with almost no personal memories. According to the Memory Police, preserving the memories means that they cannot "weaken their [citizens'] sense of individual identity" and thus cannot make them act like "the social whole" (Walsh, 1972, p.143). Since the Memory Police try to create a collective mentality and memory, the solution they have for the individuals who do not fit into the social whole is to exterminate them completely, which is why these people hide from them.

> it became increasingly common to hear that someone had suddenly
> vanished—a friend from the next town, an acquaintance from school,

> a distant relative of the fishmonger. You never knew whether they
> had been taken away or had been fortunate enough to find a place to
> hide—or if the place they'd been hiding had been discovered and
> they'd been arrested (Ogawa, 2019, p.65).

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

Considering the role of memory in identity formation, it might also be claimed that the heterotopia of memory resembles the mirror heterotopia that Foucault explains in "Of Other Spaces" because similarly, it allows people to perceive themselves but through memories this time. In "Of Other Spaces", Foucault says that the mirror is a heterotopia because it enables the subject to observe himself in a place where he is actually absent. That is to say, the subject sees himself existing in a place where he is not present. In the case of memory, as a heterotopia it creates a similar situation. When people remember a past experience along with where and when they had this experience, they go back to that place and time even though they really do not exist in that place at the moment of remembering. During the process of recalling the past experiences, they can constitute

themselves in that place and time through memory. This also means that the performer of the past action and the one who remembers it now are the same person, which proves that this experience is a part of his identity. In the novel, it is seen that the narrator lacks having a recollection of objects the Memory Police erased so it might be concluded that every disappearance of objects and related memories causes losses in her identity, too. However, in the second chapter of the novel, the narrator remembers the memories of her father, who was an ornithologist long before the birds disappeared. She remembers her father working in his office while she was with him.

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

It is revealed that she tries to hold on to these memories since they are the only ones that remain for her. She strives to keep "the traces of [her] father's presence" (Ogawa,2019,p.14) by preserving the room he used to study in the house as it was until the Memory Police arrived to check if they could find "anything that contained the word 'bird' "(Ogawa, 2019, p.13). Later, she uses her father's room to write her novels.

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

Since she can observe her father and herself again in that room through her memory it can be considered an example of her memory as heterotopia. Throughout most of the novel, she is unable to remember the disappeared objects, so she does not show any resistance against the Memory Police without her memories. However, this memory of her father about how he works and spends time with her is the one that is out of the Memory police's reach. It can be claimed that this might be a reason why she chooses her father's study to create a safe room under its floorboards to protect R - the editor of her books and a man who keeps his memories of the lost objects - from the Memory

Police. Since the Memory Police cannot reach the room, they cannot reach the memories that are going to be kept there so the room can be considered an indicator of her individual resistance. Even if she is vulnerable to the Memory Police as she does not remember the lost objects and related memories, the safe room as a heterotopia is not. This room welcomes and hides not only R but also the objects that R and the narrator's mother tried to keep secretly from the Memory Police. In addition, because her memory about her father is an important part of her identity, by building the safe room based on this memory, the narrator probably tries to keep her identity intact against the Memory Police, as well.

Other than individual memories of the people and the safe room, there are different heterotopias which are connected to collective memory and therefore targeted by the Memory Police as expected from a totalitarian authority. The Memory Police aim for collective memory that they shape so they terminate public places such as the library, rose garden, and ferryboat, all of which are listed as heterotopias by Foucault. In the fourth principle in "Of Other Spaces", Foucault explains that the library is a heterotopia of time - also called a heterochrony - where "all times, all epochs" are brought together. Libraries provide a collection of various books and materials created in different times in one specific place. While the archive they have continues to grow, they become places where the "accumulation of time" never stops. On the outside, a library is a part of the present time but on the inside, it offers "an absolute break with … traditional time" because, due to the collection it has, people can travel back and forth between different periods of time. Additionally, since they are heterotopias of time, they record time and can be considered the memory of society. For this reason, any attempt to destroy a library or book is inherently damaging for the collective memory. As the narrator states "Men who start by burning books end up by burning other men" (Ogawa, 2019, p.184). The disappearance of the books means a void for her and a loss related to her identity. When the bond between her identity as a writer and her novels is broken following the disappearance, she has no memories left about her job and her works, and consequently, she is not able to identify herself as a writer anymore. She now lacks a key memory that helps constitute her identity.

