

FATİH UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

M.A. THESIS

LOVE IN DYSTOPIA

BY

EMİNE YEŞİM BÜYÜKASLAN

ADVISOR

PROF. DR. MOHAMED BAKARİ

JUNE 2008

©EMİNE YEŞİM BÜYÜKASLAN
All rights reserved, 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and my appreciation to Dr. Metin Boşnak whom I admire greatly as a scholar, chair and professor. I am grateful to him for his encouragement and his confidence in my pursuit of an academic career. Without his support, I would not have been able to pursue my M.A. degree and present this thesis.

I am also grateful to my advisor and chair Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari, who always has been a wonderful professor, mentor and a great scholar with his intellectual qualities and encouragement. I have a better understanding of life now with his intellectual encouragement as well as his patience and peacefulness.

I would like to thank my undergraduate and graduate professors Prof. Dr. Wisam Mansour, Azize Boşnak, and Tahsin Çulhaoğlu for their support and teaching throughout my education. I owe many thanks to my friends Dr. Martin Duncan, Evelyn Brindle and Daniel Herbst for their contributions to the editing of my thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks to my dear family for everything they have done since my childhood. I would not be successful without their great care and devoted love.

APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Emine Yeşim BÜYÜKASLAN
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: English Language and Literature
Thesis Subject: Love in Dystopia
Thesis Date: June 2008

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Martin Cyr HICKS
Department Chair

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Wisam Mansour

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Clyde Forsberg

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Orhan
Director

AUTHOR DECLARATION

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has been comprised of: courses in English Literature, including literary theory, English, American, and World Literature in genres that include, narrative literature, and thematic courses such as the history of Utopia and Dystopia.

i) Research Methods. The thesis incorporates research methods taught on both the undergraduate and, on the graduate level (by thesis advisor) during the course of the study. See ii below.

ii) Sources examined in this thesis include articles from scholarly journals, other articles such as essays, and interviews with the author in question; books on philosophy, feminism in general and utopia, dystopia, politics, communism and totalitarianism in particular; thesis style guides of Turkish universities and international universities as well as many relevant books published by university presses on this subject.

Emine Yeşim BÜYÜKASLAN

June, 2008

University: Fatih University
Institute: Institute of Social Sciences
Department: English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari
Degree Awarded and Date: June 2008

ABSTRACT

LOVE IN DYSTOPIA

Emine Yeşim BÜYÜKASLAN

This thesis analyzes the impact of the dystopian state on the individual citizen based on a comparative study of two dystopian novels: George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale. The first chapter discusses utopia and dystopia in general terms. While utopian literature engenders heaven, dystopian literature depicts societies of advanced technology and widespread ideologies threatening vast populations. Chapter Two presents examples and analyses of characters in conflict with the dystopian authorities. This section evaluates the methods employed by the fictional totalitarian state in order to educate and condition the characters to be obedient citizens. Specifically, the dystopian nature of Orwellian and Atwoodian society is highlighted as we examine why the totalitarian regime praises hatred and promotes paranoia while discouraging love and intimacy. Chapter Three follows with an evaluation of the dystopian state's impact on love, marriage and family life in these exemplary novels. The thesis concludes with a summation of why love should be considered a political act when manifested within the barren emotional landscapes depicted in The Handmaid's Tale and Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Üniversite: Fatih Üniversitesi
Enstitüsü: Sosyal Bilimler
Anabilim Dalı: İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari
Tez Tarihi: Haziran 2008

KISA ÖZET

DİSTOPYALARDA AŞK

Emine Yeşim BÜYÜKASLAN

Bu tez George Orwell'in Nineteen Eighty-Four adlı romanı ile Margaret Atwood'un The Handmaid's Tale adlı romanının ana teması olan komünist rejimin aşk ve evliliğe bakış açısını, bireysel hak ve özgürlüklerin kısıtlanmasını karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemektedir. Distopya, ütopyanın tam tersi olarak adlandırılan bir edebiyat türü olsa da aslında birbirini tamamlar niteliktedir. Bu nedenle tezin ilk bölümünde ütopya ve distopyanın genel özellikleri anlatılmaktadır. Ütopya cennetvari mekanlar sunarken, distopya teknolojinin hızla gelişmesi ve bu gelişimin insan ve toplum üzerindeki olumsuz etkileri ile toplumları tehdit eden ideolojileri inceleyen bir edebiyat türüdür. Tezin ikinci bölümü distopya devlet rejiminin birey üzerindeki etkilerini tartışır. Distopya totaliter rejim biçimini yansıtır ve devlet, rejimin devamlılığı için bireyleri hayatın her alanında kontrol edip kısıtlar. Bu nedenle eğitim devlet kontrolündedir ve eğitimde amaç asi ruhlu bireyler yerine kurallara uyan bireyler yetiştirmektir. Tezin üçüncü bölümünde devletin aşk, evlilik ve aile hayatı üzerindeki etkileri incelenmektedir. Aynı zamanda devlet baskıcı politikası ile bireyleri suç işlemeye zorlar çünkü bireyler yaşamlarını devam ettirmek zorundadırlar. Devlet, bireylere öfke ve nefret aşılarken, sevgi ve aşkı yasaklar ve her iki romanda da aşk devlete karşı yapılmış anarşik eylemi ifade eder.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Approval Page.....	iv
Author Declarations.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
Kısa Özet.....	vii
Table of Contents.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1	
<i>Utopia and Dystopia</i>	
1.1. The Emergence of Utopia.....	8
1.2. Utopian Communism.....	16
1.3. Purpose of Utopia.....	19
1.4. Education and Indoctrination in Utopia.....	20
1.5. Marriage and Family life in Utopia.....	22
1.6. Dystopia.....	25
Chapter 2	
<i>The Interaction of the Dystopian State with the Individual</i>	
2.1. Dystopian States: Oceania and Gilead.....	30
2.2. Indoctrination.....	43
2.3. <u>Nineteen-Eighty Four</u> 's Winston and <u>The Handmaid's Tale</u> 's Offred.....	50
Chapter 3	
<i>The Impact of the Dystopian State on Love, Marriage and Family Life</i>	
3.1. Love as a Political Act.....	56
3.2. Invasion of Privacy and Love.....	67
3.3. Coupling in Dystopia: Winston- Julia and Offred-Commander.....	74
Conclusion.....	82
Works Cited.....	86

LOVE IN DYSTOPIA

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, we intend to analyze the nature of totalitarian regimes and their impact on love, marriage and family life in two dystopian novels: George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale. We will demonstrate through description how individuals are forced to commit crimes since they are oppressed and totalitarian regimes expect to be loved by individuals despite the prohibition of love. In both dystopian novels, love is prohibited and considered as a political act. Individuals violate the rules in order to survive; in this regard, dystopian states preserve some contradictory ideologies.

Totalitarian regimes tend to control every aspect of life through certain practices such as indoctrination and invasion of privacy. Every individual is the commodity of the regime and the state has the absolute power over each person. Humane feelings are also controlled and love is a threatening emotion to be abolished from each person. Orwell and Atwood project the nature of totalitarian regimes and their perspective on love, marriage and family life.

The first chapter of the thesis discusses two important notions: utopia and dystopia. Both of them support totalitarianism as the regime of the state. The concept of utopia has to be described in details in order to have a better understanding of

dystopia because these two concepts complement each other. Plato's The Republic is one of the utopian works of Western Literature. It has inspired many disciplines in the Western World and the term "utopia" was coined by Thomas More in his Utopia in the sixteenth century. Utopia is a dreamland where people live peacefully because the needs of each person are provided by the state. Poverty, greed and inequality are abolished from society and utopia refers to equality of humankind. Utopia supports totalitarianism through reasoning. It emerges with the dreams and desires of humankind.

Dystopia is a nightmare of a society where totalitarianism is practiced thoroughly. Utopian dream turns into dystopia. Dystopian literature becomes one of the leading genres and dystopian fiction warns the society against the harsh practices of totalitarianism because a dystopian state imposes terror and hatred on citizens. The laws of the state are on behalf of the elite and citizens are controlled and monitored everywhere. Dystopia attacks the emotions of individuals; whereas utopia promotes reason. Dystopia also restricts the feelings and freedom of citizens. Dystopian literature tries to project the future of humankind under the influence and advancement of technology. Terrifying scenes are depicted in dystopian novels.

In the second chapter, I try to analyze the interaction of dystopian state with the individual in three sections: Dystopian States: Oceania and Gilead, Indoctrination, and Nineteen-Eighty Four's Winston and The Handmaid's Tale's Offred. George Orwell depicts the harsh practices of totalitarian regimes over individuals in Nineteen Eighty-

Four. Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale primarily concentrates on gender discrimination. Atwood envisions a fundamentalist country in the United States of America where women are inferior to men and the regime is based on the Bible.

First, I compare the dystopian practices of Oceania and Gilead. They operate in the same way as they classify individuals in order to control the masses. The interaction of individuals and dystopian state becomes a power struggle. The dystopian state has power over people because it applies physical and psychological force on each individual. Oceania is ruled by totalitarianism under the reign of Big Brother. He is a fictive figure and the symbol of absolute power of the state. Winston and all members of the society are forced to love and appreciate him. They are all indoctrinated for that purpose. There is nothing beyond the existence of the state. There are two parties in Oceania: The Inner Party and The Outer Party. The state arranges the relationships between the members of these parties. They are all comrades to each other and intimate relationships are forbidden.

The Republic of Gilead is also a dystopian state controlling each individual and their relationships. Men are superior to women and women are classified according to their social roles in the society. Gilead controls each woman through classification and close watch. Handmaids are trained to serve barren couples and the survival of the state depends on procreation. Handmaids are indoctrinated to be submissive to their Commanders and Wives. Actually, all women have to be obedient to men and the regime because men represent the dystopian state and its power over people.

Indoctrination is another issue that I discuss in the second chapter. Oceania and Gilead control each person through indoctrination. The ideology and the love for the state are indoctrinated to everybody from their childhood so that each one becomes celibate and devoted citizens of the regime. Oceania manipulates history and reality so that doublethink can flourish in the best way. Creating doublethink leads the society to confusion and indoctrination is achieved thoroughly in Oceania. Gilead also indoctrinates each person through praising the new regime. The Aunts indoctrinate the handmaids and compare the new regime with the old one. The new regime values womanhood and motherhood. However, pre-Gilead society promotes the violence on women. That's why, Gilead protects women. In reality, handmaids are the seeds and they are just for procreation.

The last section of chapter two compares the protagonists of these dystopian novels: Winston and Offred. They both struggle to adapt themselves to the dystopian states because they experience the transition period of the regimes. Winston is a rebellious person who works for the Inner Party. He has flashbacks and he owns nothing but a diary which is illegal. He does not hesitate to commit crimes because his rebellious spirit leads him to love Julia and he tries to undermine the regime. Offred also has flashbacks and she narrates her life in Gilead in details. Moreover, she is the narrator of the novel. Offred does not have a name. Her name comes from her Commander's name. She has no name and identity. Winston and Offred are the victims of dystopian states and they are both shaped by the regime.

The last chapter of the thesis focuses on the impact of dystopian state on love, marriage and family life in three sections: Love as a Political Act, Invasion of Privacy and Love, Coupling in Dystopia: Winston- Julia and Offred- Commander. Love is abolished for each individual in order to make them celibate and devoted citizens. Love is a political act in both dystopian novels. Desire is a thoughtcrime and it is illegal in Oceania. The sexual act is forbidden in Oceania because sexual energy has to be transformed into politics rather than personal pleasures. Winston falls in love with Julia, another worker of the Inner Party. However, love and sex are prohibited by the regime. Sex and marriages are for procreation. Individual pleasures are discouraged and the love for the state is encouraged and indoctrinated to each person. The Inner Party wants to create obedient and celibate party members for the existence of the regime. Therefore, Winston and Julia violate the rules of the Inner Party because their love affair is a threat to the dystopian state. When their relationship is publicized, the state indoctrinates Winston to love Big Brother not Julia. Personal relationships, affection and love are controlled by the dystopian state.

Love is a threat in Gilead, too. Procreation is the only purpose of the dystopian state because Gilead suffers from low reproduction rates. Women are classified and there are handmaids to serve barren couples. The Handmaid Offred is not allowed to have personal relationships with anyone. The dystopian state arranges her relationships and emotions because her service for the state is the only concern of the regime. She is a commodity for the regime. Despite her intimacy with the Commander, she is not

allowed to feel love towards the Commander. Their relationship is a business transaction. Offred and the Commander have sexual relationship at certain times and this is called Ceremony. The Ceremony takes place before the wife of the Commander, Serena Joy. This practice humiliates both women. Ceremony is mechanical and love is abolished completely. Offred longs for love and intimacy, but she has to be away from any kind of love and affection. The Commander feels intimacy and love towards Offred. However, the regime does not allow this.

The second section discusses invasion of privacy and love. The dystopian regime invades the privacy of each person because secrecy is also abolished. Oceania has telescreens and microphones to monitor everyone everywhere because this is the control mechanism of the regime. Winston is closely watched and he cannot move freely. Therefore, he rents an apartment to meet Julia secretly. Lovers meet as they wish, but soon they are caught by the police and Winston is taken to be indoctrinated. The practices of the dystopian regime in Gilead are slightly different from Oceania. It is more traditional and has no telescreens and microphones. Offred has a room but she cannot lock it properly. It is obvious that she is monitored and has no privacy. She also has a small tattoo on her ankle to confirm that she is a national source of the regime.

The last section of chapter three analyzes the relationships of couples: Winston-Julia and Offred- Commander. The dystopian state has a great impact on their relationships. They are completely controlled by the state. Winston and Julia are lovers; however, Offred and the Commander are not because the regime brings them together.

Winston and Julia love each other despite the regime. On the other hand, the Commander just wants to have a love affair with Offred violating his own rules as the leader of Gilead. Winston and Julia discuss how to remain strong and firm against the regime; whereas Offred and the Commander discuss the misery of women in pre-Gilead society and abolition of love from the society. The Commander is content with his regime and supports it against Offred.

