

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Amar Thelidji University, Laghouat
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



***Examining the Heterotopic Dimension in
Dystopian Novels:
Fahrenheit 451 as a Case Study***

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English as a Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for a 'Master' Degree in English Literature and Civilization

By

Takhi Mhammed
Djoudi Nouha Souad

Board of Examiners

Dr....., Chairman

Dr. Brahim Aribi, Supervisor

Mrs....., Examiner

Academic year: 2020-2021

Dedication 1

I dedicate the work of my dissertation to my family and friends. Exceptional feelings of immense gratitude for my loving and supporting parents, Karima and Naima Takhi, whose words of encouragement and reassurance ring in my ears and push me to always do better. Thank you for being there for me throughout the entire process of conducting this research.

I dedicate this dissertation and give special thanks to my beloved siblings Lina and Amina, especially my older sister, Lina who throughout my life has been a source of inspiration and guidance. Both of you have always been by my side. You along with our parents have been my biggest supporters.

I also dedicate this work to my many friends who have supported me throughout the process.

To the best cousin, friend and my biggest supporter Toufiq Yahya, I will always be appreciative of your help and encouragement.

Thank you for pushing, supporting and believing in me when I doubted myself.

Mhammed .

Dedication 2

It is with genuine appreciation and warm regard that I dedicate this work to my family and some friends. A special feeling of gratitude to my respectful and loving parents who encouraged and pushed me for tenacity. My sister Manal, has never left my side and continue to support me throughout the process.

At the same time, my thanks also go to my caring brothers whose gave me valuable advice whenever I needed it the most. And my best friend kenza who has been my best cheerleader. I will always appreciate all what they have done.

Nouha.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge and express our sincerest gratitude for our supervisor Dr. Ibrahim Aribi. In the duration of working on this research, Dr. Aribi encouraged us and provided us with valuable guidance, feedback and any assistance requested. His great efforts and patience with us throughout the entire process of conducting this research; while enduring health issues are admirable and greatly appreciated.

A special thanks to our former teacher, Miss Boutheina Boukhalfa, for her willingness to assist and provide us with feedback that made the completion of this research an easier experience.

We also extend a special thanks for all the teachers in the English department, who assisted and guided us with this project.

Finally, we wish to thank the jury members for being generous with their expertise and precious time and accepting to examine and evaluate our dissertation.

Abstract

Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia, ever since it was introduced, has garnered the interest of various domains, such as architecture, sociology and literature. The wide adaptation and appropriation of this concept is a result of its ambiguous definition. Heterotopia seems as though it is inherently contradictory, for it is described as both an impossible space only represented in language; and a real space of otherness that contests other spaces surrounding it. On this account, this paper makes use of the concept and employs it by identifying with its literary origins, and attributing it with metaphorical and literary spaces rather than physical places exclusively. To this end, this work considers Foucault's account of heterotopia and attempts to identify its principles with elements from Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* as the very concept of heterotopias entails. Even more importantly, relating the novel to the principles of heterotopias brings the heterotopic dimension existing in the novel even forward, which subsequently allows it for better understanding.

Table of Contents

Dedication 1.....	I
Dedication 2.....	II
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract.....	IV
Table of Contents	V
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter one: Foucauldian Heterotopia	
1. Definition and Principles of Heterotopia.....	8
1. 1. Definition.....	8
1. 2. The Six Principles of Foucauldian Heterotopia	11
1. 2. 1. Heterotopia of Crisis and Deviation	11
1. 2. 2. Heterotopia of Emplacement and Displacement	12
1. 2. 3. Heterotopia of Juxtaposition.....	12
1. 2. 4. Heterotopia of Time	13
1. 2. 5. Heterotopia of Opening and Closing.....	13
1. 2. 6. Heterotopia of Illusion and Compensation.....	14
1. 3. Heterotopic Sites	14
1. 3. 1. Library	14
1. 3. 2. Ship.....	14
1. 3. 3. Cemetery	15
1. 3. 4. Garden	15
1. 3. 5. Museum.....	16
1. 3. 6. Other Heterotopic Sites	16
2. History of the Concept of Heterotopia.....	17

2. 1. Shaking the Order of Things	17
2. 2. The Games Children Play.....	19
2. 3. Lessons for Architects.....	20
2. 4. An Exploration of the Lecture	22
3. Paradoxical Sites: ‘placeless places’	25

Chapter two: The Heterotopic Dimension in Fahrenheit 451

1. Fahrenheit 451: Background, Synopsis and Analysis.....	31
1. 1. Fahrenheit 451 Synopsis	32
1. 2. Fahrenheit 451 Analysis.....	36
2. The Heterotopic Dimension in the Novel Fahrenheit 451.	42
2. 1. The Forest as a Heterotopic Space	42
2. 2. Heterotopic Attributes of literature	48
2. 3. The Book People as a Heterotopic Library	51
General Conclusion	55
Bibliography	56

General Introduction

General Introduction

The concept of heterotopia as introduced by Michel Foucault entails spaces of otherness that break the order of things through their altered mode of ordering. Generally speaking, however, this concept is commonly perceived as spaces of otherness and contestation. Thus, many studies have been conducted to identify a specific site or text as heterotopia, while straying away from Foucault's analysis of space.

Even though Foucault's accounts of heterotopia are brief and overall lacking an absolute definition which poses difficulties utilizing the concept adequately, it still leaves room for interpretation and adaptation.

Accordingly, this dissertation relies mostly on Foucault's description of heterotopia in his essay "*Of Other Spaces*" and his book *The Order of Things* in order to establish a theoretical background. With this objective in mind, the paper will seek an outline for examining and highlighting physical, metaphorical or literary heterotopic spaces in Ray Bradbury's dystopian novel Fahrenheit 451. The heterotopic status of these spaces will be identified and accompanied with textual references from the novel based on the principles of heterotopia set by Foucault himself.

Fahrenheit 451 is considered as classic work of dystopian science fiction. The majority of literature composed on this novel is mostly through postmodern dystopian perspective. There are various researches that analyze and highlight its dystopian elements such as oppression, regimentation, subjugation of individuals, conformity and hegemony, which are all prominent elements in the novel. There are also discussions about the story's purpose as a cautionary tale against the overextension of governmental power and the dangers of the rapidly advancing technology. However, there is barely an investigation or discussion of heterotopia in the novel Fahrenheit 451.

General Introduction

This scarcity of scholarly research conducted on the concept heterotopia as a metaphorical and literary space is due to the fact that heterotopia is generally identified with the examination of physical spaces at the expense of its literary origins. Likewise, there is a lack of research that specifically adapts the concept of heterotopia in Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*.

Therefore, the primary purpose of this dissertation is to specifically examine an overlooked and unexplored aspect in the novel *Fahrenheit 451* which is heterotopia. After establishing a theoretical background, we will argue that prominent elements such as the forest, literature, books and the Book People can be perceived as heterotopias. Their heterotopic status will be established by identifying textual references that relate to the aforementioned elements with Foucault's principles of heterotopia.

Fahrenheit 451 is regarded as a classic work of dystopian fiction that seems to be stemmed in Ray Bradbury's irrational fear of technological development and concerns about government prohibitions and restrictions. Sam Weller perceives *Fahrenheit 451* as "a bona fide international classic" where the author Bradbury utilizes the class of sci-fi as an astute way to muse on not the future but rather the present. He zeroed in on the rising significance of innovation and its entrancing appeal, which draws us ever further from books and vis-à-vis discussion. Moreover, Weller's examination of the novel intently through the focal points of anecdotal, social and detailed analysis, the novel's artistic life span, literary longevity and the critical acclaim that it receives till this day is of no surprise to him.

As opposed to typical dystopian novels by Aldous Huxley and George Orwell's, Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* does not picture abhorrent tyrants (like Orwell's O'Brien) or degenerate thinker rulers (like Huxley's Mustapha Mond), despite the fact that Bradbury's Chief Beatty shares a slight similitude to Mustapha Mond. The urgent distinction is that Bradbury's tale

General Introduction

does not zero in on the ruling elite nor does it portray a higher society, yet rather, it depicts the methods for persecution and regimentation through the duration of a clueless and smug, however an at last genuine and temperate, average saint (Montag). Interestingly, Orwell and Huxley decide to depict the existences of insignificant officials (Winston Smith and Bernard Marx, individually), whose estranged lives share similitudes to the abstract characters of creator Franz Kafka

Many scholars have conducted detailed examinations of the specifications of dystopia with the attention to the remarkable themes utilized in the novel, its dystopian components and both artistic and non-abstract suggestions like the correspondences between the extremist government that Bradbury established and the actual political systems of the 20th century.

Since many years, Michel Foucault's idea of Heterotopia has been the subject of philosophical and architectural discussion, but the exploration of its true significance and rationale in the social sense has remained complex and enigmatic. In contrast to utopian spaces, Foucault coined the word "heterotopia" to describe the productive or practical spaces in society. Although the idea of Heterotopia continues to confound scholars, it has also opened the door for many architectural and urbanism theories. The word heterotopia is a term coined by Foucault to describe real-life sites that represent and therefore expose certain ideals of the society in which they live. (He points out that "utopias" serve a similar purpose, though they do not exist in reality.)

Kevin Hetherington offers the following explanation of Foucault's concept "The term heterotopia originally comes from the study of anatomy. It is used to refer to parts of the body that are either out of place, missing, extra, or, like tumors, alien. For Foucault places of Otherness are spaces, whose existence set up unsettling juxtapositions of incommensurate 'objects' which challenge the way we think, especially the way our thinking is ordered.

General Introduction

Heterotopia has a shock effect that derives from their different mode of ordering." (Hetherington, 1997, p.42)

Kelvin T. Knight in his research titled "*Real places and impossible spaces: Foucault's heterotopia in the fiction of James Joyce, Vladimir Nabokov, and W.G. Sebald*", traces heterotopic space in prominent works of literature of authors like Vladimir Nabokov, James Joyce and W. G. Sebald. He disputes the perception of heterotopias as physical places and try to return the concept to its literary origins. Hence, establishing literature as an ideal medium that best encompasses the heterotopic properties as a space of "otherness"..

Only two times does Foucault mention heterotopias: once in the preface of *The Order of Things* and again in 1967, when he gave a lecture on heterotopias that became the basis for the text "Different Spaces." In both texts, Foucault contrasts heterotopias and utopias, claiming that utopias are always unreal and imaginary, while heterotopias are always actual. However, these two texts vary in their descriptions of what heterotopias are and what they do which makes the definitions of the concept various and diverse in meaning, therefor it is open to interpretations.

Various literary works have already covered both Michel Foucault's heterotopia and the novel *Fahrenheit 451*, which provides many sources of information to consult. However, there are no works that have dealt with both the concept and the novel simultaneously. As such this research relies mainly on Foucault's accounts of heterotopia in 'The order Of Things 'and 'Of Other Spaces', as well as the novel *Fahrenheit 451* which serve as primary sources. In addition to secondary sources such as books, documents and articles, which is entailed by the qualitative nature of topic and its originality, for the lack of works that has attempted similar research. Therefore, the approach of this work will be qualitative content analysis method, which relays on the analysis of the aforementioned sources.

General Introduction

This research will use analysis-based methods conducted on Foucault's concept and Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*. Moreover, the novel will be analyzed then identified with the principles of heterotopia, in order to demonstrate the heterotopic dimension in *Fahrenheit 451* after laying the theoretical basis in accordance with Michel Foucault's concept.