As for the collective memory, the disappearance of books and the library serves the purpose of the Memory Police to create it according to their advantage. People start fires on the streets to burn the "books of all sorts—some in slipcases, some bound in leather, weighty tomes and slender novellas—piled together awaiting their turn in the

flames" (Ogawa, 2019, p.179). The library is also on fire. The narrator discloses the reason why the Memory Police aim to erase the books and the library from the memories of people through the dialogue of the citizens that gathered around the fire to burn the books. And one of them hears that "they'll build a headquarters for the Memory Police someday" (Ogawa, 2019, p.183). In the collective memory of the society, the library is thus planned to be replaced by the Memory Police leaving no heterotopic space for them to realize the attempts of the Memory Police and resist.

Every disappearance on the island forces people to give up on the ideas, concepts, and meanings as well as the objects. Due to the disappearance of books, more words gradually disappear from the memory of the people and the language. Language is considered a tool, "a key weapon for the reigning dystopian power structure[s]" (Bacccolini& Moylan, 2003, p.5) like the Memory Police. According to Baccolini and Moylan, the resistance of the main character in dystopian fiction often manifests itself in the "reappropriation of language" because the power structure restrains its subjects by forbidding them to use the language. They argue that only if the protagonist gains the control of "language, representation, memory", the resistance they show results in a change in the society, so it is clear that language has an essential role both in the manipulation process of totalitarian authority and the resistance of individuals to that authority.In the case of *The Memory Police*, the restriction of the language occurs due to the disappearance of the books, or rather textual heterotopias, from the memory of individuals. In *The Order of Things*, Foucault defines heterotopias as textual spaces that are located in language and contest language. Literature can be given as an example of textual heterotopias that contest language by offering a different ordering and relation between the language and things that exists in our knowledge. The Chinese Encyclopaedia that Foucault presents as a textual heterotopia, for example, offers a different classification of animals that does not exist in our system of thought but this classification is possible in the space of language and literature. By erasing books and words, and consequently language, from the memory, the Memory Police cause the disappearance of this textual heterotopia while they destroy the 'real space' of library heterotopia at the same time. The outcome of the disappearance of these heterotopic spaces for the individuals on the island is that they now lack any spaces that remind them different orderings are possible and where they can show resistance to the authority in order to protect their identities. In the novel, for example, the narrator fears so much about "what will happen if words disappear" that she even avoids saying it

loudly because "it might come true" (Ogawa, 2019, p.26). The reason why is that if it comes true, she will not be able to keep writing because she can't remember the words. This also means that she can't create or reappropriate the language that lets her resist unless she remembers.

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

**Memory as a Heterotopic Space in *The Giver***

*The Giver* (1993) by Lois Lowry describes, too, a dystopian setting in which the inhabitants' memories have been erased by an unseen governing state for the totalitarian control to last. Unlike Ogawa's *The Memory Police*, however, in Lowry's world memories are not lost gradually. All the members of the community, except the protagonist Jonas, have already had no individual and collective memories regarding the past in that for the government in *The Giver* memory is a tool for the oppression of the citizens. Additionally, the absence of memory leads to the absence of individuality which results in the 'Sameness' that forms the basis of community in *The Giver*. Since "it is almost impossible to see that what is going on around us was not always the same" (Moylan, *Scraps* 26) without memories, by erasing memories the government also hinders any acts of resistance that might arise after a possible realization of the difference between past and present ruling order. Therefore, memory is arguably a heterotopic space that secures the idea of resistance against the flawed system. Unlike

the protagonist of *The Memory Police*, Jonas, the twelve-year-old protagonist of *The Giver* is well aware of the role of heterotopic space of memory in his resistance against the order in his community. Memory in *The Giver* as a heterotopic space helps the protagonist succeed in his opposition to the system of his so-called utopian society.

