



Copyright@Author(s) - Available online at dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/igusbd. Content of this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

A Review on Dystopia and Critical Dystopia Examples in the Debates on Civil Liberties and the Future of Opposition

Sivil Özgürlükler ve Muhalefetin Geleceği Tartışmalarında Distopya ve Eleştirel Distopya Örnekleri Üzerine İnceleme

Tuğçe GÜR
TÜRKDOĞAN 

Abstract

Based on the relationship between opposition and democracy, the study aims to discuss the space of civil liberties and the future of opposition. The possibilities and limitations of social opposition in existing (and different) social formations are analysed in depth in the context of dystopian examples. Within the scope of the study, the dystopias titled *We*, 1984, *Brave New World*, and *The Dispossessed* are discussed in the context of their common features (fictionalising a more advanced historical period, opening capitalist relations of production to discussion, expansion of state power to all areas of life and criticism of the consumer society) and the narrowing of the space of both civil liberties and opposition in conditions where the boundaries and authority of the state are blurred, and the future of opposition and democracy in this context are discussed.

Keywords

Social Opposition, Democracy, Dystopia, Future of Opposition, Social Movements

This study is derived from his PhD dissertation entitled "Changing Forms of Opposition", which was accepted by Dokuz Eylül University Institute of Social Sciences in 2021 and supervised by Prof. Dr. Atilla Göktürk.

PhD, İstanbul Gelisim University, Department Political Sciences and Public Administration, İstanbul, Türkiye.

✉ tugur@gelisim.edu.tr

Geliş/Received: 26.08.2023

Kabul/Accepted: 13.09.2023

Öz

Çalışma, muhalefet ve demokrasi arasında kurulan ilişkiden hareketle, sivil özgürlüklerin alanı ile muhalefetin geleceğini tartışma konusu yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Mevcut (ve farklı) toplumsal formasyonlarda toplumsal muhalefetin sahip olduğu imkanlar ve sınırlılıklar distopya örnekleri bağlamında derinlemesine incelenmiştir. Çalışma kapsamında, *Biz*, 1984, *Cesur Yeni Dünya* ve *Mülksüzler* isimli distopyalar ele alınarak, sahip oldukları ortak özellikler bağlamında (daha ileri bir tarihsel periyodu kurgulaması, kapitalist üretim ilişkilerini tartışmaya açması, devlet iktidarının yaşamın tüm alanlarına yayılması ve tüketim toplumu eleştirisi) devletin sınırlarının ve otoritesinin muğlaklaştığı koşullarda hem sivil özgürlüklerin hem de muhalefetin alanının daralması ve bu bağlamda muhalefetin ve demokrasinin geleceği tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Toplumsal Muhalefet, Demokrasi, Distopya, Muhalefetin Geleceği, Toplumsal Hareketler

Introduction

In the social formation of the 20th century, which was expected to be a golden age in time and space, experiences such as the two great World Wars, Nazi and Stalin totalitarianism, Hiroshima and Nagasaki created the opposite picture and resulted in an increasing gap between political powers with authoritarian tendencies and social classes. As Steinhoff (1975, s. 8) points out, the utopian promise of Enlightenment thought in the combination of science, development and happiness has not been realized, and beyond that, the goal of creating a happier and freer world has been replaced by violence and domination. In the context of the effects of the current social formation, dystopias have begun to be used to depict the despotic and totalitarian systems of the 20th century and the individual's struggle for rebellion. With Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell, dystopia emerged as a warning against the loss of individual freedom in the scientific, social and political domination systems of the field. Similarly, the events of the 21st century, the evolution of the social formation from a factory-based life to the transformation of all of life into a factory, the control of technology over all areas of our lives and the gradual increase in the sphere of this state have begun to question the sphere of social opposition. In the relationship established between democracy and opposition, the limitation of the space of opposition in the public sphere results in the direct limitation of the space of democracy.

This study aims to discuss utopia as an alternative way of life in the context of civil liberties in societies at different levels of development through important dystopias. In line with this aim, it is aimed to examine the elements of opposition in well-known dystopias such as, "Brave New World", "1984", "The Dispossessed" which is considered as the first example of critical dystopia, and "We" and to create an important context in terms of the relationship that can be established between utopia and opposition as a reaction or rebellion against authority.

The Authoritarian State and Civil Liberties

Authoritarian and predominantly totalitarian regimes are defined as political systems that integrate and harmonize the state and society and impose a common worldview on the whole society. The main features are that all forms of opposition are prohibited, and the government controls all areas of life without any distinction between private and public spheres¹ (Heywood, 2012, p. 255). While the concept is defined as a modern phenomenon by Arendt and accepted as a phenomenon that emerged with capitalism, Stanley defines it as a tendency that has existed since the emergence of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled. In this context, it can exist in pre-capitalist societies as well as in capitalist societies, and it continues to exist in the various forms that capitalism has taken (Stanley, 1987, p. 77). Zbigniew-Brzezinski defines capitalism as structures in which civil liberties and freedom of thought disappear as a result of the politicization of society as a whole by political power through technical means (Friedrich and Zbigniew, 1964, p. 130-132). In Nazi Germany, the Intent Law, a far-reaching criminal law norm against the expression of critical opinions on everyday life and public debate on political issues, can be seen in this context. In 1936, there were 8,000 cases, but within a year the number of intent cases reached 17,000. The punishments, which started with admonition and warning, followed a hierarchy from bail to precautionary imprisonment and the death Penalty, and followed a severe course aimed at eliminating dissent (Dams, and Stolle: 2017, p. 113-114).

Neoliberalism enables the strengthening of authoritarian governments on a global scale in order to protect its gains - high profits and a weak organized labor force, for example (Akçoraoğlu, p. 43). In the picture created by the current developments, literary dystopias take their place as a defender of freedom in response to the "intensification" of oppression, both as a critique of the state's expansion of its borders into the realm of civil liberties and as a reaction to the "intensification" of oppression

¹The establishment of the "Reich Center for Combating Homosexuality and Abortion" in Nazi Germany in 1936 with a secret circular is an example of the limitlessness of the borders of the state. All homosexual citizens were required to become members of this center, and then homosexuals were brought before judges on the grounds that they had committed a crime. During the Nazi period, according to official records, between 10.00-15.00 homosexuals were sent to concentration camps, while 10,000 people were imprisoned (Dams and Stolle, 2017, p. 153).

in order to keep the “principle of hope²” alive by emphasizing the continuity of the effort to achieve civil liberties (Beauchamp. 1975, p. 161).