As I read both novels, I realized that the supporters of dystopian states do not suffer much even though they violate the rules of the regime. Julia and the Commander do not suffer at the end. They continue their lives as before because they are protected by the regime. However, Winston is indoctrinated to love Big Brother and support the regime. He becomes a new person at the end of the novel. Offred is taken to somewhere that the readers do not know. She also suffers both as a woman and a handmaid in Gilead.

CHAPTER 1

UTOPIA AND DYSTOPIA

1.1. The Emergence of Utopia

“A Map of the World that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at
...”

(Qtd. In Mumford iii)

“WHY DEVOTE SEASONS OF YOUR LIFE TO THE STUDY OF
UTOPIAS? YOU DO know, don't you, that every one ever proposed or realized has
failed.”

(Rothstein, Muschamp, and Marty 49)

These two quotations clearly express the nature and future of utopia, an ideal based on unlimited human desires, dreams, and imaginations. Mumford cannot imagine a world without dreams, hopes and expectations. However, Rothstein and others are trying to determine whether utopia is worth our consideration. This dilemma stems from the ambiguity of utopia itself. This chapter analyzes the concept of utopia as a whole; the emergence, mission, contribution, conflict, ambiguity, practice and nature of utopia.

Utopia emerges from the infinite desires of humankind. As Donald F. Busky states, “Desires are infinite in nature” (21), and this is the most distinctive feature of humankind. Human desires have no limits and boundaries. Therefore, utopia emerges from unlimited human desires, and hopes. The ultimate human goal is happiness, and people always long for a better society, especially when the social system does not function well nor satisfy their demands. Every society has failures and hopes, every society unconsciously desires utopia. For this reason, we consider utopia a universal concept.

Utopian genre emerges when Plato criticizes the corruption of Greek society and describes his ideal state as he questions the concepts of virtue, equality, happiness and justice in The Republic. He believes that these virtues would form the ideal state. Athens lacks these virtues, so Plato voices his discontent about the state, politics, social life, education and family life in The Republic. Pappas explains Plato’s aim as follows:

When describing his ideal city in the Republic, Plato permits himself a wistful tone, almost a nostalgia for the future he envisions. And although his city is to display very different virtues from the one he grew up in, we may recognize in Plato's hope for a perfect community something of his sense of loss for the Athens that had flourished until his early childhood. (3)

Plato creates utopian genre, and it is the means for both criticism of the current system, and idealization of an alternative. Plato has a great impact on Western political thought.

His ideals and theories find a way in every discipline in the West. He has inspired philosophers, politicians, and authors with many dimensions of The Republic, because his masterpiece has many dimensions and perspectives throughout centuries.

Aristotle, Plato's pupil, follows his mentor by questioning and criticizing his master's ideals and thoughts. He does not form an original set of thoughts and ideals but rather bases his concepts on Plato's philosophy. Barker states that Aristotle regards himself as the systematiser:

As a matter of fact, his eschatology led Aristotle to regard himself rather as the systematiser of a given knowledge, than as the creator of an original philosophy. It led him to attach great importance to the results of previous thinkers; and in the *Politics* especially we are conscious of a constant reference, explicit or implied, to the teaching of his precursors in this field of inquiry. (208, 209)

Although Aristotle discusses the virtues that Plato has discussed earlier, he is practical and does not idealize a perfect state as Plato has done. He interprets Plato's ideals and claims that ideals are unreachable, and impractical. Aristotle tries to describe the most applicable state considering human nature, and weakness.

Utopia is not limited to Western civilization. It is a timeless and universal concept that longs for the hopeful dreams of humanity. Every society has its own version of utopia. The Epic of Gilgamesh portrays the utopia of immortality.

Immortality is the ultimate dream of every living creature, and The Epic of Gilgamesh tells the story of King Gilgamesh's quest for it. However, Oinas explains the main theme of The Epic of Gilgamesh and opposes the idea that it is an epic: "The Gilgamesh cycle is less concerned with history and more concerned with the general themes of man's existence, specifically: the fear of death and the quest for eternal youth and eternal life" (28). The Epic of Gilgamesh features the utopian element in Gilgamesh's search for immortality. He has an impossible dream. Not only The Epic of Gilgamesh, but most of the epic poems have utopian characteristics, since the epic genre is concerned with the great dreams and missions of heroes.

It is Thomas More, who introduces the term "utopia" to the literary genre in the sixteenth century with his famous book Utopia, which means "no place" in Greek. "Utopia" is nowhere, an imaginary place. According to Kumar, the desire for utopia is the desire "to live in a world that cannot be but where one fervently wishes to be" (1). Utopian land is very much like heaven, where a fantastic landscape is described and praised. Place is the first concern of all utopian authors, because location of the land also projects the identity of that community. Utopian authors locate their "imagined communities" far away from corrupted civilizations to protect the state from the harmful effects of other states and nations (Wegner xvi). Wegner points out that, "utopia's imaginary community is thus not only a way of imagining subjectivity, but also a way of imagining space" (xvii). Subjectivity of thoughts combines with the space, and a new ideal community emerges. Therefore, the place of the "imagined

community” is an indicator of their life style and standards. Utopia, “the principal of hope” (Pippin, and Aichele 6), is a static place that is depicted through “performance of discourse” (Wegner xviii, xix). The imaginary utopian land is static, which cooperates with literature and becomes immortal as Rees mentions, “The true origin and location of utopia is in the imagination, and its immortality is in literature” (35). Literature promotes utopia to emerge and develop, since it is the mean of emotions, expectations and ideas of humanity. Utopia is the blueprint of human desires. Thus, literature is the only place where utopia can revive and feed the human imagination. Beaujour asserts, “Literature has traditionally been a privileged vehicle for the creation of utopian landscape because the literary imagination can disregard current limitations of material means and technology” (2). Literature has no boundaries and limitations, and as Thorndike emphasizes, “Its bounds, its ideals, its purposes are never secure” (5). Therefore, utopia finds its path in literature with its fantasies, dreams, and hopes that “supplies the missing link between practical and theoretical interests” (Bauman 15). The utopian ideal encompasses humanity’s aim to reach a perfect system, and is nurtured by the belief that there was a perfect age once upon a time. This period is the Golden Age of unlimited justice and happiness. It is believed that society had no corrupted institutions in that age. Therefore, people long for that marvelous and fantastic age described by Hesiod:

The gods who own Olympus as dwelling-place
deathless, made first of mortals a Golden Race,

(this was the time when Kronos in heaven dwelt)
and they lived like gods and now sorrow of heart they felt.
Nothing for toil or pitiful age they cared,
but in strength of hand and foot still unimpaired
they feasted gaily, undarkened by sufferings.
They died as if falling asleep; and all good things
were theirs, for the fruitful earth unstintingly bore
unforced her plenty, and they, amid their store
enjoyed their landed ease which nothing stirred
loved by the gods and rich in many of herd.
(qtd. in Claeys, Sargent, 7)

Hesiod's description symbolizes happiness, justice, morality, fertility, and all the goodness and dreams that humanity has longed for ages. The description of The Golden Age also ponders humanity's fear of the inevitable end of all living things: death. Even death is different and not terrifying in The Golden Age. The Golden Age is within the collective unconscious of humankind existing throughout all ages and nations.

Utopia does not belong to any specific period or religion; it is a universal concept. Whether secular or religious, utopia has the same features: the ideal state and its consequently perfect society. Although there are some differences in various utopian practices, the uniformity of utopia is fundamental. Secular and religious utopias both

praise the same virtues of humankind. Plato's The Republic, and Aristotle's Politics are two examples of secular utopia produced in a pagan society. However, they promote the virtues that every religion has in its teachings. As Cooper maintains, the boundaries between religion and paganism are tenuous:

In a sense, the Bible is a parallel to the Republic. It begins with an ideal Earthly Paradise, and ends with an ideal City in the Heavens. Forerunners of Plato as well as of all modern writers of Utopias are the prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the so-called deuterio-Isaiah....With Christian writers, the New Jerusalem takes the place of Socrates' Hellenic ideal of the city-state; it is the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse of John, of Bunyan in *The Holy City*, and of Blake on Milton. Blake fights the pagan Greek. With Saint Augustine the Greek ideal is not rejected, but converted to the Christian in *The City of God*.
(281)

It is interesting that in a pagan world, Plato and Aristotle base their utopias on the same virtues as Christianity. This indicates that religions also have their own utopias with the same themes and motifs. Moreover, we may argue that fundamental human virtues remain the same over the ages both in secular and religious utopias.

Religious utopias are based on faith in divinity. However, secular utopias claim that social structure and politics will better the society. Busky clarifies the differences:

Indeed, the oldest known utopian literature is found in the Bible. Many of the Old Testament prophets spoke of a perfect world to come. What distinguishes biblical utopianism from utopian socialism, other than it having no conception of a socially owned economy, is that perfection was to come about not through the actions of men and women, but through divine intervention. (2)

According to Christianity, early glimpses of utopia exist in the Bible. The heavenly utopian land is associated with The Garden of Eden, which people wish to reach through the teachings of Christianity. Ferns argues that, “Utopia represents a rationalized version of the underlying Edenic dream” (42). People idealize The Garden of Eden, where the first man and woman are created, and live in peace until the Original Sin. It is believed that corruption of humanity starts with the Original Sin. People seek ways of reaching Eden, and Eden is a reward for the believers after death. Therefore, religious utopias depict the paradise, and here is the description of paradise in the book of Isaiah:

The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall feed; their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The sucking child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den. They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the

knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea. (Isaiah 11:6-9 RSV) (qtd. in Pippin, and Aichele 1)

Longxi describes the elements of utopia in Christianity: “To be sure, there are utopian elements in Christian doctrine, such as the richly imagined Garden of Eden, the meliorist belief in the human capacity to improve, and the idea of the millennium” (1). Moreover, Saint Augustine “pictured a future city on earth and in heaven where men would be at peace with their Creator, and where they would do good to all within their reach” (Laidler 7). Religious utopias expect spiritual and sacred salvation rather than the improvement of social and economic elements of the society.

Utopia is a dynamic force, and this dynamism contains both positive and negative aspects. Utopia differs from one ideology to another, because expectations and worldviews are not alike. Therefore, utopia is a relative term, and “Every utopia is, inevitably, someone’s dystopia” (Frye 2). There is not one single utopia or dystopia for everyone, because dreams and imaginations change in time and space. Ideologies differ from one community to another. Furthermore, utopia and dystopia complete each other with common ideologies, and they apply totalitarian policy to rule the masses.

1.2. Utopian Communism

Utopian communism is the primitive communism theorized by Plato. Plato’s main concern is to establish justice and equality in society. Utopianism is not based on

economy. Barker states that, "Plato's system of socialism, therefore, is one which has nothing at all to do with the economic structure of society-- which leaves an individualistic system of production still standing, and does not touch a single producer" (245). Plato's communism deals with the life of guardians rather than that of workers, farmers and other strata of society. Therefore, Plato's communism is elitist, and "it is argued that his ruling elite, forbidden to enjoy the pleasures of wealth and marriage, was the first example of a Communist society" (Crossman 216). Utopian communism is different from Marxism. Marx believes that the working class will initiate revolution because they are oppressed by the rich. Marx argues that history is full of class struggles, inequality and oppression of the working class by the rich capitalist system. Therefore, his main concern is economic equality. Busky clarifies the differences between utopian communism and Marxist communism:

Plato saw democracy as anarchy, and a stage on the way to dictatorship. This rejection of democracy is a characteristic of modern-day communism. However, unlike Marx, Plato did not see communism coming about by a proletarian revolution from below. He had no role for the workers and farmers in politics. His was an elitist utopia, to be imposed from above by a philosopher who became king or vice versa. (16)

While Marx is concerned with the proletariat, Plato does not care so much about workers and farmers. Moreover, he does not believe that they must have political roles. Thus, this is the fundamental distinction between utopian communism and Marxism.

Plato idealizes a virtuous state, and for him communism is at the service of virtue, not the economy of the state. While Marx advocates communism in economy, Plato abolishes family life and marriage to advocate communism as sharing women and children. His perception of communism attacks family life, not economic equality.

Aristotle's point of view on communism is different from Plato's. For him virtue, "a tendency to control a certain class of feeling and to act rightly in a certain kind of situation" (Ross 209), is the basis of a state rather than as a result of a communist social system. He believes that virtue will abolish the inequality in society, and equality must be in education rather than in property. According to Aristotle, "it was more necessary to equalize men's desires than their properties" (Busky 20). Morality is the solution for inequality, injustice and corruption.

Thomas More's communism is based on equality in economy. More criticizes economic policy in England in his Utopia. More is a Christian; therefore, the life of Jesus Christ is the best example for the communal life style. Religions are to purify human greed and ambition. Utopia aims to purify negative aspects of humanity. Utopians do not respect gold, and money is abolished in the state. Cities and houses are all alike and there is no private ownership. Furthermore, families switch their houses every decade. Utopia has division of labor, equality of humankind before laws and communal life style in many social institutions.

1.3. Purpose of Utopia

In this remarkable statement regarding utopia's mission, Rothstein and others explain, "But utopias, properly interpreted, are visions of what should be, even if they show what shouldn't be" (Rothstein, Muschamp, and Marty 3). Utopian literature not only idealizes a perfect society, but also criticizes the current society by dreaming of an alternative one. The comparison between the two clearly identifies the dysfunctional institutions of society.

Utopia does not consist only of simple dreams and imaginations. It also has some progressive missions to improve cultures and civilizations. Dreams and imaginations are the muse and inspiration of all improvements, and Anatole France praises utopia with his following sentences:

Without the Utopians of other times, men would still live in caves, miserable and naked. It was Utopians who traced the lines of the first city. . . . Out of generous dreams come beneficial realities. Utopia is the principle of all progress, and the essay into a better future. (qtd. in Mumford 22)

The contribution of utopia to humanity is undeniable. Inventions and improvements depend on creativity, and creativity is fed by dreams and imaginations. Therefore, utopia improves societies, and Bauman explains the necessity of utopia, "The presence of a utopia, the ability to think of alternative solutions to the festering problems of the present, may be seen therefore as a necessary condition of historical change" (13).

