Al-Adab Journal **Issue. No (151) (December) 2024**

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 **P-ISSN: 1994-473X**

"The Future Isn't What It Used to Be"[1]: Heterotopia, Power, and Surveillance in Caryl Churchill's *Far Away*

Asst. Prof. Basaad Maher Mhayyal (PhD Candidate) Department of Biology/ College of Science for Women/ University of Baghdad
Email: basaadmm@csw.uobaghdad.edu.iq
Asst. Prof. Sanaa AL Ghareeb (PhD) Department of English/ College of Education for Women/ University of Baghdad.
Email: sanalazim@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31973/p1ahtv77

Abstract:

This paper aims to answer the question of whether dystopian narratives may have any glimpse of hope although they reflect a pessimistic view of their writers. In *Far Away*, Caryl Churchill's most terrifying play despite not including horror scenes except for the parade scene that takes place every night and the terror is reflected through conversation only, the playwright tried her best to shed light on a grotesque vision of a dystopian society where only terrorism, oppression, imprisonment, disloyalty, and violence are found. This dystopian world reveals how everything is considered an enemy to everything else, even nature becomes an enemy to humans and Churchill humanizes nature instead of dehumanizing people. This paper tackles *Far Away* in the light of the Foucauldian concepts of the docile body, heterotopia, carceral society, power, and surveillance which are reflected by Churchill.

Keywords: *Far Away*, dystopia, docile body, heterotopia, carceral society, surveillance, power.

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

Introduction:

Carly Churchill's innovative artistic approach gives rise to a carnivalesque theatrical experience that challenges logocentric power systems, including those inherent in dramatic texts (Kermany, 2008, p.5). Churchill is eager to bring her audience back to hear the terrified voice of the future, symbolized by a kid in *Far Away*, as she sends the audience into carnival hell to witness the feast and the fight. Carnival fear in *Far Away* interrupts the seemingly child-adult transitioning from voyeurism to participation in the safety of their bedroom. Churchill reveals a history of conflicting deaths, in contrast to Mikhail Bakhtin's deathless carnival, unlike the medieval carnivalistic society (Alied, 2014, p.216).

In 1960, once talking about her aesthetics, Churchill claimed that the writers could not give solutions to the current political and social problems. They "see the world in a mess and don't know how to do anything about it. We mistrust causes and abstract words spelt with capital letters." She added:

We need to find new questions, which may help us answer the old ones or make them unimportant, and this means new subjects and new forms. . .. The imagination needn't have the same limits as factual knowledge; we may make cautious philosophical and scientific statements, but we do not have to feel, visualize, and imagine cautiously. (Churchill, 1960, "Not Ordinary, Not Safe: A Direction for Drama?", p.446.)

That is why Churchill, throughout her career, has tried to introduce new dramatic forms so that she can answer the political, scientific, and philosophical questions of her time. She always tries her best to alert her audiences about dangers to their environment and existence, such as those posed by capitalism, sexism, or terrorism.

2. *Far Away* as "a world turned against itself, filled with horror and disgust"

On November 24, 2000, *Far Away* had its world premiere at the Royal Court's Theatre Upstairs in the year of the new century, which is significant. It is considered Churchill's most terrifying and confusing play although it has only three characters. She wrote it after a break in writing in 1997. The play takes the audiences/ readers from the use of coercive power in domestic affairs to a totalitarian regime and ultimately to a horrific and ridiculous world war. Churchill insists on a more metaphorical level that individual behavior and global devastation are inextricably linked. Churchill remarked that it was the end of a time in which she experimented with self-implosive form, adding that

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

Far Away feels to me quite different since the play isn't being undermined. The three parts can seem disconnected, linked only by the girl who goes through them and widening hostilities, but I think they are also linked by the characters' desire to be on the side of what's right. (Churchill, 2008, *Plays Four*, p. 5)

Churchill does not give her audiences information that could enable them to follow the progression of one event from another in terms of a traditional plot. However, it is still an attempt to give dystopian content a dystopian form. The world of the play is a dystopia, with no clear sense of place and time. In this play, it appears as though Churchill's dystopian world was "planned to be deliberately terrifying and awful." (Aston, 2001, p.1). Like *The Skriker* (1994), *Far Away* incorporates elements of the fantastical inside its dystopian setting. However, rather than featuring mythological monsters, the play humanizes nature, which actively participates in the global worldwide war that unfolds. The play portrays a dystopian society devastated by a worldwide conflict, where all elements of the planet, including the non-human natural environment, are involved (Luckhurst, 2015, p.143).