She resonance of state-induced grievances in civil society has led to a process of special emphasis on civil society in the defense of political rights and cultural freedoms (Wood, 2008, p. 281). The process is discussed in relation to the fact that civil society has sided with opposition forces against state repression in totalitarian societies, especially after 1980. This has led to the establishment of a relationship between civil society and opposition and democracy through this instrument, and civil society has come to be referred to as the space of social opposition (Fraser, 2015, p. 104). From this point of view, by focusing on the opposition between the state and civil society, civil society has started to express the process of defining civil society as a “field of activity” that restricts the pressure and intervention of political power as a field of organization and assembly (Ozan, 2015, p. 100-102). According to Wood (2008, p. 242), beyond a civil society-centered evaluation, it is necessary to focus on the relationship established between capitalism and democracy in the context of citizenship law. The economic and political status of the individual does not determine the scope of the right to citizenship; this right is defined as a universal right that begins at birth and comes to life in the context of equality before the rule of law. Since the capitalist mode of production abolished all relations of dependence, the rules that the masses must abide by were determined within the scope of civil law. These rights and freedoms are expanding with the momentum created by the mass movements of the period, and the struggle can be extended by reading civil liberties as principles of legitimacy, freedom of expression and association, and the protection of non-state spheres against state intervention. It is the sphere of civil liberties that is specified in this context. It is the enactment of institutional protections for civil liberties to exist and be consolidated. Ultimately, the principle of opposition is realized by protecting individual liberties by establishing historical and structural connections. (Wood, 2008, p. 286). Through publicity, the public sphere came into existence as an institution between society and the state, and through fundamental rights and freedoms, it was aimed for citizens to institutionalize this mechanism, that is, opposition. The destruction of the public sphere, on the other hand, reinforces the conditions for the existence of totalitarian states. However, under these conditions, the potential of citizens to come together in the public sphere is destroyed and their ability to question and control political power is eliminated. There is no institutional mechanism for the limitation or control of political power, and the fact that every sphere of life is under the control of political power does not allow for the definition of any right considered in connection with the right to dissent. The main context of this study is the existence of rebellion against authority or power in all kinds of social formations despite all kinds of restrictions and prohibitions. For example, the emergence of a series of opposition movements in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the form of the Cinema Workers’ Union and the subsequent struggle for the abolition of pre-censorship is an important example in this context (Daniels, 2007, p. 352). The Relations Among advanced technological developments, the limits of the state, democracy and the existence of opposition is being intensely debated today. In addition to the many advantages provided by technological developments, the process of unlimited state authority and intervention has come along with it. The crises in the current social formation in terms of the individual and society are manifested in the resistance of the nation-state to globalization, in the transformation of the modernization period into a surveillance society, in the social and cultural problems created by unjust income distribution, and in the homogeneous citizen of market capitalism. All of this has resulted in the revival of utopia in recent years as a hope for a better future and a desire to establish a more liveable world (Çörekçioğlu, 2015, p. 9).

²He concept is used by referring to Ernst Bloch’s famous work “The Principle of Hope”. The work is at the center of contemporary readings with the aim of reviving utopia. Bloch’s work is not only about the principle of hope, but also about the history of hope, the ways in which it manifests itself in culture and cultural products, and the longing for a better world (for more details see. Bloch. E. (2007). *The Principle of Hope*, Volume 1. Translated by Tanıl Bora, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları).

Dystopia and the Future of Opposition

Foran argues that in the future of opposition, new oppositional movements “will emerge through a magical blend of realism and utopianism” (Foran, 2014, p. 107). In a globalized and imperialized world, in the postmodern age, that is, in a world that no longer has an “outside”, Negri expresses utopia as a new field of experience that connects with the past (Negri, 2016, p. 46). This new experience is closely related to the transformations of labor and new technological developments. According to Mannheim, utopia is an idea with the possibility or potential for realisation. They are ideas that transcend the existing reality, “break the connection points of the existing order” and remove “the order of things...” from its context. The essence and character of the concept considered in the context of “relative utopia” is constituted by its functional aspect, which gains visibility with its power to be transformed into action and realised in practice (Mannheim, 1979, p. 173-176). Negri (2007, p. 46-47) analyses utopia historically and states that there are at least two approaches to utopia³. In both approaches, the concept of utopia is accepted as a path towards what is longed for and desired, and is designed by many thinkers as a depiction tool or programme. According to Negri, utopia can be defined from a methodological point of view as follows;

In Machiavelli, utopia is born out of anger and turns into resistance and a political programme. In the realist Machiavelli, utopia constitutes the programme. In Spinoza, utopia is drawn into the process of passions: It is the force that moves desire towards love. In Marx, utopia merges with the material conditions of exploitation and is a real force participating in the dynamics of life, the new power of collective freedom (Negri, p. 47).

Ricoeur define utopia as “a complex network of different elements”. According to Ricoeur, this complex network has three basic components. The first of these is the critical aspect, which can be expressed as “self-reflexive”, and while this feature refers to the power of human beings to change, it also gives utopias their character. The second component is that utopias are specific to the Enlightenment tradition. They are born out of the conditions of the existing social formation and in this context they are historical. The third and final component is fantasy, which is defined as an element of rational hope. The concept is dealt with in the context of individual and society, freedom and civilisation as discussed by Habermas and emphasises utopian action, that is, rebellion (Ricoeur, 1986, p. 251-253).

Within the scope of this study, examples were selected based on utopia’s emphasis on the dynamics of the power of collective freedom in Marx’s definition. In this context, the concept of alienation as defined by Marx, bourgeois ideology and the idea of human sacrifice for economic and technological development constitute common points in dystopian examples (Booker, 1994, p. 30-34). The dystopian examples analysed are, Brave New World, , 1984 The Dispossessed and We. As in Plato’s “The State”, Thomas Moore’s “Utopia”, Bacon’s “Atlantis” and Moris’s “News from Nowhere”, the selected examples are not depictions of a perfect society, but rather a critical analysis of the existing system and counter-utopian examples of the conditions that may arise afterwards.

Utopias and dystopias as a literary genre have aimed to answer, criticise or better discuss the basic questions about the problem of organisation, the institutionalisation process of political power and how the economy will function since Plato wrote his work “The State”. The answers given to where people will live, what their basic needs are and how they will be met, how they will reproduce, how they will raise children, how power and power relations will be distributed, or how the economy will function become decisive in the context of depicting, criticising and reconstructing society (Atwood, p. 2017:11).