Utopia is a dynamic force, an alternative approach for change and improvement, because it enriches one's ability to think and criticizes the present state of affairs.

1.4. Education and Indoctrination in Utopia

The utopian state follows some strategies in education. The aim of utopian education is to produce masses that serve the state; state pedagogy emphasizes conditioning and indoctrination. A utopian state tries to create a peaceful atmosphere, and it is believed that this can be managed through conditioning. Rees professes that, "Any ideal society has to perpetuate itself through conditioning its citizens" (4). The state aims to educate devoted citizens and patriots who are at the service of the state. In that case, schools promote the ideology of the utopian state and the regime. Ablin reminds us that, "The school is not simply an educational establishment. It is an ideological institution" (34). Therefore, state centered education is the most important source of the utopian regime.

Children belong to the state, and the state is responsible for their education. The state imposes the ideology on the children so that "each child would learn the utopian principles from infancy and would grow up into a new kind of person dedicated to the new way of life" (Kesten 113). As some critics assert that the state does not allow families to educate their children stating that their teaching methods are wrong. The state completely takes control of education, even to the degree of blocking parental influence.

Children learn to be obedient from their infancy. They are not allowed to criticize the practices of the regime and their monotonous way of life. Therefore, “nothing ever happens; no one ever disagrees with any one; the government, whatever its form may be, is always so wisely guided that there may be room for gratitude but never for criticism” (Gray 63). Criticism feeds the revolutionary ideas, and revolution destroys the peaceful atmosphere of utopian land.

Utopian education does not encourage people to improve and change. Utopian society is monolithic and closed to any other alternatives and changes. Although it is an alternative to all regimes, it offers no further alternatives beyond itself. It is believed to be the most perfect society that humanity has never had. Therefore, utopia “denies or grasps every alternative, and where meaning is not kept open and the object of debate. Such totalitarian and repressive utopias offer closure and no possibility for future change, only a realization of one grand design. This is Utopian thinking without any possibility of alternatives” (Dahlberg, and Moss 190). A closed society suppresses and restricts the people. It blunts critical thinking skills. In fact, the aim of the state is to abolish critical thinking, because critical thinking leads to rebellion, and disobedience.

Vriens identifies education as, “helping children to become adults, which means autonomous participants in social and cultural life” (59). There is no individuality but there are strategies for bonding individuals to the state and the system. The unity is a must because progression and change harm the monotonous way of life in utopian land. The state indoctrinates and conditions the children in order to kill individual identity,

thus creating identical human beings who are alienated from themselves. Kesten asserts the duties of teachers in a utopian state, “Teachers would inculcate emotional restraint and thereby eradicate individualism” (11). The state does not want to educate intelligent and introspective individuals, because they are threats for the regime.

An imposed and controlled education does not bring happiness by itself. People are conditioned to find happiness in patriotism, so that they can serve the state in the best way. They are educated to appreciate and endure the state, because “The aim of education is to promote good citizenship” (Counts 23). A good citizen must be shaped by the state. The state is not for the individual, but rather the individual is for the state. Therefore, the aim of the state’s existence is contradictory.

1.5. Marriage and Family life in Utopia

The main pillar of utopia is family life, because society is composed of families. The family is the microcosm of the whole social system. Marriages in utopia are arranged, practical, and they are not based on love. Booker argues that “marriage is considered a service to the state rather than an expression of individual love” (48). Marriages are based on the need of procreation, and the aim of the marriage is to legitimize the sexual life of individuals.

Utopian philosophers have different views on marriage and women. But the main argument remains the same: procreation. Plato’s thoughts are totally different from Aristotle and other philosophers after him. Plato thinks that women and children

must be the properties of the society. Family and marriage are abolished in The Republic. Plato diffuses communal life style to every social unit, and totally abolishes private ownership. He believes that family life is the source of selfishness, and Annas presents Plato's ideas on family and women:

Plato's Republic, and to a lesser extent Laws, are famous for the idea that in an ideally governed society the nuclear family would be either abolished or severely limited. Plato is struck by the way that families often serve as schools of selfishness and a competitive and hostile attitude to outsiders, and that this often closes off the spread of attachment to wider groups. Cities will have citizens with real attachment to their city and its ideals, he thinks, only if the kind of influences provided within the nuclear family are reined in. Among the benefits of this idea he sees a release of the potential in women, who will exchange a narrow life of caring for husband and children at home for one in which their physical and mental capacities can be developed in wider contexts, just as those of men are. (47, 48)

As clearly indicated, the unity and peace of the society is more important than individual happiness and peace. Regarding the issue of women, Plato has contradictions. He realizes that women have various problems in. He abolishes the restriction of women, and encourages them to get the same educational opportunities that men have. However, Plato still considers women weak by nature, and that On also emphasizes Plato's dilemma: "On the other hand, Plato continually adds that women

are by nature weaker, less rational and ultimately a punishment for a soul's living less than a righteous life” (41). This contradiction shows us that Plato cannot totally overcome his society’s mainstream bias against women.

Aristotle disagrees with Plato on the issue of women and family life. He believes that sharing women and children would kill the sense of responsibility in humankind, and cause chaos in society. In Politics women are inferior to men and they have no rights in society. Aristotle emphasizes the reproductive aspects of women frequently. Tuana asserts that, “Aristotle, like the majority of philosophers after him, associates woman's defects with her reproductive role” (9). Aristotle’s views on women and family life completely reflect the utopian view and perspective on the issue. The main role of women and marriage is procreation. Marriage and women are at the service of the state.

In utopian society marriages are arranged according to specific strategies. Marriage is arranged between healthy and intelligent males and females for healthy offspring. As Parrinder explains, eugenics has an important role in utopia: “The traditional utopia, it can be argued, depends on eugenics just as it depends on stability, social stratification, and the abolition of private property. Plato, More, Campanella, and Charlotte Perkins Gilman are among those who were unable to conceive a utopia without controls over the choice of a sexual partner and the production of offspring” (1). The state not only arranges the marriage, but also interferes in the relationship of parents and children. Rees draws our attention to the relationship of parents and

children and claims that, “the state cuts the cords of personal relationships between, parent and child, man and woman” (19). Personal relationships are restricted, and the children belong to the state.

A utopian state establishes a mechanical life without love and emotions. Love is a dangerous concept for the state. Therefore, romantic love is forbidden, whereas love for state is appreciated and encouraged. Romantic love is considered a crime, and the lovers have to be punished since they are violating laws of the state. The state cannot tolerate the emotional unity of individuals. The responsibility is towards the state, and its laws not to the family or others. Any emotional unity among male and female could undermine the utopian state. Therefore, no love is allowed, only procreation.

1.6. Dystopia

Dystopia has several names to describe the nightmare of a society, and “From the Utopian genre has come the eutopia, the dystopia and the antiUtopia” (Horton and Baumeister 248). Basically, dystopia is considered the opposite concept of utopia. While utopia portrays an imaginary heaven, dystopia portrays an imaginary hell:

Utopian fiction explores the perfectibility of human society through hypothetical advancements in technology, philosophy, and social structures, resulting in perfect or near-perfect communities located in distant lands or in the future. Dystopian fiction, utopia's polarized offspring, turns human perfectibility

on its head by pessimistically extrapolating contemporary social trends into oppressive and terrifying societies. Utopia's optimistic portrayal of advancement toward stable human societies gives way, in dystopia, to totalitarian stagnation. Individual freedom, especially the freedom to entertain and communicate unorthodox ideas, is ruthlessly suppressed in dystopias. (Sisk 2)

Booker describes dystopian literature as a warning against the consequences of utopianism: “Briefly, dystopian literature is specifically that literature which situates itself in direct opposition to utopian thought, warning against the potential negative consequences of arrant utopianism” (3). Despite great hopes and expectations of utopia, dystopia emerges, and blurs the differences between the fantasy and the nightmare.

Dystopia emerges with the advancement of science and technology in the nineteenth century. The utopian dream dies and dystopia develops in a scientific period. James and Mendlesohn claims, “It is sometimes said that the ability of the writer to imagine a better place in which to live died in the course of the twentieth century, extinguished by the horrors of total war, of genocide and of totalitarianism” (219). The optimistic perspective of authors switches to pessimism as they watch the scientific and technological developments of the nineteenth century push the world to World War I and II. These wars indicate the harmful effects of advanced technology, and weakness of humankind when confronted by its own inventions. Moreover, the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 led to totalitarianism that clearly displayed negative consequences

that became the basis of some dystopian novels, such as Zamyatin's We, and George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Advanced technology and the gloomy atmosphere of the world become the themes of many books. Dystopia criticizes political and social corruption. While utopia idealizes a perfect world, dystopia projects a corrupted society with no moral and political values. Therefore, dystopia is a moral and political warning addressed to the future. Dystopia foresees the corruption beforehand with the current political, social and economic depressions. Fern describes dystopia as “means of satirizing and warning against some of the more alarming trends in contemporary society” (15). The problems raised in contemporary societies inspire many famous authors to write dystopian novels. Animal Farm (1945) and Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949) by George Orwell, Brave New World (1932) by Aldous Huxley, A Handmaid's Tale (1985) by Margaret Atwood, Erewhon (1871) by Samuel Butler, Fahrenheit 451 (1953) by Ray Bradbury, Lord of the Flies (1954) by William Golding are some important dystopian novels that give warning, and also criticize their own corrupted societies. These novels, with totalitarian settings, unify utopia and dystopia into one literary genre, and present the results of utopia.

Utopia, the imaginary land, and dystopia, the nightmare, have a long continuum. There is no sharp distinction between these two concepts. Each of them embraces the other despite some differences in prediction, intention, and hope. Since these concepts are relative, “in the background of many a dystopia there is a secret utopia” (Manuel,

and Manuel 6). Moreover, utopia and dystopia are unified genres, and both appear consequently. The similarities and differences between the two complement each other.

Utopia and dystopia have political visions, and missions. Utopia praises central authority; however, dystopia points out the consequences of utopia and central authority. Dystopia satirizes the power-knowledge relationship thoroughly. It indicates how monarchy turns into tyranny in a totalitarian regime. At this point, utopia turns into dystopia, and dystopia appears to be the continuum of utopia. This continuum has some similarities as well as some differences. In dystopia, there is a gloomy, dark atmosphere, where advanced technology creates a series of harmful impacts on society. Dystopian literature deals with these harmful impacts. With the advanced technology in dystopia, people are under state control. Technology is at the service of the state to watch citizens everywhere, and kill individual privacy. People are extremely unhappy; though paradoxically they are all conditioned to be happy from their infancy. People are not purified but rather not under strict control and conditioning of the state. Society is deteriorating each day, and the state is guilty of leading them to corruption. In utopia, the atmosphere appears bright and full of life. People are conditioned to have virtues, and they are not deteriorating. They are purified to have communal lives in peace. Utopia projects the perfect self-sufficient social life. The state maintains the basic needs of people, and does not let them have more. Utopian regime and its practices are totally against human nature, and these practices lead the utopian society to dystopia.

In conclusion, utopia and dystopia emerge from the imagination of individuals. Utopia constructs reason and the society is ruled by reason. Emotions are eliminated in order to perfect citizens. There is not any emotional torture. However, dystopia attacks the emotions of humankind. Reason is abolished from society and subjectivity is dominant instead of objectivity. Sisk claims that, "In purely literary terms, dystopia's aims are closer to those of fiction than are those of utopian literature. Where utopia appeals to reason, dystopia works on emotions" (80). In utopia, elimination of emotions aim to provide coherence among individuals, but dystopia's emotional manipulation aims to provide absolute obedience to the regime.

CHAPTER 2

THE INTERACTION OF THE DYSTOPIAN STATE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL

2.1 Dystopian States: Oceania and Gilead

This chapter analyzes the impact of the dystopian state on the individual through a comparative study of two dystopian novels: George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale. First, I compare Oceania and Gilead, two dystopian states, and identify the crucial elements of the dystopian states in order to have a better understanding of their social and political systems. The second aspect is the indoctrination policy of the dystopian states in order to create obedient and conformist citizens and establish stability in society. The last part of this chapter compares the main characters of the two dystopian novels: Nineteen-Eighty Four's Winston and The Handmaid's Tale's Offred. I discuss the dominance and impact of totalitarian regimes over the individuals and their relationships.

Oceania and Gilead, the imaginary dystopian states of Orwell and Atwood, project the 20th century phenomenon that has undergone many technological developments as well as social and political changes. Roy says that "tomorrow's society as one in which people will be conditioned, standardized, and dehumanized; in which the past will have been obliterated; in which reading and thinking will be suspect

activities and individuality a crime” (135). Roy’s explanation of totalitarianism enlightens us about the crucial aspects of totalitarian regimes. Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Handmaid’s Tale depict the political, social and cultural transformation of their societies that have been affected by totalitarianism. Totalitarianism creates dehumanized individuals through conditioning and creates a new history and regime.

In the novel Nineteen Eighty-Four, one of the most important contemporary works of dystopian literature, George Orwell warns us against totalitarianism as he satirizes England during World War II: “Nineteen Eighty-Four explicitly deals with the possibility of the irresistible totalitarian state being founded by postwar thought and technology”. Slusser and et al. explain that; “It is a memo to the future, addressed to “1984”” (Slusser, et al. 127). As an ideological project, Orwell’s novel depicts the destruction of human individuality and human community by a totalitarian state (Resch 141). Orwell’s England suffers from the outcome of postwar era whereas politicians accrue their personal benefits. Totalitarianism seems to be the most fair ideology and regime for people; however, greedy politicians abuse the system and benefit fully. They ignore the essence of totalitarianism and manipulate people, history and language for their own benefit. Therefore, the totalitarian system corrupts and creates dehumanized and unhappy people in the society. Politicians promote terror and hatred to dominate the masses. They rule the country through terror and force rather than love.