*The Giver* narrates the story of twelve-year-old Jonas, who lives with his family unit in a community that is seemingly utopian, from a third-person point of view. The name of the community or its location is not mentioned. The community follows the guidance and rules of the Committee of Elders but it is also implied that there is a "larger political body"(Hanson, 2020, p.112) of which the community is a part. This larger political body delivers supplies by cargo planes or tracks down people if they try to escape. Traces of totalitarian control are observed both in the formation of society and in people's behaviours. The structure of the community has thoroughly been organized and people have neither control over their lives nor freedom of choice: the careers people will have are predetermined by the Committee of Elders after they are carefully observed starting from their childhood. When children turn twelve, they are assigned their jobs at the Ceremony of Twelve held every December. The spouses citizens will have is also determined by the Committee because the Matching of Spouses is important for the community. An adult applies for a spouse and waits until the Committee agrees on a match whose "disposition, energy level, intelligence and interests ... correspond and ... interact perfectly" (Lowry, 1993, p.48). After the Matching of Spouses, a couple waits for three years before they are allowed to apply to have the children who are delivered by Birthmothers. And, the number of children a family has is limited to two - one boy and one girl. Jonas' family is formed in the same way. At the Ceremony of Twelve, Jonas is "selected to be ... [the] next Receiver of Memory" (Lowry, 1993, p.60). The position is considered to be "the most honored" (Lowry, 1993, p.61) because the Receiver is the only person who is able to keep "the memories of the whole world"(Lowry, 1993, p.77). The memories are transmitted by the Giver, who is actually the previous Receiver, in a community where all the members lack individual or collective memories of the past. The totalitarian control erases all memories of the people so that they live free from "the pain, knowledge and guilt of human history" (Levy as quoted in Hanson, 2020, p.111). However, together with painful memories, people also lose good, comforting, and useful memories. The government has built a society where people do not remember any memories and thus are easy to control and manipulate, and since people do not have the heterotopic space

of memory, they cannot compare past and present, or realize that they lose what is good and bad altogether and ask for their freedom of choice.

The government aims for "Sameness" in The Giver, so as well as losing memories, the community is devoid of many things such as colours, music, and emotions. The government controls the climate and it never snows so that they grow food without any problems related to weather and transportation is better without snow. Landscape changes, too. Hills disappear and it becomes more convenient for trucks and buses to move.  In addition, skin, hair and eye colors are almost the same.

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

Since sameness does not require any features regarding individuality, the state removes all memories. However, memories are important in identity formation because through these memories the individual confirms that the person who performed the action in the past and the person who remembers it are the same.

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

The only act of resistance is shown by Jonas since he is the possessor of the memories. Although he first receives the memories of "generations before him" (Lowry, 1993, p.78) that he does not know they ever existed, then not only does he realize how different the world was before Sameness but also he starts to have new, individual memories which "exist completely outside of his society's ideology" and which he "actively anticipate[s] a future with color, choices, and collectively held memories" (Hanson, 2020, p.119). The first principle that Foucault mentions while defining heterotopias is that every culture creates heterotopias so heterotopias are not universal. It can be claimed that they are unique to every culture. In the community in *The Giver*, however, it is not possible to talk about the presence of unique heterotopia of memory