While utopia expresses the desire and dream of man to be happy in a place of his own making (Çörekçioğlu, 2015, p. 9), dystopias are defined as the expression of the individual’s conflict with society, the private with the public, the heterogeneous with the homogeneous by placing rebellion at the centre (Beauchamp, 1975, p. 297). Similarly- dystopian examples are selected due to their

³According to Negri, conservative thought depicts utopia in its religious origins and concludes with the longing for paradise. In leftist thought, on the other hand, utopia expresses a longing for the future. Negri defined this situation as futurism.

four basic and common features, and in the context of these examples, the field of opposition and the future of democracy are emphasised in conditions where the borders and authority of the state are blurred. This is because, according to Beauchamp, dystopia activates the sense of freedom that is innate and derived from being human and transfers the sense of change and history to the text by destroying the static given structure of utopia (Beauchamp, 1975, p. 168).

First of all, all of these dystopias depict a historical period that is more advanced than the current conditions. There is a description of a social formation in which advanced technology permeates and shapes every moment of life, from production techniques to social life and from there to individual decisions. Secondly, and predominantly, in the capitalist mode of production, the “pressure” of the conditions of mechanisation on the lives of individuals is narrated. Thirdly, they describe societies in which the limits of the state expand into the realm of personal freedoms and civil liberties are not allowed to find a living space. Finally, it offers a strong criticism of the capitalist system based on the questioning of consumer society.

Firstly, it provides a critical depiction of a historical moment that is more advanced than the historical period in which all four dystopias are located. “Brave New World” was written by Huxley in 1932. It matured in the years when the Fordist regime of accumulation began to emerge as a system of production and presents a pessimistic picture of the future based on the present. The world depicted in Dystopia is the year After Ford (A.F.) 632 A.D., similar to the year after Christ (A.D.). In other words, it depicts the philosophy of the totalitarian state and its control of all life within the structure of society divided into classes at a certain moment of technological development level 632 years after the new system established by Henry Ford (Huxley, p. 2017). Similarly, George Orwell’s work “1984”, written in 1949, is set in the year “1984”. He describes a new social formation that surpasses his own historical conditions by more than a quarter of a century. In his depiction, he describes societies where everything is completely under the control of political power, where this control is felt at all times through advanced technology, and where there is no civil freedom and consequently no opposition (Orwell, p. 2017). The Dispossessed, which is defined as an ambivalent dystopia, was written in 1974 on two twin worlds named “Anarres” and “Urras”. These two worlds, which revolve around each other and therefore we cannot tell which one is the centre⁴, and the journey back and forth between these worlds are the main subject of the work. The space journey between the primary locations and the fact that the main character is working on a communication machine (the Responder) that will enable interplanetary communication corresponds to a date and level of technological sophistication later than the period in which it was written. Anarres was founded by anarchist Urrasians who migrated to the Moon after a social and political uprising and conflict on Urras. These places (primary and secondary) refer to the social formation (the bipolar world and those outside it) in which the work was written⁵, and according to Burns, which world is utopia or whether utopia exists or not constitutes the most important question of the study (Burns, 2020, p. 118-122). We, written by Zamyatin, was written in 1924 and tells the story of the 26th century. It aims to show the consequences of the control over society and individuals under the rule of an authoritarian “One State” that constructs every aspect of life in a “rational” way (Zamyatin, p. 2016).

In this context, as the first common feature, all four dystopian examples aim to narrate authoritarian states that increase their control over individuals by drawing attention to the importance of technological progress in the fictionalisation of the future. In terms of the study, this point serves the purpose of reflecting on the effects of suppressing critical thinking in a society. In the context of the post-pandemic period, the use of the possibilities of technology by governments to establish surveillance society and authoritarian practices is very topical (Türkmen, p. 2020).

Secondly, and predominantly, it contains a criticism of the living conditions of individuals within the system of production and distribution dominated by capitalist relations of production.

⁴...There are people who sit there on a hill in Urras and look at Anarres, at us, and say, ‘Look, there’s the moon. I had never really thought about it. Our world is their moon, our moon is their world...’ (LeGuin, 43).

⁵Wegner’s analysis of the dispossessed is that there is a modern versus postmodern debate. According to Wegner, there is a questioning that takes its source from Kant’s dilemma of freedom and happiness, which is also seen in other dystopian examples. Anarres’ world and Urras’ world are opposite to each other (Wegner 2002, p.178-180).

Brave New World presents a critique of the system with the depiction of advanced technology within the capitalist production system, where the Fordist accumulation regime is the dominant production regime. Henry Ford's first car, the T model, which he produced based on specialised labour power through the production line system, was chosen as the starting date of the new era. The industrial philosophy of Ford, the leader of the Brave New World, determined the basic principles of the World State, and all areas of life, from individual relations to organisational relations, were shaped in accordance with this philosophy. Stability based on mass production and mass consumption was accepted as the essential element of this social formation (Huxley, p. 65-66). This system brings people a life without hunger, disease, war and rebellion. However, the only way this can be done is through unconditional obedience⁶. The existence of the system is self-fulfilling in that everyone wants everything for each other (repetitively, everyone is for everyone). 1984 differs from other dystopias in that it is read as a strong criticism of socialism. However, it is also stated that reading 1984 only as a criticism of socialism is a political endeavour. In this study, it is seen as a criticism of a form of state in which power and authority are exercised unlimitedly and freedoms are eliminated by using the advantages provided by technology. "Ingsos", which is defined as "British Socialism" in the New Discourse, is a description of a system in which people turn into a machine but do not even realise it. "Similar to pre-revolutionary times, the proletariat is not assigned any important role other than the continuation of the generation and the production of goods, and in addition, it is constantly oppressed. Orwell's work criticises the new order (socialist) while at the same time criticising the capitalist system (Orwell, p. 82- 84). In British socialism, according to the dominant sources, the modern world is fairer and more equal than before. However, there is no means for questioning the sources (Orwell, p. 86). In the modern life depicted, hunger, poverty and inequality, which were characteristic of capitalism and which were to the detriment of the proletariat, were eliminated. For example, the literacy rate among the proletariat, which was 5 per cent before the revolution, increased to 40 per cent after the revolution. Similarly, child mortality rates, which were 30 per cent before the revolution, decreased to 16 per cent after the revolution.