The three stylistically separate acts alternate between a domestic interior in Act I, a dictatorial environment in Act II, and an apocalyptic conflict-filled world in Act III, where humans, animals, and other living things count and energy forces are engaged in the war that will end all wars, and the Earth is falling into self-destruction. This nature of the play urged John Peter to say that "*Far Away* is a terrible play, in the Yeatsian sense of a terrible beauty, you emerge shaken. There's nothing else like this play" (qtd. in ibid). The acts of the play are based on Joan's experiences growing up with weird things happening to her. She is a young child residing at her aunt's house in the first act when she unintentionally learns an uncomfortable secret that the adults share. Her aunt, however, advises her to remain silent and to keep the information a secret to "protect herself." The girl begins working as a hatter at a factory in her second act as an adult. There, she meets a guy who wants to expose the truth about the covert activities taken on in their society. Submerging herself in her work, she feels compelled to remain silent once more, and ultimately joins the brutality that exists in the world of adults. The play may be difficult to understand because, although appearing to include official repression, imprisonment, and execution, the implied "secret" from Act I is still a myth by the conclusion of Act III. In contrast to the first two acts' realism, the final act's writing style is symbolism. This act's lines are created through a pattern of incredibly complex and abstract

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

ideological symbols, particularly the central symbol of ornately decorated hats. The piece subtly criticizes the politically indifferent response to cruelty in contemporary society as a result of globalization (Yu, 2016, pp 94-5). In this play, Churchill illustrates the terror that a government instills in its people. This terror is evident in everything Joan's uncle does, from smuggling people to organizing the public march of death for government inmates. Nobody assumes societal responsibility and instead lets chaos reign. It implies a lack of political and social responsibility. The play proves the absence of a functional system. Even with their terrible circumstances and constant exposure to terror and fear, Joan, Harper, and Todd enjoy the horrible sequences in which characters are tortured in the play.

Far Away represents a significant move for Churchill, shifting from *Top Girls* (1982) and *Not Not Not Not Not Enough Oxygen* (1971) which have obvious difficulties that are related to our world, to *The Skriker* and *Far Away*, where the enemies suddenly appear everywhere, making it difficult to know who or what to believe. At least in *The Skriker*, the audience as well as the readers know who is right and who is wrong, but in *Far Away*, not even the viewers can tell if Joan is on the good or bad side if there is one. Elaine Aston states that the dystopian world of this play is horrifying. She says:

This is a bleak vision for a new century, but one that brings a renewed emphasis to Churchill's concern to show just how "frightening" the legacy of a world damaged by a political and social creed of self-interest is, a legacy that, her theatre tells us, is not so very 'far away' (Aston, 2001, p.120).

Far Away ends with a dystopian vision of apocalyptic horror as is clear from Joan's description of her world at the end of the play:

there were thunderstorms all through the mountains … The rats are bleeding out of their mouths and ears, which is good, and so were the girls by the side of the road. It was tiring there because everything's been recruited, there were piles of bodies and if you stopped to find out there was one killed by coffee or one killed by pins, they were killed by heroin, petrol, chainsaws, hairspray, bleach, foxgloves, the smell of smoke was where we were burning the grass that wouldn't serve (38).

Now, in this dystopian world, a wide range of common goods are murder weapons: coffee, pins, heroin, petrol … etc. Each of these components is a "small agency" with a unique influence and potential, and that agency is dispersed among a diverse collection of matter. Because of this, Churchill's play brings together a diverse cast of

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

people, nonhuman animals, and objects to tell a story that is based on "a vital materialist theory of democracy" (Ahmadi, 2009, p.377).

3. The Foucauldian Concepts of Heterotopia, Power, and Surveillance in *Far Away*

In his lecture "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias," Michel Foucault (1926-1984) began with a contemplation of the society of his day; he believed that it was more focused on the issue of space than time. He introduced the term 'heterotopia' to refer to places that are

outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them, by way of contrast to utopias, heterotopias (Foucault, 1984, "Of Other Spaces", p. 4).

