

The Dispossessed: an Ideological Distopia ***Mülksüzler: İdeolojik Bir Distopya***

Ela İpek Gündüz*
Gaziantep Üniversitesi

Abstract

Ursula K. Le Guin, in her dystopian novel *The Dispossessed* creates two opposite worlds. Both worlds have contrasting ideologies: a non-authoritarian planet called Anarres, in which individuals experience freedom consciously and deliberately in their own terms (by the equal distribution of the power dynamics in an anarchic society), and its moon Urras with its authoritarian governmental system (both by a capitalist country called A-İo, and by a communist country Thu). Through her depiction of these reverse poles Le Guin achieves to mirror the failure of different kinds of governmental systems which are the practices of the ideologies. These administrative systems fail because they cannot obtain pursuit of human freedom and happiness. According to Le Guin, the ideological representations of the governments are doomed to failure because in spite of their being imaginary systems to create a sphere of happiness for human beings, they are apart from being ideal and they have misapplications.

In this article, the systematic unconscious effects of ideology (in an Alhusserian sense) on social, economic and political issues and the influences of the governmental organization on alienating the individuals to themselves by restricting their creativity and trust for themselves will be highlighted with the help of Le Guin's two opposite dystopian worlds. Therefore, although these two opposite worlds have different ideologies, in the end they both turn out to be distopias. Le Guin proposes a solution to the problem of searching human happiness within the ideologies (represented in the administrative systems) by replacing it with the individual (who could change himself, get rid of all the prejudices, transgress all the boundaries).

Key Words: ideology, dystopia, hegemony, ideological state apparatuses, Ursula K. Le

Guin

Özet

Ursula K. Le Guin *Mülksüzler* adlı romanında birbirine zıt ideolojilere sahip iki dünya yaratır. Biri, bir devlet düzeni olmayan Anarres adındaki gezegen (ki bu ülkedeki insanlar bilinçli ve istekli bir şekilde özgürlüklerini anarşik bir toplumdaki eşit şekilde dağıtılan güç dinamikleriyle tecrübe etmektedirler); diğeri de onun uydusu olan Urras'tır ki (Urras'taki kapitalist A-İo, ve komünist Thu adlı ülkelerle betimlenir) ve otoriter devlet sistemini

* Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, e-posta: elaipekgunduz@hotmail.com

yansıtır. Bu iki zıt kutbu yaratarak Le Guin ideolojilerin uygulanmaları olan değişik yönetim biçimlerinin başarısızlıklarını yansıtmayı başarır. Le Guin'e göre, ideolojilerin temsil edildiği devletlerin başarısızlığı, insanlara ortak bir hayali ideal olan uzlaşma ortamını sağlayıp, onlara mutluluk dolu bir ortam yaratamamasıdır. Le Guin'e göre, ideolojilerin temsil edildiği devletler başarısızlığa mahkûmdur çünkü insanlara mutluluk sağlamak için oluşturulmuş hayali sistemlerdir ama ideal olmaktan uzaktırlar ve yanlış uygulamaları vardır.

Bu makalede, sosyal, ekonomik ve politik bağlamlarda ideolojinin sistematik bilinçaltı etkileri (Althusser'in görüşleriyle), ve yönetsel organizasyonların bireylerin kendilerine olan güvenlerini ve yaratıcılıklarını kısıtlayarak nasıl kendilerine yabancılaştırıldıkları Le Guin'in romanındaki distopik dünya yardımıyla incelenecektir. Böylece, farklı ideolojilere sahip bu her iki zıt dünyanın distopyaya nasıl dönüştüğü anlaşılacaktır. Sonuç olarak, Le Guin insanların devletin içinde mutluluğu arama sorununa, devlet düzenlerine değil de, (bütün sınırları aşabilecek olan) bireye odaklanarak, çözüm bulmaya çalıştığı görülecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ideoloji, distopya, egemenlik, ideolojik devlet aygıtları, Ursula K. LeGuin

I. INTRODUCTION

When the development of the term “utopia” is considered, Plato's *The Republic* could be regarded as the first work devising an ideal society in which conditions are as equal and preferable for all citizens. It is a utopian world created for the welfare of the human beings by a well-structured social and governmental system. Whereas, Thomas Moore in *Utopia* proposes individual participation in politics against the governmental abuse of power. Afterwards, the concept of sharing and the collective good becomes the main theme of the utopias. However, current utopian texts turn out to be dystopian as a result of the impossibility of the utopias and even the dreams turn out to be the nightmares of the people¹.