In *The Dispossessed*, there are two different types of state and different forms of state⁷, and it is distinguished from the others by its comprehensive criticism of all existing formations. Anarres has a syndicalist-anarchist social order that is closed to communication with the outside world and whose natural conditions and climate are not suitable for living. Anarres is depicted as a border society based on minimal government, individual freedoms, local power, production and consumption relations. A syndicalist economic model, taking into account the harshness of the climate, is shaped to meet basic needs. The production structure of Anarres with the motto "small is beautiful" is a mixture of labour-controlled economy, local manufacturing, small craft works, communal agriculture, fishing and mining (Maylon, 1986, p. 92). While LeGuin discusses the publicness of private property and the solidarity-based economic model and capitalist production relations, she also questions the "phenomenon of governance" itself in line with the findings in Anarres society regarding the bureaucracy that has ossified and dominated the society, the personal reputation in human relations and the passion for power. The wall⁸ is a powerful metaphor used to divide utopian societies. The planet Urras, which is defined as the opposite of Anarres, is divided into three sections and each section corresponds to a different form of state. A-Io is a rich and prosperous country where the liberal-capitalist order prevails. Shevek, the main protagonist of the work, saw an electronics factory,

⁶Genetic engineering realises the conditioning of individuals in all aspects of their lives. Welfare engineering, persuasion through hypnosis, strict caste system and "soma" (an industrial drug to be produced to make everyone happy) constitute the tools used for the survival of this system. The relationship between freedom and happiness is also seen here.

⁷It is used in accordance with the conceptualisation made by Poulantzas to define the form that a certain type of state takes under certain historical conditions. While the ordinary forms of the capitalist state type are liberal democracy and authoritarian state, the extraordinary forms are defined as fascism and military dictatorship (Poulantzas, 2014: 213).

⁸The symbol of the wall, which is used extensively in the text, is a basic element that has entered dystopian writing since Zamyatin. In *The Dispossessed* this element expresses the closure of all kinds of communication, especially by referring to the Berlin Wall.

a fully automated steel mill and a nuclear fusion plant on the first day of his visit to the city and made the observation that he encountered a fully industrialised society contrary to all his negative accumulation (LeGuin, p. 78). However, over time, when he observed life there in depth, he realised that the reality was quite different. Shevek when he realizes that despite all the unemployed people in the city, he sees no poor people, he has great hope and compares the city he came to with a huge decorated package (LeGuin, p. 252). Thu Country - state socialism - and Benhili - military dictatorship - are two other nation states. In Thu there is a centralised, repressive and tyrannical government, while the other is dominated by a military dictatorship, which is dominated by riots and uprisings and intense social opposition (Le Guin, p. 2021).

Our last dystopian example, *We*, is an analysis of a society under the rule of a single authoritarian state at the level of economic and technological development of the 26th century. The benefactor is the head of the state and leads a social life determined by the Time Table. "*We*" is a fictionalisation of the future of the Taylorist production system. Zamyatin summarises the current conditions as follows;

Every morning millions of us wake up as one body at the same time and at the same hour. Millions of us start work at the same time, and millions of us finish work in harmony. Millions of hands and millions of heads attached to a single body, we take our spoons to our mouths at the same time, as organised by the Time Table. At the same time we go for a walk, at the same time we go to Taylor's Gym or to sleep." (Zamyatin, p. 27).

It provides an opportunity to question the basic desires and wishes of individuals in a society where Taylor's time and movement studies are extended to all areas of life, where the rationality that dominates the production regime is supported by a mathematical moral system, and which functions like a machine. In the depiction of a society where logic is thought to solve every problem, it questions the emergence of uprisings and revolts and the effect of mechanisation on people.

Thirdly, it includes the criticism of authoritarian-totalitarian states where individual freedoms have no chance of survival as a result of the expansion of the borders of the state. In the four dystopian examples analysed, the totalitarian societies, which are defined as a huge garrison (Sartori, p. 249) in which the mass society is imprisoned, are depicted as totalitarian societies in which the opposition cannot find a chance to live on legal grounds and from this moment on, its transformation into uprising, occupation or revolution is depicted.

Brave New World is accepted as a criticism of the totalitarian state. The system constructed through the advanced level of technology, *one egg, one embryo, one adult, is normality* and the state has gathered the power in one hand in order to combat crises and according to Huxley, the process of increasing the control of the state is quite different from the old order (Huxley, p. 25- 339). The state establishes its authority by developing methods of persuasion instead of using direct means of coercion. Civil liberties are constitutionally guaranteed, but "free thought" is eliminated through both a rigid caste system and the teaching of fundamental values before birth. The main criticism of the persuasion method used in Brave New World is the prevention of free thought. This system is illustrated in the following paragraph, in which the director of the incubation centre expresses his thoughts.

"Until finally the child's mind is transformed into these teachings, and the sum total of these teachings forms the child's mind. Not only the child's mind. But also the adult mind throughout life. The mind that judges, desires and decides will be made up of these teachings. But all these teachings are our teachings. "The teachings of the State." (Huxley, p. 55).

Among the dystopias analysed, the strongest authoritarian state criticism is seen in 1984. In 1984, the silent protest against the interventionist, intolerant and oppressive totalitarianism against resistance and opposition is conveyed. When the general structure of society is considered as a pyramid, Big Brother is at the top⁹. All areas of life are monitored and controlled by "Big Brother" through tele-screens ("Big Brother is Watching You"). *"The purpose of oppression is oppression, the purpose of torture is torture. The purpose of power is power"* (Orwell, p. 262-263). The private and

⁹At the bottom of the pyramid are the members of the inner party and the members of the outer party, the inner party being the brain of the state and the outer party its hands and arms. At the lowest and broadest layer is the proletariat, which constitutes 85 per cent of the population (Orwell, p. 226).

public spheres are dissolved within the unlimited will of Big Brother. Winston's decision to keep a diary in the notebook he bought from Charrington's junk shop is expressed as the beginning of the emergence of a heterogeneous space against the homogenous world of Oceania (Çörekçioğlu, p. 125). Through the ministries, the government can control the citizens as it wishes. Civil liberties have melted away under state control. Private areas are listened to by the tele-screen and all kinds of questioning discourse are vaporised under the name of thought crime. "The contrary vaporises". To convey this situation from Winston's thoughts at the first moment he started to keep a diary;

"keeping a diary was not illegal (in fact, nothing was illegal, because there was no such thing as law anymore), but if it was discovered, Winston was almost certain to be sentenced to death or taken to a forced labour camp for at least twenty-five years" (Orwell, p. 16).

In the case of mass detention, a social order in which even basic rights are not recognised, such as freedom of expression, thought and conscience, together with the rights of dissent. From this point of view, a warning is given to the world of the future.

In The Dispossessed, Anarres society maintains a post-industrial, urban-rural balance and focuses on improving communication and technology to maintain a high level of civilisation. In this context, in the case of Anarres, individual freedoms and the health of the community are kept in balance. Moreover, in this egalitarian society, there are no class, gender, race or domination relations. Despite all this, the fact that the protagonist, a scientist in the field of metacosmology, is unable to achieve the scientific autonomy he envisages for his research reveals the restrictions on freedom of thought and free will.