Heterotopia describes specific 'other' cultural, institutional, and discursive spaces. Heterotopias are passionate, unsettling, conflicting, or transformative. They are universes inside universes that both reflect and disturb the outside world. Foucault gives examples of heterotopia like the graveyard, the garden, the jail, or the ship. In his heterotopia, the camp, more especially, the refugee camp, need not even be legally connected to a particular state; it exists as a physical representation of the state of exception that borders the international order and persists even in the absence of the state. The associated imagery of being deported to the camp is closely related to the cultural imagery of the camp. One of the tropes of twentieth-century combat that has permeated post-modern collective experience is the picture of people crammed together on a train or truck to be evacuated or hauled away as the case with the people in Act I whereby Joan's uncle pushes them into a shed by beating them with a metal stick (Trémouilhe, 2019, p.63). During the events described by Joan in Act I, the readers/viewers find out that she "is out" right away. Churchill establishes a contrast between the safe house and the hazardous area outside. Elaine Aston and Elin Diamond state that this pattern, "weaving its way through most if not all of her [Churchill's] plays, is the affective gap between violence and harm "out there" versus a protected, if anxious, "here." (Aston & Diamond, 2009, "Introduction: on Caryl Churchill", p. 6).

One of the main features of dystopian and utopian literature is space, which is highlighted right away in the title of this play. The action appears to be taking place in a far-off area, as suggested by the title. The audience does not know whether it is remote from something or someone. In the play, the issue of perspective comes up frequently.

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

There are wide differences in the characters' understanding of and degree of intimacy with horror. From the first to the third act, dread and space change simultaneously. *Far Away* shifts from a home's interior to a totalitarian system's working environment. It then expands with the prisoner procession and, at the very end, embraces the entire world, albeit through the protagonists' dialogue, this time while they are back in Harper's home. As a result, the dystopian environment is divided into two parts: the comforting house of the aunt and the strange post-apocalyptic world beyond. The third act offers a glimpse of the overarching horror to the viewer. The narrative of Joan's voyage creates a scene that resembles a wasteland. Every living thing, including the components of nature, is either dying or struggling for an unidentified cause if there is one (Trémouilhe, 2019, pp. 55-6).

The events of the third act, where even nature has descended into warfare, with the elephants siding with the Dutch, and the Japanese being fortunate with the weather, might seem unreal. However, this misguided belief demonstrates that if people declare war on the world, it will declare war on them in return. Unavoidably, they start to turn against themselves and grow suspicious of the people they love (Lyn 2014). As the case with Sarah Kane's *Blasted* (1995) when The Soldier witnesses "thousands of people packing into trucks like pigs trying to leave town" (Kane, 2011, p.47); the same happens in *Far Away* when night falls in the courtyard, little Joan sliding into utter conflict reports to her aunt what she saw:

Joan: There was a lorry.
Harper: Yes, I expect there was.
Joan: When I put my ear against the side of the lorry, I heard crying inside.
Harper: How could you do that from up in the tree? … There might be things that are not your business when you're a visitor in someone else's house.
Joan: Yes, I'd rather not have seen. I'm sorry. … If it's a party, why was there so much blood?
Harper: There isn't any blood. … In the dark? How would you see that in the dark? …You've found out something secret. You know that don't you? … Something you shouldn't know.
Joan: Yes I'm sorry.
Harper: Something you must never talk about. Because if you do you could put people's life in danger (142-4).

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

Harper tries her best to discharge what Joan heard and witnessed so that she can blur the reality and as a result, Joan accepts the changed facts as reality. The young Joan, who was uncomfortable being a witness, raises awareness of the harsh world of familial abuse. Throughout her conversation with her aunt, she deftly reveals more and more details about what she observed. The reader or viewer discovers that the girl "went out" (139) right away which makes Churchill create a distinction between the safe house and the hazardous area outside immediately. As soon as Joan starts to describe what she heard and saw, Harper challenges her credibility by using her adult status to exert control over both the kid and the truth:

HARPER: Poor girl, what a fright you must have had imagining you heard somebody screaming. You should have come straight down here to me.
JOAN: I wanted to see.
HARPER: It was dark.
JOAN: Yes but I did see.
HARPER: Now what did you imagine you saw in the dark? (141).