Given all this, the main question that springs to one's mind and rummages for an answer in this dissertation is whether the dystopian novel *Fahrenheit 451* encompasses a heterotopic dimension, under which the following sub-questions may be formulated: a) how does Michel Foucault conceptualize the notion of heterotopia? b) how does *Fahrenheit 451* reflect heterotopic spaces? Subsequently, we do hypothesize that *Fahrenheit 451* does encompass a heterotopic dimension that can be examined through tracing Foucault's theorization of heterotopias. And providing textual references from the novel and relating them to the principles of heterotopia as stated by Foucault, will demonstrate the fact that this hypothesis is well established and that the heterotopic dimension, represented in its elements, is indeed prevalent in the novel.

For that purpose, the dissertation is arranged into two chapters. The first chapter provides a theoretical background of the concept of heterotopia as defined by Foucault along with its principles. This chapter also explores the history of the concept, which explains how Foucault came up with his concept and finally the paradoxical sites: placeless places which entails that heterotopias are beyond physical places. The aim is to provide a comprehensive theoretical view of the concept of heterotopia, which the second chapter will be based on.

The second chapter offers a plot synopsis and a thorough analysis of the novel *Fahrenheit 451*. This will provide textual references that refer to Foucault's concept of heterotopia and space. Thus, elements from the novel such as the forest, literature, book and the book people with the principles of heterotopias will be identified and accordingly established as components of the heterotopic dimension in the novel.

Chapter one

Foucauldian Heterotopia

The intention of this chapter is to first explore Michel Foucault's conceptualization of heterotopia and its literary origins. After that, we will explain the proposed six defining principles by Foucault to establish his "heterotopology," a taxonomy of various spatial types of heterotopias, which are explained in detail illustrated with Examples of heterotopic sites provided by Michel Foucault. As well as exploring the history of the concept, which explains how, Foucault came up with his concept. Finally, the chapter ends by the paradoxical sites: placeless places, which entails those heterotopias, are beyond physical places.

1. Definition and Principles of Heterotopia

1. 1. Definition

Foucault established the concept of heterotopia in order to introduce a new spatial type: The Heterotopia. Heterotopia is a medical term that describes the movement of an organ or a part of the body from its normal position. The term "heterotopia," which Foucault uses as his theory counterpart to the heterotopia, is etymologically linked to 'utopia.' He says that both heterotopias and utopias are exterior sites that "have the odd feature of having connections to all other sites, but in such a way that the relationship they identify, mirror or reflect is suspected, neutralized or inverted." Whereas utopias are unreal, fantastic, and ideal, Foucault says that heterotopias are genuine locations, expressing, contesting, and inverting all other conventional sites at the same time, that exist as "counter-sites.". The heterotopia is a relational, "juxtapositional" space that represents incompatible spaces and reveals paradoxes.

Heterotopias are defined as places that are associated with aspects and stages of our life and somehow reflect, distort, disturb or invert other dimensions, Foucault developed the term heterotopia to characterize real-life locations that embody and so reveal certain values of the society in which they exist. (He notes that "utopias" serve a similar role, despite the fact that they do not exist in reality). He provides examples including honeymoon suites, graves,

brothels, libraries, hotels, and ships, all of which are very different from everyday places, yet they are nevertheless linked to them. For example, the mirror, according to Foucault, is a position that blends aspects of both utopia and heterotopia. It is a utopia because it is a place that does not exist. In the mirror, you see yourself as if you do not exist. Behind the surface, there is an unreal world. At the same time, the mirror is real, and it reflects and interacts with the physical space that one occupies. As a result, the mirror can also be seen as a heterotopia.

Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia has been the subject of philosophical and architectural debates for many years, but in exploring its true meaning and justification in a social context, it has remained complex and vaguely understandable. Foucault coined the term to denote actual or realistic spaces in society as opposed to utopian spaces, as discussed later in the essay. Etymologically, the word comes from the combination of the terms 'hetero', which means different and 'topos', which means place, literally translated as undefined in 1967 Foucault first discussed the term at a conference at the '*cercle d'études architecturales* ' (Dehaene and Cauter 2007: 13). The conference went unpublished for nearly two decades. The rumored incorporation of the term into architectural and philosophical jargon prompted a reconsideration of the concept of space. The concept of heterotopia continues to perplex theorists; it has also given rise to numerous theories of architecture and urbanism.

When the text was finally published in 1984 as 'Des espaces autres,' the text's mysterious and disputed nature revealed why it had been "forgotten by Foucault until late in his life" (Dehaene and DE Cauter, 2007: 13). Because of its openness to understanding and ambiguity to understanding, this is one of Foucault's most challenging pieces. Whereas there can probably be many interpretations of what Foucault really means, the ambiguous nature of his writing clearly makes it tough to perceive his ideas.

The nineteenth century was the epoch of history, according to Foucault. There was a fascination with various historical themes such as development, crisis, accumulation of the past, and so on. The current epoch, on the other hand, is one of space. This is where he starts the main discussion by introducing the concept of "Heterotopia" as a portrayal of true utopias that have disorderly or unwanted elements. Although he gives various instances, such as museums, libraries, prisons, and gardens, this does not help readers grasp the concept all at once.

While Foucault describes the qualities of heterotopias in his text, he does not discuss the ramifications. While his idea may appear oppositional or disciplinary, it clearly defines the realm of space, the distinction between a place and a non-place, and the relationships between these spaces.

Heterotopias, according to Foucault, are places that break life's normalcy. Places that were "other" from the usual appeared to cause societal changes. Heterotopias are completely contrary to utopia and are the experiences that Foucault outlines in his reflection example from the real world to the utopian world. Unlike utopias, heterotopias can be localized.

Foucault uses the metaphor of a mirror to represent the duality and contradictions of utopia and heterotopia, as well as the reality and unreality of utopia and heterotopia. Because the image you see in a mirror does not exist, it is a metaphor for utopia, but it is also a heterotopia because the mirror is a real object that shapes how we relate to our own image.

The mirror, according to Foucault, is a utopian location because it is a placeless place where one can see themselves where they are not. It is only reflection that gives the impression of being in a realm devoid of reality. The image of existence beyond the surface of the mirror is a deception. At the same time, he refers to it as a heterotopia because the mirror does exist. Despite the fact that it gives the illusion of an imaginary environment, it cannot be

denied that it is a reflection of reality. The virtual world on the opposite side of the mirror aids in locating oneself in reality. The image is just the result of one's existence. The mirror's functional ability to be both real and unreal at the same time, according to Foucault, gives it the functional ability to be a heterotopia. However, in light of his own explanations, this concept may appear confusing and inconsistent.

Dystopian literature explores and over exaggerates the darkest parts of the human mind and nature. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as "an imaginative location or circumstance in which everything is as horrible as possible,". In order to understand dystopias and dystopian literature, we should take into consideration that dystopias are mostly the result of a society's government and laws being oppressive and made to empower a minority from society on the expense of subjugating the masses. This minority usually being the government or an antagonistic tyrant. The population is expected to be homogeneous and conformist so that a perfect society established on the basis of order, and obedience. While dystopian literature is fiction, it can eerily resemble our own past, present, and future for it mirrors our reality. dystopian literature is one of the best genres through which we could explore and understand man's inhumanity, and how our world would become nightmarish if corruption and tyranny prevailed.

1. 2. The Six Principles of Foucauldian Heterotopia

Foucault attempts to formulate six Heterotopia principles to describe the conflict between the mythological and real worlds. He refers to this as "Heterotopology". First and foremost, Michel Foucault's six principles of heterotopic space must be discussed. Each of the six principles is explained in depth below, along with textual references

1. 2. 1. Heterotopia of Crisis and Deviation

Heterotopia is divided into two categories according to the first premise. The first is what Foucault refers to as the crisis heterotopia. This heterotopia is a safe haven for members

of a society who are experiencing difficulties (Foucault, 1987). For those who are able to grasp art's full potential as a space without judgment for the source of the crisis, it has always served as a heterotopia of crisis (whatever that cause may be) , Crisis heterotopias are sacred and forbidden places for people who are in a state of crisis (menstruating women, pregnant women, the elderly) . These crisis heterotopias, according to Foucault, are rapidly being replaced by the second category of heterotopias: deviant heterotopias, such as rest homes, clinics, psychiatric hospitals, and prisons. These new heterotopias serve as gathering places for people who deviate from social norms in some way, this is a heterotopia for persons who act in ways that are contrary to the accepted/dominant norms.

1. 2. 2. Heterotopia of Emplacement and Displacement

The second principle of heterotopias is that society can refashion their use over time in order for them to function in vastly different ways. Where once proximity to the city center marked one's status, death is now seen as a contagion that must be expelled, as Foucault illustrates with the movement of cemeteries from the church in the heart of the city to the suburbs. Furthermore, because death is personal, everyone requires their own space; as a result, the suburban cemetery becomes the city of the dead, both a place where everyone can rest eternally and individually and a kind of death quarantine. However, the purpose of this principle is not to discuss cemeteries. It is just one example of how heterotopian analysis can be applied to social change.

1. 2. 3. Heterotopia of Juxtaposition

Multiple places that are otherwise incompatible are brought together in a heterotopic space, according to the third principle of heterotopia. This is known as juxtaposition heterotopia. This is, without a doubt, the most intriguing aspect of Foucault's essay. Unlike utopia, which is known for its uniformity of attitudes, fashions, and designs, heterotopia is all about diversity, managed "otherness," and opposition. It has "the power to juxtapose in a single real place several spaces, several emplacements that are in themselves incompatible"

(p. 19). The theater, as a heterotopia of many spaces merged into one, represents a convergence of diverse worlds, norms, and customs on the stage. The traditional garden is used by Foucault to illustrate his point. Plants from all over the world have gathered in this location to create a unique setting. At first glance, the garden may appear to be merely enjoyable, a lovely setting in which to marvel at the world's diversity in a single location. We also understand heterotopia's ability to strategically organize oppositions.

1. 2. 4. Heterotopia of Time

Heterotopias are frequently associated with "slices in time," which Foucault refers to as "heterochronies" for the sake of symmetry. Because of its ability to arrive at an "absolute break" with traditional experiences of time and temporality, this intersection and phasing of space and time allows the heterotopia to "function at full capacity". Many specialized sites exist in the modern world to record these crossroads of space and time. It is a specific period of time that he depicts in two ways:

Principle 4a : Heterotopias of accumulation, "First and foremost, there are heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time," such as museums and libraries, where "time never stops building up" in an attempt to create a general archive, "a place of all times that is itself outside of time and inaccessible to its ravages," according to the author.

Principle 4b : Heterotopias of festivity, Heterotopias are frequently found. Those more fleeting, transitory, and precarious spaces of time stand in opposition to these heterotopias. Festival sites, fairgrounds, vacations, and leisure villages are all worth mentioning.

1. 2. 5. Heterotopia of Opening and Closing

According to the fifth principle, Heterotopias require a system of opening and closing that isolates them from other spaces while maintaining their permeability as they are not open to anyone who wants to come and go as they please. Either people will be forced to enter such a space, as in prisons, or they will have to "submit to the rites and purifications", as Foucault

points out (Foucault, 1987, p. 7). That makes them both isolated and permeable, in contrast to what is usually thought of as more freely accessible public space. These heterotopias are either forced entry, such as in barracks and prisons, or ritual purification ceremonies or hygienic cleansing, such as in Muslim hammams and Scandinavian saunas.

1. 2. 6. Heterotopia of Illusion and Compensation

The last principle of heterotopia is about illusion and compensation. These heterotopias serve a purpose in relation to all spaces outside of them. Between two extreme poles, this function unfolds. The purpose of heterotopia of illusion is to create an illusionary space that exposes every real space, whereas the purpose of heterotopia of compensation is to create a real space, a space that is different. As a result, heterotopias allow us to confront our illusions while also allowing us to create new illusions of utopias we cannot have.