because this aspect of memory as a heterotopic space is targeted by the state. Due to the loss of all memories, which is a result of the state's policy of sameness, neither collective nor individual memory is formed. Thus, the state annihilates the possibility of resistance against society's system in the first place by not allowing the existence of memory. Apart from losing memories, having no collective memory is related to the way the state forms the family units in the community. The formation of family units does not allow memories to be transmitted or kept. Parents are given children without any bloodline due to Birthmothers. When children become old enough to have their own predetermined family units, parents and children are separated from each other, and until the day they are released, parents spend the rest of their lives in the House of the Old, where "they were so well cared for and respected" (Lowry, 1993, p.123). Therefore, a family unit does not include any grandparents, or in other words, any previous generations, who can transmit memories, history or traditions. That's why all the people in the community, like Jonas, "do not know what you [the Giver] mean when you say 'the whole world' or 'generations before him'. I thought there was only us...there was only now" (Lowry, 1993, p.78). In this way, the state prevents the formation of collective memory as well as individual memory of family members in order to control people and leave them no space to realize the situation and resist. Without the heterotopic space of memory, the whole society that is formed by the family units never attempts to resist even the way they have their families. Additionally, considering "our identities are simply an accumulation of memories" (Simon, 2021), by having no space for memories, they are forced to give up their identities and conform with the state's idea of Sameness, as well. The place where the Giver transmits the memories to Jonas is the Annex behind the House of the Olds. The Annex is arguably another heterotopic space related to memory that might be associated with the fifth principle because it creates a kind of illusion. In the community, the spaces are designed and controlled by the state. Houses, for example, are identical to each other furnished only with "practical, sturdy" furniture such as "[a] bed for sleeping. A table for eating.A desk for sleeping" (Lowry, 1993, p.74). All the furniture in a house is only functional. Everywhere, including the family unit's dwellingsis surrounded by loudspeakers for the announcements of the state and to remind the citizens of the rules in case of a violation. In addition, "[n]o doors in the community were locked, ever". Since these places are products of the system, they are not heterotopic and they do not include any personal items or furniture that cause the formation of memories for the individuals. Instead,

they are the spaces where the state's surveillance and control is intensely revealed. The Annex, however, is different from the places in the community on the inside while it looks quite ordinary with an unremarkable door on the outside (Lowry, 1993). First of all, there is a lock on the door to ensure "the Receiver's privacy" (Lowry, 1993, p.73). It has no loudspeakers for surveillance. Instead, there are lots of books inside the Annex, which Jonas sees for the first time, because in his house the only books allowed are "a dictionary, a … community volume [describing] every office, factory, building and committee. [And] the Book of Rules" (Lowry, 1993, p.74). The Annex is actually a part of the community and is located behind the House of the Old, but it is free from the rules and arrangements of the state, which "isolates [it] [but] makes [it] penetrable" (Foucault) at the same time. Therefore, by the time Jonas enters the Annex thanks to him being the Receiver of Memory, he symbolically goes out of the community and its restrictions, which can be considered an illusion the Annex heterotopia creates.

In *The Giver*, the state removes the books and library, which is a heterochrony according to Foucault, from the people's memory, too, because the written records of the past might turn into memories later for the next generations and play a key role in emerging collective memory which the totalitarian state assumes to be a threat to their control. Except for a dictionary, a community volume, and the Book of Rules that are among the limited furniture in the dwellings, the citizens in Jonas' community are not granted access to the books by the state. Similarly, throughout the novel, the existence of a library is not mentioned at all. Judging from Jonas' astonishment, it is confirmed that there is not one in the community and it is the first time he has seen a place that resembles a library. Since people have no memories of the past, books and libraries, and they are not educated about history or geography because of the erased memories related to other communities and cultures, Jonas concludes that these books must also be the books of rules.

> But this room's walls were completely covered by the bookcases,
> filled, which reached to the ceiling. There must have been hundreds
> - perhaps thousands - of books, their titles embossed in shiny letters.
>
> Jonas stared at them. He couldn't imagine what the thousands of
> pages contained. Could there be rules beyond the rules that
> governed the community? (Lowry, 1993, p.74)