Ursula K. Le Guin creates her novel the *Dispossessed* by using dystopia as a genre because utopianism has finished and with the definite examples from history such as America and Soviet Union (that were supposed to be utopias) turned into failures and dystopias. The socialist utopia of the Soviets became the totalitarian dystopia of Stalinism and the free/liberal utopia of America turned into hypocrite dystopia of capitalism (Kumar, 1987: 594). Le Guin attempts to depict these real dystopias with an imaginary anarchic one to show the ambiguity of the social order. Moreover, even the idealized anarchic society Anarres turns out to be a failure in the sense that still the system exploits the individual. Furthermore, Le Guin in her novel depicts the utopianist aspect of Marxism in the sense that Marx and Engels expect to have a kind of revolution through which individuals will experience a kind of self-realization by the removal of the exploitation of the capitalist systems,

¹ exploringutopia.weebly.com

but she reverses this expectancy by showing the revolutionized country Anarres as a dystopian world. Therefore, for Le Guin the solution is not focused on the administrative systems or the public in general; instead she emphasizes the importance of the individual efforts to understand the importance of the social welfare.

Ursula K. Le Guin, in *The Dispossessed* imagines a non-authoritarian country - called Anarres- in which individuals consciously and deliberately experience their potential of experiencing freedom by the equal distribution of the power dynamics in an anarchic society. In contrast, its moon Urras with its authoritarian governmental system – both by a capitalist ruling system of A-İo (representing USA), and by a communist system of Thu (representing) USSR – fails to create a sphere of happiness for human beings. Therefore, as Le Guin reflects in one way or another, consciously or unconsciously, the systematic unconscious effects of ideology (in an Althusserian sense) on social, economic and political issues and the effects of the governmental organization on alienating the individuals to themselves by restricting their creativity and trust for themselves is inevitable. Therefore, her novel is titled as “an Ambiguous Utopia” because both the authoritative state systems and the anarchic (stateless) order fail to be utopias and only way to depict these handicaps is to use dystopia. The question is: Is it enough to find the ultimate happiness for human beings to reach happiness by only trusting themselves and getting rid of all kinds of the governmental systems as Le Guin proposes?

In this article, the established governmental systems as the products of the repressive and ongoing ideologies will be analyzed as dystopias (which are the blurred images of the real governmental systems), and as a Le Guinian solution individual efforts of contemplating all the ideological apparatuses will be discussed. As Althusser argues; to maintain the existence of the hegemony of the state, governments need the consent of all its subjects either voluntary or involuntary. While doing this, the state uses the ideological state apparatuses (which will be analyzed in relation to the novel). Moreover, with her dystopian world, Le Guin tries to find an answer to an Althusserian question to the individual need to be represented by the oppressive state that is the fake system compelling the human beings to surrender a hegemonic power in spite of their unhappiness.

II. THE DISPOSSESSED

In the dystopian twin world Urrasti and Anarresti, Anarres is regarded as Urras’s moon but this is also relative: “Our earth is their Moon; our Moon is their earth” (*The Dispossessed*, 2003: 41). Therefore, they are binaries to each other but the one that is the powerful/utopic is ambiguous (Easterbrook, 1997: 56-57).

The name ‘Urras’ is taken from the two superpowers of the time, USA and USSR to point out the cold war like conflict and clash of states in Urras. The first two letters ‘Ur-‘are also the prefix in German which means ‘source and beginning’ to imply that Urras is the source where the immigrants leave for Anarres. The name

'Anarres' reminds 'anarchy' and also means 'place beyond things or independent of things' with the suffix '-res' (Somay, 2010: 333).

Urras representing the real totalitarian worlds is possessed by the hegemony of capitalism (in A-Io) and communism (in Thu), and Anarres is the dispossessed anarchist world established by the Odonian separatists who were once living in Urras. As Gramsci argues; there are two major 'superstructural levels': 'civil/private society' or 'political society/state': "These two levels corresponds on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of 'direct domination' or command exercised through the State and 'juridical' government" (Gramsci, 1971: 12). In Urras, the hegemony of the State with its all dimensions is experienced by the people. As Gramsci mentions, this hegemony includes both "the spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population... [and] the apparatus of state coercive power which legally enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively" (Gramsci, 1971: 12). Therefore, people have to show their obedience to live in the society. Especially, in Urras this kind of unconscious surrender of the majority is seen.