At this stage, Joan's story might still be the product of her dreams or perhaps a nightmare she thought was real, but the conversation changes as a result of her response. The fact that Joan saw her uncle initially sounds plausible and innocent, but once the reader or viewer discovers that "he was pushing someone," (141) the information quickly becomes unsettling. He was stowing someone away in a shed. The girl continues: "There was a light on. That's how I could see the blood inside the shed. I could see the faces and which ones had blood on" (144). Harper, who up until that point had to persuade her niece that all she saw was a pleasant gathering and the indentations of a poor dog that had been struck by a car, must concede that there is some validity to Joan's account. She silences the girl by threatening her and using the power of secrecy. However, horror has infiltrated the home, upsetting its previous sense of security. Both Joan and the audience are perplexed and struggle to discern between truth and falsehood, as well as between right and wrong. During the conversation that follows, Harper persuades her niece that she and her husband are kind people who are "helping others escape" and "giving them shelter" (144). Human trading is implied by the scenario in which individuals are beaten up and concealed in trucks and sheds that will take them to an unidentified place. It might also be used to describe the removal of immigrants or deportations to concentration

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

camps (Trémouilhe, 2019, p.63). Harper's home is portrayed once more as a violent environment where those who are looking for assistance are beaten and even killed.

As for the Foucauldian concept of power, this play presents a terrifying picture of the twenty-first century that mixes ecological catastrophe with warfare. It presents a disturbing portrayal of a dystopian society in which cultural and social conventions rapidly deteriorate, leading to the outbreak of war. The play comprises three distinct episodes that follow a narrative trajectory, transitioning from a concealed portrayal of domestic terror to the portrayal of outlandish nationalistic alliances formed by animals and birds during a hypothetical global war. Beth Watkins states that "Caryl Churchill created, in *Far Away*, a terrifying vision of dystopia, where cultural and social norms slid headlong into war." Moreover, he clarifies that the scenes in the play develop "from secret domestic horror to absurd descriptions of the nationalistic alliances made by animals and birds in a new world war." (Watkins, 2001, p.481). Like the majority of dystopian literature, *Far Away* imagines a surreal dystopia not far away from the present day, where a totalitarian government imposes its power over its citizens by conducting weekly mass executions to the sound of tinny martial music. The global conflict has become so bad that the government has replaced the millinery trade for reprehensible and perverse reasons, in addition to the French and Chinese developing strategic alliances and the world's rivers, crocodiles, and cats. A lot of fictional dystopias, especially future-oriented stories, including *Far Away*, present futuristic communities "as countries or nations run by totalitarian governments which dehumanize its citizens; often the world is in a difficult situation as a result of some kind of an environmental disaster or a destructive war that brought about a significant decline in society." (Markocki, 2016, p.120). These stories depict a futuristic world in which a dictatorial regime has complete control over everything and where people are compelled to serve it despite its corrupt strategy. In Act II, Joan and Toad are not assembly line workers making identical hats in large quantities; rather, they are talented artisans who approach their millinery with style and individuality. They appear to be opposing the oppressive system, but they also appear to be supporting it by creating the hats. Despite discussing the potential for unethical capitalism, they continue to make new hats; their deeds contradict what they say (Adiseshiah, 2009, p.212). Joan tells Todd, "The management's corrupt – you've told me. We're too low paid – you've told me" (151). Joan is aware that creating the hats only serves to maintain the

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

oppressive system in place. When Todd goes to the administration to discuss every issue they are facing, they answer him by saying "These things must be thought about" (155) and Todd believes that the manager may fire him and maybe he will lose his job. This demonstrates blatant hostility between the employer and employee; the situation is so wrong that not only is management abusing its power over the workforce, but workers also believe that using forceful communication techniques is the best approach to resolve conflicts. Todd is aware of these facts, or at least has strong suspicions about them, but the way the workplace is set up prevents him from taking risky action to address injustices. He says, "I'm the only person in this place who's got any principles, don't tell me I should do something, I spend my days wondering what to do" (152). In a secure workplace, this should not present a problem for any employee. Even though persecuted, Joan and Todd have honor and optimism. They want to follow the right path, and at the end of the play, they even decide to quit together and find another kind of parade to work with if this inquiry destroys their jobs. A capitalist, corrupt, and cruel society that exploits its workers, uses its power over them, and oppresses its residents is evident in the glaring power imbalance between employers and employees as well as between society and those being executed in large numbers. The most striking observation is how the authorities appear to value human lives and well-being atrociously low; this applies to both employees and inmates (Ehnström, 2022, p.15).