1. 3. HETEROTOPIC SITES

The term heterotopia is not defined succinctly or without difficulty in Foucault's "*Of Other Spaces*". He did, however, show us several examples of heterotopic sites.

1. 3. 1. Library

According to Foucault (1986a), the library environment possesses a variety of traits that make it an example of heterotopia. He asserts that such a region is a manifestation of "the will to enclose in one place all times, all forms, all tastes" (p. 26). He mentions the library is "a place of all times that is itself outside of time and inaccessible to its ravages" (p. 26) Using Foucault's (1986a) idea of heterotopia, a vision of the library as space has been offered in order to question commonly held beliefs about the library experience. It is apparent that the library is much more than a place where specific activities take place, such as reading, checking out materials, conducting research, and so on.

1. 3. 2. Ship

The ship, according to Foucault, is the "heterotopia par excellence". The ship is "a

floating piece of space, a placeless place" that operates according to its own set of rules in the space between ports, cultures, and stable points. Since the sixteenth century, the ship has been both the most important tool for economic development and the most imaginative reserve. "In civilizations without a boat, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates", Foucault observes.

1. 3. 3. Cemetery

Cemeteries were located in the heart of the city, in or next to the church, until the end of the 18th century, according to Foucault, and were still deeply associated with sacred resurrection and the immortality of the soul. However, beginning in the early 1800s, cemeteries were relegated to the periphery in a "bourgeois appropriation" aimed at improving public health, with death becoming inextricably linked to illness. Furthermore, because death is personal, everyone requires their own space; as a result, the suburban cemetery becomes the city of the dead, both a place where everyone can rest eternally and individually and a kind of death quarantine.

A cemetery is a heterotopia because the tombstones form a sort of ideal town for the dead, with each one placed and displayed according to his or her social status. The cemetery gives visitors the impression that their departed relatives still exist and have a status, which is symbolized by the tombstone. It is a simulated utopia of life after death, but it is also a depiction of the real world, where blood ties, wealth, and power are all important.

1. 3. 4. Garden

The garden is a heterotopic site, according to Foucault, because it is a real space designed to be a microcosm of various environments. The garden is both the tiniest part of the world and idealized representations of it. For example, an English garden reflects nature's irregularity; a French garden's straight lines celebrate man's mastery of nature; a Japanese garden reflects nature's balance; and a Persian garden brings together scenes and seasons from

the sacred cosmology. Gardens are attempts to recreate a perfect, utopian natural environment. They are mirroring their contemporaries' beliefs in this way. Gardens, according to Foucault, are heterotopias of illusion.

"The garden is a rug onto which the whole world comes to enact its symbolic perfection, and the rug is a sort of garden that can move across space", Foucault says of the Persian garden. The Persian rug, according to Foucault, is a "sort of mobile garden" that allows the cosmic symbolism of the garden to be carried into rooms and houses.

1. 3. 5. Museum

The museum is described by Foucault as a time heterotopia. It brings together disparate objects from various eras in a single space, attempting to enclose the entirety of time – a totality protected from time's erosion. The museum is thus caught in a double bind: it contains infinite time in a finite space, and it is both a space of time and a 'timeless' space, attempting to freeze time in "period rooms" that slice time into "set pieces". A museum is a palimpsest, a never-ending accumulation of time, a dystopia "in which time never stops building up and topping its own summit".

In that, they contain collections of cultures and histories in an attempt to create a place outside of time, and in that they attempt to describe the other – those deviating from the "western" norm, ethnographic museums are examples of both heterotopias of crisis and heterotopias of deviance.

1. 3. 6. Other Heterotopic Sites

Other heterotopias of illusion mentioned by Foucault include a library that collects all times into one place that is outside of time. In addition to, holiday village that promises a temporary return to a lost "natural" way of life, an amusement park that offers concentration of intense experiences in a single locus. And a Jesuit colony in Paraguay where the daily rhythm was strictly regulated and planned, in contrast to a Jesuit colony in Paraguay where the daily rhythm was strictly regulated and planned. Another example is the train,

which is a place where we can sit, a mode of transportation that takes us between two distant points, and an object that passes us while we remain stationary in one place.

Foucault (1977) later uses the panopticon to represent the heterotopias of deviance. The panopticon was Jeremy Bentham's design for a prison that grouped cells around a central viewing tower in the late eighteenth century. The panopticon is a common method of monitoring and disciplining human behavior, a kind of invisible fence that allows for simultaneous surveillance and disciplinary power over specific groups of people, such as prisoners and students.

2. History of the Concept of Heterotopia

2. 1. Shaking the order of things

In the preface to *Les Mots et les choses*, later translated into English as *The Order of Things*, Foucault made his first reference to the concept of heterotopia in 1966. According to Foucault, the reading of a passage by Jorge Luis Borges in which he recounts the perplexing classification of animals found in an imaginary Chinese Encyclopedia inspired him to write his book. Borges, a philosopher and writer from Argentina, published a collection of essays on world literature, mathematics, metaphysics, religion, and language in 1952. (1975).

Borges is reminded of a Doctor Franz Kuhn who discovered a Chinese Encyclopedia titled "Celestial Empire of Benevolent Knowledge" in one essay about the "analytical language of John Wilkins." Foucault uses the following animal classification:

(a) belonging to the Emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied (j) innumerable. (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having

just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies (Foucault, 1970: xv)

The passage made Foucault laugh out loud because it seemed to "break all the familiar landmarks of my thought – our thought", as well as all the traditional ways of dividing the world in order to comprehend it. This strange, wonderful taxonomy, according to Foucault, called into question the "limitation of our own, the stark impossibility of thinking that" (1970: xv – original emphasis). What fascinates Foucault is not just the amazing juxtapositions found in Borges' enumeration, but the fact that such juxtapositions are impossible to achieve anywhere other than in the space of language, a contradictory 'unthinkable space' (xvii). He compares this ambiguous textual space to the tradition of 'utopias,' a place (topos) that is both nowhere (outopia) and somewhere (eutopia). Borges' creation, on the other hand, is a 'heterotopia,' a different (heteros) place. It is also worth noting that, whether Foucault was aware of it or not, heterotopia was originally a medical term referring to a specific tissue that develops in a different location than usual. The tissue is not diseased or particularly dangerous but merely placed elsewhere, a dislocation (Lax, 1998: 114). Utopias, however fantastic, present an ordered, coherent whole, according to Foucault's very limited characterization, whereas Borges' scheme shatters language itself and completely undermines the usual ways in which words and things are drawn together. Utopias evolve in lockstep with our lexicon. Borges, on the other hand, creates a highly disturbing textual environment (xviii). Heterotopias are unsettling, and they stifle language: "*they desiccate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilise the lyricism of our sentences*" (xviii)

Because it raises questions about the establishment of order in our culture, or the basic codes that govern perceptions, language, and practice (the French title of Foucault's book makes this point more explicit: *Les Mots et les choses*), this loosening of words and things

becomes the initial stimulus for Foucault's deliberations. From the seventeenth century onwards, Foucault investigates a formal history of 'order', or how things are divided up, compared, classified, and arranged.

2. 2. The games children play

Foucault gave a radio talk on 'France Culture' as part of a series on utopia and literature the same year as *The Order of Things* was published. In the talk, Foucault muses on the possibility of systematically studying a variety of "different spaces" that challenge or contest the space we live in. Rather than textual spaces, the focus is now on cultural and social sites. The broadcast, which was recently released as a CD (Foucault, 2004), is fascinating because it follows the same format as the later, more well-known lecture, but with some content and style differences. His initial images refer to the various imaginative children's games, which include Indian gardens and dens, and all the games on or under the beds of the parents. The children's imaginative play creates a different space that reflects what they see around them. At the same time, the space reflects and contests. Cemeteries, brothels, prisons, asylums, and holiday villages are just a few of the 'counter-spaces' Foucault mentions as being out of the ordinary in various ways. He goes on to say that such places can be found in all cultures, and that there might be a 'science' of these extraordinary spaces called 'heterotopology'. He explains how in 'primitive culture,' different spaces are set aside for some form of rites of passage, or initiation, whereas in the nineteenth century, this setting apart can be seen in boarding or military schools among the privileged classes. Furthermore he claims that modern heterotopian sites are more concerned with enclosing some form of deviation than with marking a life stage. As an example, Foucault uses the rest home, which is a place for the unproductive, for doing nothing.

2. 3. Lessons for architects

The context for Foucault's most detailed account of heterotopia, according to Defert, began with some befuddled amusement. In a letter to Defert, Foucault wrote: “*Do you remember the telegram that gave us such a laugh, where an architect said he glimpsed a new conception of urbanism? But it wasn't in the book; it was in a talk on the radio about utopia. They want me to give it again....*” (Defert, 1997: 274).

In March 1967, Foucault was invited to speak to the Cercle d'études architecturales [Circle of Architectural Studies] in Paris. Although some excerpts appeared in the Italian journal *L'architettura* (1968), Foucault was said to be hesitant to publish the lecture at the time, but shortly before his death, he agreed to its publication to coincide with an exhibition held in Berlin in 1984. (Macey, 1993:186). *Des espaces autres* was first published in the French journal *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* in 1984, and was later translated into English by Miskowicz in *Diacritics* two years later as 'Of other spaces' (1986). The text is based on a transcript of a lecture given by a group of architects and circulated among them. Hurley (1998) translated the text into two more English versions, one under the title 'Different Spaces', and the other recently by Dehaene and De Cautier (2008) under the title 'Of Other Spaces'. I use the Hurley translation unless referring to the original French, and I will also argue for an overall interpretation that emphasizes the relational 'difference' from, or transformation of, the ordinary rather than retaining the connotations of radical alterity or fundamentally 'other' spaces (see translation notes in Dehaene and De Cautier, 2008: 22-23).

The lecture presents some unique challenges for the translator, as indicated by the different titles. In France, the term "espace" has a broader meaning than "space", referring to a variety of areas set aside for specific purposes or activities. Augé (1995: 83) describes the term's use in France as being particularly "plastic". As is frequently noted, there are complex

and subtle differences between space [espace] and place [lieu] in English and French. Augé distinguishes himself in a concise manner. He claims that the concept of 'space' is more abstract than the concept of 'place'. The former term can refer to a space, a distance, and, most importantly for Foucault's concept of heterotopia, a time period (the space of two days). The latter, more concrete term is relational, concerned with identity and linked to a mythical or real event or history (81-84). According to Agnew, space is traditionally regarded as a broad and objective concept associated with some form of location, whereas place is more specific and associated with the 'occupation' of a location (2005: 142). However, Foucault prefers the term emplacement, which has a sense of both space and place and appears more than twenty times in the opening few pages.

He seems to use the term emplacement deliberately to give it a "technical" sense, as De Cautier and Dehaene point out, avoiding more common words like place, lieu, and endroit. The term involves site, but also a relational sense involving location and support. In French, emplacement mainly refers to the marking out of a spot within an archaeological site, but it can also refer to a defined camping pitch within a larger camping site. Unfortunately, the significance of this term is completely lost in the first translation by Miskowiec that appeared in *Diacritics*. It is changed to 'site', and the English word 'emplacement', which is confusing, is used to translate 'la localisation'. As a result, phrases like "today the site (l'emplacement) has been substituted for extension, which had replaced emplacement (la localisation)" are misleading. This difficulty is usually overcome in the more recent translations by Hurley and De Cautier and Deaene by keeping the word "emplacement" in English. As we will see, Foucault goes on to define heterotopia both via and in the context of this phrase, which he says characterizes our current era's geographical difficulties.