The protagonist of the novel is Winston Smith who works in the department of the Ministry of Truth affiliated with the Inner Party. He hates the Inner Party and

supports Emmanuel Goldstein whom he thinks will bring peace and stability. He has a rebellious spirit and thinks critically of the new totalitarian system he is in. He has flashbacks of his mother and sister. He has a lover called Julia who also works for the Inner Party. However, Julia is selfish and does not care much about the new oppressive regime. She does not have a rebellious spirit.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, Oceania, a totalitarian state at war with Eurasia, is ruled by the Inner Party. The illusory Big Brother, symbol of the Inner Party, is ubiquitous on Oceanian telescreens, watching over citizens obliged to love and obey him. The main goal of the Inner Party is to engender a totally artificial society. They manipulate language, history, knowledge and every social structure through oppression, conditioning, and brainwashing. “Doublethink”, which Orwell defines as the ability to hold and accept two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, is an important means for oppressing the citizens of Oceania (193).

Oceania has four major departments. The Ministry of Truth deals with news, entertainment, education and the fine arts. The Ministry of Peace makes wars. The Ministry of Love dispenses law and order. The Ministry of Plenty is responsible for economic affairs. The names of the departments are in complete contradiction with their missions and responsibilities. Through these ministries, The Inner Party strictly controls and oppresses Oceanians. The twisted doublethink evident in these departments' paradoxical names is part of the dictatorship's linguistic strategy of social engineering. “WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH!” are

Inner Party mottos. These contradictory words are chosen intentionally to confuse the masses and foment doublethink. Doublethink deconstructs truth and reality, rebuilds norms and beliefs as strict propaganda.

Two languages are spoken in Oceania: Oldspeak and Newspeak. Newspeak, an artifice of The Inner Party, has fewer and fewer words each year. As a person cannot understand any concept that he or she cannot put into words, Newspeak reduces intellectual capacity and degenerates cognitive ability” (Sisk 12). “Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?” asks Syme, Winston’s colleague. “Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller” (Orwell 49). The Inner Party’s dystopic agenda is to impose the ideologies promoted by the four ministries. If, as Carter states, “language is power, life, and the instrument of culture, the instrument of domination and liberation,” then in Nineteen Eighty-Four we can see how Orwell portrays linguistic manipulation as a key component in his fictional society’s degradation (qtd. in Cavalcanti 152).

The Inner Party also subverts historical facts in order to reconstruct a nebulous past that frustrates any understanding of the present totalitarian reality of Nineteen Eighty-Four. Upon any attempt to scrutinize the past, “Everything melted into mist” (Orwell 35). The Inner Party rewrites history for its own benefit. The media is controlled by the party to promote its policy and ideology. Newspapers, books, periodicals, posters and pamphlets all promote the new ideology in doublespeak. The narrator of Nineteen Eighty-Four describes:

Every record has been destroyed and falsified, every book has been re-written, every picture has been re-painted, every statue and street and building has been re-named, every date has been altered. And that process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right. (141, 142)

Even the most obvious historical facts are falsified. The Inner Party's slogan summarizes their objective: "Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell 225). Erasing history means erasing culture, tradition, civilization and Oceania's collective consciousness as a nation-state.

The Handmaid's Tale by Margaret Atwood is a feminist dystopian novel that is a "direct reaction to the growing political power of the American religious right in the 1980s," (Booker 78). Atwood depicts a fundamentalist state reducing women's role to procreation and replaces The United States with The Republic of Gilead. The novel is mainly based on gender roles, as Michael observes:

More specifically, the novel warns of the dangers inherent in all forms of extremism and fanaticism, so that both right-wing anti-feminist and radical feminist notions about gender roles and women's positions are depicted as flawed and potentially dangerous. Gilead takes to its extreme the right-wing position that women should stay home and focus solely on childbirth and raising children. (135)

The Republic of Gilead is ruled by religious fundamentalism that classifies women according to their fertility. Fertile women are removed from their husbands to be trained and served to the Commanders. These fertile women are called handmaids and they serve the society as incubators. The Commanders impregnate the handmaids and the babies are given to wives of the Commanders.

The novel is narrated by the handmaid Offred. She is also the protagonist of the novel who has flashbacks just like Winston in Nineteen Eighty-Four. She narrates to us her life when she was with her husband and daughter. They were exiled by The Republic of Gilead and Offred was sent to the Red Center to be indoctrinated and trained for her new status to serve as a handmaid for barren couples. She is the handmaid of Commander and his wife Serena Joy. Offred has to have sex with her Commander and that ritual is called Ceremony. The Commander reads the Bible before the Ceremony and the household listens to him. Then, with the company of Serena Joy, the Ceremony takes place. Love and emotion are forbidden between the handmaids and the Commanders. Offred experiences such a hard life in Gilead and she describes the practices of the new system in Gilead and her life in Commander's house as a handmaid.

The Republic of Gilead is also a totalitarian state ruled by the Commander who takes control of the state by a military coup. The founders of Gilead assassinate the president of the state and all the members of the Congress. They abolish the rights of women completely. Women lose their jobs and property. Men gain the power whereas

women are classified and have no freedom and identity. They function as incubators in order to perpetuate the offspring of the state. Rubenstein claims that:

From the central issue of procreation to the language and imagery that form the substructure of Offred's narrative, *The Handmaid's Tale* demonstrates multiple inversions and violations of nature and natural. Not only is the female body used as a tool for reproduction, but bodies in general are objectified and described in terms of parts rather than as wholes. (103)

The Republic of Gilead objectifies the bodies of women because procreation is the ultimate goal of the state due to the low reproduction rates. Therefore handmaids are trained and indoctrinated to serve elite couples who cannot conceive. Women are “two-legged wombs” as Atwood writes in *The Handmaid's Tale* (146). Their privacy and rights are all restricted in order to make them submissive to the state.

Classification is part of totalitarian systems and women of The Republic of Gilead are all classified and named according to their status and roles. Handmaids are strictly controlled and are at the service of elite and infertile couples to procreate. Men are free compared to women. The Aunts are the educators of the handmaids who support the regime of Gilead and indoctrinate the handmaids accordingly. The other groups of women are Marthas and Econowives who are infertile and working for elite couples. They are for domestic purposes and inferior to handmaids because they cannot procreate. Moreover, women are valued according to their fertility.

The Republic of Gilead classifies women also in terms of names and clothing. The handmaids are named after their commanders with whom they are supposed to conceive. They are not allowed to use their real names which come from pre-Gilead society. All handmaids have “of” before their names and the rest of the name comes from their commanders’ names. The handmaid Offred is named after her Commander whose name is Fred. The Republic of Gilead eliminates the identity of each individual and the existence of each depends on the state. The same regulation is applied to clothing. They dress identically because the totalitarian system creates identical human beings. Therefore, handmaids are dressed in red to symbolize fertility. Wives are dressed in blue, Marthas in green, the Aunts in brown, and Econowives in stripes. Infertile handmaids and women who commit crimes and do not obey the rules of the state are sent to colonies and named “unwoman”. Thus, Atwood projects that fertility and obedience exemplify the identity of women. The survival and the existence of women depend on fertility.

Literacy is another issue controlled by The Republic of Gilead. Women are not allowed to read and write. The university is closed and education is forbidden. Harvard University is in ruins and its garden and walls serve for the hanging of rebellious people. Even the names of the shops are changed into symbols as Offred narrates: “You can see the place, under the lily, where the lettering was painted out, when they decided that even the names of shops were too much temptation for us. Now places are known by their signs alone” (Atwood 35). Literacy rate is getting lower each day

because, “given the historical link between literacy and power in the Western world, denying literacy to particular groups of people becomes a method of controlling and thus subordinating them” (Michael 135). Therefore; the only word Offred is given to read is “FAITH”. This explains the indoctrination and the power of the state over people and reminds Offred that this is her faith to be a handmaid.

The Republic of Gilead is an ideological state where people feel insecure and are suspicious of each other as being the Eye. It promotes totalitarianism as an ideology and people are all controlled and watched everywhere by the Eye, the secret police force of the state. The stability of the state depends on gender classification:

Like *Brave New World*, *The Handmaid's Tale* depicts a world in which social stability and communal identity are associated with intensified gender and class polarization, but Atwood's novel underscores the relationship between the two. There is some possibility of upward economic and social mobility among the men, but women's positions are fixed—except for the possibility of exile. (S, and Adams 104)

This is an unstable society in which diversity is banned and people are all classified in order to be controlled in every aspect of their lives. Atwood not only classifies genders as man and woman, she classifies women and their roles in the society.

Oceania and Gilead are ideological states where totalitarianism suppresses the mass and creates isolated individuals. Although totalitarian regimes aim to unite people for the same purpose, the strict control and dictatorship leave each individual lonely and suspicious. Each state has a control mechanism of its own. Telescreens and microphones are used in Oceania to monitor the citizens. However, Gilead does not have that technology and secret police force to watch over people. Hammer also draws our attention to this and states, “One of the most striking features of this futurist novel is its lack of futuristic technological trappings-be they gismos, robots, or outlandish scientific theories, advances, or practices” (44). Atwood does not need technology to control people in her novel because her main concern is to depict the situation of women in the near future in their relationship to fundamentalism. Therefore, her focus is not in the technological developments but on procreation.

Oceania has a legendary leader called the Big Brother. Citizens are forced to love him and devote themselves to his ideology although they have never met him. He is a fictive figure over the dictatorship. His name also serves as the motto of the state: The Big Brother is watching you! The narrator of Nineteen Eighty-Four describes Big Brother in the following terms: “Big Brother is infallible and all-powerful. Every success, every achievement, every victory, every scientific discovery, all knowledge, all wisdom, all happiness, all virtue, are held to issue directly from his leadership and inspiration. Nobody has ever seen Big Brother. He is a face on the hoardings, a voice on the telescreen” (187, 188). This glorification creates a God like figure out of Big

Brother in order to make the regime infallible and powerful. On the other hand, Gilead does not have such a legendary and illusory leader. The Commander establishes the regime in Gilead and takes the control of the state and sets totalitarianism through oppression and close surveillance. However, he is not glorified by his supporters as Big Brother.

The purpose of Oceania and Gilead is to set up totalitarianism but both states disguise the real purpose with an illusion of equality and peace. Oceania controls the masses without gender classification. However, Gilead concentrates on gender classification and aims to eliminate the misuse of women and sexuality with a hidden agenda. Bergmann summarizes the core of the novel by stating that: Atwood sets her novel in a future America, called Gilead. Pollution and war have resulted in a depletion of the white elite population and after a takeover of the government a stern religious patriarchy institutes a new regime dedicated to increasing the white population (847). Although, procreation policy in Oceania is more political than the procreation policy of Gilead, both states need more supporters for their regimes.

Commander confesses that what he has done was not completely right. He explains the mentality of totalitarianism by referring to Stalin's phrase: You can't make an omelette without breaking eggs (qtd. in Atwood 222). At the beginning, he did not hesitate to make everyone suffer for the sake of common good but then he realizes his mistake and says, "We thought we could do better" (Atwood 222). Now he is aware of the flaws of the regime and he confesses that the new regime is not a success because

he could not make everyone happy. On the other hand, O'Brien is proud of the new regime and thinks that what they have done is the best thing for the common good:

Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing. Do you begin to see, then, what kind of world we are creating? It is the exact opposite of the stupid hedonistic Utopias that the old reformers imagined. A world of fear and treachery and torment, a world of trampling and being trampled upon, a world which will grow not less but MORE merciless as it refines itself. Progress in our world will be progress towards more pain. The old civilizations claimed that they were founded on love or justice. Ours is founded upon hatred. In our world there will be no emotions except fear, rage, triumph, and self-abasement. Everything else we shall destroy—everything. (Orwell 241)

O'Brien criticizes the old regimes and civilizations because they were based on love and justice. However, Oceania has no tolerance on love and justice. It promotes hatred and injustice. O'Brien explains the goals of the regime to Winston one by one. Terror, hatred, torment are the goals that Oceania aims to have for the future. However, Commander does not have such goals because he has experienced all of those and now he is not very content with the results of the new regime. He appears to be a prisoner of the society that he has created.

Oceania and Gilead cut communication between the family members and friends in order to make everyone dependent on the states rather than each other. O'Brien talks about the goal of the party, "We have cut the links between child and parent, and between man and man, and between man and woman. No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer. But in the future there will be no wives and no friends" (Orwell 241). This alienation policy is also dominant in Gilead. Women are enemies of each other and Gilead applies the same policy. Wives have to share their husbands with the handmaids in order to have babies. Therefore, there is animosity between the wives and the handmaids. Furthermore, marthas and handmaids are not allowed to communicate because they are classified according to their status in the society. Offred wants to chat with them but she is aware of the policy and tells, "The Marthas are not supposed to fraternize with us" (Atwood 21). Animosity and alienation policy are intentional because these dystopian states have the fear of losing control of the state. When the communication is cut, people would not come together and rebel against the regime. Therefore, the dystopian states diffuse hatred, terror and fear to indoctrinate individuals and create an unstable society.

2.2. Indoctrination

Indoctrination is the most crucial method of totalitarian regimes to stabilize the society and create obedient citizens. Reality is manipulated and transformed into illusions through images in totalitarian regimes in order to dehumanize and condition the masses. The totalitarian states are aware of the power and the weakness of the human mind. Howe criticizes totalitarian regimes from this perspective:

The totalitarian state assumes that--given modern technology, complete political control, the means of terror and a rationalized contempt for moral tradition--anything is possible. Anything can be done with men, anything with their minds, with history and with words. Reality is no longer something to be acknowledged or experienced or even transformed; it is fabricated according to the need and will of the state, sometimes in anticipation of the future, sometimes as a retrospective improvement upon the past. (241)

Howe also summarizes the practice and purpose of totalitarian regimes that consider humanity, reality; past and future are all malleable. Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Handmaid's Tale also depict such malleable concepts of humankind. People are controlled both mentally and physically by the fanatic supporters of the regimes who justify the tortures and create illusions and myths to reach their goals. O'Brien in Nineteen Eighty-Four and the Aunts in The Handmaid's Tale are chosen to represent

the policy of the state. People get to know the ideology of the states through their indoctrination.