On the other hand, Odo's (the goddess of Anarres) understanding from anarchy is the notion of minimal interference of the government and she tries to develop mutual aid and a utilitarian order: "We are responsible to you and you to us" (Easterbrook, 1997: 54). They continue: "Responsibility is our freedom... We have no law but the single principle of mutual aid between individuals... We are sharers, not owners" (205). In the novel, Shevek as the neutral figure who is deprived of Anarres's giving more importance to the benefits of the society instead of the individual's happiness is in search for a common platform of uniting Urras and Anarres.

The novel starts with a chapter called Anarres-Urras; then one Anarres, the other Urras in turn and the last chapter again is called Urras-Anarres narrating Shevek's return to Anarres: "To be whole is to be part; true voyage is return" (84). In the first sentence, Shevek explains the dual/ambiguous position of the Anarres/Urras domain with the symbol of wall both acquiring freedom and restriction for its citizens: "There was a wall. It didn't look important. ... a line, an idea of boundary. But the idea was real. It was important. ... Like walls it was ambiguous, two-faced. What was inside it and what was outside it depended upon which side of it you were on" (1). Therefore, human beings' understanding of the notions of freedom, hegemony or liberation depends on the side they are belonging to. Still, in one way or another, people are subjected to surrender to some kind of a governmental system which continuously exploits the human beings.

As Althusser explains "...in order to exist, every social formation must reproduce the conditions of its production at the same time as it produces, and in order to be able to produce. It must therefore reproduce ... the material conditions of production: the reproduction of the means of production" (Althusser, 1971: 128). As it is understood, in the society some conditions should be produced and reproduced in order to continue the existing system that regulates the social life: in Anarres it is achieved with the mutual consent of the people; in Urras with the

totalitarian regime urging people to consent this hegemonic power. When the position of people living in the societies is concerned, it is important to understand the mechanism that they unconsciously learn “know-how” even when they are children. According to Althusser,

...reproduction of labor power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class ‘in words’ (Althusser, 1971: 133).

Therefore, in one way or another, ideology is experienced by the agents’ (both the dominant and subordinate ones’) reproducing the means of the productions as a task. In Anarres, the people seem to submit to the system voluntarily because they think that the system is for their own happiness and benefit; on the contrary in Urras – either capitalist or communist – people involuntarily have to accept the rules of the dominant system. The point is; still there is this submission of people as subjects who are surrendering to the mainstream ideology both in Anarres and Urras.

During his visit to Urras, both Shevek and the readers begin to realize that Urrasti life is depending on the division between the superiors and inferiors of beauty, intelligence, money. It doesn’t depend on mutual aid as Anarresti people exemplifies; instead they believe in mutual ambition. Their society is based on the belief that: “The law of existence is struggle, competition, elimination of the weak, a ruthless war for survival... [they] know no relation but possession. They are possessed” (130). And Shevek makes a comparison between the two worlds:

Everything is beautiful here, only not the faces. On Anarres nothing is beautiful, nothing but the faces... We have nothing but that, nothing but each other. Here you see the jewels, there you see the eyes. And in the eyes you see splendor, splendor of the human spirit. Because our men and women are free, possessing nothing they are free. And you the possessors are possessed. You are all in jail... You live in prison, you die in prison. It is all I can see in your eyes-the wall, the wall (229).

Le Guin in her utopic world for human beings gives the main role to the character Shevek who symbolizes individual urge to have power and will instead of showing the whole society as a tool for transforming the world into an ideal world. To emphasize the importance of the individual, she firstly points out the basic needs for survival (as Marx mentions) – working, creating and earning money. To achieve this dual understanding of individual versus society, she juxtaposes the real (capitalist) world of ours with the imaginary (anarchic) world of Odo. It would be helpful to analyze the world Urras from a Marxist point of view by which the exploitation mechanisms of the capitalist society dominate the individuals by reducing them to the parts of the huge machine of the capitalist system. As a result, they become alienated both to themselves and to the job they make. As Marx claims in his famous *Communist Manifesto*:

Hitherto, every form of society has been based ... on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence... The modern laborer ...instead of rising with the progress of industry sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence... [On the other hand,] The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition of capital is wage-labor... rest[ing] exclusively on competition between laborers (Marx and Engels, 2006: 19).