2. 4. An exploration of the lecture

The lecture begins with broad assertions, such as the fact that, while the nineteenth century seemed preoccupied with history and time, the present is more concerned with structure and space. Foucault recalls in an interview from 1980 that his remarks seemed to hit an ideological minefield. At the conclusion of his talk, he said: “. . . *someone spoke up – a Sartrean psychologist- who firebombed me, saying that space is reactionary and capitalist, but history and becoming are revolutionary. This absurd discourse was not unusual at the time*” (2002: 361).

In his brief remarks about the nineteenth century's "great obsession" with time, Foucault appears to be thinking of Hegel and Darwin. He refers to the current focus on space as “an era of the simultaneous, of juxtaposition, of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the scattered” in reference to the contemporary focus on space (1998: 175). Casey proposes that such an interpretation pits Leibniz against Heidegger, with the former as the dominant voice (1998: 299). Space, according to Leibniz, is the order of concurrent or simultaneous things, emphasizing characteristics such as interval, position, emplacement, and distance (see also Casey, 1998: 167-170 and Genocchio, 1995: 37). However, Foucault defines structuralism as a broad mode of analysis that strongly favors space over time. The structuralist aspect of his account will be addressed further in this essay, but it is worth noting here that his brief definition of structuralism, identifying a ‘set of relations that makes them appear juxtaposed, opposed, implied by one another’, echoes throughout his account of space in general and heterotopia in particular. The establishment of *‘l’ensemble des relations’* within and between spaces appears to be a key feature of his approach.

Following his opening remarks, Foucault looks at what he refers to as the "history of space", appearing to apply a distinction developed in Koyré's *From the Closed World to the*

Infinite Universe (1957). Simply defined, previous to Galileo, space was what Koyré calls "attributive" or "substantial" (275), alluding to a hierarchy, a binary set of locations such as sacred and profane, or celestial and terrestrial. For Foucault, it is a space of 'localisation'. Since the seventeenth century, Cartesian extension, the infinitely open, has replaced or dissolved these sets of enclosed places. Foucault expands on this oversimplified and somewhat distorted history (see Casey, 1998: 298) by arguing that in the present, this conception of space is being replaced by one of 'emplacement'. Today's question is about finite space, such as demography and whether there is enough space for humanity, but it is also about the relationships between various sites and our place within them. To summarize, extension has supplanted localization, and we are now living in the era of 'emplacement.' Space, according to Foucault, is now "defined by the relations of proximity between points or elements" (1998: 176). Space, unlike time, may not yet be fully 'desacralized'; it may still contain persistent if unacknowledged sacralized oppositions such as private/public, family/social, work/leisure, and cultural/useful.

Foucault then pays homage to Bachelard's work by delving into the spatial metaphors of imagination, or the poetics of intimate space "laden with qualities" and haunted by fantasies (177). In contrast to these internal musings, Foucault returns to his primary concern: the space of the outside [du dehors]. He wishes to, in a sense, turn Bachelard inside out. This space in which we live is a set of relations cut through with time, which is telling. It is the space in which we are "drawn outside ourselves" and "the erosion of our life" occurs. He claims that this space is both rich and diverse. The space that 'eats and scrapes away at us' includes everyday occurrences such as houses, specific rooms, trains, streets, cafés, beaches, and so on, but Foucault distinguishes some that have: ". . . *the curious property of being connected to all other emplacements, but in such a way that they suspend, neutralise, or reverse the set of*

relations that are designated, reflected or represented [reflechis] by them. . . .” (Foucault, 1998: 178)

Returning to the words employed in the preface to *The Order of Things* as well as the radio broadcast, Foucault differentiates two sorts of emplacements that involve these remarkable properties: utopias and heterotopias. The latter are ‘likely to be found in every culture, in every civilization’. These sites, like utopias, relate to other sites by both representing and inverting them; however, unlike utopias, they are localized and real. They are similar to utopias that are practiced or enacted in some ways. Foucault also devotes some time to what he refers to as the “intermediate example of the “mirror”. The mirror’s highly disruptive experience creates a “placeless place”. The connection with heterotopia is the ability to be both different and the same, unreal and real: *“the mirror functions as a heterotopia in the sense that it makes this place, I occupy at the moment I look at myself in the glass both utterly real, connected with the entire space surrounding it, and utterly unreal. . . .”* (179)

The effect of the mirrors seemed to fascinate Foucault. He gives an engrossing account of the painting *Un bar aux Folies-Bergère* in a lecture on Manet given a few years later in Tunis (2009b). The iconic image depicts a woman with a large mirror behind her, reflecting her back and the patrons of the bar. Manet transforms a traditional composition into a perplexing series of spatial incompatibilities or distortions, according to Foucault. He refers to the painting as a “place that is both empty and occupied” (77) , The most remarkable component, according to Foucault, is the undermining of the viewer’s position, as “Manet plays with the picture’s property of being not in the least a normative space whereby the representation fixes us to a unique point from which to look” (78). Overall, he argues in his Manet lecture that the painter created disturbing ‘object-paintings’ that foreshadowed not only impressionism

but, more importantly, non-representative art, focusing entirely on the play of 'material properties'.

3. Paradoxical sites: 'placeless places'

For geographers, architects and literary critics, Michel Foucault's concept of Heterotopia continues to inspire. It is notoriously mis-defined, however. In different words, the concept seems intrinsically contradictory as both an impossible space that can be represented only in language and as a genuine place that exists somehow outside all other space. In the first place, we need to focus our attention on Foucault's notion that heterotopia had moved out of an impossible space into some sort of actual space between the April 1966 publication of the *Order of Things* and this March 1967 lecture, which was part of a series on Literature and Utopia for France Culture. The leading cultural radio station in France during this time Foucault was actually invited to speak to the architects only as a result of this broadcasting, which he initially found absurd. 'Do you remember the telegram that gave us such a laugh', he asked in a letter to his partner Daniel Defert, 'where an architect said he glimpsed A new urban planning concept?' But it didn't appear in the book; it was in a radio conference on utopia.

'Les Hétérotopies' opens with a recapitulation of the literary pedigree of utopia itself, as well as the assertion that "*there are some countries without a place and some stories that are not chronological.*" While utopias are simply defined as "sites with no real place" in "*Of Other Spaces*", they are also closely associated with language in "*The Order of Things*", being described as "*the presupposing convergence of an a priori imaginary landscape and the narrative by which it is mapped*". 'In the minds of men, or rather, in the gaps between their words, in the thickness of their tales', says Foucault. However, paradoxically, he claims that some utopias can be linked to a specific time and place, a time and place that they are said to simultaneously "efface, compensate, neutralize, or purify".

Although a little confusing, the heterotopia's obviously literary tone and context, as well as the odd circumstances of its subsequent adaption for an architectural audience, appear to suggest that it was never meant as a tool for the study of real urban space. Instead, it appears to have the potential of a notion of the heterotopia that sees it as a collection of literary themes utilized by authors to show an alternate spatial configuration. It is not difficult to see how the two definitions of heterotopia could be reconciled from here. If we take the term to refer to fictional representations of real places, as well as their mythic and real dimensions, then the latter definition of the concept finds its own common ground with Borges' encyclopedia in the realm of language, where, as we have seen, the simultaneous presence of incompatibilities is entirely possible.

There appears to be a contradiction between the only two texts in which Foucault mentions heterotopias, because the concept of heterotopias in "Different Spaces" is applied to physical places, whereas it is applied to language in the prologue of *The Order of Things*. Both works share the contrast of utopias and heterotopias, and heterotopias have the feature of being a sort of contestation in both writings. However, if in "Different Spaces", heterotopias are places that question the space in which we dwell, heterotopias in *The Order of Things* contest language.

While there appears to be a tension between "Different Spaces", in which heterotopias are physical spaces, and *The Order of Things*, in which heterotopias are tied to language, these texts are not inherently contradictory. I argued that when Foucault says in *The Order of Things* that heterotopias are disturbing because they undermine language, and that these heterotopias can be found in Borges' literature, it is because these short stories provide a different space of ordering, a different table upon which language intersects space. As a result, Borges' stories contest and reverse the modern understanding of the relationship between language and things. However, this occurs not only in Borges' literature, but also in Cervantes'

Don Quixote in the Renaissance and Sade's Justine and Juliette in the Classical period. All three writers' works, which Foucault discusses, can be considered as heterotopias.

According to Foucault's text "*Different Spaces*", he is interested in spaces that "have the curious property of being connected to all the other emplacements, but in such a way that they suspend, neutralize, or reverse the set of relations that are designated, reflected, or represented by them" (Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology 178). These spaces, which are linked to all the other spaces but contradict or disagree with them, are, according to Foucault, 'of two great types' (178). Utopias and heterotopias are the two types of spaces. Utopias, according to Foucault, are emplacements with "no real place". They are emplacements that have a general relationship of direct or inverse analogy with society's actual space. They are either society perfected or the inverse of society, but in any case, these utopias are fundamentally and essentially unreal spaces' (178). Unlike utopias, which are unreal places, heterotopias are real, actual, and localizable places that are 'completely different from all the emplacements that they reflect or refer to' (178). According to Foucault, heterotopias are places "designed into the very institution of society, which are sorts of actually realized utopias in which the real emplacements, all the other real emplacements that can be found within the culture are, at the same time, represented, contested, and reversed" (178). They are real places, but they are 'sorts of places that are outside of all places, despite the fact that they are actually localizable' (178). As such, heterotopias are 'different spaces, other places'; places that, according to Foucault, are 'a kind of mythical and real contestation of the space in which we live' (179).

The relationship between placelessness and subjectivity-free language is further clarified in Foucault's article 'The Thought of the Outside' (1966), which bears multiple parallels to Foucault's speech to the *Cercle d'études architecturales*. According to Andrew Thacker, the presence of heterotopia in this article can be determined by the fact that 'Foucault twice uses the term "*placeless places*" to describe Blanchot's use of language'.⁴² However, while they

are inextricably linked, a deeper examination reveals a substantial difference between these two uses of the same phrase. Later, in the context in which Thacker uses it, it particularly relates to Blanchot's language, about which Foucault says *'unfolds a placeless place that is the outside of all speech and writing'*. However, it was originally meant to characterize the repeating settings of Blanchot's narratives, the "houses, corridors, doors, and rooms" that create the ethereal backdrops for his fictions. As a result, this article, which appeared between the publication of *The Order of Things* and the broadcast of 'Les Hétérotopies', represents an additional link between the textual space of Borges' encyclopedia and the material places of 'Of Other Spaces'.

So, Foucault's reading of Blanchot appears to be the key to developing a coherent theory of heterotopia, one that does not apply to real urban locations, but rather to fictional depictions of mythological and real locales, such as the mirror, the garden, the library, the jail, and so on. By juxtaposing incompatible and contradictory aspects in the same location, these sites create an inconceivable textual realm similar to the one identified by Foucault as lurking beneath Borges' Chinese encyclopedia. In doing so, they demonstrate the dominant role of textual space as a center of contestation, rather than, as Foucault puts it, "of the place in which we live".

Michel Foucault, seemingly, did not provide a conclusive definition to his concept of heterotopia, which led to the adaptation of this concept by various domains. Hence, the concept strayed away from its literary origins that were set by Foucault. Although he only mentions briefly from Borges in the prologue to *The Order of Things*, so as discussed in this chapter, It is conceivable to construct a new heterotopia, either within or outside of the preconceived notion of heterotopia, which has been established in this chapter, it covers definition of the concept, principles, history and paradoxical sites of placeless places. Therefore, intending to

restore Foucault heterotopia to its literary origins. Concluding that heterotopias are not constrained to physical spaces contrary to the general conception of heterotopia.