The narrator of Nineteen Eighty-Four narrates indoctrination and doublethink as the methods of the party to manipulate people from infancy. The party considers human beings malleable, easy to shape and form into new identities. Children are raised with the slogans of the party that are considered as games and toys for them. The party maintains hatred, terror, fear and suspicion for children so that they can “systematically turned into ungovernable little savages” (Orwell 25). They even spy on their parents if they realize symptoms of unorthodoxy in them. With the indoctrination of the youth, the party produces new generations that are totally devoted to the regime. Personal relationships are weakened and individuals are alienated from one another. Therefore, “Family members are effectively turned against one another, with children being encouraged to inform on their parents and spouses encouraged to spy on one another” (Booker 75). Healthy human relationships are one of the most conspicuous casualties of dystopia, as the manipulation of human psychology corrupts natural affective impulses.

The Inner Party performs brainwashing and conditioning while forcing and torturing people to believe illusions through images. The psychological oppression and restriction lead people to have illusions and they are suspicious about the truth and their existence. Created images are gradually substituted for reality and truth. “Big Brother” is the first image that the Inner Party imposes on the masses in order to control and oppress them. Big Brother is a fictive figure and The Inner Party violates privacy

through him. The motto is “BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU!” This motto is the verbal and visual power of the party. Big Brother is the symbol of power and source of all virtues and achievements. He is invisible; however, his voice and image are on telescreens every day.

“WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH!” is another motto of the Inner Party. These contradictory words are chosen intentionally to confuse the minds of the masses and to create doublethink. The Inner Party tries to deconstruct the universal ideas, norms and beliefs. Doublethink deconstructs the truth and reality. As Orwell states, the party policy is based on doublethink and it means “to reject the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command” (74). O’Brien tortures and conditions Winston as he tells the policy of the Inner Party. Winston is a disobedient person and he has a rebellious spirit that the party cannot tolerate. O’Brien explains to him that, “Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else. Not in the individual mind, which can make mistakes, and in any case soon perishes: only in the mind of the Party, which is collective and immortal” (Orwell 225, 226). Orwell enlightens his readers about the subjectivity of reality accepted and appreciated by the party members. The Inner Party attributes the features of collectivity and immortality to the regime in order to gain and endure its power.

The Ministry of Peace also contributes to the Inner Party's mission. The Ministry's propaganda confuses citizens about the enemy because the Inner Party always changes its alliance. This confusion is on purpose and the concept of war "also stimulates an emotional atmosphere in which Doublethink can best flourish" (Kessler 575). The war outside is analogous to the war inside of each individual. The mysterious war against Eurasia takes a greater toll on the physical and psychological welfare of the Oceanians than on the real—or perhaps imagined--enemy.

Indoctrination in The Handmaid's Tale is more or less the same and managed by the Aunts. The handmaids are kept in the Red Center to be trained and indoctrinated. The policy of the Aunts is to praise the Republic of Gilead and criticize the previous society which allowed sexual violence on women. Aunt Lydia acts as the voice of authority when she claims that, "There is more than one kind of freedom... Freedom to and freedom from. In the days of anarchy, it was freedom to. Now you are being given freedom from. Don't underrate it" (Atwood 34). According to the new regime, pre-Gilead society has anarchy because of having too much freedom given to the people. However, now Gilead has the authority to distribute freedom. Therefore, it is not freedom but dictatorship because it is limited by the state. Aunt Lydia is aware of this as she says "Don't underrate it". She does not want the handmaids to rebel against the regime. She is a fanatic supporter of the Republic of Gilead and she indoctrinates the handmaids that the new regime respects women and protects them against sexual violence.

The strongest motto of the regime is “Gilead is within you” (Atwood 33). This motto serves to arouse the love of the state in the handmaids. The handmaids are indoctrinated to identify themselves with the state. They are not individual human beings but seeds for procreation. As Aunt Lydia indoctrinates the handmaids, she says, “Think of yourselves as seeds” (Atwood 28). The handmaids are for breeding purposes and their womanhood is just for procreation. This is emphasized over and over again in the Red Center during daily trainings.

As handmaid Offred narrates her life in the Red Center, she also enlightens us that indoctrination is not just verbal but also physiological and she claims, “We were on some kind of pill or drug I think, they put in the food, to keep us calm” (Atwood 80). Offred is a conscious handmaid and she tries to understand the methods of indoctrination in the Red Center. She wants to analyze the reasons of their calmness towards certain practices of the regime because she is aware that things are not normal.

The handmaids are also trained to have empathy towards the wives of their Commanders. They have to be concerned about the wives. Offred reports the advice of Aunt Lydia:

It’s not the husbands you have to watch out for, said Aunt Lydia, it’s the Wives. You should always try to imagine what they must be feeling. Of course they will resent you. It is only natural. Try to feel for them. Aunt Lydia thought she was

very good at feeling for other people. Try to pity them. Forgive them, for they know not what they do. (Atwood 56)

The Aunts appear to establish good relationships between the wives and the handmaids. However, this policy of the regime tries to make handmaids submissive and obedient. The Aunts try to balance the situation of handmaids with the wives. This speech of Aunt Lydia clarifies that not only handmaids but also wives are the victims of the regime.

The Republic of Gilead appears to empathize with the handmaids as they brainwash them. Offred lets us know how this happens as she narrates, “You are a transitional generation, said Aunt Lydia. It is the hardest for you. We know the sacrifices you are being expected to make. It is hard when men revile you. For the ones who come after you, it will be easier. They will accept their duties with willing hearts” (Atwood 127). The future handmaids will never have any memory of the past. Therefore; Aunt Lydia is sure about the obedience of future handmaids because they will be in the system as they are born. There will be nothing to criticize and they will have nothing to long for.

The Aunts are not the only people who indoctrinate the women. Serena Joy, the wife of the Commander and the former Gospel Singer, gives speeches on TV channels to convince women “about how women should stay home. Serena Joy didn’t do this herself, she made speeches instead, but she presented this failure of hers as a sacrifice

she was making for the good of all” (Atwood 55). She is part of the regime as a supporter and also a sufferer because her husband has a handmaid whom she hates. She appears to be a devoted person for the common good; however, what she supports prepares her own unhappiness.

Oceania and Gilead follow the same policy: criticize the old regime and praise the new one passionately. The new regime is built on the ruins of the old one. The love for the state is encouraged and the purpose of indoctrination is to condition citizens to serve the state in the best way. There are some strategies that the regimes follow to indoctrinate people. One of them is to build up mottos so that the ideology can flourish in each individual as they apply them in daily life. Oceania centers Big Brother as a motto; however, the motto of Gilead is based on procreation such as “Think yourselves as seeds”. Handmaids are the targets of Gilead because Gilead is founded for procreation and Gilead eliminates sexual violence on women. However, indoctrination in Oceania does not have gender discrimination and it is not just mental but also physical as O’Brien warns Linda about Winston:

We may be obliged to give him a new identity. His face, his movements, the shape of his hands, the colour of his hair--even his voice would be different. And you yourself might have become a different person. Our surgeons can alter people beyond recognition. Sometimes it is necessary. Sometimes we even amputate a limb. (Orwell 157)

Indoctrination in Oceania is very cruel compared to Gilead in the sense that the victim in Oceania is manipulated completely. Even the body of the victim is transformed into a new one. It is easy for the regime to erase the existence of that person from the world.

2.3. Nineteen-Eighty Four's Winston and The Handmaid's Tale's Offred

Nineteen-Eighty Four's Winston Smith and The Handmaid's Tale's Offred are the citizens of two totalitarian states: Oceania and Gilead. They both live in the transition period of their societies and they have been experiencing social and political changes. In this section, I discuss how Winston and Offred try to adapt themselves to the new regime and how the regime shapes them through oppression and indoctrination.

Winston is the protagonist of Nineteen-Eighty Four. He works for the Inner Party, but he is rebellious. He believes that Emmanuel Goldstein should be the true leader of the country instead of Big Brother. However, Big Brother is praised and supported by the new regime and Winston would be a traitor and killed by the state if he reveals his faith in Emmanuel Goldstein. Knowing all these truths and the terrifying policy of the regime, he commits many crimes intentionally to test the power of the state. Winston is the bravest character of the novel.

Winston has flashbacks and he remembers his mother and his sister during the years of poverty that they lived through the settlement of the new regime. He misses them and feels guilty for his actions towards his mother and sister. When he was a kid,

he steals his sister's chocolate and after this incident, his mother and sister get lost. He blames himself for being selfish towards his family in those times. He also remembers his wife, Katherine who is a devoted Inner Party supporter. He recalls their relationship and marriage deeply affected by the regime. As he reveals his past, the impact of the regime on love and marriage becomes clear.

Winston is a rebellious person and he does not hesitate to commit crimes. He writes a diary to communicate with the future. The diary is a crime because he writes of his faith in Emmanuel Goldstein and he criticizes Big Brother. He writes "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" and he knows that it is a thought crime. Winston is a criminal because "He was abusing Big Brother, he was denouncing the dictatorship of the Party, he was demanding the immediate conclusion of peace with Eurasia, he was advocating freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, he was crying hysterically that the revolution had been betrayed (Orwell 14,15). His rebellious spirit and his ambition to tear the Inner party down lead him to commit more crimes. Another crime he commits is his love affair with Julia, another Inner Party worker. Love and sex are forbidden among party members. The only love that is permitted is the love of Big Brother and the Inner Party. Therefore, his love affair with Julia is a political act against the regime.

Gender discrimination is the core motif of The Handmaid's Tale. Offred suffers from the theocratic and totalitarian system in Gilead both as a woman and a citizen. She

is trained as a handmaid by the state and carries all the burden of the system within herself. She has no name and identity as Goldblatt claims:

She no longer owns a name; she is "Of Fred," the concubine named for the man who will impregnate her. Every step, every mouthful of food, every move is observed, reported, circumvented, or approved for the sake of the child she might carry to term. Her only worth resides in her biological function. Her dreams and desires are unimportant. Her goal is survival (278).

She experiences the military coup that overthrows the president and the Congress of the state. She loses her job and property overnight and the society becomes male dominated with the new theocratic regime. Not only her property and status are taken by the military, but also her husband and daughter. She tries to escape from the country with her husband and daughter but she is caught and sent to the Red Center to become a handmaid. She does not know where her husband and daughter are sent and she suffers deeply for her destiny.

Offred has flashbacks as she narrates her new life as a handmaid. She is the narrator and protagonist of The Handmaid's Tale. She not only narrates the general panorama of Gilead, but also narrates how she is treated in Gilead as a woman and how this affects her psychology deeply: "I have them, these attacks of the past, like faintness, a wave sweeping over my head. Sometimes it can hardly be borne. What is to be done, what is to be done, I thought. There is nothing to be done" (Atwood 62). She is

hopeless and knows that she can do nothing to change the new system. The new regime does not let women own any property. Offred's bank account and her properties are transferred to her husband. She is weakened financially and emotionally by the state. She owns nothing. The state has the power, not the individuals. Therefore, her past is the only thing she possesses in the Republic of Gilead.

Offred's flashbacks inform us that she was married with a daughter. Actually, Luke, her husband, was married when their love affair started. Luke divorces his wife and marries Offred. They were happily married till the establishment of Gilead. Offred also informs us about her mother who was an activist of feminism. However, she is also lost and Offred does not know where she is. Offred is alone in the Republic of Gilead having no family support. She misses her family and realizes that she was very happy in pre-Gilead society.

Offred is sent to the Commander's house as a handmaid to serve this barren couple. When she gives birth to a baby, she will give the baby to the Commander and his wife. Her real name is not mentioned in the novel. The state does not let handmaids to have their own identities. They are just for breeding purposes. Therefore, her duty as a handmaid is described in detail because fertility is the reason of her existence in The Republic of Gilead. She will be a nonentity if she cannot conceive a baby. Infertile handmaids are sent to colonies and nobody knows what happens to them there.

Winston and Offred are the victims of the totalitarian regime. As they try to adapt themselves to the regime, their pasts follow them and shape their psyche. They are not happy where they are and they are stuck in two times and regimes as Atwood enlightens us about Offred in an interview, “Well, she doesn't like where she is, but neither does Winston Smith. Dystopias are places in which you don't like where you are; that's what they are by definition” (Dodson 100). Offred and Winston are lost in dystopian states and they are trying to interact with themselves and their pasts. Their identities do not belong to them. They are possessed by the state.

There are many similarities and differences these protagonists share. Gender difference does not change their situation in the regime. They are both commodities for the regime to perpetuate and improve. What make the differences are their personalities. Offred is more submissive to the regime than Winston. She is weaker and does not support any political party or person. She is afraid of committing any type of crime. When the doctor examines her and offers to impregnate her, she refuses due to the penalty she will get if she is caught. Actually, she will be punished if she does not conceive a baby from the Commander. In any case, she will be penalized. Therefore, the regime pushes her to commit a crime one way or another. Not one crime is committed through her free will. She meets the Commander in his study room every night with the Commander's own wish and desire. She has sex with Nick because Serena Joy wants her to do it. She goes to Jezebel Night Club with the Commander because it is his will.

Winston is different in that sense. He commits all his crimes voluntarily. He tells Julia: "I hate purity, I hate goodness! I don't want any virtue to exist anywhere. I want everyone to be corrupted to the bones" (Orwell 115). He wants everyone to commit crimes because he knows that crimes and corruption will prepare the end of the Inner Party and the regime. He is not hopeless like Offred. He believes in Emmanuel Goldstein and his political party will bring peace and stability to the country.

In conclusion, this chapter enlightens us about the interaction of dystopian state with each individual through the experiences of Winston and Offred. Citizenship has a new shape in dystopian state and responsibilities of each citizen are distributed by the dystopian state. People have no freedom of choice in education, work, family life, marriage and love. The dystopian state is the authority of every unit of the society. Everything is under the control of the state. People are not allowed to have personal relationships which may risk the existence of the state. Personal relationships and love have the potential of undermining a regime. Therefore, each individual must belong to the state.