Throughout the play, it is effectively shown how the naked life is excluded when its presence is denied, an exclusion that ought not to be permitted but occurs in modern society. It is never quite clear what Joan saw in her aunt's home. There are only hints as to the kind of repression the state employs on its people. The spectators only hear Todd's story and are spared the shock of seeing the actual brutality because even his brief and, in any event, incredibly strange explanation of his actions during the battle creates a frightening, terrible mood:

TODD I've shot cattle and children in Ethiopia. I've gassed mixed troops of Spanish, computer programmers and dogs. I've torn starlings apart with my bare hands. And I liked doing it with my bare hands. So don't suggest I'm not reliable.

HARPER I'm not saying you can't kill.

TODD And I know it's not all about excitement. I've done boring jobs. I've worked in abattoirs stunning pigs and musicians and

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

by the end of the day your back aches and all you can see when you shut your eyes is people hanging upside down by their feet (161).

Todd's description suggests that the play's central taboo, which will be on display, lies somewhere else. Todd claims to have performed in dull professions. Still, the audience would never guess that one of them was working in slaughterhouses with stunning musicians and pigs, where he would spend his days to the point where all he could see when he closed his eyes was people dangling by their feet, upside down. The apocalyptic imagination in this play is genuinely subversive because of its narrative unpredictability, which reclaims the prospect of a future devoid of all current conditions.

According to Foucault, modern society is inherently carceral; therefore, the contrast between life inside and outside of prison is not as stark as it might initially appear. In the carceral society, people appear to be primarily under the control of vast, invisible systems of official power (Foucault, 1979, *Discipline and Punish*, p.26). Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1977) swiftly emerged as, and would continue to be, a powerful and intensely fascinating classic for surveillance specialists. Diamond states that it is Foucault's concept of "the carceral," an all-pervasive system of discipline to which everyone submits, that corresponds with Churchill's mounting terror at uncontrolled global marketing, pervasive war-mongering, and actual conflict in the 1990s. Through her works: *A Mouthful of Birds* (1986), *Thyestes* (1994), and *Far Away*, Churchill has provided her readers with startling dramatic depictions of everyday life in a state of horror imposed by a carceral system (Diamond, 2009, "On Churchill and terror." p.140).

While the developing romance between Joan and Todd is the main focus of the second act, as the act goes on, the reader is given more and more signs that suggest there may be a struggle between the characters and the society they live in. The first hint comes from Todd's nearly immediate explanation that hatmakers now only have one week to produce the hats for parades instead of the two weeks they once had and "they're talking about cutting a day. (149). Less time to create hats equals more parades, which equals more executions. Todd provides evidence for this by stating that he "stay[s] up till four every morning watching the trials." (150). It is only reasonable to believe that the trials and the executions are related. The concept that trials should be broadcast on television, much less every night till four in the morning, is strange and only serves to heighten the unpleasant sensation that a greater power is descending on vast numbers of people in a brutal display of power, publicly. Todd makes

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

an effort to respond to society and the government without using violence, despite their apparent brutality. The doubtful methods employed by the hat industry take on particular significance when attempting to explain the conflict between employees and their employers. “TODD You’ll find there’s a lot wrong with this place. / JOAN I thought it was one of the best jobs. / TODD It is. Do you know where to go for lunch?” (149). One can only imagine how exploited employees in other fields are if the hatmakers’ workshop is among the best places to work (Ehnström, 2022, p.14).

Churchill emphasizes the significance of the fifth scene of Act II by asking the characters to do the following: *The Parade (Scene 2.5): five is too few and twenty better than ten. A hundred?* (137). This scene represents all death marches and other victim processions that happened during the twentieth century. It brings to mind images of mass flights from Rwandan massacres, expelled Armenians marching across the Syrian Desert, trains carrying prisoners to Pol Pot’s Killing Fields, refugees fleeing war-torn former Yugoslavia, and prisoners being transported to concentration and extermination camps in Hitler’s Third Reich (Prado Pérez, 2002, pp.98, 101). Possible interpretations include slaves, forced laborers, inmates, asylum seekers, refugees, and captives; because of the stage direction’s constrained language, production may even decide to refer to a more recent occurrence. In Berlin’s June 2001 staging of *Far Away*, for instance, sixty shackled inmates with their eyes taped shut with black duct tape were shown (Boll, 2001, p.62). The protagonists emphasize the transient nature of the hats as a metaphor for life, even though the executions of inmates demonstrate the transient nature of existence.