Chapter Two

Heterotopic Dimension in Fahrenheit 451

After providing a plot synopsis of the dystopian novel Fahrenheit 451 followed by an in depth analysis of the novel, this chapter discuss and highlights prominent factors in the novel that fit specific categories of heterotopia. Such factors are the forest, literature, books and the book people, for these elements are argued to represent heterotopias by using Michel Foucault's principals of heterotopia as an outline. In order to establish the heterotopic status of these factors from the novel, textual references are provided and associated with the related principles of heterotopia.

1. Fahrenheit 451 Background, Synopsis and Analysis.

Fahrenheit 451 is a dystopian novel written by American author Ray Bradbury. He proves to be a well-versed author who experiences with various genres, most notably science fiction. He first started writing around the time of the Cold War, which the United States was part of. The era was marked by "materialism, military expansion, ideological anxiety and a sense of the rapid transformation of consciousness." Not to forget the important role that the media played in people's quotidian life. That made writers try their best to keep up with the quickly advancing technology and media in order to undermine its dominance over literature. These points were made prominent features of Fahrenheit 451.

During the time at which Bradbury's novel was published, the Cold War with the Soviet Union was at its height. The Red Scare or fear of a communist invasion marked the lives of American citizens throughout much of the 1940s and 1950s. Those who were suspected of supporting leftist causes were criminalized and prosecuted. The government. They deemed them as a threat to democracy and the national security. Thus, the majority of published material were heavily monitored. A smear campaign was led against those who were under the suspicion of possessing or writing books and journals the government disapproved or branded as communist friendly.

Fahrenheit 451 functions as Ray Bradbury's personal manifesto through which he contests the extreme measures taken by publishing supervisors. The severe censorship of published writings deeply undermined the quality, originality and creativity of what authors produced. Alas, Fahrenheit 451 that was itself a means of protesting met the same fate; it was censored and rewritten for containing foul language. Nonetheless, the novel is recognized as a classic work of literature and since its release, it has amassed millions of sales records over the years.

1. 1. Fahrenheit 451 Synopsis

Ray Bradbury's novel portrays a world in which books are banned from all aspects of life, and reading, not to mention possessing them, is forbidden. The protagonist, Guy Montag, is a fireman whose job is to destroy whatever remaining books, which he does with great pleasure. However, his pleasure soon turns into doubt; the story raises critical questions of how to preserve one's mind and human spirit in a society where free will, self-expression, and curiosity are diminishing.

In Montag's world, mass media has total control over information, thus nearly eradicating the population's freedom of thought; achieved by the mass propagation tools such as the seashell radio and wall-sized screens. Montag's wife Mildred pins her ears to the radio at all times, at home three of their parlor walls are covered with screens. At work, the smell of kerosene latches on the banal firemen, who smoke and set the mechanical hound to chase after rats to entertain themselves. When the alarm rings, they ride their salamander-shaped vehicles, to burn books and at times even whole libraries are burned to the ground. As Montag sets books aflame regularly, his thoughts seldom wander to the smuggled books that lie hidden in his home. Slowly but surely, he begins to make inquiries about the basis of his profession. Montag then apprehends the fact that he has always sensed perturbed but has

lacked the adequate words to express his sentiments in a society where even the utterance of “once upon a time” lead to fatal repercussions.

Fahrenheit 451 depicts an ultramodern America. A panopticon oppressive government, widely advanced technology, and virtual reality, are key features of Fahrenheit 451. Such depiction was surprisingly clairvoyant, yet still addresses the fears of the time. The novel was published in 1953, during the pinnacle of the Cold War. This era sparked paranoia and fear monger of a “Second Red Scare” throughout the United States, which was augmented by the suppression of information and fierce government investigations. The “McCarthyism” and smear campaign that targeted artists and writers who were accused of possible association with Communism had an immense effect on the people. Bradbury was extremely startled by the cultural and creativity suppression. He thought it would conventionalize a dangerous example for further censorship, and was reminded of the demolition of the Library of Alexandria and the book burning of Fascist government. Such unsettling connections are evident in Fahrenheit 451, titled after the temperature at which book papers catches on fire and starts burning, which its accuracy has been debated. Whether correct or false, it does not take away from the novel’s standing as a masterpiece of dystopian fiction.

Dystopian fiction tends to magnify and over-exaggerate the troubling features of the world that surround us. It cautions against taking things far to an extreme limit. In many dystopian stories, the government enforces limitations onto unwilling subjects. Alas, in Fahrenheit 451, it is discovered that the indifference of the masses towards such restrictions is what allowed. The government exploited the population’s short attention span and the enthusiasm for mindless entertainment, which facilitated the regime’s mission of subjugating them.

As hegemony dominates, individuality and self-expression are subsequently repressed. Even the way people converse is abbreviated; case in point when Montag's boss Captain Beatty describes the acceleration of mass culture:

Speed up the film, Montag, quick. Click? Pic? Look, Eye, Now, Flick, Here, There, Swift, Pace, Up, Down, In, Out, Why, How, Who, What, Where, Eh? Uh! Bang! Smack! Wallop, Bing, Bong, Boom! Digest-digests, digest-digest-digests. Politics? One column, two sentences, a headline! Then, in mid-air, all vanishes! Whirl man's mind around about so fast under the pumping hands of publishers, exploiters, broadcasters, that the centrifuge flings off all unnecessary, time-wasting thought! (Fahrenheit 451)

Montag reaches to the point of wallowing in doubt, thus he becomes disillusioned with his work and life. The sight of Mrs. Blake, who is willing to be burned with her books rather than live while they disintegrate into nothingness, serve to consolidate Montag's recent change of character. He tells his wife: "*You weren't there, you didn't see. [...] There must be something in books, things we can't imagine, to make a woman stay in a burning house; there must be something there. You don't stay for nothing*" (Fahrenheit 451: 51). He is displeased with himself and those around him submitting and not resisting this kind of oppression without as much off a second thought to consider what motive lies behind it.

At this point, Montag is completely alienated from his usual self. He smuggles the books he was meant to burn so that he may read and hide them away. Montag is in disdain as his society is oblivious. Along with his co-workers, the firemen, they set out on a mission to burn books in response to a report; all the while Montag is unaware that they are heading to his own home. Mildred, his wife, reported him to the authorities. He succumbs to captain Beatty's orders and sets his house aflame. Montag gets into an altercation with Beatty. Faber, who gave Montag a device to put in the ear so that they stay in contact, instruct him to fight

back the firemen and run for his life. That prompts him to take actions and ends up by killing the captain and fleeing as his old crumbles in the fire he set :

The street empty, the house burnt like an ancient bit of stagerscenery, the other homes dark, the Hound here, Beatty there, the three other firemen another place, and the Salamander . . . ? He gazed at the immense engine. That would have to go, too. [...] Montag stood looking in now at this queer house, made strange by the hour of the night, by murmuring neighbor voices, by littered glass, and there on the floor, their covers torn off and spilled out like swan feathers, the incredible books that looked so silly and really not worth bothering with, for these were nothing but black type and yellowed paper and raveled binding. (Fahrenheit 451:114 - 115)

Montag manages to escape and seek refuge at Faber's house, the former English Professor. Faber is an intellectual who memorize books in order to preserve their contents. He directs Montag to the book people, who like Faber learn by heart the books so to preserve the knowledge they contain. Montag was successful in making an escape from the city where he finally arrives at the book people's hiding place in the forest. They accommodate and shelter him from the firemen and the Mechanical Hound, a robotic dog that is able to locate banned books and wanted people.

Finally, Guy Montag is asked to join the society of book people. A society where people protect the contents of books through memorization. Each person of these bibliophiles embodies the book that they have memorized in hopes of eventually rewriting them. Likewise, Montag also commits the Book of Ecclesiastes into memory.

As the book comes to a conclusion, an atomic bomb completely destroy the city; prompting the book people to head back to the city with Montag leading them there. A sermon is delivered by Granger on the Phoenix, which revives itself from its ashes that brought about by fire. Relating to their plan to build a new society from the bricks and dust of the old city. Hoping to restore the burned texts of burnt books from the memories of the book people.

1. 2. Fahrenheit 451 Analysis

Fahrenheit 451 serves as a criticism of the American society in the 1950s during the McCarthy era. Fahrenheit 451 is set in an ultra-modern American society, which is governed by modern technological gadgets and mass media propaganda. The novel reports concerns over cultural and political hegemony, conformism, the wide spread of propaganda and fear monger by the media. Themes of censorship, the clash between individualism and herd mentality in addition to repression of knowledge and truth, are prevalent and cleverly presented throughout the novel.

Bradbury portrays the eventual demise of this society so corrupt and oppressive; caused by an atomic bomb, which its threat was impending from the beginning as a purging and renewal of human values so that a new civilization rises. That leads us to assume that the rise of this new civilization would replicate Plato's republic. However, utopias, as opposed to heterotopias, cannot be created in reality. As suggested by the novel's epilogue, it ends with an ominous and subtle hint, that there is a strong possibility that the new civilization established by the book people will eventually end up the same as its predecessor. Alas, it mirrors the society's fear of government seizing all the power. One that would ultimately evolve into an oppressive, pantopticon and authoritarian regime, such as the one illustrated in Fahrenheit 451.

Fahrenheit 451 portrays a variety of themes, notably censorship and book banning which make a major theme throughout the novel. The main reason the government forbade reading and keeping books is to have some sort of control over the population. They wanted to make people vane and mindless to what is happening around them. They wanted them to empty vessels that the government can fill with whatever it deemed fit, via television and radio. After all, the last thing the government wanted people to have was awareness and freedom of thought and expression. They censored the society from the education that books offer.

Another major theme that the book discuss is conformity. The people conform to specific political, cultural and societal norms by the compulsion of the government. For that reason, Clarisse was rejected and shunned by her peers, for she is so different from the rest of them. She and her family were suspected of hiding books, everyone believed so even after investigating them, even though there was no evidence to incriminate them. Nevertheless, Clarisse embraced her uniqueness, even if she was casted aside by society for not complying with the standards and rules. Through the exchange that she has with Montag, Clarisse expresses how often she is disregarded and thought of as crazy because of her lively and inquisitive spirit. She intrigued Montag, so he entertained a conversation with her instead of ignoring the young girl. Such action granted Clarisse feelings of happiness, because for once she was heard and noticed rather than scrutinized and judged.

Montag's living room has three walls, which are television screens. The programs broadcasted do not seem to be educational nor thought provoking but rather trivial. These shows are a mix of colors, loud noises and neutral shared conversations that spur mild pleasure in people. Faber tells Montag: *"Most of us cannot rush around, talk to everyone, know all the cities of the world, we haven't time, money or that many friends. the things you're looking for, Montag, are in the world, but the only way the average chap will ever see ninety-nine per cent of them is in a book"* (Fahrenheit451: 86).

The same applies for the radio, for the government exploits it as well. Montag's wife Mildred is constantly using the Seashell Radio; so much so, she is addicted to it. She is always connected to either medias, even in her sleep to ensuring that she does not miss anything. The television and radio are supposed to be means of entertainment, yet they give the impression that reality has next to no intelligible or intellectual influence. Their only use in this world is to suppress individuality and freedom of thought.

In this society, the government has banned all books, claiming that they cause confusion and sadness for those who read them. For example, Montag takes one of the books that he was supposed to burn is subtly warned by Captain Beatty, who exemplifies the government and ensures the rules are followed, states:

Do you know, I had a dream an hour ago. [...] in this dream you and I, Montag, got into a furious debate on books. You towered with rage, yelled quotes at me. I calmly parried every thrust. [...] Oh, you were scared silly [...] for I was doing a terrible thing in using the very books you clung to, to rebut you on every hand, on every point! What traitors books can be! You think they're backing you up, and they turn on you. Others can use them, too, and there you are, lost in the middle of the moor, in a great welter of nouns and verbs and adjectives (Fahrenheit451: 106-107).

