



Cities of Surveillance: A Foucauldian Reading of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Arslanoğlu's *Silence Towers 2084*¹

Gözetim Şehirleri: Orwell'in 1984 ve Arslanoğlu'nun Sessizlik Kuleleri 2084 Romanlarının Foucaultcu Bir Okuması

Alper Tulgar² 

ABSTRACT

Based on Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon architectural system, Michel Foucault employs Bentham's model as a metaphor to illuminate the mechanisms of discipline and power. In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault discusses the Panopticon, a prison model designed by Jeremy Bentham in 1785. The Panopticon is a circular building with a high watchtower at its centre. In this model, the inability of the inmates to see the observer is critical since it gives them a sense of constant surveillance, which causes them to regulate themselves. Discipline is thus sustained through visibility of the inmates and the invisibility of the supervisor. Individuals are categorized, which makes controlling them simpler. With this design, the ultimate aim is to create order and obedience. Similar designs can be encountered on a large scale in dystopian cities. Cities embody the mindsets of the systems to which they belong. This analysis examines the cities that are portrayed in Kaan Arslanoğlu's novel *Silence Towers 2084*, a novel by the Turkish author and the city in the renowned *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell from a Foucauldian stance. Both cities demonstrate how control and discipline are ordained through the visibility of citizens, revealing the urban exercise of power. The reason for selecting these two novels is their portrayal of how individuals are taken under control by various tools embedded in everyday life. While the city in Arslanoğlu's 2084 showcases a more advanced society with technologies absent in Orwell's 1984, it ultimately lacks crucial elements such as individualism, diversity, and autonomy. Orwell's city presents a stark contrast. There are the megastructures of the ministries with wealthy neighbourhoods and areas in poverty. In those areas, the underprivileged live without meeting even their most basic needs as humans. In comparison, Arslanoğlu's city has a more synthetic quality. Cities in both novels function like Bentham's panopticon by incorporating mechanisms of surveillance, categorisation, discipline and self-regulation. In these cities, where visibility acts as a means of self-regulation and internalizing discipline without questioning, a disciplinary society, as Foucault suggests, emerges.

Key Words: City, Panopticonism, 1984, 2084, Foucault

ÖZ

Jeremy Bentham'ın Panoptikon mimari sisteminden yola çıkarak Michel Foucault, disiplin ve iktidar mekanizmalarını açıklamak için Bentham'ın modelini bir metafor olarak kullanmıştır. *Disiplin ve Ceza: Hapishanenin Doğuşu* adlı eserinde Foucault, Jeremy Bentham tarafından 1785'te tasarlanan bir hapishane modeli olan Panoptikon'u ele alır. Panoptikon, merkezinde yüksek bir gözetleme kulesi bulunan dairesel bir yapıdır. Bu modelde, mahkumların gözlemciyi görememesi kritik öneme sahiptir çünkü bu durum onlara sürekli bir gözetim hissi verir ve bu da kendilerini denetlemelerine neden olur. Böylece disiplin, mahkumların görünürlüğü ve gözetmenin görünmezliği ile sağlanır. Bireyler kategorilere ayrılır ve bu da onları kontrol etmeyi kolaylaştırır. Bu tasarımda nihai amaç düzen ve itaat yaratmaktır. Benzer tasarımlara distopik şehirlerde büyük ölçekte rastlanabilir çünkü şehirler, ait oldukları sistemlerin zihniyetlerini somutlaştırır. Bu analiz, Türk yazar Kaan Arslanoğlu'nun *Sessizlik Kuleleri 2084* ve George Orwell'in ünlü *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* romanlarında tasvir edilen şehirleri Foucaultcu bir bakış açısıyla inceler. Her iki şehir de vatandaşların görünürlüğüyle kontrolün ve disiplinin nasıl sağlandığını, kentsel güç kullanımının nasıl ortaya çıkarıldığını göstermektedir. Bu iki romanın seçilmesinin nedeni, bireylerin günlük

¹ This article is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled "The Change of the City in One Hundred Years: Arslanoğlu's *Silence Towers 2084* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" presented at the Taras Shevchenko 7th International Congress on Social Sciences, Ankara, Türkiye, on November, 24–25, 2021. It, however, approaches the topic from a different analytical perspective and includes additional discussion and findings.

² **Corresponding Author | Yetkili Yazar:** Atatürk University, School of Foreign Languages, alper.tulgar@atauni.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-8784-0795



yaşama yerleştirilmiş çeşitli araçlar tarafından şehirlerde nasıl kontrol altına alındığını göstermektedir. Arslanoğlu'nun *2084* romanındaki şehir, Orwell'in *1984* romanında bulunmayan teknolojilere sahip daha gelişmiş bir toplumu yansıtırken nihayetinde bireysellik, çeşitlilik ve özerklik gibi önemli unsurlardan yoksundur. Orwell'in şehri ise tam bir tezat oluşturur. Şehrin bakanlıkların mega yapılarının olduğu zengin mahalleleri ve yoksul bölgeleri vardır. Bu bölgelerde, dezavantajlı kesimler en temel ihtiyaçlarını bile karşılayamamaktadır. Buna karşılık, Arslanoğlu'nun şehri daha sentetik bir niteliğe sahiptir. Her iki romandaki şehirler, gözetim, sınıflandırma, disiplin ve özdenetim mekanizmalarını bir araya getirerek Bentham'ın panoptikonu gibi işlev görür. Görünürlüğün özdenetim ve sorgulamadan disiplini içselleştirmenin bir aracı olarak işlev gördüğü bu şehirlerde, Foucault'nun öne sürdüğü gibi disiplinli bir toplum ortaya çıkar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kent, Panoptikon, 1984, 2084, Foucault