Adrian Page states that Churchill derived her theories on nonviolent social control, that is, the marginalization, confinement, and suppression of dissident elements, from Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish*. When she read that book in 1982, she discovered a discussion that clarified her initial interest in the easier ways that discipline integrates into an internal feedback system, a technology of the body necessary for contemporary society to function (Page, 1992, p.87). Although Foucault did not advocate for political change, it is evident that the power dynamics he depicts, which “invest [the] body, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs” (Foucault, 1979, *Discipline and Punish*, p.25), are ingrained in the social structures that are found in everyday life, including families, schools, the military, government agencies, and cultural institutions. Humans must first be

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

made "docile" by society for them to be productive (Diamond, 2006, "Caryl Churchill: Feeling Global", p.479).

Foucault's theory of power also includes the concepts of panopticism, surveillance, discipline, and dispositive. He demonstrates that he is also an innovative political theorist through his understanding of power. Panopticism is an important concept of his work that has received much attention and it is one of the disciplinary institutions that has been used most frequently by theorists working with Foucault's writings. Foucault's panopticism is frequently brought up by researchers and journalists whenever they discuss surveillance. His book *Discipline and Punish* has become a key text in the field of surveillance studies. Gilles Deleuze, a French philosopher, believes that society in the computer age is no longer a disciplinary society; rather, it is transitioning to a control society, whose major concern and point of reference are 'individuals and databases' rather than individuals and bodies. With this claim, Deleuze goes into the arena of surveillance which makes him the founder of 'post-panoptic literature' (Deleuze, 1988, p.90). According to Foucault, the panoptic design is an example of a larger trend in contemporary society where the ability to obtain a steady stream of information about the actions of the subjects of that power is becoming more and more crucial to official power (kaziliunaite, 2020, pp.5-15).

In this play, Churchill shows how the totalitarian state uses disciplinary compulsion to exploit, regulate, and control the human body and mind to guarantee complete submission and maximum output. Foucault believes that the state views "the body as object and target of power" with the ultimate goal of creating "a body-weapon, body-tool, body-machine complex" (Foucault, 1979, *Discipline and Punish*, pp.136, 153). This approach achieves two objectives at once: the more productive and valuable the body is, the more submissive and docile it becomes. According to Foucault, "disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination" (Ibid, p.138). The state uses a strict system of widespread surveillance to enforce the body's docility. Foucault believed that this surveillance "had to be like a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception: thousands of eyes posted everywhere" to police and track all citizens' thoughts and actions (Ibid, pp. 138, 214).

Churchill makes *Far Away* conceal the terror, except in the third scene/ Act II whereby the audience can see a world that is full of horror and grotesque events. As a result, viewers are primarily presented with seemingly normal people changing within enclosed,

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

well-known, and somewhat "safe" environments like a home or a workshop. It is also disturbing that these people have feelings of love for each other. Nevertheless, they are repressed in this system of terror and surveillance to the extent that they cannot rebel against the bad working conditions and low wages. This proves Foucault's point that the state maintains ultimate control over bodies by enforcing discipline and monitoring all citizens. Docile bodies need to be watched over and observed to ensure that they abide by the law, carry out their social obligations, and do not dare to challenge authority. In his *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault examines the monitoring system and how it should compel people. He does this by using the Panopticon schema to explore the necessity of surveillance in a disciplined society. Foucault claims that because the panopticon design makes authority both "visible and unverifiable," it is ideal for surveillance, not just in jails but also in society at large (Ibid, p.201). He also states that the prisoner "should be constantly observed by an inspector" and that he "should always have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied on." (Ibid). In other words, regular observation and awareness of one's own body are necessary to guarantee that the body is "docile". Since there is no way of knowing for sure whether you are being watched or not, this knowledge will ensure discipline on the part of the body (Gerhard, 2012, p.52). Thus, the person's awareness of maybe being continuously watched over guaranteed automatic docility and discipline. Thus, it became unnecessary to employ force to control patients, workers, lunatics, schoolchildren, or convicts. One can draw parallels between Foucault's dystopian vision of modern society and the panopticon inmate's plight by noting how the average modern citizen is subject to surveillance through the use of modern technology and how many contemporary institutions like schools, factories, and prisons are derived from the same emphasis on data collection. As a result, this type of spatial layout involves a specific kind of power relationship and behavior constraint. Foucault believes that "Prisons today resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals" (Foucault, 1979, *Discipline and Punish*, p.228).