The government is willing to go to any lengths in order to subdue any sign of resistance or intellectual debate; so, to supposedly ensure the happiness of the population. Beatty tells Montag that: *"If you don't want a man unhappy politically, don't give him two sides to a question to worry him; give him one. Better yet, give him none. Let him forget there is such a thing as war"* (Fahrenheit451: 61). Hence, the firemen set books on fire, people who demonstrate critical thinking and intellectual awareness. So was the case for Clarisse, Montag's neighbor, who either disappeared or was assassinated by the government.

Moreover, the looming threat of an atomic bomb is downplayed by the media, hence the people were oblivious to the calamity they were about to encounter.

Guy Montag is the protagonist of the novel and he plays an essential role in his society. He is a fireman, who serve as the system's tool of oppression. His job is to set fires, rather than put them out and has immense pleasure in doing so. In the beginning, Montag and his fellow firemen burn books into ashes. He felt fulfilled and pleased with his work and had the impression that he was happy. Then comes a time when Montag starts to question the nature of his work and how his life is going. All instigated by an encounter with 17-year-old Clarisse McClellan, his neighbor who is differentiated from the rest of the population. With her inquisitive nature, profound and thought-provoking conversation she made Montag reflect on himself and the aspects of his life

He glanced back at the wall. How like a mirror, too, her face. Impossible; for how many people did you know that refracted your own light to you? People were more often-he searched for a simile, found one in his work-torches, blazing away until they whiffed out. How rarely did other people's faces take of you and throw back to you your own expression, your own innermost trembling thought? [...] He felt his smile slide away, melt, fold over, and down on itself like a tallow skin, like the stuff of a fantastic candle burning too long and now collapsing and now blown out. Darkness. He was not happy. He was not happy. He said the words to himself. He recognized this as the true state of affairs. He wore his happiness like a mask and the girl had run off across the lawn with the mask and there was no way of going to knock on her door and ask for it back. (Fahrenheit451: 8-10)

Clarisse is a stark contradiction of Mildred, Montag's wife, who represents how the system's control and influence is deeply rooted within this society. She, Mildred, blindly and unquestioningly conforms to societal norms and values. In due course, Clarisse is made to

vanish along with her family mysteriously possibly because of her inquisitive soul. Even though it is reported by Mildred that she was hit by a speeding car and died. However, Mildred is completely consumed by the media and believes whatever it is told on the news. It would not be wrong to assume that Clarisse was either assassinated or locked away by the government for proven “different” and a nonconformist.

Montag faces feelings of being alienated from his own life; it is evident as he even feels as such towards his wife Mildred, who is supposed to be the closest person to him. She is delusional and refuse to deal with reality or even acknowledge it. Instead, she descends into a destructive spiral of overconsumption of tranquilizers and sedatives while tuning to the radio and television the majority of her time because they offer an alternative reality where she can escape from the real world. Mildred’s overdosing incident makes Montag question their way of living even more.

Montag reaches to a point where the doubts consume this mind, which cause him to become disillusioned with his life and work. The sight of Mrs. Blake, who is willing to be burned with her books rather than live while they disintegrate into nothingness, serve to consolidate Montag’s recent change of character. He tells his wife: *“You weren’t there, you didn’t see. [...] There must be something in books, things we can’t imagine, to make a woman stay in a burning house; there must be something there. You don’t stay for nothing”* (Fahrenheit 451: 51). Showing how displeased he is with himself and those around him submitting and not resisting this kind of oppression without as much off a second thought to consider what motive lies behind it.

As the story progresses, Montag becomes more and more enlightened by the books he has read to the point where he could no longer play in the system tyrannical practices against the population. The rising events in the novel depicts a scene that shows Montag’s ultimate act of resistance and rebellion against the system. As Montag along with the firemen answer

to a report of books found in a house, he finds himself at his house that he burns to the ground. This scene shows how much Montag detests the life he has lived so far. Him burning his own house symbolizes his rebirth from the fire that burned the shackles and restraints of his former life. When Montag engages in an altercation with captain Beatty, he is provoked to take actions and ends up killing the captain and fleeing as his old crumbles in the fire he set. This scene indicates the end of Montag's meaningless life as a paw of the system that destroys the books. He has stepped away from the herd mentality and realized his individuality; thus, the start of his journey to establish a new life that serves a meaningful purpose.

Montag was successful in making an escape, eventually he finds the book people who accommodate and shelter him from the firemen and the Mechanical Hound that chased and was almost successful in killing him.

Finally, Guy Montag is asked to join the society of book people. A society where people preserve the contents of books through memorization. In the process, they shed their true identity to assume that of the book. Ultimately, these people embody and take on the name of the books they memorize; through which we can perceive them a human heterotopia, a moving human library. They pass the books they have memorized by heart from one person to the other. Patiently waiting for when it is safe again for them to rewrite the books, preferably in a world where truth and knowledge are valued instead of muted. The novel's ending illustrates the unescapable self-afflicted destruction of a society that was oppressive, as an atomic bomb sweeps cities and destroy anything on its way. Now, the book people set out on an endeavor to reestablish civilization with the books they contain in their minds. The ending of the novel can be thought of as an allegory of history repeating itself. Therefore, we have to learn from it and make sure the same mistakes of those who preceded us are not committed once again. As Montag leads the book people back towards the city, he recites passages from the bible Ecclesiastes; it displays how he is contemplating a new beginning. Now that he realizes how tyrannical and oppressive his society was, he acknowledges the

detrimental role he played as a fireman, so they intend to build a society drastically different from the one he lived in.

Overall, Fahrenheit 451 is a tale of morality that illustrates the struggle of individualism against collectivism and knowledge versus ignorance. In a society where technology, mass media control and censorship are prevalent and is afflicted with herd mentality, it becomes complicit in its own destruction. The population was so mindless and unaware of what is happening around them that they met their demise by an atomic bomb, which its threat was looming from the beginning.

2. The Heterotopic Dimension in the Novel Fahrenheit 451.

2. 1. The Forest as a Heterotopic Space

Heterotopias are sites that break the order of things; they have their own altered mode of ordering which is different from that of the sites that surrounds them. Such sites encourage acts of resistance and non-conformity. Not only that but, heterotopia serve another significant purpose, according to Foucault They were to act “*as spaces for the means of alternative ordering through their difference and Otherness*”. As Foucault puts it, it can also be the ordering of total control.

He distinguishes between heterotopia of deviation and that of crisis “*Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory....Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled.*” As noted, He refers to heterotopia of crisis as sanctified or forbidden places, held in reserve for individuals who are in a state of crisis in accordance to society and the cultural environment that they inhabit. Heterotopia of deviation on the other hand, serve as a gathering place for nonconformist people who stray away from social norms. This heterotopia is for individuals who act in an opposing manner to the dominant culture.

A prominent storyline throughout the dystopian novel Fahrenheit 451 is the fight against the prohibition of books, and the authority's oppressive practices as they tampered with history and pushed propaganda as the only truth. The Book People safeguarding books and memorizing them threatens the control of the government over the population. Therefore, conflict between the two opposing entities is inevitable. Accordingly, a heterotopia of crisis is created by those who escaped the city to ensure their survival.

The forest as depicted in the novel is inhabited by the Book People can be perceived as a heterotopia of crisis and deviation for both share key heterotopic factors of crisis and deviation. According to Henri Lefebvre:

Space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users', but also of some artists and perhaps of those, such as a few writers and philosophers, who describe and aspire to do no more than describe. This is the dominated—and hence passively experienced—space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects. (Henri Lefebvre 1991:39)

At first glance, the forest seems to be used by Bradbury as a tool of criticizing dominant societal norms and the prevalent technology that touched all aspects of their life nevertheless, the forest carries deeper meanings. It harbors runaway intellectuals, the Book People, who were prosecuted by the authorities. These people are a group of nomadic intellectuals; Montag meets them in the outer edge of the city hiding away in the wilderness to avoid imprisonment. The book people elected to pledge their lives to the salvation of knowledge that the government is set on destroying. Since the possession of books is illegal, the book people made the conscious decision to memorize books instead of keeping the hard copies. That is to avoid the risk of getting arrested for having books. These are individuals who reject hegemony and conformity thus society and the government label them delinquent, criminals who do not abide by the law and societal rules because of their actions.

Heterotopia of deviation provide an accommodation for individualists, a place for those who dare question and break free from hegemonic social structures. Which is consistent with how Hetherington recognizes Foucault's heterotopia as a space of otherness detached from the mainstream

within this in-between space that I call heterotopia. To do that it is in my interest, made possible by Marin, to keep this space-between not quite nowhere, but not as a good space either. Heterotopia do exist, but they only exist in this space-between, in this relationship between spaces, in particular between eu-topia and ou-topia. Heterotopia are not quite spaces of transition—the chasm they represent can never be closed up—but they are spaces of deferral, spaces where ideas and practices that represent the good life can come into being, from nowhere, even if they never actually achieve what they set out to achieve—social order, or control and freedom. (Hetherington 1998:7)

Such is the case for the Book People, who are considered to act defiantly and deviously. On that basis, the forest that they inhabit, represents a heterotopia of deviation and crisis; for it offers a place of congregation and a safe hideaway for people who are deemed to be like the Book People.

Guy Montag the protagonist in the novel, initially represented the fireman as the government's tool of book destruction and he even enjoyed it "*It was a pleasure to burn,*" (Fahrenheit 451). Yet, a fateful encounter with the eccentric Clarisse McClellan raises questions inside Montag's head that he cannot silence. Their conversation had an immense effect on him, so much so, it opened Montag's eyes to realize things he was oblivious to. Montag has been conditioned by society to not question and to only follow the rules. He remains ignorant as long as he blindly conforms and abide by the societal norms and laws. Montag ultimately assume an active role in his life, rids himself from being a mere tool of

burning books

and seeks to learn about ways to break free from his meaningless existence. He realizes that what he is doing makes him an enemy of the state, but seeks Faber's literary advice nonetheless. Asking for Faber's help in understanding what he has read and searching for answers also portrays his curiosity. Montag wants to learn how to make sense of literature and the world around him. (Fahrenheit 451)

Montag could not easily accept and adapt to the newfound enlightenment and revelations, which leads him to experience feelings alienation and a distorted sense of reality. He is torn between two extremes, fulfilling his job as a book burner, and satisfying his curiosity for books. The predicament that Montag is facing stimulates a behavior of deviance; such behavior is only accepted in the forest which proves the claim that it is indeed a heterotopia of crisis and deviation.

While the forest is in fact a real place, it encompasses utopic traits. Since utopias are not real and cannot be established, the forest then accomplishes the role of heterotopia of emplacement and displacement in a closed and remote setting inhabited by the book people. The book people emplace themselves in a heterotopia of crisis and deviation; as they contest and oppose dominant societal rules and government's restrictions. They establish a space where thinking, questioning and individuality are encouraged.

The third principle of heterotopia, heterotopia of Juxtaposition deals with multiple places, while they are otherwise incompatible; these places are brought together to form a heterotopic space. Compared to utopia, which is known to imagine a perfect and pacific world that is characteristically homogeneous, heterotopia on the other hand advocates for diversity, "otherness," and resists dominance and control. In a sense, it was meant to represent some sort of a microcosm. It has "*the power to juxtapose in a single real place several spaces, several emplacements that are in themselves incompatible*". Foucault provides the traditional garden

as an example to illustrate his point. These gardens are constituted of a variety of plants from all over the world, put together in this location to form an exceptional site. This example demonstrates how heterotopia strategically organize and contain vastly diverse entities, which is reflected in the novel. The forest, as a heterotopia, shelters different kinds of people. Guy Montag is a fireman who burned books and amongst the book people we find individuals who were professors, authors, and priests. All different from each other, yet they coexist harmoniously and freely without conflict. Contrary to what the government claims, being intellectual and reading books amplifies the differences between people therefore conflict and violence ensues.