CHAPTER 3

THE IMPACT OF THE DYSTOPIAN STATE ON LOVE, MARRIAGE AND FAMILY LIFE

3.1. Love as a Political Act

This chapter analyzes the impact of the dystopian state on love, marriage and family life in Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Handmaid's Tale. I intend to discuss how love is restricted and reduced to procreation rather than pure intimacy and passion in these novels. In this section, I analyze the attitude of dystopian states on love and how love is considered as a political act. Love is freedom; however, this freedom is restricted for people. The second section discusses the invasion of privacy and love in dystopian states. Privacy is invaded and love has no space to flourish. The last section concentrates on the impact of dystopian states on the couples of these two dystopian novels. Coupling is challenging in dystopian states and it is completely under the dominance of the regime.

If we consider love as a sort of magic that counteracts oppression, then the rebellious spirit of love threatens the future of dystopian states. The regime needs obedient citizens, not joyfully empowered lovers. De Rougemont explains the most crucial element of love and claims that "Love is freedom itself" (6). To love and be

loved requires freedom so that mutual desire can easily bloom and give full satisfaction to lovers. Thus, love is a political act and a threat for the dystopian state.

Winston Smith is the protagonist of George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. He works for the Inner Party which is the ruling party of Oceania and he loves another Inner Party worker, Julia. Due to the policy of the Inner Party, Winston hates Julia because "she was young and pretty and sexless, because he wanted to go to bed with her and would never do so," (Orwell 17). Winston is aware of the duality of having a love affair with Julia and the indoctrination of the regime he is under. Julia's beauty and attraction is a threat for Winston and hatred is the only emotion he is allowed to feel.

Winston and Julia, both members of the Inner Party that serves the regime, are the rebellious lovers of Nineteen Eighty-Four. They are strictly controlled everywhere and at every moment. Julia is involved in party business more than Winston. She works for the Junior Anti-Sex League that indoctrinates youth in order to suppress their sexual desires. Although Winston is generally disobedient, his perspective towards love and sex follows the Party line in the beginning. He has learned to dislike all women, even Julia. The repressive policy of the party creates hysteria towards women. According to Helmski, "Hatred is frustrated love, the shadow of love" (49). The antipathy towards women grows in Winston each day. The narrator describes Winston's feelings, "I hate purity, I hate goodness! I don't want any virtue to exist anywhere. I want everyone to be corrupted to the bones" (Orwell 115). He believes that the corrupting influences of sexual attraction will destroy the Party thoroughly. However,

Winston begins to change when Julia admits her love to him, and eventually he is able to reciprocate and even risk his life for her.

Winston and Julia first meet at the Victory Square in a crowd. Julia makes the plan and decides to meet Winston in the countryside away from the telescreens and microphones. Their love must be kept secret because the Inner Party does not allow love to flourish among people. Love is an obstacle for the regime and hatred and terror are the crucial emotions that help the regime to survive. O'Kane claims that, "Totalitarian regimes set out to destroy not only political pluralism but social pluralism too. Added to this destruction they substituted government, even as dictatorship, with rule through terror" (115). Dictatorship survives through fear and terror. That's why; Winston and Julia commit crime according to the laws of the regime because they violate the rules.

Desire is a thought crime and a rebellion to the party. The sexual act is forbidden to the masses and they are forced to substitute political effort for sexual energy. The party believes that sexually repressed individuals will serve the regime in the best way. Thus sexuality is an obstacle for the masses to be evoked easily by the party as Julia explains:

When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside

yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and the Three- Year Plans and the Two Minutes Hate and all the rest of their bloody rots? (Orwell 121)

Julia explains the reasons of sexual restriction and repression. Sexual energy is sublimated into public activities and affairs. Sigmund Freud also claims that, “a large amount of the psychical energy which it uses for its own purposes has to be withdrawn from sexuality” (qtd. in Strachey 51). The party’s purpose is to repress sexuality and get the perfect result with this sexual transformation. Sexual energy is the main source of the party. Therefore, the Inner Party is trying to kill “the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it” (Orwell 61). Individuals become devoted and celibate party members with the indoctrination policy of the state.

The love of Big Brother is the first goal of the Inner Party during indoctrination. Romantic love is exterminated and love of Big Brother is substituted. “The sex instinct will be eradicated. Procreation will be an annual formality like the renewal of a ration card. We shall abolish the orgasm. Our neurologists are at work upon it now. There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother (Orwell 242). Love and procreation remain ritualistic rather than emotional and humane. The Inner Party even manipulates the physiology of individuals to reach its goal. The existence of the regime depends on each devoted and celibate individual. Therefore, great attention is paid on education and indoctrination of each citizen.

Sexual intercourse is a ritual for the Inner Party and it is just for procreation. The party concerns about the new generation in order to perpetuate and have supporters in the future. Therefore, marriages are not social but completely political contracts as the narrator says:

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. (Orwell 61)

Marriage in Oceania is a duty towards the state to have children. Winston was married before and he recalls the attitude of his wife Katharine towards sex and marriage, “She had two names for it. One was 'making a baby', and the other was 'our duty to the Party' (yes, she had actually used that phrase)” (Orwell 62). Katharine is so indoctrinated that it is impossible for Winston to change her mind about love and any kind of passion or affection. Her consciousness is imbued with the ideology of the regime. The Inner Party acts as an impediment between spouses.

Love is a political act in The Handmaid's Tale as well. The Republic of Gilead also reduces love and passion to procreation. Actually, the main purpose of the regime in The Handmaid's Tale is to increase the reproduction rate. The Republic of Gilead suffers low reproduction rates and the regime claims to abolish the sexual violence on

women in order to have a fundamentalist state. The regime of the Republic of Gilead is based on the Bible and the rights of women are abolished completely. Women are classified and handmaids are at the service of barren couples. Procreation is the ultimate purpose of the regime and the state does not hesitate to sacrifice people for this purpose. Every law is on behalf of men. Women have no right and they are inferior to men. “There is no such thing as a sterile man any more, not officially. There are only women who are fruitful and women who are barren, that’s the law” (Atwood 70, 71). Men are never blamed for being barren. The law protects them and women suffer when they cannot conceive from their barren Commanders. Therefore, the Republic of Gilead is not only fundamentalist but also male dominant.

The Handmaid Offred is the protagonist of The Handmaid’s Tale. She is the handmaid of the Commander, the founder of the Republic of Gilead. Offred has a file and this indicates that she is closely monitored everywhere. Her service as a handmaid is considered a business transaction by Serena Joy as she says, “I’ve read your file. As far as I’m concerned, this is like a business transaction” (Atwood 25). Serena Joy considers this service of Offred as a business transaction because she is part of the system and she has to accept Offred without questioning. Her husband is the founder of the new state and she has no right to rebel against it. Women suffer in the new system both as handmaids and wives. The social status of a woman does not matter much. “Within the Wives class, women are reproductive consumers, competing with one another for access to the scarcest commodity: children. Handmaids, as reproductive

laborers, also compete among themselves to produce children for the market” (S, and Adams 107). Handmaids reproduce children and Wives are their consumers. Offred emphasizes this crucial phenomenon, “No woman in her right mind, these days, would seek to prevent a birth, should she be so lucky as to conceive” (Atwood 43). Wives gain status via having children from handmaids. For both parties, womanhood in Gilead is challenging and full of misery. Womanhood is humiliated in every aspect in the society.

Offred and the Commander have sexual intercourse in the presence of Serena Joy and this ritualistic action is called Ceremony. Serena Joy, wife of the Commander, witnesses what Michael describes as, “monthly fertilization ceremony is particularly chilling: it depicts the dehumanization of both handmaid and wife, who are made to participate as passive objects and victims in a sex act robbed of sensuality, desire, and love. The novel thus lends itself to discussing the dangers of reducing women to their reproductive” (135). The Ceremony is for reproduction purposes and it is ritualistic because love and passion are banned. Moreover, the sexual act is a duty for the regime and as Offred describes, “The sexual act, although he performed it in a perfunctory way, must have been largely unconscious, for him, like scratching himself” (Atwood 169). Affection and love are abolished between couples because love has a rebellious element that can easily undermine the regime. Therefore, totalitarian regimes cannot risk its existence. Love is prohibited and hated. Offred informs us about this indoctrination, “*Love*, said Aunt Lydia with distaste. Don’t let me catch you at it. No mooning and June-ing around here, girls. Wagging her finger at us. *Love* is not the

point” (Atwood 232). Aunt Lydia clearly indicates that love is never promoted and encouraged. Love is a crime that girls must avoid to commit.

Aunt Lydia reduces love to sex and criticizes the nature of men in such a way that men are still superior to women. She tells the handmaids that they should accept men as they are. Offred narrates her sentences, “Men are sex machines, said Aunt Lydia, and not much more. They only want one thing. You must learn to manipulate them, for your own good. Lead them around by the nose; that is a metaphor. It’s nature’s way. It’s God’s device. It’s the ways things are” (Atwood 153). Aunt Lydia also wants the handmaids to be submissive to the nature of men. She even insists that this is God’s arrangement and handmaids must know how to manipulate men for their own good. This speech is a kind of warning to handmaids not to be in love with men because men are sex machines.

Offred visits a doctor regularly because she cannot conceive a baby from the Commander. The doctor examines her and wants to have sex with her because Offred is fertile, but the Commander is barren. The doctor reveals this to Offred and reminds her that after some time, she will be announced barren and sent to the Colonies as an “unwoman”. The law is on behalf of men and there is no sterile man in Gilead. Offred does not accept the doctor’s offer because it is a crime. She would be killed if she has sexual intercourse with the doctor. On the other hand, she will be sent to the Colonies if she cannot conceive a baby. The system forces her to have illegitimate relationships and in both cases she will be blamed and sentenced to death. The regime seems to be

protective to women; however, as Walker claims, “*The Handmaid's Tale* is in some measure a rewriting of Hawthorne *The Scarlet Letter*: fundamentalist morality can mean that women are forced to be adulteresses just as it can punish them for adultery” (41). Offred suffers just like Hester Prynne in The Scarlet Letter. The fundamentalist regime does not protect women as it claims to be. Each step leads individuals to crime and Offred continues committing crimes as the novel progresses.

Another crime she is forced to commit is a love affair with Nick, the chauffeur of the Commander. Serena Joy wants Offred to have sexual intercourse with Nick because the Commander is sterile. Serena Joy wants Offred to be impregnated by Nick, so that she can have a baby and her social status will be higher among Wives. The system leads every individual to corruption. Serena Joy is also committing a crime in her offer to Offred. This is the nature of totalitarian regimes. The system forces the individuals to commit crimes. The laws protect the leaders of the regime, not individuals. Therefore, the common good is for the leaders, not for the whole society.

Commander develops love and affection towards Offred and he invites her to his study room every night. This love affair is a crime and the Commander does not hesitate to risk Offred's life. As a male, he has the right to do anything he wants. Offred visits Commander's study room after dinner when Serena Joy knits in the living room. These secret meetings continue for a while. The commander's passion grows each day and he even wants to feel passion during the Ceremony. However, love and affection are prohibited during the Ceremony. Offred and the Commander are not allowed this

loving feeling in the Ceremony and this situation confuses Offred's mind and feelings towards the Commander. She thinks that she should feel hatred for the Commander as she says, "I ought to feel hatred for this man. I know I ought to feel it, but it isn't what I do feel. What I feel is more complicated than that. I don't know what to call it. It isn't love" (Atwood 68). Offred cannot name her feelings. She knows that love is restricted and it is a crime that she has to be away from. She is confused and this confusion is created by the regime on purpose. Offred describes her feelings, "It's lack of love we die from. There's nobody here I can love, all the people I could love are dead or elsewhere. Who knows where they are or what their names are now? They might as well be nowhere, as I am for them. I too am a missing person" (Atwood 113). Offred complains about lack of love in her life. She has nobody to love and there is no one to be in loved with. She is alone in Gilead and she is a missing person without an identity of her own. Her life and identity are determined by the regime. She is a "thing" owned by the state and she is at the service of the state.

Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Handmaid's Tale depict the harsh practices of totalitarian regimes and its attitude towards love, marriage and family life. Both novels consider love as a threat to the existence of the regime. The nature of love has the potential to undermine the regime. The sexual act does not contain love and it is a ritual in both novels. Winston's wife Katharine is a devoted citizen and she views love and sex as a political act against the regime. "The sexual act, successfully performed, was rebellion. Desire was thought crime. Even to have awakened Katharine, if he could

have achieved it, would have been like a seduction, although she was his wife” (Orwell 63). The regime does not promote family relationships. There is only one family that they consider. The whole system is the family and there are no individual pleasures and interest. Gilead practices the same policy. Devoted citizens are at the service of the regime and love is a business that they have to complete. Offred explains the mind set of the Commander as she narrates, “This is not recreation, even for the Commander. This is serious business. The Commander, too, is doing his duty” (Atwood 105). The Commander is the founder of the regime and he is under the influence and control of his own regime. Although he feels intimacy and love with Offred, Ceremony is a duty for him, too.

Both dystopian novels try to achieve their goals through normalizing the individual. They have certain standards each member of the society must have in their lives. Totalitarian regimes have their own rules and norms and “society expects from each of its members a certain kind of behavior, imposing innumerable and various rules, all of which tend to “normalize” its members, to make them behave, to exclude spontaneous action or outstanding achievement” (Arendt 40). Normalizing each person means to abolish romantic love and indoctrinate the love for the state. Love is a spontaneous action that has to be excluded from the state. Love for the state is included and encouraged rather than pure and spontaneous romantic love. However, without individual romantic love, how can the state expect to be loved by every member of the society?