As opposed to the authority in Urras, there is no government [in Anarres] and individuals are controlled by public opinion and the consent of others: “My society is also an idea. An idea of freedom, of change, of human solidarity, an important idea” (300) but their society does not change anymore, so they loose the revolutionary soul: “You cannot buy the revolution. You cannot make the revolution. You can only be the revolution. It is in your spirit or it is nowhere” (248). Moreover, people in Urras lost their belief in revolution, because they continue to be the possessor of their own possessions. Therefore, both Anarres and Urras are on a point of losing their chance to have a revolution for the betterment of the society.

One of the most important ideas that Le Guin proposes in her novel is that: the ongoing dominant systems (especially capitalism) restrict human creativity and reduce their sense of self-trust and happiness. Althusser also mentions the State functioning as “repressive machine” in which “... the requirements of legal practice, i.e. the police, the courts, the prisons, but also the army... intervenes directly as a supplementary repressive force...” (Althusser, 1971: 137). Especially in Urras – as the representation of capitalism and communist administrative system, the domineering effects of the ‘repressive state apparatus’ on individuals could be seen. Shevek expresses this in the novel as:

... there is nothing, nothing on Urras that we Anarrasti need!... Because there is nothing here but States and their weapons, the rich and their lies, and the poor and their misery. There is no way to act rightly, with a clear heart on Urras. There is nothing you can do that profit does not enter to, and fear of loss, and the wish for power. You cannot say good morning without knowing which one of you is superior to the other, or trying to prove it... There is no freedom...Hell is Urras (346).

Shevek cannot understand the weight of the dominance of State on People in Urras, because in Anarres there is not such a repressive kind of authority exploiting individuals:

No. we have no government, no laws, all right... ideas never controlled by laws and governments... The archists tried to stamp it out by force, and failed. You cannot crash ideas by suppressing them. By refusing to think, refusing to change... Public opinion! That’s the power structure he’s part of, and knows how to use. The unadmitted, inadmissible government that rules the Odonian society by stifling the individual mind (165).

Still, Shevek questions the administrative order even in Anarres although it depends on mutual consent and regulated by the majority with equal participation and he defines the term government:

'government: the legal use of power to maintain and extend power... [On the other hand, in Odonian philosophy, it is recommended that]; ... human solidarity is our one hope. But we've betrayed that hope. We've let cooperation become obedience. On Urras they have government by the minority. Here we have government by the majority. But it is government! The social conscience isn't a living thing anymore, but a machine, a power machine, controlled by bureaucrats! (167).

Therefore, according to Shevek, Annarresti people also failed to create free minds depending on Odonian principles based on a government-less system. He blames his society because of their blindly accepting the existing order without any personal interrogation. Through Shevek's speech Le Guin criticizes unthinking individuals because for her the only solution for the betterment of human kind is through thinking and changing:

...stability gives scope to the authoritarian impulse... People discriminated very carefully then [in the early years] between administrating things and governing people. They did it so well that we forgot that the will to dominance is as central in human beings as the impulse to mutual aid is, and has to be trained in each individual, in each new generation... We don't educate for freedom. Education, the most important activity of the social organism, has become rigid, moralistic, authoritarian... (168).

Although, Shevek sees the education as the most important tool for the betterment of individuals, it could be seen that both in Anarres and Urras, it fails to be free and ideal. On the contrary, education serves to the main needs of the government as an 'ideological state apparatus' and it creates unthinking and ideologically shaped uniform individuals. About the university students in Urras, Shevek comments: "What they were free to do, however, was another question. It appeared to Shevek that their freedom from obligation was in exact proportion to their lack of freedom initiative" (127). With exploring education as an example of an 'ideological state apparatus', it can be said that it functions not 'by violence' but 'by ideology': the people who are subjected to it by learning 'know-how' become the total reflections of the dominant ideology.

According to Le Guin, human beings have the necessary notions to reach 'an ideal life' which can make them happy so that she created Anarres in opposition to Urras representing the real world of human beings. However, in spite of her belief in human beings about their having the potential to experience that kind of a social system, she imagines "an ambiguous utopia" of human dreams depending on their self-creativity which is imperfect because of representing the weaknesses of the human beings. Therefore, as Brennan and Downs argue, Le Guin's utopia "...comes to term with man as he is – mortal, weak, and potentially spiteful – rather than with man as he would be were he angelic" (in Libretti, 2004: 306). Actually, Le Guin's tendency is to show the human potential to use their own will to create individual happiness: "... her recognition that human nature is not such that people require repression to motivate them to take part in the fulfillment of social tasks but

that people are by nature creative and productive and thus, in seeking to fulfill themselves, will by nature exercise their creativity in the service of social development” (Libretti, 2004: 306) as Bedap also claims in the novel: “the will to dominance is as central in human beings as the impulse to mutual aid, and has to be trained in each individual, in each new generation” (168).