INTRODUCTION

The city as Diana Agrest suggests, has always been a special place for architects and planners who consider it a place where all kinds of structures and systems are imaginable. The city is regarded to be a place full of potential for new ideas and arrangements. While the city holds the possibility of endless new orders, there is also a risk of its being a place where these orders “annihilate, support, or, destroy each other” (1980, p. 8). The relationship between the city and literature has been an area of interest for scholars due to endless types of representation. According to Kristiaan Versluys (2000, p. 228), studies focusing on literary texts suggest that cities are full of meaning, shaped by ideas and symbols. Keeping in mind that the critic is referring to the year 2000, Versluys compares the recent studies of the period to older studies and concludes that new ones consider cities as places where different ideas and beliefs are in rivalry. The critic suggests that viewing cities as places of ideas and beliefs can make the physical reality of the city seem less important or entirely redundant. The critic opposes the approach to taking the city as a mere form of connotation and argues that the best studies have been able to combine this view of cities as symbolic with the real-life experiences of real people. City thus loses its essence once it is interpreted as merely a form of symbolic meaning. City in literary texts has been viewed from various perspectives. Richard Lehan, in his seminal work, for instance, puts forward that Daniel Defoe depicted the city as a place which emerged out of commercial needs and as a place with new opportunities for a rising class. Charles Dickens, on the other hand, had a more cynical view on city as a place changed by materialism, which had made people more unsympathetic and less compassionate (1998, p. 4). From the emergence of the novel as a literary genre to the 19th century, the meaning of cities thus changed drastically. City has turned into a phenomenon embedded with different ideas attributed to it by different authors. According to Lehan, as cities become more complex physically due to their expansion beyond their limits, they present challenges for individuals since the city now leads them to be more passive. Lehan attracts attention to individuals' passivity in their relationship to their surroundings: “As the city becomes more complex as a physical structure, the ways of seeing it become more difficult and the individual more passive in relationship to it” (2023, p. 8). The critic also links the emergence of cities to a surplus of food, which enabled the division of tasks, making them easier and more diverse, which can also be attributed to the birth of civilization in this sense since a surplus of food meant more free time and, thus, more development. The critic, however, states that this diversity also introduced challenges related to maintaining order. As the cities grew larger due to the industrial era, more significant environmental issues, such as pollution and the emergence of slums arose (1998, p. 8). The growing complexity of the city suggests that people fail to understand it as a whole because it is much larger than one can imagine. As a result of this failure to grasp it as a whole entity, individuals become more passive in their relationship with the city. Instead of an active relationship with it, they may become merely observers who are overwhelmed by its massiveness and complexity.

Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon Model and Michel Foucault's Interpretation

In *The Order of Things*, Michel Foucault explores two contrasting concepts: utopias and heterotopias. Foucault distinguishes between utopias, which are depicted by the critic as imaginary and idealized

places that inspire hope, and heterotopias, which are often discomfoting and unsettling. He describes utopian spaces as perfect cities with wide avenues, gardens, and a life of ease for their inhabitants, even though these places and the paths to reach them exist only in fantasy. On the other hand, Foucault states that heterotopias are real spaces in society that disrupt our usual ways of thinking and using language since they clearly challenge how we name and classify things, which makes it hard to connect words with their meanings. The unsettling nature of heterotopias thus creates confusion which eventually becomes unsettling. Michel Foucault states: “*Utopias* afford consolation: although they have no real locality there is nevertheless a fantastic, untroubled region in which they are able to unfold; they open up cities with vast avenues, superbly planted gardens, countries where life is easy, even though the road to them is chimerical” (1994, p. xviii). The critic stresses the idealized nature of utopias and the reason they appear comforting to the reader. On the contrary, the existence of heterotopias is undeniable; however, they fail to provide comfort as utopias do because they disrupt conventional thought and language: “*Heterotopias* are disturbing: probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this *and* that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy ‘syntax’ in advance” (Foucault, 1994, p. xviii). The article “Troubles in Theory VI: From Utopia to Heterotopia” by Anthony Vidler, published in *The Architectural Review*, examines the evolution of spatial theory from the Modernist concept of utopia to Michel Foucault’s suggestion of heterotopia. Vidler examines how Modernist architects and theorists dealt with utopias and considered them as perfect environments achievable through design to establish ideal societies; however, these utopian concepts frequently failed to consider the complexities and challenges that are present in non-imaginary social settings. In contrast, Vidler asserts that Foucault suggested the notion of heterotopia, which recognized the presence of “other” real spaces in society, such as cemeteries, prisons, gardens, asylums, and even theatres and cinemas, that are not in line with traditional spatial norms, and they have multiple layers of meaning and exist beyond the borders of society and daily life. Vidler (2014) also emphasizes that Foucault was able to make a shift from the idea of a perfect society, which is stressed in utopia, to recognizing the diverse and various spaces we actually encounter in society, and he called it heterotopia. From this perspective, the city as a whole entity in this study will be treated as a heterotopia because the cities in *1984* and *Silence Towers 2084* challenge conventional norms and social structures; they exist beyond societal expectations, serving as “other” spaces where various meanings are understood in a multi-layered context. Categorizing an entire city as heterotopic is a complicated issue since based on Foucault’s theory, heterotopic spaces exist within a society but in separate buildings. Although Michel Foucault does not directly define or elaborate on *dystopias* in his works in detail, his ideas about power dynamics, various spaces, and social control provide valuable insights into how dystopias might be perceived within his theories. Besides his views on utopias and heterotopias, dystopias could be interpreted based on Foucault’s discussions and views on utopias, since a clear contrast could be drawn between them, and on the exercise of power, control, and biopolitics. For instance, based on Jeremy Bentham’s suggestion of *Panopticon* in 1785, Foucault discussed in his acclaimed work *Discipline and Punish* (1995) that architecture and space can be used to enforce constant surveillance on individuals, which eventually turns into self-regulation. A dystopian city, in this sense, could be one where power is abused through various technological tools rather than a *Panopticon*, a tower that allows with its design to observe every movement of prisoners. This idea of a technological *Panopticon* offers constant surveillance and discipline and strict control on citizens, creating a city (a space in this regard) that enforces total submissive behaviours that do not reflect individuality or autonomy. Foucault discusses Betham’s *Panopticon*:

“All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy. By the

effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery.” (1995, p. 200)

While a building with a suitable architectural design provides complete surveillance of individuals, a city as a whole can function as a watchtower. The cities in the years 1984 and 2084 are similar in this respect to a *Panopticon*, which allows no room for personal freedom, even in their minds. While Foucault describes heterotopias as “other spaces” within a society that challenge societal norms, they could also have dystopian features attributed to them. For instance, a prison (which is regarded to be a heterotopia) may be presented as a dystopia, creating harsh conditions. Heterotopias, thus, often mirror darker and more oppressive features of a society. A dystopic city, in this sense, could be considered a heterotopic entity, which is an “other space” within other non-dystopic cities.

The City as a Modern Panopticon Prison

In addition to the dystopic features of cities, another notable aspect that major urban centres share is their immense size, which makes their residents feel overwhelmed. Ihab Hassan's statement, “Thus dystopia becomes a synonym of megalopolis” (1981, p. 97) refers to Jean Gottmann's concept of “Megalopolis.” Jean Gottmann's concept defines an urban region of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C., which is characterized by continuous urbanization, economic growth, and connection between these major cities. In his seminal work, *Megalopolis: The Urbanized Northeastern Seaboard of the United States* (1961), Gottmann described this corridor from Boston to Washington D.C. and named it “Megalopolis.” Gottmann highlighted the interconnectedness of these urban centres and noted their shared features, such as high population density, economic interdependence, continuous growth, and cultural and technological development (1961). This term has since been used more broadly, not limited to the Boston-Washington corridor, to describe similar massive urban areas worldwide. Hassan, by referring to Megalopolis, suggests that massive urban centres are often associated with various features that dystopian societies share. These characteristics are related to overpopulation, excessive use of technology, environmental problems, such as pollution and deforestation, social inequality, and the emergence of slums. Although dystopian cities and megalopolises are similar in terms of the features that shape their urban landscapes, they differ greatly in terms of ideologies, and thus, it is not fair to assume that every megalopolis may be associated with dystopian cities where strict control over citizens who do not possess individuality is a common practice. On the other hand, some megalopolises in the real world where towering structures shape the city's vertical profile can be associated with those in many dystopian narratives, as it is clear in the selected works in this study. The ostensible similarities between fictional and real-world cities largely depend on the governing system and the prevailing ideologies and passive attitudes of their citizens.

In Leslie Fiedler's essay “Mythicizing the City”, the long history of moving to cities is discussed along with the reasons for humans leaving rural areas. The critic emphasizes the meaning of “civilization” (people gathering together to form *civis*, i.e., city) and “politics” (living together in *polis*, i.e., city). Fiedler identifies the city as both a symbol of human progress and a space that has lost some of its original essence since Aristotle put forward that “no one is truly human, but either a god or a beast” referring to those who do not live in a society (1981, p. 113). The meaning and essence of cities were once centred on building a civilization with a diverse population working in various fields based on their merits. However, this aspect of cities has changed over time. In dystopian narratives, the essence and meaning of cities shift to serving the ruling class and creating an unsettling atmosphere for their citizens who feel the constant pressure. In the selected works, the dystopian cities of 1984 and 2084 can be viewed as open prisons rather than strong civilizations founded on the comfort of their inhabitants.

The city, from this perspective and Foucault's interpretation of Jeremy Bentham's model can be conceptualized as a panopticon as a whole instead of breaking it into smaller units and buildings. Dealing with the city as a panopticon in dystopian novels serves the purpose to showcase how docile citizens can turn into due to feeling under constant observation. Although Jeremy Bentham's original panopticon initially served as a sole architectural design for prisons, rather than a metaphor for abusive power, Michel Foucault reinterpreted it and expanded its usage as a powerful metaphor for modern systems of surveillance and social control. In this study, the cities in the selected novels have been treated as two panopticons that controlled the societies and ensured complete dominance of the governments.