Love is the core of life and the reason of our existence. Repression and restriction of any kind of emotion lead people to depression and hopelessness. Therefore, people are depressed in totalitarian regimes and this depression is the ultimate purpose of totalitarian regimes. Such an atmosphere makes indoctrination easier. Totalitarian regimes ignore the core element of life and abolish romantic love from the society to achieve its goal. The mentality of totalitarianism considers love as a threat to the existence of the regime. However, without individual love, there cannot be any kind of love towards the state. Love must be shared among people in order to flourish and reach the level of patriotism. Totalitarianism wants patriots without planting seeds of love into the hearts of each individual.

3.2. Invasion of Privacy and Love

Totalitarian regimes invade the privacy of each individual in order to monitor every citizen. Oceania and Gilead collect enough data about everybody for the sake of regime's future. Therefore; secrecy is totally abolished and privacy is invaded in both dystopian novels. The life of each individual is publicized via advanced technology in Nineteen Eighty-Four; whereas, The Handmaid's Tale is more traditional in that sense because there is no advanced technology to monitor people. The couples Winston and Julia, Offred and the Commander try to create their own space and privacy against the restrictive policy of the regime. The regime follows the couples wherever they go and

whatever they do. The privacy of each individual is invaded in dystopian novels and the dystopian state preserves the right to monitor everyone in everywhere.

Nineteen Eighty-Four describes how the Inner Party violates people's privacy through telescreens and microphones, that are located everywhere. The narrator of Nineteen Eighty-Four describes telescreens in detail: The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it; moreover, so long as commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment (Orwell 6). The Inner Party innovates an illusory figure, Big Brother, to oppress the masses emphasizing the phrase "Big Brother is watching you" over and over again every day. Mcgrath claims that, "It was pretty clear what everyone meant by the phrase 'Big Brother'-they meant invasion of privacy" (vii). That's why; Big Brother serves both for indoctrination and invasion of privacy. The state announces that privacy is under the control of the regime and the state is the ultimate power over the society.

Invasion of privacy is not limited to telescreens and microphones. Winston, the main character of Nineteen Eighty-Four, writes a diary and this is illegal. People are not allowed to read, think, write or analyze. These concepts are the most important threats for the regime and they are strictly controlled. Writing a diary means communicating with the future. The policy of the state cuts the communication not just between individuals but also within themselves. Pyle argues:

Nothing invades privacy more than the manipulation of communications in order to destroy the ability of individuals to know truth and thereby defend themselves against psychological manipulation. But citizens are not the only victims of this manipulation. Politicians also suffer as they come to believe their own propaganda and lose the ability to distinguish between images and reality. (133)

The Inner Party alienates each individual and does not provide peace and happiness. This alienation eliminates the differences between reality and image. People are forced to believe illusions and images that do not exist. Even the politicians lose the ability to identify reality from images. The society becomes thoroughly disillusioned.

Orwell's phrase "Nothing was your own except the few centimeters inside your skull" (27) also indicates that the state invades everywhere, even the brain of an individual. There is no privacy or private ownership in totalitarianism. Everyone and everything belongs to the state. As Arendt claims, "Whether a nation consists of equals or non-equals is of no great importance in this respect, for society always demands that its members act as though they were members of one enormous family which has only one opinion and one interest" (39). Every individual is a member of the big family and the main concern is the common good of society rather than personal interest. Each person has to be obedient to the state and each one belongs to the state.

It is a real challenge to be away from the restrictive and dominant leaders of the regime. “The physical difficulty of meeting was enormous. It was like trying to make a move at chess when you were already mated. Whichever way you turned, the telescreen faced you” (Orwell 101). Therefore, Winston rents an apartment in order to meet Julia secretly whenever they have time. They have to be away from telescreens and microphones. “Dirty or clean, the room was paradise” (Orwell 136) for the lovers because their privacy is protected in that room. Julia says, “In this room I’m going to be a woman, not a party comrade” (Orwell 130). The dystopian regime and the invasion of privacy kill the womanly instinct of all women in the state. The regime allows them to be party comrades not lovers or wives. Therefore, this secret room gives Julia her womanhood as well. Her identity as a woman is protected in this room. She feels herself a woman towards Winston and their love easily flourishes in this secret room.

Winston and Julia feel no threat in their private apartment. They share their love and their ideas about the regime that they are up against. The room is a sanctuary for the lovers as the narrator tells, “So long as they were actually in this room, they both felt, no harm could come to them. Getting there was difficult and dangerous, but the room itself was sanctuary” (Orwell 137). Their real feelings and identities are aroused in this room where they feel real happiness being together. However, the room is monitored by the state secretly. The owner of the apartment, Mr. Charrington, informs the state about the secret room of the lovers and a telescreen is located in the wall. Finally, Winston and Julia are caught by the Thought Police. Julia continues her life away from Winston.

However, Winston suffers more each day. He is taken to the Ministry of Love to be tortured and indoctrinated. O'Brien tortures and manipulates him completely. Winston becomes a new person and does not feel any love or intimacy towards Julia at the end of the novel. The dystopian state achieves its goal and separates the lovers from each other for its own sake. The threat is removed and the state preserves its existence.

The Handmaid's Tale follows the same policy and invades the privacy of each individual. There are no telescreens or microphones but the state has traditional methods to monitor each person. Offred has a tattoo on her ankle to approve that she belongs to the state, "I cannot avoid seeing, now, the small tattoo on my ankle. Four digits and an eye, a passport in reverse. It's supposed to guarantee that I will never be able to fade, finally, into another landscape. I am too important, too scarce, for that. I am a national resource" (Atwood 75). Offred is treated as a possession of the state and she is a national resource to be used and benefited from. Her body is important for the state because she is a handmaid trained to bear children for the state. Therefore, she does not have any privacy of her own. As she narrates, "The door of the room-not my room, I refuse to say *my*- is not locked. In fact it doesn't shut properly" (Atwood 18). Offred cannot own her room because everything belongs to the state. She cannot even name it as "my room". Her privacy is violated by the state. As Bartowski states, "The handmaid in her tale has a room of her very own, but she can never be sure of being alone; there is the eye of surveillance in the ceiling above her, and there are the others

in the house who are watching at most times” (152). Offred is closely watched even in her own room. She is never alone and there is no privacy for her.

The Commander invites Offred to his study room every night. He wants to have a private relationship with his handmaid. He wants to get to know her well despite the legacy of the state that he supports. However, it is illegal to meet Offred alone as she describes:

My presence here is illegal. It’s forbidden for us to be alone with the Commanders. We are for breeding purposes: we aren’t concubines, geisha girls, courtesans. On the contrary: everything possible has been done to remove us from that category. There is supposed to be nothing entertaining about us, no room is to be permitted for the flowering of secret lusts; no special favours are to be wheedled, by them or us, there are to be no footholds for love. We are two-legged wombs, that’s all: sacred vessels, ambulatory chalices. (Atwood 146)

Offred has to obey the commands of the Commander but she is aware of her position in Gilead. Offred tells that the policy of the new regime protects them to be called concubines, geisha girls, but what she has with the Commander is illegal both in the new regime and in the old one. The regime claims to protect the women from violence. On the other hand, handmaids have relations with married men. This is also illegal, but the new regulation legalizes the Ceremony. The social status of women does not change and it even gets worse than before.

Offred and the Commander meet in the study room every night. The Commander kisses Offred and feels love towards her. He wants to feel the love that is abolished in the Ceremony. He wants to feel his love and intimacy away from the regime. He wants to get closer to the woman he has sexual intercourse with. However, he does not have the freedom he had in pre-Gilead society. He cannot love a woman freely. Therefore, he violates the rules of the regime and meets Offred secretly. He wants Offred to love him by bringing her hand lotions and magazines that she asks him to maintain. Hand lotions and magazines are forbidden in Gilead because they are all associated with womanhood and there is no womanhood in Gilead. The Commander offers womanhood to Offred with magazines and lotions. However, these secret meetings are revealed and Offred is sent somewhere that the readers do not know. The Commander cannot rescue Offred from this situation. Although he violates the rules whenever he wants, and he encourages her to do the same, he does not help her at the end. He does not risk his life, but he does risk Offred's life.

Privacy is publicized by the state in both dystopian novels. Although Oceania and Gilead have different ways of monitoring individuals, in essence they both invade the privacy of each person. Every individual is considered a threat to the totalitarian regime. Therefore, each person is watched closely to see if there is any violation. Unorthodoxy is forbidden and people are indoctrinated by the regime to be submissive to the regime. The state owns not only individuals but also the space they live in. There

must be no space for love to flourish because love has the power to undermine the regime. Therefore, privacy is invaded and controlled by the totalitarian regime.

3.3. Coupling in Dystopia: Winston - Julia and Offred - Commander

In this section of the chapter, I intend to analyze the relationship between couples and how they are affected by the dystopian policy. Coupling in dystopia is so challenging that couples of both novels risk their lives in order to share their love. Winston and Julia are passionate lovers who risk their lives to share the intimacy and the love they feel for each other. However, the Commander and Offred are not lovers in the real sense. The Commander feels affection towards Offred because he reserves the right to have Offred whenever he wants as the founder of the regime. Offred has to be obedient to what he wants. Offred hungers towards love and passion and she risks her life to feel that intimacy that she longs for. Although the conditions of each couple are different, the policy of totalitarianism shapes each one in the same way.

Winston hates Julia at the beginning of the novel because he knows that it is impossible to be in love with Julia. Julia is a young and pretty woman but the regime prohibits love and passion between people. They have to be comrades, not lovers. Their love flourishes despite all impossibilities and Winston and Julia are aware of their crime as the narrator tells, "It was impossible that this affair should end successfully; such things did not happen in real life" (Orwell 103). Lovers have no hope for their future because the regime is so dominant that sooner or later, they will be apart. Their love

cannot flourish as they want and the following conversation between Winston and Julia tells us about the future of their relation and the policy and practice of the regime on their love:

'We may be together for another six months--a year--there's no knowing. At the end we're certain to be apart. Do you realize how utterly alone we shall be? When once they get hold of us there will be nothing, literally nothing, that either of us can do for the other. If I confess, they'll shoot you, and if I refuse to confess, they'll shoot you just the same. Nothing that I can do or say, or stop myself from saying, will put off your death for as much as five minutes. Neither of us will even know whether the other is alive or dead. We shall be utterly without power of any kind. The one thing that matters is that we shouldn't betray one another, although even that can't make the slightest difference.'

'If you mean confessing,' she said, 'we shall do that, right enough. Everybody always confesses. You can't help it. They torture you.'

'I don't mean confessing. Confession is not betrayal. What you say or do doesn't matter: only feelings matter. If they could make me stop loving you--that would be the real betrayal.'

She thought it over. 'They can't do that,' she said finally. 'It's the one thing they can't do. They can make you say anything--ANYTHING--but they can't make you believe it. They can't get inside you.'

'No,' he said a little more hopefully, 'no; that's quite true. They can't get inside you. If you can FEEL that staying human is worth while, even when it can't have any result whatever, you've beaten them.' (Orwell 150, 151)

This conversation informs us how the regime dominates the feelings of the lovers and how lovers want to stay human despite the tortures of the regime. They want to resist towards the practices of the state. They know that they will be killed or indoctrinated to obey the policy of the regime. They are hopeless but still believe that the regime cannot get inside of them. This means they can continue to love each other despite everything.

Offred and the Commander are not lovers in the real sense. The regime brings them together. Offred is the handmaid of the Commander and the regime legalizes their sexual intercourse for the purpose of breeding, not for individual pleasures. Still the regime dominates their relationship. Offred is confused about her love towards the Commander as she says, “He was no longer a thing to me. That was the problem. I realized it that night, and the realization has stayed with me. It complicates” (Atwood 170). She cannot identify her emotions because it is not her choice to be the Commander’s lover or couple. She develops affection towards him, but that affection may stem from lack of any sort of love in her life. She even considers herself as the mistress of the Commander:

The fact is that I’m his mistress. Men at the top have always had mistresses, why should things be any different now? The arrangements aren’t quite the

same, granted. The mistress used to be kept in a minor house or apartment of her own, and now they've amalgamated things. But underneath it's the same. More or less. *Outside woman*, they used to be called, in some countries. I am the outside woman. It is my job to provide what is otherwise lacking. (Atwood 172)

Offred is the victim of the regime and she is not loved by the Commander as Julia is. Her social role and identity in the society are determined by the regime and she cannot seek for more.

One night, the Commander takes Offred to Jezebels, a brothel. The Commander gives Serena Joy's clothes and make up to Offred. They go to Jezebels secretly because it is illegal for handmaids to go out and Jezebels is also illegal. However, the regime contradicts with itself. The Commander says to Offred, "If someone asks you, say you're an evening rental," (Atwood 245). Offred is an evening rental in Jezebels. Her status is lower than before. This humiliating attitude shows the harsh practices of Gilead towards women. Sexual violence on women is not removed from the society. Women are categorized according to the needs of the regime. Although the regime claims to protect women, Jezebels is the place that reveals the real intention of the regime. It also demonstrates that human nature is the same in every regime.

Strict rules and restrictions do not solve problems in Gilead. Moreover, restrictions lead Offred and the Commander to commit a crime. Offred and the Commander commit a crime as they go to Jezebels, because they withdraw from their

social roles as a handmaid and Commander and they become a couple. Their approved that social identities are no longer with them in Jezebels. They are simply a couple away from the control of the state. The Commander justifies the policy of Gilead as he converses with Offred:

“We’ve given them more than we’ve taken away, said the Commander. Think of the trouble they had before. Don’t you remember the singles bars, the indignity of high-school blind dates? The meat market. Don’t you remember the terrible gap between the ones who could get a man easily and the ones who couldn’t? Some of them were desperate, they starved themselves thin or pumped their breasts full of silicone, had their noses cut off. Think of the human misery. He waved a hand at his stacks of old magazines. They were always complaining. Problems this, problems that. Remember the ads in the Personal columns, *Bright attractive women, thirty-five....*This way they all get a man, nobody’s left out. And then if they did marry, they could be left out with a kid, two kids, the husband might just get fed up and take off, disappear, they’d have to go on welfare. Or else he’d stay around and beat them up. Or if they had a job, the children in daycare or left with some brutal ignorant woman, and they’d have to pay for that themselves, out of their wretched little paycheques. Money was the only measure of worth, for everyone, they got no respect as mothers. No wonder they were giving up on the whole business. This way they’re protected, they can fulfill their biological destinies in peace. With full support and encouragement.