The fifth principle, heterotopia of opening and closing, states that heterotopias require a system of opening and closing that sets them apart from other spaces yet still be accessible for certain individuals. Meaning that they are not open to the public and masses. Such spaces are either entered by force, as in prisons, or by "*submit to the rites and purifications*," (Foucault, 1987, p. 7) as Foucault points out that makes them both isolated and penetrable, contrary to what is thought of as an accessible public space for anyone. Again, the forest in Fahrenheit 451 fits this description. The boundaries of the site are not marked in an obvious manner. Moreover, the access to and use of the site are not explicit or officially written. Yet, the Book People know how to reach and access it. They were prosecuted for possessing and reading books, they opposed the government, which grants them entry into the heterotopic site. The forest represents a place where books and intellectuals are celebrated and kept safe. As Hetherington suggest that heterotopia is a space of resistance and or rebellion in relation to the dominant culture. Thus, the forest functions as safeguard for knowledge and those who hold it.

When Montag wanted to flee to the forest, he had to travel down the river so he could get to it. His journey down the river symbolizes a "*baptism, cleansing, resurrection*" (Jobes 167). It signifies Montag's cleansing from the wrong deeds he has committed in his former

life. The river, however, is but a mean that Montag uses to reach the forest. The forest is his ultimate destination where he can rid himself of the past and serve a meaningful purpose. Which establishes the forest as a heterotopia of opening and closing since Montag could only access it through the river and only because he has become an advocate for the preservation of books like the book people who reside in the forest who accepted him in.

2. 2. Heterotopic Attributes of Literature

The artistic third space can provide a space that challenge the powerful and dominant social spaces status quo. Therefore, heterotopias are ambivalent spaces that are in conflict with the mainstream norms that functions on their own power dynamics. As Kelvin T. Knight traces heterotopic space in prominent works of literature of authors like Vladimir Nabokov, James Joyce and W. G. Sebald. He disputes the perception of heterotopias as physical places and try to return the concept to its literary origins. Hence, establishing literature as an ideal medium that best encompasses the heterotopic properties as a space of “otherness”. In view of that, the status of literature and books, in the dystopian novel Fahrenheit 451, are argued to represent heterotopias according to Michel Foucault’s principles of heterotopia.

The perception of literature in Fahrenheit 451 fits the third principle of heterotopia. The heterotopia of juxtaposition in a sense is a microcosm, which encompasses varied aspects of our world together, and juxtaposed them against each other. Granted that literature in the novel juxtaposes power and knowledge, in this dystopian world intellectuals like the book people struggle to preserve books and the knowledge they contain in order to empower the population. Captain Beatty on the other hand, is intelligent and he employs his intelligence in favor of keeping society ignorant and subjugated by the authorities. Captain Beatty is arguably the most educated and well-read character in the novel, however his desire to destroy books juxtaposes the intentions of fellow intellectuals the book people. This serves as a juxtaposition of viewpoints therefore rendering literature a heterotopia of juxtaposition.

One more principle of heterotopia is concerned with illusion and compensation. These

heterotopias serve a purpose in relation to all spaces outside of them, and amid two extreme opposites that this function unfolds. The heterotopia of illusion exposes the real spaces in which human life is segmented. This sort of heterotopia takes a real site and intensifies its nature so that it represent a prominent aspect, and that aspect is usually of a deviant nature.

There are specific things that cannot be practiced in a public space or around others, in the novel, Montag's new bibliophilic habits falls in this category. Montag is a fireman, he is supposed to ensure people do not break the law and eliminate any threats or opposition that the government may face. Yet Montag starts questioning the prohibition of books and even dares to smuggle books he was meant to burn. At this point, he is challenging the system he once served. In this context, literature belongs in the category of heterotopia of illusion. Literature is influential and powerful, its impact on individuals is undeniable and its effect is evident on Montag's character.

Dissimilarly, heterotopia of compensation reveals a real situation that is created. One that is "*as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled*" (Foucault, 1987, p. 8). Literature, or books in the novel, could be considered as this second type of heterotopia. Books educate people, it provides the knowledge which empower them so they would not be controlled and oppressed. The government prohibited books for the alleged reason that it unsettles individuals and cause them grief, if people did not read then they are spared the negative emotion, if they were ignorant then hegemony would prevail and ultimately happiness. Montag proved this notion to be false as he started discovering prominent works of literature, which offered him solace and enlightenment therefore literature in the dystopian world of Fahrenheit 451 could be perceived as a heterotopia of compensation.

The principle of heterotopia of emplacement and displacement declares that over time society would most likely handle its heterotopias differently. "*a society, as its history unfolds, can make an existing heterotopia function in a very different fashion; for each heterotopia has a precise and determined function within a society and the same heterotopia can,*

according to the synchrony of the culture in which it occurs, have one function or another”

(Foucault, 1967, p. 26.). To illustrate this principle Foucault used the example of the changing location of cemeteries. At first, they were situated in the churchyards, over time they have been moved to burial grounds outside the city. Foucault points out that it is because the world is straying away from religion and leaning more towards atheism.

This heterotopia can be projected on the novel. Over time the way they dealt with books completely changed. According to Beatty, once books and reading were allowed, however the rapidly advancing technology caused the population to, slowly but surely, lose interest for books over the course of time. In accordance with the fast lifestyle, people were more interested in television and the radio, which were more simplified forms of entertainment. Fast-paced life in the city and trivial means of entertainment rendered the people senseless and inattentive to what is occurring around them. The only reading the people do, if they read at all, it would be wordless newspapers that only contained pictures or comic books and magazines. Books were feared because they are thought provoking which threatens to evoke questioning and thirst for more knowledge; hence undermine the ideal happiness of ignorance that the government endorse. Books transformed from being socially accepted to illegal stigmatized tools of unhappiness showcases the changed perception of literature. As such, this situation entails a heterotopia of emplacement and displacement.

The dystopian world of Fahrenheit 451 is anything but perfect and the “imperfection” of this world seems to juxtapose the imperfection that is accepted in a heterotopic space. For that reason, heterotopias in general and heterotopia of literature in particular has the capability to grow and become accepted as it exists, because of the human nature that is curious and thirsty for knowledge. To conclude, just as literature is influenced by individuals and society, literature also has the potential to be influential on them, no matter how much the authorities tried to destroy or censor it.

2. 3. The Book People as a Heterotopic Library

Metamorphosis is a major theme present in the novel, it is evident as Montag transforms from a fireman whose job is to burn books, to a “living book”. Montag as a fireman got an immense pleasure from doing his job: “*It was a special pleasure to see things eaten, to see things blackened and changed*”. However, his pleasure and satisfaction are short lived as he comes to the realization that what he is doing is contributing to destruction of knowledge and keeping the population ignorant. He embarks on journey to find himself and live a meaningful life with purpose. His journey ends as he reaches the forest along with the book people, where he will start his new life, not as Montag but as the book of Ecclesiastes that he partially memorizes. It is revealed that there is only one other Book of Ecclesiastes, making Montag the backup copy, and the last one left in case anything happens to the man who memorize it.

Granger declares himself as Plato's Republic and another person in the campfire as Marcus Aurelius' work. He introduces the book people not by their names, but rather by the names of authors and books, they have memorized. These men demonstrate that the knowledge they preserve is of more importance by opting to shed their true identity, and instead, identifying themselves as the works they have memorized. Preconceived

The book people refer to themselves as “*dust jackets for books disregard, of no significance otherwise.*” They are patiently waiting for when it is safe for them to retreat from their hiding and recite the books they remember. Their main mission is preserving knowledge and the literature that provides wisdom and knowledge necessary to rebuild society. They serve a purpose similar to that of a library, which is provided as an example of heterotopia by Michel Foucault.

The book people and Montag's actions created for them a heterotopic situation that best fits the description of the first principle of heterotopia. This principle classifies them into two

groups: heterotopia of crisis and deviation. The first is reserved for individuals who are in a state of a crisis according to their society, which applies to the book people and eventually Montag. In a society that illegalize books, the book people are considered as criminals and the state's enemies, and for that they are prosecuted by the authorities which puts them in crisis for committing things that are unacceptable by society and the government. Hence indicating their situation as a heterotopia of crisis.

The second type is heterotopia of deviation, it is intended for individuals who act in a devious manner that does not conform to the social norms. As do the bibliophilic people in the novel, they defiantly read books and work to save as many they can from being eaten by the firemen's flames. The characters who start showing deviant behaviors commit themselves for the cause of saving the banned literature and seek the liberty of reading freely without constraints as they eventually metamorphose into books. Thus, the book people create a heterotopia of deviance for themselves.

Heterotopic places are sites which disrupts the order of things, as Foucault states

Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory....Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. (Of Other Spaces 1967, Michel Foucault).

They serve as spaces of alternative ordering through their differences and otherness. As such, the book people serve as a heterotopic library, wherein individuals disregard themselves and embody the book they have memorized; hence, the mind and body functions as an archive for books. Collectively, the book people constitute a library in the sense of it being a place that contain various works of literature. Which is relevant to the principle of heterotopia that

deals with illusion and compensation. The heterotopia of illusion exposes the real spaces in which human life is fragmented. This sort of heterotopia takes a real site and intensifies its nature so that it represents a prominent aspect, and that aspect is usually of a deviant nature. As is the case for the heterotopic library that is constituted of the bibliophilic people. Such thing is extremely unacceptable by neither society nor the government. Therefore, they create a space of illusion that exposes the city which rejects reading and is constantly burning obscene amounts of books as a dystopia. They also create a space of compensation, a real space where individuals are allowed the freedom to read and seek knowledge. Moreover, this space gathers and protects the book people who are the personification of books they committed to their memory.

The principle of heterotopia of emplacement and displacement, which states that a society might behave differently towards its heterotopia. This heterotopia applies to the novel. As we have already established, in Fahrenheit 451, literature has been treated differently by people who bought into the fast lifestyle of the city and the technological advancement. Because it offered them trivial means of entertainment that did not challenge their minds. For that reason, over time, the authorities completely banned books. Thus, replacing libraries and books with television and the radio, marking the shift of attitudes towards literature and consequently libraries, therefore establishing their status as a heterotopia of emplacement and displacement.

The principle of heterotopia of opening and closing is one more principle that fits the case of the book people as a heterotopic library. It is concerned with the acceptance of people into the heterotopic space. As stated by Foucault, heterotopias have a system of opening and closing that isolates them, yet still allow them to be penetrable. These spaces can be either entered by force, or require a special permission or a ritual to access them. Heterotopias are not abundantly available for anyone to go into or leave as they wish. Implying that the masses

should not gain an easy access to a heterotopia. Since they “*presupposes a system of opening and closing*” (Foucault, 1987) it relates to the book people as a heterotopic library which is illustrated by how Montag came to join them. He first had to prove himself as a liable individual who would preserve books and eventually commit one to his memory. However, to join the book people in their place of hiding required Montag some sort of a permission. He was given directions so he could find them by professor Faber. He had to travel down the river and then walk deep in the forest, seemingly as an initiation ritual into the heterotopic real of the forest which has been established. In order become part of the heterotopic library, Montag was asked what contributions he could add to the group, and Montag provided the Book of Ecclesiastes. Proving that his initiation to the heterotopia of the book people required him to, first be directed to their place of hiding and to join them, he had to prove himself beneficial for their mission.