Act II shows an example of surveillance in which the audience sees Joan in her first week as a prize-winning milliner after receiving her certification. She falls in love with her coworker Todd, who has made close to 300 hats. They discuss their artistic viewpoints and reveal as many intimate details as they dare. They are uncomfortable in their interactions because they are always being watched, and are scared of being overheard. It seems that they are employed by a

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

capitalist government that does not prioritize the welfare of its citizens. Through their conversation about their job in hat-making, Todd and Joan seem to work for a company that creates hats for inmates who must parade in them before being executed. They receive low wages and suffer from bad work conditions.

Another example of surveillance is in Act III whereby social reconnection is evident at the end of the play. Joan has decided to "have one day" (163) with Todd rather than continue serving in her current role in the war. She has taken a significant risk by doing this, and an unidentified authority may penalize her which makes Harper very angry with her out of her fear of Joan's being watched and followed:

HARPER: You can't stay here, they'll be after you. What are you going to say when you go back, you ran off to spend a day with your husband? … Did anyone see you leave? Which way did you come? Were you followed? There are ospreys here who will have seen you arrive. And you're risking your life for you don't know what because he says things that are not right. Don't you care? (162).

Joan has given up on her military role and risked everything to spend even a small moment of peace with the person she loves in the middle of this chaos of death and destruction. She therefore exemplifies how love may inspire a life that is driven by anything more than the need to survive. She had to face her dread of uncertainty when she got to the river in addition to the obvious threats in her path to get to Todd. She finally gave in to hesitation and entered the water, realizing that she would have to get over this formidable barrier to reach Todd. This bravery, which required an alliance rather than a fight, was necessitated by Joan's love. Her behavior is a symbol of hope even though it was motivated by personal passion and devotion rather than by impersonal principles. Amelia Howe Kritzer claims that Churchill challenges the in-yer-face [2] dramatists' argument against activism through the character of Joan. Joan was mistreated as a child by being lied to and grew up in an autocratic society that exploited her talent for obscene demonstrations of its strength and brutality. Despite being thrust into Armageddon and having to face destruction while fending off attacks from both nature and man-made materials, Joan finds a compass for her incredible adventure in her love for Todd (Kritzer, 2008, *Political Theatre in Post-Thatcher Britain*, pp.34-5). Kritzer is among the critics who search for hopeful moments in the play. She states that "Joan, who has braved all the bizarre dangers of her conflict-ridden world to be with Todd... demonstrates her choice to make a meaningful commitment." Kritzer sees these as signs of

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

hope for the future, or a "Brechtian 'way out' of the dystopia of a world disintegrating in chaotic conflict" (Kritzer, 2002, "Political Currents in Caryl Churchill's Plays at the Turn of the Millennium", p.66).

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, *Far Away* portrays a dystopian society where people as well as other elements of nature are subject to dominance by totalitarian governments, global wars, and terrorism. Churchill successfully made her audience feel the dangerous consequences that may surround them everywhere and every time. However, she uses only verbal descriptions of the violent, bloody situations the characters face in their daily lives. The world of *Far Away* is not that far away from modern people if they stay passive and do not take action to change their realities. Churchill's play lends itself successfully to the Foucauldian notions of heterotopia, power, and surveillance as it reflects these concepts in the daily lives of the characters who do not differentiate between what is right and wrong due to the corruption found in their society which affected them in a bad way.

End-Notes

1. Lawrence Peter "Yogi," Berra was an American professional baseball catcher, manager, and coach who played 19 seasons in Major League Baseball.
2. The term "in-yer-face theatrical movement" first appeared in the late 1990s, coined by Aleks Sierz to characterize the work of young writers who use graphic, frightening, and confronting material on stage to engage and impact their audiences.

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

References

Adiseshiah, Siân. (2009). *Churchill's Socialism: Political Resistance in the Plays of Caryl Churchill*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ahmadi, Mohebat. (2019). "Setting the stage for political agency and ecological democracy: towards an ecodramaturgical space in *Far Away*". In *Green Letters*. 23:4. 367-379.

Angelaki, Vicky. (2017). *Social and Political Theatre in 21st-Century Britain. Staging Crisis.* London: Bloomsbury.

Alied, Amani. (2014). "A Desacralisation of Violence in Modern British Playwriting". Unpublished MA Thesis. School of Arts, Languages and Cultures.

Aston, Elaine. (2001). *Caryl Churchill*. Devon: Northcote House Publisher, Ltd.