Now, tell me. You're an intelligent person, I like to hear what you think. What did we overlook?"

Love, I said.

Love? said the Commander. What kind of love?

Falling in love, I said.

The Commander looked at me with his candid boy's eyes. Oh yes, he said. I've read the magazines, that's what they pushing, wasn't it? But look at the stats, my dear. Was it really worth it, *falling in love*? Arranged marriages have always worked out just as well, if not better. (Atwood 231, 232)

The Commander is proud of the new regime he has founded. He thinks that he saves women from violence and negligence. The sorrows of women in pre-Gilead society are enormous. They are not appreciated as mothers and men look for attractive and beautiful women. Some women cannot find husbands and they all try to look better to find men. However, Gilead solves all these problems with its new regime. The status of women is no longer the same as before. Their status is higher and they can fulfill their biological destinies and become mothers with respect and support. However, love is overlooked in the new regime. Offred thinks that the Commander appreciates love; however, the Commander believes in arranged marriages despite his attitude towards Offred.

The Commander is the founder of the regime and he is proud of his regime. Offred is not a lover for him. She is just a woman to be with and to enjoy his time. Although he feels intimacy towards Offred, he considers this as the nature of men ignoring love and passion. There is a hierarchy between the Commander and Offred. The regime brings them together and the Commander is the initiator of their relationship. He violates his regime by having a love affair with Offred. He is not the victim of the totalitarian system because he is happy with what he has. However, Winston loves Julia and he believes in romantic love. They are both the victims of the regime and there is no hierarchy between Winston and Julia. They both work for the Inner Party and Winston has no respect and appreciation for the regime. Julia does not care much about the policy of the regime and lives her life as she wants. She declares her love to Winston and violates the rules of the Inner Party as the worker of the party. Although Julia and the Commander sympathize with the regime, they do not hesitate to have love affairs. They violate the regime and suffer less than Winston and Offred because they accept the regime as it is and they are not rebellious. They do not want to change the system. They just want to endure their lives in any condition.

Offred and Winston suffer more than Julia and the Commander because they do not accept the new regime. They long for their old days and they do not want to be part of a dysfunctional system. Offred remains as a womb in Gilead and then she is lost at the end of the novel. She is taken to somewhere that is not revealed to the readers. Winston is tortured and indoctrinated by the state at the end of the novel. He loses his

rebellious spirit and he becomes an ordinary member of the society. However, Julia and the Commander do not experience any change in their lives. They continue their lives as before. The Commander is protected by the regime as the leader of Gilead. He has the right to violate the rules. Julia is also protected by the regime because she follows the rules of the party in her own way. She is opportunistic. Offred and Winston suffer under totalitarianism although they do not violate the rules of the regime as Julia and the Commander do.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have explored the fundamental aspects of totalitarianism and how it has been reflected in utopian and dystopian literatures. Utopian and dystopian literatures envision the future of the world and seek for an ideal world and an ideal political regime for the common good. They are fed by dreams and imaginations. Both utopia and dystopia promote totalitarianism; however, the application of totalitarian regime is different in each one. In a utopian society, people are in peace and willing to share their properties. They are devoted to the regime and the political leaders work for the common good. However, in a dystopian society, people are dehumanized and indoctrinated to be patriots. Leaders violate the rules of the regime and the common good is neglected. People are monitored and restricted everywhere both in utopian and dystopian societies. Privacy is invaded and love is prohibited. In utopian societies, all of these regulations are done smoothly and peacefully. However, in dystopian societies, totalitarianism is harsh and depends on unhappy citizens who are forced to be devoted to the regime.

Both romantic and physical loves are the main concerns of dystopian societies because the state wants to transform the sexual energy of each person to political matters. Therefore, any kind of emotion is under the control of the dystopian regime. Both dystopian novels inform us about the regulation of totalitarian regimes. Totalitarianism seems to be the best system for humanity. There is no poverty and misery because the state owns everything and distributes the services equally to each

citizen. The common good is the main concern and people do not have to worry about their future. The state provides the needs of people and reserves the right to interfere in everything related to each person. Education, occupation, marriage are controlled and arranged by the state. Education is for the purpose of indoctrinating the ideology of the regime to the youth. Marriages are arranged for procreation rather than pure intimacy and love. “No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax of the victory. It was a blow struck against Party. It was a political act” (Orwell 115, 116). The rebellious spirit of love is a threat for the regime; thus, it is a political act.

George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four and Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid's Tale project the dystopian fantasy of modern era. These two dystopian novels depict the terrifying atmosphere of totalitarianism which is fed by utopia and concluded with dystopia. Utopia turns into a nightmare and named dystopia. Totalitarianism is considered utopia before it is practiced. Utopia is a wonderfully planned society, a paradise for all social strata and the best regime humankind ever had. However, the rules and regulations of the regime show the masses that totalitarianism is no longer utopia, but definitely dystopia. This is the main difference between utopia and dystopia. Every social unit is under the control of the regime and everything belongs to the state. The state is the absolute power and source of existence. Every individual and every emotion is closely controlled by the state. Love is the most important emotion that has to be abolished from the society.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the dystopian state is called Oceania where people experience the harsh practices of totalitarianism. Winston, the victim of the regime, is monitored everywhere and love is taken away from his life. When he falls in love with Julia, a new life begins for him. But this love affair paves the way to his end because he violates the rules of the Inner Party. Love is forbidden and he is in love with a young woman, Julia. The Inner Party expects each person to be at the service of the regime and sexual impulses have to be transformed into political hysteria. The Inner Party kills the sexual instinct of each individual for the perpetuation of the regime. The party supports the love for the state instead of romantic love. Desire is a thought crime and each person has to be indoctrinated for the sake of the regime. Therefore, Winston and Julia commit crime as they love each other. The totalitarian regime forces them to commit crime because love is prohibited among citizens. Terror and hatred are imposed to each person and an insecure society is created.

Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale is the tale of handmaids projecting a fundamentalist regime called The Republic of Gilead. Atwood dreams a dystopian state in the United States suffering from low reproduction rates. Women are classified and the handmaids are trained to serve barren couples. Handmaid Offred is the protagonist and the narrator of the novel experiencing a totalitarian and fundamentalist state. Offred has love affairs with the Commander and Nick despite the strict rules of Gilead. The state arranges her love affair with a married man, the Commander. Morally, this love affair shows us that the state is corrupted. Moreover, the system forces her to be with

Nick because the Commander is barren and if she cannot conceive a baby, she will be sent to the colonies. The state legalizes these love affairs claiming to protect women from violence. However, the status of women turns out to be worse than before because the protection is on behalf of men, not women. Handmaids are indoctrinated to hate men because the love for the state is the primary purpose of the regime.

Works Cited

- Ablin, Fred, ed. Education in the USSR: A Collection of Readings from Soviet Journals. Vol. 1. White Plains, NY: International Arts & Sciences Press, 1963.
- Annas, Julia. Plato: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago & London: 1998
- Atwood, Margaret. The Handmaid's Tale. Vintage: Great Britain, 1996.
- Barker, Ernest. Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors. London: Methuen, 1964.
- . The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle. New York: Dover, 1959.
- Bartkowski, Frances. Feminist Utopias. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. Socialism: The Active Utopia. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976.
- Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty. "Architectural Discourse and Early Soviet Literature". Journal of the History of Ideas Vol. 44, No. 3. (July. Sep., 1983), pp.477- 495.
www.jstor.org
- Bergmann, Harriet F. "Teaching Them to Read": A Fishing Expedition in the Handmaid's Tale. College English Vol. 51, No. 8. (Dec., 1989), pp. 847- 854.
www.jstor.com

- Booker, M. Keith. The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Busky, Donald F. Communism in History and Theory: From Utopian Socialism to the Fall of the Soviet Union. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
- Cavalcanti, Ildney. "Utopias of/f Language in Contemporary Feminist Literary Dystopias." Utopian Studies 11.2 (2000): 152.
- Claeys, Gregory, and Sargent, Lyman T. Utopian Reader. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Counts, George S. Character Education in Soviet Russia. Trans. Paul D. Kalachov. Ed. William Clark Trow. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Press, 1934.
- Crossman, R. H. S. Plato Today. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Dahlberg, Gunilla, and Peter Moss. Ethics and Politics in Early Childhood Education. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2005.
- De Rougemont, Denis. Love in the Western World. Princeton University Press: U.S.A, 1983.
- Dodson, Danita J. "An Interview with Margaret Atwood." Critique 38.2 (1997): 96-104.
- Ferns, Chris. Narrating Utopia: Ideology, Gender, Form in Utopian Literature. Liverpool, England: Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Frye, David. "An Alternative Approach to the Discussion Class". The History Teacher Vol. 27, No. 2. (Feb., 1994), pp. 167- 175. www.jstor.org
- Goldblatt, Patricia F. "Reconstructing Margaret Atwood's Protagonists." World Literature Today 73.2 (1999): 275- 282.

- Gray, Alexander. The Socialist Tradition, Moses to Lenin. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946.
- Hammer, Stephanie Barbé. "The World as It will Be? Female Satire and the Technology of Power in "The Handmaid's Tale"". Modern Language Studies Vol. 20, No. 2. (Spring, 1990): 39- 49.
- Helminski, Kabir. The Knowing Heart: A Sufi Path of Transformation. Shambhala: U.S.A, 1999.
- Horton, John, and Andrea T. Baumeister, eds. Literature and the Political Imagination. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Howe, Irving. Politics and the Novel. New York: Horizon Press, 1957.
- James, Edward, and Farah Mendlesohn, eds. The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Kessler, Martin. "Power and the Perfect State." Political Science Quarterly Vol. 72, No. 4. (Dec., 1957), pp. 565- 577.
- Kesten, Seymour R. Utopian Episodes: Daily Life in Experimental Colonies Dedicated to Changing the World. 1st ed. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1993.
- Kumar, Krishan. Utopianism. Great Britain: University of Minnesota Press: 1991
- Laidler, Harry W. Social-Economic Movements: An Historical and Comparative Survey of Socialism, Communism, Co-Operation, Utopianism; and Other Systems of Reform and Reconstruction. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1944.

- Le Roy, Gaylord C. "A.F. 632 to 1984." College English Vol. 12, No. 3. (Dec., 1950), pp. 135- 138.
- Longxi, Zhang. "The Utopian Vision, East and West." Utopian Studies 13.1 (2002).
- Manuel, Frank E, and Manuel Fritzie P. Utopian Thought in The Western World. USA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Mcgrath, John E. Loving Big Brother: Performance, Privacy, and Surveillance Space. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Michael, Magali Cornier. "Freedom Reconsidered: Margaret Atwood's the Handmaid's Tale (1985)." Women in Literature: Reading Through the Lens of Gender Ed. Jerilyn Fisher and Ellen S. Silber. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2003.
- Mumford, Lewis. The Story of Utopias. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922.
- Oinas, Felix J., ed. An Introduction to the World's Great Folk Epics An Introduction to the World's Great Folk Epics. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- O'Kane, Rosemary H. T. Paths to Democracy: Revolution and Totalitarianism. London: Routledge, 2004.
- On, Bat-Ami Bar, ed. Engendering Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Orwell, George. Nineteen Eighty-Four. Penguin Books: England, 2000.
- Pappas, Nickolas. Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Plato and the Republic. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Parrinder, Patrick. "Eugenics and Utopia: Sexual Selection from Galton to Morris." Utopian Studies 8.2 (1997): 1+.

- Pippin, Tina, and George Aichele. Violence, Utopia, and the Kingdom of God: Fantasy and Ideology in the Bible. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Plato. Plato: Phaedrus, Ion, Gorgias, and Symposium, with Passages from the Republic and Laws. Trans. Lane Cooper. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Pohl, Frederik. "Coming Up on 1984." Storm Warnings: Science Fiction Confronts the Future. Ed. George E. Slusser, Colin Greenland, and Eric S. Rabkin. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987. 97- 113.
- Pyle, Christopher H. "The Invasion of Privacy." The Communications Revolution in Politics. Ed. Gerald Benjamin. New York: Academy of Political Science, 1982. 20- 142.
- Rees, Christine. Utopian Imagination and Eighteenth-Century Fiction. New York: Longman, 1996.
- Resch, Robert Paul. "Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty -Four." Boundary 2 Vol. 24, No. 1. (Spring, 1997), pp. 137- 176.
- Ross, David. Aristotle. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Rothstein, Edward, Herbert Muschamp, and Martin E. Marty. Visions of Utopia. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Rubenstein, Roberta. "Nature and Nurture in Dystopia the Handmaid's Tale." Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms. Ed. Kathryn VanSpanckeren and Jan Garden Castro. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988. 101- 111.
- Sisk, David W. Transformations of Language in Modern Dystopias. Westport, CT:

Greenwood Press, 1997.

Strachey, James, ed. Civilization and Its Discontents. 1st ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1961.

S, A L C E E. A D A M, and Alice E. (alice Elaine) Adams. Reproducing the Womb: Images of Childbirth in Science, Feminist Theory, and Literature. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Walker, Nancy A. Feminist Alternatives: Irony and Fantasy in the Contemporary Novel by Women. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1990.

Wegner, Phillip E. Imaginary Communities: Utopia, the Nation, and the Spatial Histories of Modernity. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Thorndike, Ashley H. Literature in a Changing Age. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

Tuana, Nancy. Woman and the History of Philosophy. 1st ed. St. Paul, MN: Paragon Press, 1992.

Vriens, Lennart. "Chapter 5 Education for Peace: Concepts, Contexts, and Challenges." Education of Minorities and Peace Education in Pluralistic Societies. Ed. Yaacov Iram and Hillel Wahrman. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 57- 74.