1. A Foucauldian Reading of Arslanoğlu's *Silence Towers 2084* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Urban Symbols: Cities as Narratives, Not Just Structures

From a historical perspective, Diana Agres discusses how different historical periods, such as the Renaissance and the 17th century, have influenced the representation of the city. The cities had a variety of purposes, ranging from analogies to hidden meanings and allegories. The urban transformation of cities, like Rome under Pope Sixtus V, illustrates how urban planning and architecture have been used for a specific purpose to convey ideological, religious, and political messages. Rather than confining the sacred to a specific area within the city walls, the entire city undertakes the role of being sacred and thus carries an ideological role (1980, pp. 9-11).

Considering the cities as holy and divinely favoured places caused them to be the centres of various religious activities since they were home to many temples and other religiously important structures, such as churches or mosques. The city then had a secret meaning filled with religious feelings and purposes. The city is thus not simply composed of structures, the designs of which change over time, for people to live. It reflects the dominant ideas, beliefs, and mindsets that people hold in a specific era. In *Silence Towers 2084*, churches continue to exist within the city, and people still conduct religious ceremonies; however, the overall message the city conveys to its residents is far from one of comfort. The sacred nature of cities with religious structures juxtaposed with the negative aspects of corruption and tyranny in dystopic narratives is quite surprising. Comparatively, Rob Latham and Jeff Hicks (2014) state that in dystopias, the city holds negative features such as tyranny, decay, and destruction. The authors put forward that, especially after World War I, dystopias became more popular by introducing oppressive and hopeless places instead of positive and hopeful environments. It is clear that in dystopias, the city reflects the features of the oppressive regime of its government. This controlled environment displays the social, political, and economic difficulties people go through. The ruling class has total control over citizens, which causes the city to be under constant surveillance. The city is depicted as a gloomy, hopeless, and lifeless environment. People with limited freedom are unable to explore what the city offers to them. It thus serves as a powerful symbol of dehumanization, oppression, and societal degeneration.

Latham and Hicks observe that despite the clear contradictions between the two cities of Orwell's and Zamyatin's, both exhibit the trait that meaningful relationships cannot be established since the constant fear of betrayal prevents people from building stronger connections (2014, p. 166). While London is depicted as dull and gloomy, OneState is more technologically advanced, shiny, and sterile; nevertheless, in OneState, people are still dehumanized and alienated as they are in London. The same contrast exists between 1984 and 2084. The artificial and controlled environment that OneState offers its citizens does not allow them to express their individualities, just as the sterile environment in 2084 fails to do for its inhabitants. In OneState, the city creates the illusion of a perfect and well-regulated society; however, it becomes clear that a strict authoritarian and corrupt

regime controls it. It is a highly industrialized and technologized city with little or no connection to nature or human connections.

Cities, therefore, can be seen not merely as collections of architectural structures but as symbolic constructs shaped by their authors' use of specific metaphors, meanings, and attributions. This is particularly clear in dystopian settings where cities function as more than physical spaces for the characters to interact since they become saturated with symbolic significance and layered allusions. The authors of *1984* and *Silence Towers 2084* in this context use their imaginary cities beyond their physical restrictions. The cities in these two narratives were designed specifically to undermine any individuality. Thinkers like Foucault, Lefebvre, and Marcuse explore this concern for designing space to suppress freedom, creativity, and originality. In *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre (1991), for instance, argues that space is shaped by power relations instead of being neutral and without meaning. He states that space introduces the interests of the dominant powers of the era to control urban life. In *The Right to the City (Le Droit à la ville)*, Lefebvre (1996) advocates for people's right to reclaim urban spaces from the dominant powers created by capitalism. It is stressed that cities should be able to mirror the identities of their citizens instead of fulfilling the desires and needs of specific groups and elites. Similarly, the citizens in the years 1984 and 2084 are unable to live in urban spaces that prioritize individuality and diversity. These two cities reflect that they are designed for absolute control, uniformity, and exclusion.

Dystopian Cities in 1984 and 2084 as Panopticons

Moving to cities is not always a deliberate choice but a compulsory action for many. Baldwin suggests that cities are one of the most visible products of the Industrial Revolution and implies that people moved from rural areas to cities not voluntarily but compulsorily, since they had no other option. Urbanization can thus be considered one of the unavoidable outcomes of the Industrial Revolution, rather than a deliberate and natural result (1981, p. 134).

The compulsory move to cities, due to economic change, more job opportunities, mechanization, and mass production, (Hobsbawm, 1962) created unprecedented challenges in social life. Alienation from nature and being confined into cities, where space is strictly regulated by dominant powers, can be attributed to the notion that urban spaces can function as modern panoptic systems. Multiple factors contribute to the notion of urban spaces as modern panoptic spaces. The existence of CCTV cameras, biometric facial recognition technologies, and smart technologies capable of monitoring individuals creates an open panoptic space where citizens may fail to realise whether they are being watched or not. This feeling of uncertainty leads to self-regulatory behaviours due to the sense of being under constant surveillance. Discipline is thus internalized. In this context, the central tower that Bentham suggests to allow visibility in the prison is the digital surveillance system, which is more efficient and effective. Dystopian cities can thus be panoptic systems where power is sustained through visibility, discipline, and self-regulation.