"It's not a system of government or a government - this is not Urras!" "No. We have no governments, no laws - all right! But as far as I can see, thoughts have never been controlled by laws and governments, not even on Urras. If that were so, how would Odo have developed his own thoughts? How would Odoism have become a worldwide movement? The statists tried to suppress the movement by force and failed. Thoughts cannot be destroyed by repression. They can only be destroyed by being ignored. By refusing to think - by refusing to change. That's what our society does! This is the system of power of which he is a part, and he knows how to use it well. The inaccessible power that rules the society of Odoclars by suppressing the mind of the individual, whose existence is never recognised" (LeGuin, p. 145)

In a society where individual freedoms are based on the principles of solidarity and voluntary work, encountering obstacles and a rigid bureaucratic structure in scientific institutions becomes a means of overcoming a crisis situation through self-critical action and critical questioning. "All they say is come here! Now! Then they say that we are free people, that we should be free" (LeGuin, p. 224). The main concept questioned by the dispossessed in "Anarres" is the phenomenon of management itself, which emerges in the context of division of labour, authority and hierarchy. The increasing authority of the central administration, especially in times of crisis, constitutes another aspect of the topicality of the work. "We watched as co-operation turned into submission! In Urras there is the rule of the minority. Here it is the rule of the majority. But it is still a government! The social conscience is no longer a living thing, but an apparatus, an apparatus of power controlled by bureaucrats" (LeGuin, p. 147). At this point, it is stated that the author emphasises the basic values of liberal ideology in the context of his desire to attain scientific freedom (Çörekçioğlu, p. 141). It is thought that a direct reference is made to the public sphere in the context of public thinking, speaking and discussion practices and to the opposition, which we deal with in the context of a right and freedom. LeGuin also discusses state forms in capitalist state types through the Dispossessed. Shevek, who comes to the city of A-lo, which can be defined as an example of liberal democracy, to continue his scientific research, learns the real reason for the invitation made to him, and this is the beginning of in-depth analyses. Beyond the first impression, Shevek learns that the main purpose of Shevek's stay in the city is to seize the time theory and the communication machine and that they aim to use it only for their own interests. At this point, it would be appropriate to mention the organised Odoists in the city as a parenthesis. The beginning of the interrogation for Shevek is in this note he receives. "If you are an Anarchist, why are you betraying your Earth and the Odoist Hope and collaborating with the power system, or are you here to bring us that Hope? We are tired of injustice and oppression and

have turned to Brother Earth to see the light of freedom in the dark night. Join us, your brothers and sisters!" (LeGuin, p. 167). After this note, Shevek begins to re-evaluate his ideas about capitalist society. LeGuin here makes an evaluation in the context of past, present and future and a critique of existing social formations. Shevek expresses his first systematic criticism of the essence of the capitalist mode of production. He describes the essence of class societies on the basis of profit, time, damage, poverty, freedom and obey (LeGuin, p. 224). The loss of freedom, as analysed by Wegner, is heavily felt in the work and again the protagonist's comparison of the city of Urras to a huge prison and her observation that it bears the characteristics of class societies in terms of gender inequality, according to Wegner, show that Urras cannot be a utopia and that it is the possible present or future of the world (Wegner, p. 2002). In the conversations between the characters, it is seen that LeGuin criticises the current conditions. As a comparison, through Anarres, LeGuin refers to the feminism and sexual liberation movements that gained momentum at the end of the nineteen sixties with the design of Odo as a female leader, the release of his homosexuality and the discourse that all problems regarding the equality of men and women have disappeared (Maylon, p, 1986).

"We" depicts the means of oppression of an authoritarian "One State" that controls and controls the whole of people's lives and the resistance of a group of people against them. It depicts the rebellion of individuals against a system that is constructed with the promise of eternal happiness in return for taking away their right to choose, in the opposition of freedom and happiness. The authoritarian state has taken every aspect of life under its control, from the time individuals get up and go to bed to their sexuality, from the scientific activities to be done (One State Science) to which film or book to read (National Institute of Writers and Poets), and there is no autonomous space for civil liberties to find a living space. Unlimited state intervention means that individuals lose their critical thinking and end up thinking in accordance with the interests of the dominant mind¹⁰. In this sense, the fact that there is no possibility for any critical thought to come to life, let alone for opposition to gain a legal basis, shows that authoritarian states paint a pessimistic picture for the future of opposition.

Criticism of consumer society is expressed as the last common feature. The order based on the new and consumption, which is fictionalised in *Brave New World*, is expressed as the dystopia with the most intense criticism of the consumer society. The reproduction of the system becomes possible through consumption culture and is supported in all areas of life. In this context, it is seen as one of the basic values that should be taught from childhood. It is imposed at every moment through tools such as sleep learning and games. Not consuming enough is given as a fundamental value as the greatest of the crimes committed against society (Huxley, p. 73). It is intended to depict the emptiness created on people by seeing human beings as a being consisting only of consumption. Similar to the conditions created by today's post-fordist accumulation regime, working with the hunger created by the replacement of basic human values by consumption remains current.

In 1984, the level of technological development has made it possible for everyone to have equal and certain standards, but based on the assumption that a hierarchical society will survive in poverty and ignorance, a world is depicted in which what is produced is not equally distributed. The reason for the unequal distribution of resources is the threat of war. Through war, the continuity of the system is ensured through the continuation of the functioning of industry without increasing the wealth of society. In addition, technological progress is used for no other purpose than to narrow human freedom and experimental thinking is prevented. In 1984, it is explained that the party has two main aims. The first of these is to take over the entire earth and the other is to eliminate any possibility of independent thinking. Therefore, everything that is done under the name of scientific work is based on being able to read what people think. Many studies and experiments are carried out to understand what people think from their gestures, demeanour or tone of voice (Orwell, p. 209-210). In this context, *The Dispossessed* has become a place where those who are quite unfamiliar

¹⁰He questions himself in a way that shows the absence of free and critical thinking; Freedom? How interesting that the instinct to commit crimes still exists in human nature! I use the word "crime" deliberately. Freedom and crime are linked together like the speed and movement of an indivisible aeronaut. When the speed of the aeron is zero, it cannot move. Man, too, cannot commit a crime when his freedom is at zero. This is clear. To save man from crime, it is necessary to save him from freedom. And now, when we have just got rid of it, some malicious half-wits (Zamyatin, p., 48).

with the consumer society and those who have grown up with it, as well as the place where existence and non-existence meet. LeGuin Shevek's criticism of a life that is only for consumption in the world of the character *"The radio, which he has not paid much attention to since he discovered that its only purpose was to advertise the things sold..."*, you are the owners with the owners. One hundred and seventy years ago we left empty-handed, and we were right Urras is a box, a package, all wrapped up... you open the box, and what's inside? A black basement full of dust and a dead man in it. Finally, I arrived in hell...