Aston, Elaine & Elin Diamond. (2009). "Introduction: on Caryl Churchill." In *The Cambridge Companion to Caryl Churchill*. (Eds.) E. Aston and E. Diamond. Cambridge University Press. 1-17.

Boll, Julia. (2011). "The Unlisted Character: On the Representation of War and Conflict on the Contemporary Stage". Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Edinburgh.

Churchill, Caryl. (2008). *Plays: Four*. London: Nick Hern Books.

_____. (1960). "Not Ordinary, Not Safe: A Direction for Drama?" In *The Twentieth Century*. Vol. 168. Nov. 443–51.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1988). *Foucault*. Translated by Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Diamond, Elin. (2006). "Caryl Churchill: Feeling Global". In *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880–2005*. (Ed.) Mary Luckhurst. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 476-487.

_____. (2009)."On Churchill and terror." In *The Cambridge Companion to Caryl Churchill*. (Eds.) E. Aston and E. Diamond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 125-143.

Ehnström, Elvira. (2022). *Ecoconflict in Caryl Churchill's Far Away and Escaped Alone*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Faculty of Arts/ University of Helsinki.

Foucault, Michel. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. Vintage: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

_____. (1984). "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias". In Architecture/ Mouvement/ Continuité. Trans. Jay Miskowiec, Panama: Publications du moniteur.

Gerhard, Julia. (2012). "Control and Resistance in the Dystopian Novel: A Comparative Analysis". Unpublished MA Thesis. Faculty of California State University, Chicoby, Spring.

Kane, Sarah. (2011). *Blasted*. London: Methuen Drama.

Kermany, Fereshteh Varziri Nasab. (2008). "Towards Delogocentrism: A Study of the Dramatic Works of Samuel Beckett, Tom Stoppard, and Caryl Churchill". Unpublished PhD Dissertation. der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität.

Kritzer, Amelia Howe. (2002). "Political Currents in Caryl Churchill's Plays at the Turn of the Millennium." In *Crucible of Cultures: Anglophone Drama at the Dawn of the New Millennium*. (Eds.) Marc Maufort and Franca Bellarsi. Lausanne: Peter Lang. 57-67.

_____ . (2008). *Political Theatre in Post-Thatcher Britain, 1995–2005*. London: Palgrave.

Luckhurst, Mary. (2015). *Caryl Churchill*. Milton Park Taylor & Francis Group.

Lyn, Gardner. (2014). "Far Away review- dystopian drama takes close look at a world at war. Nov. 16th. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/nov/16/far-away-review-samantha-colley-caryl-churchil. Retrieved Dec. 12th, 2023.

Markocki, Miłosz. (2016). "Creating Utopian or Dystopian Worlds in Digital Games." In *More After More*. Edited by Ksenia Olkusz, Michał Kłosiński Krzysztof M. Maj, Facta Ficta Research Centre. 118-33.

Kaziliunaite, Aušra. (2020). *Michel Foucault's Panopticism and Dystopian Discourses: The Asymmetry of the Gaze in Philosophy and Film*. Vilnius University.

Page, Adrian. (1992). *The Death of the Playwright? Modern British Drama and Literary Theory*. London: Lumiere Cooperative Press Ltd.

Prado Pérez, José Ramón. (2002). "Issues of Representation and Political Discourse in Caryl Churchill's Latest Work." In *(Dis)Continuities. Trends and Traditions in Contemporary Theatre and Drama in English*. (Eds.) Rubik, Margarete and Elke Mettinger-Schartmann. Wissenschaftlicher Verlag. 91-104.

Trémouilhe, Julie. (2019). "Caryl Churchill's Aesthetic of Silence: Terror and Language in *Far Away* and *Escaped Alone*". Unpublished MA Thesis. Université catholique de Louvain.

Watkins, Beth. (2001). "*Spinning into Butter*, and: *Far Away*, and: *Credible Witness*, and: *The Bogus Woman*, and: *The Mother* (review)". In *Theatre Journal*, Volume 53, Number 3, October. Published by Johns Hopkins University Press. 481-484.

E-ISSN: 2706-9931 P-ISSN: 1994-473X

Yu, Hsiao Min. (2016). “English drama for critical pedagogy: adapting Caryl Churchill’s dramas as a methodological tool for community-engaged theatre workshopping in post-Umbrella Movement Hong Kong”. Unpublished Dissertation. Lingnan University.