Heterotopias are generally thought to deal with physical places, yet its origins suggests that it is also concerned with the metaphorical representation of space in literature. In this chapter, we conclude that through a detailed analysis of the novel Fahrenheit 451, we can expose elements present in the novel that reflect heterotopic traits. Our analysis resulted with exposing the forest, books, and the book people as physical and metaphorical heterotopias, each related to the principles of heterotopia.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

Michel Foucault's definition of his concept of heterotopia is ambiguous, which led to the adaptation of this concept by various domains. Hence, the concept strayed away from its literary origins that were set by Foucault. Although he only mentions briefly from Borges in the prologue to *The Order of Things*, as discussed in the first chapter. It covers definition of the concept, principles, history and paradoxical sites of placeless places. Therefore, intends to restore Foucault heterotopia to its literary origins. As it entails that the construction of new heterotopias, either within or outside of the preconceived notion of heterotopia is possible, which has been established in this chapter. Even though heterotopias are generally thought to identify with physical places, its origins suggests that it is also concerned with the metaphorical representation of space in literature. Through tracing the concept of heterotopia as Foucault entails, we discover that the concept deals with more than just physical spaces; for it also can be metaphorical and impossible spaces only represented in language. Thus, in the second chapter, we determine that through a detailed analysis of the novel *Fahrenheit 451*, we can expose elements present in the novel that reflect heterotopic traits. After conducting an in-depth analysis on the novel *Fahrenheit 451*, we are able to expose a heterotopic dimension by projecting the principles of heterotopia on the following elements from the novel: the forest, books and the book people. Our analysis resulted with exposing the forest as a physical heterotopia; books, and the book people as metaphorical heterotopias of contestation and rejection of hegemony and conformity. Each of these elements are related to the principles of heterotopia in order to establish and demonstrate their heterotopic status. Hence, concluding that heterotopias are not constrained to physical spaces contrary to the general conception of heterotopia, it can also be employed to examine and analyze places of otherness and impossible spaces that only exists in language and literature as the concept's literary origins suggests.

Bibliography

Bibliography

- ✓ Alcorn, M. W., Bracher, M. (1985). Literature, psychoanalysis, and the re-formation of the self: A new direction for reader-response theory. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 100, 342-354. doi:10.2307/462087
- ✓ Andrew Thacker, *Moving Through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), p. 44, n.51.
- ✓ Anwar, M. (2016). Postmodern Dystopian Fiction: An Analysis of Bradbury's 'Fahrenheit 451'." *International Journal*, 4(1), 246-249
- ✓ Atasoy, E. (2015). Impediment To Knowledge and Imagination in Ray Bradbury's Dystopian Novel, *Fahrenheit 451*. *Conference On Utopian Studies*. Vol. 20
- ✓ Atkins, L. et al. (2009). *Fahrenheit 451: Study guide*. Steppen Wolf Arts Exchange: Washington, DC
- ✓ Bradbury, R. (1953). *Fahrenheit 451*. New York, US: Ballantine Books
- ✓ Brians, P. (2007). *Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451 and the Dystopian Tradition*. USA: Washington State University. <https://brians.wsu.edu/2016/10/12/ray-bradburys-fahrenheit-451-and-the-dystopian-tradition/>.
- ✓ Burlacu, Mihai. "The 'Virtual Heterotopias': Reimagining Nature-Culture Relations." *Český Lid*, vol. 104, no. 2, 2017, pp. 183–198. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26426254. Accessed 8 May 2021.
- ✓ Casey, E. (1998) *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*, Berkley and LA: University of California Press.
- ✓ Defert, D. (1997) 'Foucault, Space, and the Architects' in *Politics/Poetics: Documenta X – The Book*, Ostfildern-Ruit: Cantz Verlag, 274-283.
- ✓ Dehaene, M., Cauter, L. de (Eds.) (2008) *Heterotopia and the city: Public space in a postcivil society*, Abingdon: Routledge

Bibliography

- ✓ Eliza Claudia Filimon (Author), 2014, *Heterotopia in Angela Carter's Fiction: Worlds in Collision*, Hamburg, Bedey Media GmbH, <https://www.anchor-publishing.com/document/287443>
- ✓ Foucault, M. (1984). *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité*. Translated by Miskowiec, Jay. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1>.
- ✓ Foucault, M. (1986a), "Of other spaces", *Diacritics*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 22-27.
- ✓ Foucault, M. (2004) [1966] *Utopies et heterotopias [Utopias and heterotopias]*, CD : INA, Mémoire Vive.
- ✓ Foucault, M. (2009) [1971] *Manet and the Object of Painting*, translated M. Barr, London: Tate Publishing
- ✓ Foucault, Michel. "Language to Infinity: ". *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2021, pp. 53-67. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501741913-004>
- ✓ Foucault, the Other Spaces, and Human Behaviour, IwanSudradjat
- ✓ Horsfield, J. (2017). *Distopia vs Utopia: Fighting for the future*. Hearts Minds Media.
- ✓ Johnson, P. (2016) *Brief History of the Concept of Heterotopia (revised)* *HeterotopianStudies* <http://www.heterotopiastudies.com>
- ✓ Knight, K. (2014). *Real places and impossible spaces: Foucault's heterotopia in the fiction of James Joyce, Vladimir Nabokov, and W.G. Sebald* (Doctoral thesis, University of East Anglia). Retrieved from <http://www.heterotopiastudies.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/2014KnightKTPH>
- ✓ Koyré, A. (1957) *From the Closed to the Infinite Universe*, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press.
- ✓ Lawson, B. S. (2004). [Review of Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, by H. Bloom]. *UtopianStudies*, 15(1)

Bibliography

- ✓ Lax, F. (1998) 'Heterotopia from a Biological and Medical Point of View' in R. Ritter and B. Knaller-Vlay (eds.), *Other Spaces. The Affair of the Heterotopia*, DokumentezurArchitektur 10, Graz, Austria: Haus der Architektur, 114-123.
- ✓ Macey, D. (1993) *The Lives of Michel Foucault*, London: Vintage.
- ✓ MacFarlane, B. (1996). *Novel to film: an introduction to the theory of adaptation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- ✓ McGlinn, M. (1953). *The teacher guide to Fahrenheit 451*. (New York: Simon & Schuster.
- ✓ Michel Foucault, 'Les Hétérotopies', in Daniel Defert (ed.), *Le Corps utopique suivi de Les Hétérotopies* (Paris : Nouvelles Éditions Lignes, 2009)
- ✓ Michel Foucault, 'The Thought of the Outside', in James Faubion (ed.), *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 165
- ✓ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* (New York: Pantheon, 1970) xv.
- ✓ Mik, B., 2019. *Fahrenheit 451, its Dystopian Concepts and Possible References to the Modern World*. Bachelor's Diploma Thesis. Palacký University in Olomouc Faculty of Arts Department of English and American Studies
- ✓ Nguyen Ngoc Quang, Danny Wildemeersch & Jan Masschelein (2013) *Community forests as heterotopia. The case of the Mu community forest – Ngoc Son – Ngo Luong Nature Reserve, Vietnam*, *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 70:6, 877-892
- ✓ Passon, A. B. L. By, A., & Passon, L. (2021, June 5). *What do the Mirrors Symbolize in Fahrenheit 451?* PopularAsk.net - Your daily dose of knowledge.
<https://popularask.net/what-do-the-mirrors-symbolize-in-fahrenheit-451/>.
- ✓ Kelvin T. Knight (2017) *Placeless places: resolving the paradox of Foucault's heterotopia*, *Textual Practice*, 31:1, 141-158, DOI: 10.1080/0950236X.2016.1156151 Seed, D.

Bibliography

- (1994). The Flight from the Good Life: "Fahrenheit 451" in the Context of Postwar American Dystopias. *Journal of American Studies*. 28, (2), 225-240. Retrieved 23 Oct, 2014 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40464168>
- ✓ Summary of Michel Foucault's "Of other spaces"
<https://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/wooda/149F/149-Foucault.html>
- ✓ Souvik Chowdhury, (2019). Understanding Heterotopia: Foucault's Spatial Context to Society
- ✓ Watt, D. (1980). Burning Bright: Fahrenheit 451 as Symbolic Dystopia. Ray Bradbury, edited by Joseph Olander and M.H. Greeberg, 195–213. New York: Taplinger
- ✓ Wien, H. (2012). Claiming mastery of the word: The power of discourse in Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451 and George Orwell's 1984. Norway: University of Tromsø.
- ✓ Zieleniec, Andrzej. "Henri Lefebvre: The Production of Space." *Space and Social Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2008, pp. 60-97. SAGE Knowledge. 14 Sep 2021, doi: <http://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781446215784.n3>.
- ✓ Zipes, J. (1983). Mass degradation of humanity and massive contradictions in Bradbury. E. S. Rabkin, M. H. Greenberg & D. O. Joseph (Eds.), *No Place Else: Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction* (pp. 182-199). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press

Abstract

Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia, ever since it was introduced, has garnered the interest of various domains, such as architecture, sociology and literature. The wide adaptation and appropriation of this concept is a result of its ambiguous definition. Heterotopia seems as though it is inherently contradictory, for it is described as both an impossible space only represented in language; and a real space of otherness that contests other spaces surrounding it. On this account, this paper argues that the concept should be identified with its literary origins, and attributed with metaphorical and literary spaces rather than exclusively physical places. To this end, this work considers Foucault's account of heterotopia and attempts to identify its elements from Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451 as the very concept of heterotopias entails. Even more importantly, relating the novel to the principles of heterotopias brings the heterotopic dimension existing in the novel even forward which subsequently allows it for better understanding.

Résumé

Le concept d'hétérotopie de Michel Foucault, depuis qu'il a été introduit, a suscité l'intérêt de différents domaines, tels que l'architecture, la sociologie et la littérature. La large adaptation et appropriation de ce concept est le résultat de sa définition ambiguë. L'hétérotopie semble être intrinsèquement contradictoire, car elle est décrite à la fois comme un espace impossible uniquement représenté dans le langage et comme un espace réel d'altérité qui conteste les autres espaces qui l'entourent. Dans cette optique, cet article soutient que le concept devrait être identifié à ses origines littéraires et attribué à des espaces métaphoriques et littéraires plutôt qu'à des lieux exclusivement physiques. À cette fin, ce travail considère le compte rendu de Foucault sur l'hétérotopie et tente d'identifier ses éléments dans Fahrenheit 451 de Ray Bradbury, comme le concept même d'hétérotopie l'implique. Plus important encore, le fait de relier le roman aux principes de l'hétérotopie met en avant la dimension hétérotopique existant dans le roman, ce qui permet de mieux la comprendre.

ملخص

أثار مفهوم ميشال فوكو للهتروتوبيا، منذ عرضه اهتمام مجالات مختلفة مثل الهندسة المعمارية وعلم الاجتماع والأدب. إن التكييف الواسع النطاق مع هذا المفهوم هو نتيجة لتعريفه الغامض. ويبدو أن الهتروتوبيا متناقضة بطبيعتها، حيث توصف بأنها أماكن مستحيلة ممثلة فقط في اللغة ومساحة حقيقية مغايرة تتحدى المساحات الأخرى المحيطة بها. مع وضع هذا في عين الاعتبار ويجادل هذا المقال بأن المفهوم يجب أن يتم تحديده بأصوله الأدبية ونسبه إلى المساحات المجازية والأدبية بدلا من الأماكن المادية حصرا. وتحقيقا لهذه الغاية، يعتبر هذا العمل رواية فوكو عن الهتروتوبيا ومحاولات تحديد عناصرها في فهرنهايت 451 لراي برادبري، كما يوحي مفهوم الهتروتوبيا نفسه. والأهم من ذلك، أن ربط الرواية بمبادئ هذه النظرية يسلط الضوء على البعد النظري الموجود في الرواية، مما يجعل من الممكن فهمها بشكل أفضل.