In Biz, it is expressed that in a moral order based on four operations, music, art and all the values that make human beings human are trivialised. In the world of the character, *"it is quite interesting that the ancients could not understand the absurdity of literature, it is quite funny that people write the way they want to write"*. *"In the world of the benefactor, the sound of the waves is not an art but a great source of electricity. Poetry has ceased to be a means for the artist to express his love and has become a useful service for society"* (Zamyatin, p. 77). The world constructed by Taylor resulted in the organisation of every field of management in such a way that every hour of the day could only benefit production and the state. However, in Zamyatin's dystopia, even under these conditions, the character's questioning begins and the seeds of critical thinking begin to be sown within himself (Zamyatin, p. 173)¹¹.

Contrary to the belief that opposition will only be based on the inequality of economic living conditions and will include movements to improve material living conditions, it is stated that these dystopias are addressed to the point that criticism will sprout from cracks in the system in authoritarian-totalitarian states where economic prosperity is high but interferes in the field of freedoms. In Brave New World, the realisation that people are not "free" and the emphasis on human values, including the freedom to starve, and the eventual escape from the city at the highest economic level, emphasise the importance of civil liberties. In conditions where it is enough to have only as much knowledge as they are given in order to be good and happy members of the society, and for this purpose all the books of the past are burned, museums are closed, historical monuments are destroyed, critical thinking is prevented and it becomes possible to prevent the questioning mind, it is stated that there are questioners who think differently and that oppositional thinking about human freedom finds a chance to live (Huxley, p. 32). In 1984, Orwell draws attention to the profile of human beings in Big Brother's state, which is portrayed as bland, dull and carefree, and underlines the state of unawareness as the main danger (Orwell, p. 85)¹². This is the danger of the emergence of totalitarian governments and hierarchical societies. As never before in the history of the world, there is an overwhelming consensus to crush dissent. Through the new discourse, the formation of opposition is prevented through words. The crime of thought is eliminated through the destruction of words or the meaning of words. In this dystopia, a group of people have started to adopt different ideas and struggle for this, as an indication that every oppression will create dissenters and that it is somehow realised. *"Because freedom is to be able to say that two and two make four. If this is allowed, it will continue"*¹³ Under these conditions in the world of 1984, the opposition came into existence through the "Legendary Brotherhood" organisation. From the point of view of our protagonist, there are two main revolts. The first one, as mentioned before, is the emphasis on social

¹¹they made only one mistake: they believed that they were the ultimate... but there is no such thing... there is no such thing in nature. Their mistake was Galileo's mistake: he was right that the earth revolves around the sun, but what he didn't know was that the whole solar system revolves around another centre... we know that there is no final number. (Zamyatin, 173).

¹²"... there is a nation of warriors and zealots, three hundred million people, all with identical faces, marching in step, all thinking the same things, all shouting the same slogans, all working and fighting and triumphing and persecuting" (Orwell, p. 85).

¹³The proletariat is not allowed to have opinions on political issues. The party slogan "Proletarians and animals are free" shows that the only thing expected from the proletariat is to work and that they are not allowed to have any additional wishes and desires. In this context, a compromise even more backward than the medieval mentality prevails. Of course, the reason for this is that technology did not give the opportunities provided today to the rulers of that period. Technological development has eliminated the privacy of private life. Thus, everyone can be watched at all times and it has become possible for everyone to have the same opinion (Orwell, p. 92).

memory, which starts with keeping a diary. The second is his meeting with Julia and having sexual intercourse with her. Because sexuality is forbidden by the big brother as it creates a private space against the authority and with this act, the construction of autonomous identity is started. The design of sexuality as a rebellion is common in utopias (Booker, 1994, p. 11).

The Dispossessed is an example of a dystopia that directly addresses the sphere of social opposition in accordance with the spirit and complex structure of the social formation in which it was written, and in this context, it is of particular importance. Shevek's past, present and future are considered on a single temporal plane, and his political debates with his friends¹⁴, high-level discussions in the Syndicate¹⁵, conversations based on comparisons at the dinners he is invited to in Urras¹⁶, his speech to the people during the uprising in Anarres¹⁷, and finally the conversation with the Hain envoy¹⁸ can be seen as an emphasis on the balanced world of both freedom and happiness, that is, the "possibility of another world". Through *The Dispossessed*, LeGuin emphasises a solidarity-based social opposition. Here, thanks to communication networks, it envisages a network society that is not organised from the top down, that is decentralised and self-organising.

"He wanted all communities to be connected by communication and transport networks, so that goods and ideas could go wherever they wanted to go, business could be managed easily and quickly, and no community would be excluded from exchange and exchange. But the network would not be managed from the top down. There would be no control centres, no capitals, no institutions that would serve the self-feeding apparatus of bureaucracy and the dominating instinct of individuals who aspired to be leaders, bosses, heads of state." (LeGuin, p. 88)

Through this society he defines, he emphasises the qualities of the social opposition that started in 1968 and extends to the present day. In 1974, when *The Dispossessed* was written, the social opposition experienced a significant break in terms of actors, issues, values and forms of action. With the criticism of the social opposition, which was predominantly based on the working class in the context of its actors based on rigid, hierarchical, and vertical organisation in line with the Fordist state's form of organisation (Touraine, p. 141), a period of revolt against all existing systems began. At the centre of the critique is the rigid rule-based organisation that functions like a machine (Arrighi, Hopkins & Wallerstein, p. 112), while powerful counterpublics are constructed and *experience is incorporated into the context of life and the historical agenda* (Negt & Kluge, p. 181). In terms of their subjects, new social movements are composed of flexible structures and young activists who are orientated towards dispersed networks that have expanded to include, but are not limited to, students, the unemployed, women, environmentalists, different identities and their problems. Hardt and Negri explain this process in terms of their organisation as a network that maintains diversity while maintaining differences, enabling communication and a culture of collective action and supporting diversity in unity (Hardt & Negri, 2003, p. 13). Castells similarly argues that with the advantages provided by information technology, all areas of social life, local, regional or global, are included in an *"interconnected network and that multimodal digital horizontal communication networks are the fastest and most autonomous, interactive, reprogrammable and self-developing communication networks"* in the world and that thanks to this, social opposition, which is less hierarchical and open

¹⁴"To discover what another world is like. To see what a 'horse' is like!" ... "this responsibility is our freedom. To run away from it is to lose our freedom. Would you want to live in a society where there is no responsibility and no freedom, no choice, only a false choice of obeying the law or punishment for breaking the law? Would you want to live in a real prison?" (LeGuin, p. 46).