In the novel *Silence Towers 2084*, nature appears almost always as a soothing and peaceful element compared to the city where people live forcibly due to limited resources in rural areas. When the supervisor watches her child playing in the schoolyard, she suddenly realizes the existence of her intimate and warm-hearted feelings for her child, which is not logical in the gloomy future. She finds it difficult to understand the concept and significance of being a birth parent. She calls her feelings "banal" (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 14). The system in 2084 alienates individuals from even their closest relatives, which can be regarded as a sequence of *1984*. The inspector, who is in charge of the welfare of the system, cannot experience feelings that cannot be defended in this dystopic society. At this moment, the narrator remembers a lake on the hill: "I am happy that it appeared and got inside my head" (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 15), which indicates that people clearly grew away from nature

and became a part of the massive city. City life is engrossing, suffocating people while nature remains a distant image that occasionally soothes them in their dreams.

The narrator compares the old world to the new world stating her thoughts fiercely as the defender and protector of the new-founded system. She accuses human overpopulation of icebergs melting and collapsing (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 26). It seems that all previous cities were destroyed and later rebuilt with the help of advanced technology. People ran out of clean water and food; forests around the world were burned down, and people began to kill each other (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 26). The result is that the majority of the population now lives in cities instead of living in the countryside. This compulsory move to cities is similar to the one in the Industrial Revolution: “[W]e grew pine trees as high as poplar trees in two years, we grew forests. We filled new lakes for ourselves. Soon fish will play in our seas” (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 27). The resemblance of the new world to the old is evident; however, the artificiality is also obvious. The natural cycle is corrupted and provided by advanced technological developments. The narrator wished to stress that the world was born out of its ashes. The city in the novel seems to be flawless, clean, well-structured, and in order (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 16). While one side of the city, with a high-tech and majestic facade, appears to be a part of a utopic society, the other side belongs to a dystopian nation as in *Blade Runner*, which was able to “epitomize the postmodern city. Despite depicting a future world where corporations have replaced governments and advertising has merged with art, the towering and technological splendour of this late capitalist panorama offers its own kind of utopian beauty” (Bentley, 2014, p. 175). Bentley also points out that besides the city’s seemingly utopian features, watching closely, it eventually displays dystopian features such as overcrowded streets and a gloomy atmosphere (2014, p. 175). The opening scenes of *Blade Runner* portray a vision of the post-modern city with towering high-tech buildings, a government replaced by massive corporations, and a world nearly unreal. A new feudal order, where big technological corporations control the wealth and the majority of the population becomes dependent on them, is apparent in the movie. There is also a striking contrast between this utopic face of the city and the reality behind it, with overcrowded streets below the skyscrapers. This contrast reflects the disparity between the technologically advanced world and the impoverished communities living in poverty. While the city, on the surface, is reflected as harmonious, developed, and aesthetic, alienated citizens live in dystopic and hopeless conditions. This stark contrast is also evident in Arslanoğlu’s novel, in the city with two faces. The main character of the novel, the inspector, who works in the Head Office and lives in public housing, however, does not accept this duality at the beginning of the novel. The Head Office controls people and selects the ones who are deviant from the accepted norms. Besides the tall towers in the city, a statue seems to be important to the inspector. There is a 40-metre-long cross in the centre and the figure of Jesus Christ. On the ground, just under the statue of Jesus Christ, is located the statue of Confucius, where the inspector meditates. The inspector specifies “the grand symbol” (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 30) of this statue, standing as a way to show respect to the wise people of the old world. Beneath these symbolic and religious structures lies a dystopian undercurrent that suppresses any questioning of the system.

In a similar fashion, in George Orwell’s dystopian city, questioning the system is strictly forbidden, and a reconstructed and rewritten past becomes the enemy. In a children’s history textbook, the past is always criticised, and people are intimidated and oppressed by a fearful tale told by the media constantly. This fear is so immense that people struggle to know what to believe:

In the old days (it ran), before the glorious Revolution, London was not the beautiful city that we know today. It was a dark, dirty, miserable place where hardly anybody had enough to eat and where hundreds and thousands of poor people had no boots on their feet and not even a roof to sleep under. (Orwell, 2021, p. 67)

Constantly comparing the old system to the new one and demonizing the previous system by portraying it as morally disgraceful and dangerous to the citizens enables the government to create an enemy that will help preserve the status quo and ensure a disciplined society. Ironically, the previous system is described as threatening, cruel, and supportive of practices that violate human rights. It can be deduced that the created wrongful narrative aims to foster animosity among citizens. London is described as a beautiful city by the media; however, the war still continues and devastates it. War has a significant effect in the novel, especially for the sake of the narrative created by the media. The party aims to control the citizens by intimidating them with the war. By explicitly stating that war is peace, it is highly probable that the war is fabricated by the Party although its effects are real, destroying the city and demolishing the houses. The fabricated war between Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia is maintained by the Party to preserve the status quo. The citizens of London appear to be held captive in a city with imaginary walls similar to the Panopticon of Bentham's. Katie Barclay and Jade Riddle discuss how historic European cities used walls not just as physical boundaries for protection from their enemies but as symbols of creating a sense of belonging, which separates their residents from the wilderness. The critics emphasise that the city walls served as a boundary that separated the civilisation from the rural, which was considered dangerous since it was unknown. However, these city walls no longer served their initial purpose since cities have turned into massive urban centres. Threats are no longer associated with the rural but with unknown neighbours and urban problems such as noise or pollution. On the contrary, the rural was idealised as safe and traditional spaces compared to urban centres (2021, p. 3). The perception of threats to individuals thus changes over time. In dystopian narratives, the apparent threat comes from the ruling class. Panopticon-like power is therefore exercised by the ruling class to maintain control through surveillance, discipline, and threat.