Le Guin in her novel while depicting the neutral peacemaker Shevek’s journey, actually searches for the answer of Althusser’s question: “Why do men need this imaginary transposition of their real conditions of existence in order to ‘represent to themselves’ their real conditions of existence?” (Althusser, 1971: 163) because according to Althusser, “Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (Althusser, 1971: 162). Le Guin opposes this fake representation (ideology) exploiting individuals, instead she offers individual liberation to survive in a society. Le Guin’s solution to the eternal exploitation of human beings by the dominant ideology which is the very product of the totalitarian governments, either capitalist or communist, is the model practiced in Anarres, that is “... the impulse to mutual aid as opposed to the will to dominance” (Libretti, 2004: 306). However, in Urras she depicts the preventing nature of the society based on hegemony and subordination which destroys the human creativity. In this double world of dystopia, Le Guin achieves to show the dragging sides of our own world of capitalist mode in terms of understanding the human capacity both by creating his own ideal world and failing to practice it either because of the environmental factors (the lack of natural resources in Anarres) or because of the existing governmental systems which are the products of the human beings themselves.

Urras is the capitalist society in which “the reproduction of relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of capitalist relations of exploitation” could be seen by its “... subjecting individuals to the political State ideology... The communications apparatus by cramming every ‘citizen’ with daily doses of nationalism, chauvanism, liberalism, moralism, etc, by means of the press, the radio and television. The same goes for the cultural apparatus...” (Althusser, 1971: 154). After Shevek’s arrival on Urras, the papers news about him shows the function of the media apparatus: “‘But I never said anything!’ Shevek protested... ‘Of course not. We didn’t let that lot get near you. That doesn’t cramp a birdseed journalist’s imagination! They’ll report you as saying what they want you to say, no matter what you do say, or don’t” (79). In Urras – the center of capitalism, Shevek’s experience of communicative apparatus turns out to be a nightmare of consumer culture:

The whole experience had been so bewildering to him that he put it out of mind as soon as possible, but he had dreams about it for months afterwards, nightmares... solid mass of people, traffic and things: things to buy, things for sale. Coats, dresses, gowns, robes, trousers, breeches, shirts, blouses, hats, shoes... all different, all in hundreds of different cuts, styles, colors, textures... pictures, cameras, games, vases, sofas...everything either useless to begin with or ornamented so as to disguise its use... Shevek had felt utterly exhausted. He could not look anymore. He wanted to hide his eyes (132).

After seeing this nightmarish world of consuming, he was bewildered of not seeing its producing process and blames the capitalist system for hiding the labor power and polishing the false product as means of alienating individuals to their own productive capacity – that is the other members of the society: the workers - as if it's the only source of human happiness:

And the strangest thing about the nightmare street was that none of the millions of things for sale were made there. They were only sold there. Where were the workshops, the factories, where were the farmers, ... the hands, the people who made? Out of sight, somewhere else. Behind walls. All the people in all the shops were either buyers or sellers. They had no relation to the things but that of possession (132).

Shevek fails to understand this alienation and cruelty depending on people's being slaves to products:

... all operations of capitalism were as meaningless to him as the rites of a primitive religion, as barbaric... as unnecessary, ... in the rites of the money-changers, where greed, laziness, and envy were assumed to move all men's acts even the terrible became banal... He did not admit, ... in fact it frightened him (130-131).

Instead of this exploitative mission of the work in capitalist society, Le Guin envisions the alternative model of working for individuals which is itself the root of individual happiness coming from in his/her very nature. Shevek explains this as: "In the little communities there isn't very much entertainment, and there is a lot of work to be done... Here, you think that the incentive to work is finances, need for money or desire for profit, but where there is no money the real motives are clearer, maybe. People like to do things... After all, work is done for the work's sake. It is the lasting pleasure of life" (Libretti, 2004: 312). Therefore, as in the real world, Shevek realizes that within the sphere of this ambition to earn money, within the world of competition, people forget to use their working capacity for the benefit of the society on a larger scale; instead they become interested in their egoistic individual benefits. As a result, by forgetting their own individual urge to work for pleasure, human beings neglect to get the taste of working for the advantage of the society.