¹⁵"We've gone back to barbarism: if it's new, avoid it; if you can't eat it, throw it away!" (LeGuin, p. 145).

¹⁶"Do they expect students not to be anarchists?" he said. "What else can young people be? If you are at the bottom, you must organise from the bottom up!" (LeGuin, p. 113).

¹⁷"We know that no one can help us but each other, that no hand can save us if we don't reach out. Your hand is empty, just like mine. You have nothing. You own nothing. Nothing is your property. You are free. All you have is what you are and what you give.... You can't buy the Revolution. You cannot make the Revolution. You can only be the Revolution. The Revolution is either in your soul or it is nowhere." (LeGuin, p. 257).

¹⁸"This has always been the purpose of us - of our Union, of my journey - to stir things up, to break some habits. To make people ask questions." (LeGuin, p. 327).

to public participation, finds space for action (Castells, 2003, p. 28). In this context, according to Jessop, social opposition has been transformed in a complex series of multi-centred, multi-scale, multi-time, multi-form and multi-causal processes (Jessop, 2009, p. 183). In this context, it is seen that LeGuin emphasises the possibility of independent organisation, *solidarity-based political struggle emerging at the intersection of living space and class relations* (Harvey: 2013, p. 192) and leaderless, horizontally organised structures in the system she constructs, and in this context, she makes a modern critique of modernisation.

Finally, Zamyatin sees opposition in *We* as an individual hope¹⁹. It is seen as an expression of the fact that individuals fulfil their struggle against what is imposed on them in every social formation. Everything about the freedom of choice and the unhappiness of the consequences of this freedom is a description of the existence of opposition in every society.

In lieu of Conclusion

According to Ricoeur, utopia -with a sudden leap outwards- is a radical rethinking of what structures such as family, consumption, authority and religion are (Ricoeur, p. 16). Based on this utopia as an opposition or revolt against authority constitutes an important context in terms of the relationship that can be established between utopia, opposition and democracy. In societies where civil liberties do not find a living space, the system is blocked and the behaviour of opposition is fulfilled through tools such as rebellion, uprising or revolution. In this sense, these dystopian examples express the importance of defining opposition as an activity fulfilled with legal grounds in the public sphere for citizens to live in a democratic society. In a further definition, it shows that social opposition has a particularly important place in understanding whether states are authoritarian or not or their tendency towards authoritarianism. In all four dystopias analysed, the opposition has not reached the competence to eliminate the totalitarian state, but the emergence of social opposition is considered to be very important in terms of showing the failure of oppressive authorities.

Utopia opens new social forms and alternatives of life for discussion. Since utopia is a phenomenon related to the constitutive and critical powers of the modern subject, it allows us to trace both the relationship of the modern subject with other subjects, critical reason with instrumental reason, creative imagination with ideology in literary utopias and the tension between modernity and modernisation processes. In this context, through the four utopias discussed, the focus is on relating the narrowing of both civil liberties and the space for dissent and the search for forms of dissent in the face of the increasing authoritarian tendencies of the state. The argument that opposition will be realised in every social formation can be discussed through its reflection in dystopias, and ultimately it is argued that movements for the protection of civil liberties are important in the context of the future of social opposition. Civil liberties are read as autonomous spaces against the intervention of the state, and in the historical context, it is seen that in periods when this space is ignored, the opposition loses its main reason for existence. While this situation leads to political powers being able to control all areas of life, rather than eliminating the opposition, it excludes the opposition from the public sphere. This situation also opens an important area of discussion in the context of the future of democracy.

References

- AKÇORAOĞLU, A. (2018). "Küresel Neoliberal Sistemin Krizi, Çelişkileri ve Direnci: Post-Neoliberal Küresel İktisadi Düzene Geçiş Mümkün Mü?", *İktisat ve Toplum Dergisi*, Cilt: 8(90), pp: 40-53.
- ARRIGHI, G. HOPKINS T. VE WALLERSTEIN, I. (2004). *Sistem Karşıtı Hareketler*, çev. C. Kanat, B. Somay, S. Sökmen, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- ATWOOD, M. Sunuş, (2017.) Aldous Huxley, *Cesur Yeni Dünya*, çev. Ümit Tosun, 22. Baskı, İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.

¹⁹As the city witnessed the uprising of the insurgents; "tell me the last number". D-503 laughs at her ignorance: "Don't be silly, E says, they teach this even in primary school: the number of numbers is infinite, which last number do you want?". "Then," says E, "there is no last revolution. Just as there is no last number, there is no last revolution, and D-503 adds, "What's the point when everyone is happy?" ("Zamyatin, p. 172)