Urban Panopticons in 1984 and 2084: the Fabrication of Disciplined and Compliant Citizens

In 1984, London is fictionalized, and a gloomy atmosphere pervades the novel. Daan Wesselman, in his book, highlights the increasing significance of cities in Western culture and literature, especially since the 19th century. He states that the city is no longer portrayed as a mere setting but as a central "actor" in cultural works, such as Dickens' London, Zola's and Balzac's Paris, or Dos Passos' New York. This new approach, dealing with the city as a main character, to cities has gained attention in the humanities since while urban development has long been studied in social sciences, the humanities have ignored it for a long time and have since the 1980s focused more on the representation of cities in art and literature (Wesselman, 2023).

These main characters in the selected novels create highly disciplined, obedient, and "docile bodies". Foucault, in his seminal work, states:

Thus discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an 'aptitude', a 'capacity', which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection. (1995, p. 138)

According to Foucault, discipline in a sense creates "docile bodies" that are both capable (in terms of production) and obedient. The obedience prevents them from taking part in any kind of rebellious acts. Thus, discipline becomes highly useful for those who have control over it since it increases one's capability and shapes the body in line with the needs of the power. In the selected works, "docile bodies" are frequently encountered since discipline is predominant in both societies.

London, for instance, as a central actor in the novel, is part of Oceania, a big nation with strict rules. As history is continuously changed and rewritten, the reader suspects that it is the year 1984; however, it is not known with absolute certainty. However, in Arslanoğlu's novel, it is clear that the year is 2084, as the author references Orwell's novel. Obedience is the key to survival in this society. Individuals can be sacrificed for the sake of the community. Jessica O'Leary examines how cities in southern Catholic Europe responded to the Protestant Reformation by utilising urban landscapes to proclaim their Catholic identity and demonstrate political independence. The cityscape thus serves the purpose of highlighting a community's religious or political hegemony by evoking the glories of the past, which evokes pride. The urban environment served as a tool for political and spiritual ceremonies, combining spiritual and political power emerging from the historical significance of the city (2021, p. 20). This strategy aims to create a sense of pride, which can be observed in dystopian narratives since the totalitarian regimes use the cityscape to promote their ideologies as in the case of the Big Brother. Within this constructed narrative, people live in poverty.

The city of London is divided between three social groups. While the members of the Inner Party, the wealthiest social group, live in luxury, the members of The Outer Party do not have the right to own property. They are surveilled all the time. Winston, the protagonist is one of these members. The lowest social group, stripped of any rights, lives in slums where they do not possess any basic human rights. Living in these poor conditions, they do not even protest, accepting their fate because they think that in the past, living conditions were harsher than the present. In 1984, the city is divided into different parts where people lived based on their classes. While a luxurious life is provided to the members of the Inner Party, slums are underdeveloped areas where the working class and the marginalised groups live in substandard conditions. The streets of the city are used to make propaganda and spread misinformation. The posters of Big Brother are hung on the walls to make people feel intimidated, and personal freedom is eradicated. The city in 1984 has three faces. It is clear that poverty shapes the face of the slums. While clear signs of poverty and deprivation are presented in the novel, the other face of the city with the extravagant and wasteful megastructures of the ministries is highlighted as well. Due to the unequal distribution of wealth in society, the city reflects this disparity with its buildings, neighbourhoods, and living conditions. The megastructures of the ministries, built to showcase the power of the government, reflect the juxtaposition of the neighbourhoods in poor conditions. There seems to be a clear duality that reflects economic inequality in society and also criticizes disproportionately distributed wealth, poor housing policies, and social inequalities that ignore the needs of the marginalized communities in society. The clear contrast between these megastructures demonstrating the glamorous advancements of the country and disadvantaged communities where even the basic needs are not covered presents the reader London with more than one face. These megastructures, such as The Ministry of Love, The Ministry of Plenty, The Ministry of Peace, and The Ministry of Truth, shape and define the city, whereas underprivileged communities are ignored. Poverty can be considered to be an efficient tool to create "docile bodies" in Orwell's novel since being under constant economic pressure, citizens are more inclined to comply with the demand of those in power. They discipline themselves without demonstrating rebellious acts. However, Arslanoğlu approaches the creation of *docile bodies* from a different perspective, creating a more sterile and technological society.

Disciplinary Techniques and Mental Erasure

In Arslanoğlu's novel, population growth is criticized and considered to be one of the most devastating problems of the past. There is a similar approach followed in the mindset of the ruling class. The past is so intimidating that people can willingly let go of their past. In the year 2084, the Head Office, reminiscent of a powerful ministry from 1984, erases people's memories of their troubled pasts and forbids them from forming intimate bonds, not even with their own children.