Jonas' conclusion is a result of the control of the state over the memory and individuals. The state prevents the creation of collective memory and a possible resistance that might be resulted from the comparison between the past that books and libraries kept safe and the present with no books where control is easier but resistance is impossible. The absence of books and emotions, colours, and even animals from the memories causes losses in the language, which is also used by the totalitarian state to control people in the novel. The state believes that "community can't function smoothly if people don't use precise language" (Lowry, 1993, p.127) so it forces them to use the precise language that excludes words to express feelings, colours and many other concepts and ideas because of lost memories. This precise language is an outcome of the state's attempt to destroy what Foucault mentions as "textual heterotopia" that can be found in language. Without textual heterotopia, the citizens do not have the space that reminds them theirs is not the only order, and that they can resist that order. In the novel, before Jonas becomes the next Receiver and has the heterotopic space of memory, he realizes the colour of an apple for a second, but in his community, there is no idea of colours. Nobody remembers the colours so the words explaining the colours do not exist in the language they use, too. As a member of the community, Jonas, too, cannot properly understand and explain what he sees because he lacks memory of colours and proper words. He can only name the incident as a "change" until he receives the memories of colours from the Giver:

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

Jonas continues to have memories that reveal how the state suppresses people through the language they use. He receives the memory about a family who celebrates a holiday - probably Christmas - and although he likes the memory "couldn't quite get the word for the whole feeling of it" (Lowry, 1993, p. 125). He cannot understand and name the feeling of 'love' even if he senses it because the state erases the memory of emotions and the words related to them. After this memory, the Giver tells him it is the feeling of love. Later, he asks his family if they love him but as an answer, he is told to use precise language because for them, as they have no memories of the concept, the word love is "meaningless" and "almost obsolete" (Lowry, 1993, p. 127). This experience of

Jonas with his family can be claimed as the beginning of his individual resistance, that is, he stops taking his pills that are for suppressing Stirring, which refers to emotions and feelings of pleasure people start experiencing at the beginning of adolescence. The community does not have memories and words that can be associated with pain or suffering, so the words like death, dying, and killing are all removed from the language while related emotions and memories are erased at the same time. Instead, they have the word "release". After a session with the Giver, Jonas learns about the horrors of warfare and what dying means. The memory of war he receives and a tape in which his father releases a baby help him realize the word 'release' actually means 'dying' in his community. He now knows that when somebody is released as a punishment or the olds and babies are released, they actually die. He understands that the "Release of the elderly, which was a time of celebration for a life well and fully lived" (Lowry, 1993, p.7) is a lie. The more memories he gets, the more he starts to believe that the society needs to remember.

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

The change Jonas mentions is only possible with the existence of a heterotopic space of memory in people because only if they have memories they can understand the flaws in the system of their seemingly utopian community. If they have memories back, they can compare the past and present. Although "it has been this way for what seems forever ... the memories tell (them) that it has not *always* been" (Lowry, 1993, p.154). Jonas cannot share his memories with them because of the rule that forbids him. However, even if he is determined to break the rule and share, he won't be able to share any memories because words are not enough and they lack feelings. In order to give them their memories back and make them see the true nature of the state's actions, Jonas decides to flee to Elsewhere - the only place outside the community that is expected to offer what Jonas has in his memories. The escape of Jonas from the community means the release of the memories he keeps. If he reaches Elsewhere, the memories return to people and "they will acquire some wisdom" (Lowry, 1993, p.156) which paves the way for them to resist and claim their individuality back.

Carter F. Hanson describes the community in *The Giver* as "an engineered utopia gone wrong". The destructive and excessive intrusion of the totalitarian state into people's

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

## CONCLUSION

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

Preprint

**REFERENCES AND NOTES**:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Foong, S. &Chandran, G. (2020). (Re)Imagining "Dystopian Space": Memory and Trauma in Yoko Ogawa's The Memory Police. Southeast Asian Review of English. 57. 100-122. 10.22452/sare.vol57no1.8.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Kafar,M. (2014). Michel Foucault as a Heterotopia. In M. Kafar (ed.)*Scientific Biographies between the 'Professional' and 'Non-Professional' Dimensions of Humanistic Experiences* (pp. 121-137). https://dspace.uni.lodz.pl/xmlui/handle/11089/26018

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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