- BEAUCHAMP, G. (1975). "Utopia and Its Discontents", *The Midwest Quarterly*. Vol (2).
- BLOCH. E. (2007). *Umut İlkesi*, Cilt 1. Çev Tanıl Bora, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- BOOKER, M. K. (1994). *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*, London: Grennwood Press., (özel Part I).
- BURNS T. (2010). *Political Theory, Science Fiction, and Utopian Literature: Ursula K. Le Guin and The Dispossessed* ", UK: Lexington Books.
- CASTELLS, M. (2013), İsyân ve Umut Ağları, İnternet Çağında Toplumsal Hareketler, çev. Ebru Kılıç, İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- ÇÖREKÇİOĞLU, H. (2015). *Modernite ve Ütopya, 1984 ve Mülksüzler Üzerinden*, İstanbul: Sentez Yayınları.
- DAMS, C. VE STOLLE. M. (2017). *Gestapo Nazizim Döneminde Tahakküm ve Terör*, çev. Cem Şentürk, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- DANIELS, R. V. (2007). *Rise and Fall of Communism in Russia*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- FORAN, J. (2014). Devrim ve Küreselleşme: Chiapos'tan Seattle ve Ötesine, *Toplumsal Hareketler Tarih, Teori ve Deneyim* (der Doğan Çetinkaya), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- FRASER, N. (2015). Kamusal Alanı Yeniden Düşünmek, *Kamusal Alan*, Ed. Meral Özbek, 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Hil Yayın.
- HARDT, M. & NEGRI A. (2003), *İmparatorluk*, çev. Abdullah Yılmaz, 5. Basım, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- HARVEY, D. (2013). *Asi Şehirler Şehir Hakkından Kentsel Devrime Dogru*, çeviren ve sunuş Ayşe Deniz Temiz, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- HUXLEY, A. (2017). *Cesur Yeni Dünya*, çev. Ümit Tosun, 22. Baskı, İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- MORE, T. (2010). *Utopia*, Sabahattin Eyüpoğlu (çev)., Vedat Günyol ve Mina Urgan), İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- KLUGE, A. & NEG, O. (2018). Kamusalılık ve Tecrübe Burjuva ve Proleter Kamusalılığın Analizine Doğru, çev. Müge Atala, İstanbul: Notabene Yayınları.
- JESSOP, B. (2009). Kapitalist Devletin Geleceği, çev Ahmet Özcan, Ankara: Epos Yayınları.
- LEGUIN, U. (2021). *Mülksüzler*, çev. Levent Mollamustafaoğlu, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- LEVITAS, R. (1990). *The Concept of Utopia*, Great Britain: Syracuse University Press.
- MANNHEIM, K. (1979). *Ideology and Utopia*, Ed. and trans. L. Wirth and E. Shils, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- NEGRI, A. (2016). *İmparatorluktaki Hareketler Geçişler ve Görünümler*, çev Kemal Atakay, İstanbul: Otonom Yayıncılık.
- ORWELL, G. (2017). *1984*, çev. Celal Üster, 58. Baskı, İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- PAUL R. (1986). *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, Ed. George H. Taylor, New York: Columbia University Press.
- POULANTZAS, N. (2014), *Siyasal İktidar ve Toplumsal Sınıflar*, çev, Şule Ünsaldı, Ankara: Epos Yayınları.
- RICOEUR, P. (1986). *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, Ed. George H. Taylor, New York: Columbia University Press,
- SARTORI, G. (1996). Demokrasi Teorisine Geri Dönüş, çev Tuncer Karamustafaoğlu ve Mehmet Turhan, Yetkin Basımevi.
- STANLEY. J. L. (1987). Is Totalitarianism a New Phenomenon? Reflections on Hannah Arendt's Origins of Totalitarianism, *The Review of Politics*, Cilt: 49(2), Cambridge University Press.

- STEINHOFF, W. (1975). *Orwel and the Origins of 1984*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- TOURAINÉ, A. (1985) "An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements", *Social Research*, 52(4), pp: 749-787.
- TOURAINÉ, A. (2016). *Toplumdan Toplumsal Harekete, Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler*, Ed. Kenan Çayır, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Kaktüs Yayınları.
- TÜRKMEN, B. Kepeği indiririz ama Boyun Eğmeyiz Covid 19 İzolasyonunda Toplumsal Direniş, *Birikim Dergisi*, (31. Mart 2020) <https://birikimdergisi.com/guncel/10004/kepengi-indiririz-ama-boyun-egmeyiz-covid-19-izolasyonunda-toplumsal-direnis-erisim-tarihi> (8.04.2020).
- ZAMYATIN. Y. (2016), *Biz*, Füsun Tüfek çev, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- WEGNER, P. E. (2002). *Imaginary Communities: Utopia, The Nation and the Spatial Histories of Modernity*, London: University of California Press,
- WOOD, E. M. (2008). *Kapitalizm Demokrasiye Karşı, Tarihsel Maddeciliğin Yeniden Yorumlanması*, çev. Şahin Artan, İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Özet

Toplumsal muhalefet, tarihsel formasyonun bir ürünü olarak ortaya çıkmış, dönüşmüş ve şekillenmiştir. Siyasal iktidar karşısında sürekli ve sürekli kendini yeniden üretmek zorunda kalan bu olgu, devletin alanını özel alanın sınırları aleyhine genişletmesiyle birlikte giderek özünü kaybetmeye başlamıştır. Sivil özgürlükler, konuşma ve ifade özgürlüğü, basın özgürlüğü, din ve vicdan özgürlüğü vb. çekirdek haklar ile başlayarak bunları eyleme dönüştürecek haklar bağlamında (toplantı, örgütlenme hakkı vb) güvence altına alınmıştır. 20. Yüzyıl hem teknolojik hem de bilimsel gelişmeler bağlamında bu hakların bir başlangıcı olarak görülürken ileri teknolojik gelişmeler aynı zamanda sivil özgürlüklerin alanında bir yıpranma yaratmaktadır. Disiplin toplumundan denetim toplumuna doğru yaşanan gelişme çizgisinde devlet, sivil özgürlüklerin alanına doğrudan müdahale edebiliyor hale gelirken aynı zamanda bireyin davranışlarını da şekillendirerek muhalefetin özgür ve eleştirel düşünce bağlamında yerine getirilen bir olgu olmasını dönüştürmeye başlamıştır. Bu çalışma kapsamında dönüştürücü ve değiştirici etkisi bağlamında distopyalar, muhalefetin alanını ve geleceğini tartışmaya açmaktadır. Tüm sınırlamalara rağmen muhalefetin her toplumsal formasyonda yaşam bulacağı yönündeki savı desteklemek amacıyla Biz, Cesur Yeni Dünya, 1984 ve Mülksüzler isimli distopyalardaki muhalefet öğeleri incelenmiştir. Bu sayede bir bütün olan muhalefet hakkının tüm toplumsal formasyonlardaki yeri tartışmakta ve demokrasi ile arasındaki ilişki bağlamına yerleştirilmektedir.

Çalışmada ele alınan dört distopya örneği de var olan toplumsal formasyondan ileri bir tarihsel anın hikayeleştirilmesi, kapitalist üretim ilişkilerinin gelişiminin özgürlük ve mutluluk bağlamında ele alması, devletin alanı ve bireyin özel alanı arasındaki ayrımın ortadan kalkması ve nihayetinde tüketim toplumunun birey üzerindeki etkilerini tartışması bağlamında ortaklaştırılmaktadır. Her bir örnekte muhalefet yasal bir hak olmaktan çıkarılmış ve destekleyen tüm araçlarla kamusal alanın sınırları dışarısına çıkarılmıştır. Ancak tüm örneklerde görüldüğü üzere, muhalefet bulunduğu alanlardan yeniden üretilmiştir. Bu kapsamda çalışma, distopyaların otoriteye başkaldırma ve sivil özgürlüklerinin alanına yaptığı etkiyi demokrasi, muhalefet ve muhalefetin geleceği bağlamında tartışmaktadır.