Even in their own perceptions, individuals lack true autonomy. The inspector has a child, but she does not have any intimate feelings. She sees herself as merely a biological mother feeling no attachment to her child. Both narratives portray disciplinary societies in which citizens are shaped into *docile bodies* through power tools such as strict control, discipline, and surveillance. In each, the characters internalize the demands of authority unquestionably and comply with the expectations of power without much opposition. The narrator, for instance, describes Winston in 1984 after constant torture and interrogation: “He accepted everything. The past was alterable. The past had never been altered. Oceania was at war with Eastasia. Oceania had always been at war with Eastasia” (Orwell, 1949, p. 211). This quote shows that Winston surrenders to the Party’s reshaping of the truth. The Party’s manipulations and lies are not questioned by the protagonist, and Winston no longer shows resistance and internalizes the Party’s version of reality completely. Another example of Winston’s turning into a *docile body* is when he is tortured in Room 101. He betrays Julia to save himself from his phobia of rats: “Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don’t care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me. Julia! Not me!” (1949, p. 218). Winston’s betrayal of Julia is strong evidence of his complete breakdown and complete transformation into a docile, disciplined, and submissive body. The last line of the novel demonstrates Winston’s radical change: “He loved Big Brother.” (1949, p. 226). This is the most unsettling example of the character’s passiveness and submission. Winston is entirely transformed into a person who is emotionally in line with the authority he once wanted to destroy.

While Orwell’s narrative relies on more organizational tools of enforcing discipline, such as manipulation, the use of media and propaganda, and the institutional forms of discipline (threats of the Ministries), Arslanoğlu’s narrative depends more on the use of advanced technologies such as surveillance cameras, wiping memories, and restructuring the human brain. The use of excessive technology ensures complete submission and makes any rebellious acts instantly futile. Despite their different tools, both narratives eventually illustrate to the reader that power reshapes individuals and transforms them into compliant and “docile bodies”.

Surveillance and Submission: How Technology Breeds Docility

Both cities mirror the systems which they are governed with. People mainly live in large cities, which serve as the symbols of oppression and pessimism. Individuality is oppressed by the government in these large cities where people grow away from nature, which arises alienation and isolation. Technology, instead of being used to serve people, is utilized as a tool for the oppressors, who have weaponized it to control and manipulate the masses. In 2084, technology is praised by the supervisor, who is unable to see the truth yet. The supervisor similar to Winston at the end of the novel is submissive and aligns with power.

To reinforce the ideological conformity and spread misinformation, the reality is distorted and identical to 1984, the past is demonized by those in power. Technology in urban life thus becomes a means of control and manipulation. In 2084, technology is more advanced unlike 1984. As it is clear, technology in the novel 1984 is not very different from that of the 20th century. However, in 2084, people believe in technology which is considered their only saviour. Without it, they would not have created the world as it is today. Although artificiality is apparent, they praise technological developments for offering them a chance to change the past. In 1984, technology serves as a means of oppression, leaving us uncertain if we are truly in 1984 due to the dramatic changes in history since it is rewritten constantly to distort people’s memories and their sense of reality.

Telescreens in 1984, as an effective tool of surveillance, observe everyone in the city, tracking their every action, which results in an invasion of personal space: “The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper,

would be picked up by it" (Orwell, 1949, p. 6). This shows how personal space and privacy are entirely eradicated in society. Citizens have no sanctuary from state surveillance, not even in their own homes. On the other hand, in 2084, a more developed use of technology is observed as technology is used to erase people's memories. Similar to 1984, history is manipulated and reconstructed according to a narrative. Technology is praised and represented as a saviour: "We bred, we bred, we could not fit into the seas and the plains. We consumed the crops and dried up the waters like locusts. We eventually butchered one another. We were warned though" (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 26). The issue of overpopulation is stressed in this example. Through technology, the population has been stabilized, and the efficient use of resources has been maintained. The past in both novels is sharply criticized in accordance with the established narrative. Traditional practices are condemned to pave the way for the system that undermines individuality: "We were stupid, yes, but our intelligence could not be underrated. We put the technology into use, we improved the electronics, computers, bionics, we increased our intelligence tenfold" (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 26). The city in 2084 is sterile yet also artificial: "We cleaned the atmosphere, repaired the slits. We captured the demons of the trees, in two years we grew pines that were as tall as poplars, and we made the forests green. We filled new lakes for ourselves. Soon, even fish will play in our seas" (Arslanoğlu, 2007, p. 27). The cities in both novels reveal dual identities, one of which is utopic and sterile while the other is dystopic and gloomy.

Discussion and Conclusion

Authors have been anthropomorphizing cities by treating them as main characters and also attaching hidden meanings to them for the reader to explore. The cities portrayed in both novels I have examined in this study mirror the mindset of the oppressive systems of their totalitarian governments. The well-organized but rather artificial setting in the year 2084 is marked by a strict intolerance for any humane feelings. The high buildings in both novels, the Head Office and the ministries and the statues of figures like Jesus Christ and Confucius empower the city and intimidate its residents. The denial of personal identity and intimate feelings are disregarded, and the Orwellian city is characterized by complete suppression of individual freedoms. Giant screens broadcasting constant propaganda for the party and the Big Brother, and grey and cold buildings creating discomfort for the residents are tools to control the population. Posters and telescreens disseminate misinformation and manipulate individuals.