Moreover, in this hostile world, every individual is the enemy of the other, because only 'the strongest ones survive': "none of the millions of things for sale were made there. They were only sold there. Where were ... the factories, ... the farmers, ... the people who made? Out of sight, somewhere else. Behind walls. All the people in all the shops were ether buyers or sellers. They had no relationships to the things but that of possession" and within this kind of an economic system the things people sell or buy possess the people and "the goal of the society comes to be to protect property rather than to serve people" (132). On the contrary, in Anarres individuals, because they have no money through which they can establish a world of hostility and ambitions, seem to be independent. In a society like Urras which is organized by property ownership, people lose their freedom because they become dependent to their possessions as proprietors. As Libretti explains, the end of the human beings is clear: "... the profit motive has become such a dominant cultural

value and priority that it has led us to devalue and de-prioritize activities that are pleasurable and useful in cultivating humanity but unprofitable in terms of the cash-profit nexus of capitalist political enemy” (Libretti, 2004: 316). Shevek, on the contrary, is not working both in Anarres and Urras to make profit as a scientist or to be famous; his sole aim is to be helpful to his society.

In the novel, within Shevek’s journey; a kind of revolution starts in Urras and the function of the repressive State Apparatus as an instrument of the ruling class comes into existence. Because the society is in transformation all the time; it is open to change. As Althusser claims: “...no class can hold State power over a long period without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in the State Ideological state Apparatuses” (Althusser, 1971: 146). Against the oppression of the army forces of capitalist A-Io, the revolutionaries in Thu dream of revolution and reaching the ideal world that Anarres has:

A demonstration has been announced... A strike is what we need, a general strike, and massive demonstrations... Do you know that when people here want to wish each other luck they say, ‘May you get reborn on Anarres! To know that it exists, to know that there is a society without government, without police, without economic exploitation, that they can never say again that it’s just a mirage, an idealist’s dream! Because you are an idea. A dangerous one. The idea of anarchism, made flesh... (295).

Thu, as a socialist society dreams about having an anarchist utopia of Anarres and they believe that this could be achieved by change and revolution: “‘And power isn’t achieved by passivity.’ ‘We are not seeking power. We are seeking the end of power! ... The means are the end. Only peace brings peace, only just acts bring justice!’” (296). The difference between socialist Thus and anarchist Anarresti people is that Shevek and his folk believe in peace and they are against wars as reflecting Odo’s principles.

III. Conclusion

To conclude, by opposing Annaresti bureaucracy and Urrasti revolutionary movements, Le Guin achieves to show the interaction of the cultures to start a new history: “history is made when cultures come into contact ...; Le Guin’s novel ends with a new beginning of history” (Lensing, 2006: 97). This contact is achieved by Shevek’s transgressing the boundaries. By this way, as an individual, he starts a new history beyond ideologies. Within this new history, Le Guin prefers to have a solitary kind of individual liberty as Althusser proposes: the individual should realize the existence of ideology in all the practices and apparatuses in the society and their being subjected to ideology as subjects. Le Guin reverses this as an anarchist voyager who is deconstructing the walls that shapes the human beings as ideologically prejudiced subjects. By this way, she both mirrors the existing suppressive ideologies of all the governmental systems and an imaginary self-voyage of an individual who resists these oppressions. Still, Le Guin does not show the concrete consequences of this preference of individual consciousness.

References

- Althusser, Louis. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Easterbrook, Neill. (1997). "State, Heterotopia: The Political Imagination in Heinlein, Le Guin, and Delany". *Political Science Fiction*. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Ed. Quintin Hoare. USA: International Publishers Co.
- Kumar, Krishan. (1987). *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. (2003). *The Dispossessed*. New York: Perennial Classics.
- Lensing, Dennis M. (2006). "The Fecund Androgyne: Gender and the Utopian/Dystopian Imagination of the 1970s". *Socialism and Democracy*. 20:3, 87-103. 05. 12. 2011.
- Libretti, Tim. (2004). "Dispossession and Disalienation: The Fullfillment of Life in Ursula LeGuin's *The Dispossessed*". *Contemporary Justice Review*. 7:3, 305-320. 05. 12. 2011.
- Marin, Louis. (1977). "Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalisation and the Production of Utopian Discourse". *Diacritics*. 7:2, 2-21. Web. 5. 12. 2011
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. (2006). *Communist Manifesto*. Trans. Frederick Engels. Socialist Labor Party of America.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. (2004). *The German Ideology*. Ed. J.C. Arthur. USA: International Publishers.
- Somay, Bülent. (2010). *The View from the Masterhead: Journey through Dystopia towards an Open-ended Utopia*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.