Arslanoğlu draws parallels to George Orwell's influential novel, in fact, as a tribute to it. He suggests that, a century later, society remains under the control of a tyrannical regime that now employs more advanced technology for suppression than ever. The cities depicted in both novels reflect the mindset imposed by the systems of the tyrannical regimes, suggesting individuals have a more improved quality of life in the present compared to previous periods. There appears to be a forced equality which leads to an enforced sameness, especially in the year 2084. This well-established and highly organized dystopian city is characterized by artificiality, strict discipline, and zero tolerance for individuality. The structures serve as powerful symbols of oppression and denial of selfhood. In contrast, George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four illustrates the life of thirty-nine-year-old Winston Smith within an entirely submissive society. The city's streets are utilized as instruments of propaganda by the Party and Big Brother.

Both narratives selected in this study depict the cities as panoptic spaces (similar to prisons) where surveillance, control, and discipline mechanisms reshape their identities to make them align with the demands of power. Since Arslanoğlu's narrative unfolds one hundred years after Orwell's novel, his fictional city reflects the Panopticon space shaped by Orwellian instruments such as thought control, propaganda, surveillance, and discipline. The dystopian cities in the narratives reflect totalitarian regimes, docile citizenship, and a complete disregard for personal space. The cities do not merely

comprise physical structures but also effective tools of the ruling class to create *docile bodies* that comply with the expectations and demands of those in power. Autonomy and free will are completely void, which strengthens the claim that these two cities are in fact aligned with the Panopticon model. Adapting the model to a whole city instead of smaller units showcases the true hegemony of the ruling classes in the selected narratives. In these highly controlled environments, while Arslanoğlu's novel relies heavily on technological developments beyond imagination for the time being, Orwell's acclaimed novel deals mostly with traditional manipulation techniques and propaganda of the Party. These Panoptic spaces intensify the sense of alienation and loneliness, resulting in the acceptance of power and disregarding one's autonomy and freedom. Ultimately, both narratives show the reader that modern cities can evolve into urban environments where mechanisms of power ensure visibility of citizens, leaving no room for any rebellious acts or personal space.

Compliance with Ethical Standard Conflict of Interests: There is no conflict of interest between the authors or any third-party individuals or institutions.

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee approval is not required for this study.

Funding Disclosure: No financial support has been received for this article.

Acknowledgments: -

References

- Agrest, D. (1980). The city as the place of representation. *Design Quarterly* (113/114), 8-13. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4091024>
- Baldwin, J. (1981). The language of the streets. In M. C. Jaye & A. C. Watts (Eds.), *Literature & the american urban experience: Essays on the city and literature* (133-137). Manchester University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=BxHpAAAAIAAJ>
- Barclay, K., & Riddle, J. (2021). Urban emotions and the making of the city. In K. Barclay & J. Riddle (Eds.), *Urban emotions and the making of the city: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 1-18). Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=-EaEAAQBAJ>
- Bentley, N. (2014). Postmodern cities. In K. R. McNamara (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to the city in literature* (pp. 175–187). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiedler, L. (1981). Mythicizing the city. In M. C. Jaye & A. C. Watts (Eds.), *Literature and the American urban experience: Essays on the city and literature* (pp. 113–115). Manchester University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=BxHpAAAAIAAJ>
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). 2nd Vintage Books ed. Vintage Books.
- Gottmann, J. (1961). *Megalopolis: The urbanized northeastern seaboard of the United States*. The Twentieth Century Fund.
- Hassan, I. (1981). "Cities of mind, urban words: The dematerialization of metropolis in contemporary American fiction". In M. C. Jaye & A. C. Watts (Eds.), *Literature & the American urban experience: Essays on the city and literature* (93-112). Manchester University Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=BxHpAAAAIAAJ>

- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1962). *The age of revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. Vintage Books.
- Kristiaan Versluys (2000) The city in literature: A review article on recent studies, *English Studies*, 81:3, 228-236, DOI: 10.1076/0013-838X(200005)81:3;1-M;FT236
- Latham, R., & Hicks, J. (2014). Urban dystopias. In K. R. McNamara (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to the city in literature* (pp. 163–174). Cambridge University Press
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell. (Original work published 1974)
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). The right to the city. In E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds. & Trans.), *Writings on cities* (pp. 63–181). Blackwell. (Original work published 1968)
- Lehan, R. (2023). *The city in literature: An intellectual and cultural history*. University of California Press. https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=IxEr_v_2l4YC
- O'Leary, J. (2021). Converting the cityscape: Emotions, religion and civic ritual in the renaissance city for the Tenshō embassy. In K. Barclay & J. Riddle (Eds.), *Urban emotions and the making of the city: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 19-35). Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=-EaEAAQBAJ>
- Orwell, G. (1949). *1984*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Vidler, A. (2014). Troubles in theory VI: From utopia to heterotopia. *The Architectural Review*. Retrieved January 9, 2025, from <https://www.architectural-review.com/essays/utopia/troubles-in-theory-vi-from-utopia-to-heterotopia>
- Wesselman, D. (2023). *Reflecting on the city through literature: Urban spaces, differences and embodiments*. Taylor & Francis. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=4vvSEAAQBAJ>