

IV

Deconstructing Utopia

KRZYSZTOF M. MAJ

In the topic of the sign, Utopia is the gap, the fault, the void that passes between the signifier and the signified and subverts every sign.

Jean Baudrillard, *Utopia Deferred*

The King and the Cut

Why did King Utopus cut his domain off the mainland?

The answer to that question has to be twofold, resembling in a way a bipartite composition of the founding work for all narrative utopias to come, i.e. Thomas More's *De optimo reipublicæ*. Utopia, on the one hand, could have been essentially different from *topia*, *topos*, *topoi* as a substantiation of the metaphysical reign over signs or, on the other hand, as an emanation of the holistic, totalitarian need to build a brave new world in place of perfecting the former one. However, at the same time, one must recognize utopia not only as a discourse or a particular representation of a travel narrative but also as a vivacious, vibrant, and real world enslaved by a transformative idea. The last claim seems to correspond with the fallogocentric interpretation of the origins of Utopian island, offered by Luis Marin in *Utopics. Spatial Play*:

The island of Utopia, womblike matrix and mother, originates in a violent gesture aimed at the earth itself; its birth is work of no less violence. The narrative produces a new tension or ambivalence as a result. On the one hand is offered to us the image of a welcoming enclosed space, tranquilly situated

about a center that is to be both vacuum and fullness. On the other hand we see war and violent aggression opening up space. It detaches and separates. Utopus is the male, the father; Utopia is the lunar island, enclosed and warm, the mother (Marin 1984: 108).

The centre (*umbilico terræ*) and its oversea peripheries, the island and the continent, the founding Father of Utopia and the mother island, the enclosure and the openness—all these binary oppositions are only but a consequence of the utopian rhetoric developed by Thomas More, whose “truly golden little book” is, as Artur Blaim points out in *Gazing in Useless Wonder*, full of juxtapositions like all versus nothing, any versus no-one, everywhere/anywhere versus nowhere, ever versus never, equality versus inequality, true versus false, wisdom versus folly, order versus disorder, community versus privacy—and so on (Blaim 2013: 30). Luis Marin’s interpretation goes further in terms of critical analysis, merging utopian and gender studies to show how the difference between utopia, understood as a discourse and, conversely, as a world, may be translated into cultural roles of a mother and a father. *Logós spermáthikos*, an idea inseminated in Mother Earth, is here an act of symbolical rape, subduing the world to his master’s voice just like in Luce Irigaray’s vision of the womb to where “there is no going back. Except in the father’s name” (Irigaray 1985: 353)¹. Therefore, as Marine sets it forth, the reader of *De optimo reipublicæ* is a “witness to both a rape and a birth: rape of the earth, which has been opened up by the hero and his army, birth by cutting the umbilical cord” (Marin 1984: 108). This idea was followed up by Angelika Bunner in her well-known reading of utopian origin as a birth by “cutting off the umbilical cord that had joined it [utopia—K.M.M.] to the mainland” (Bammer 2004: 13). Finally, as Darby Lewes recalls in the article *Nudes From Nowhere: Pornography, Empire, and Utopia*, this idea has been widely adopted to political discourse (not necessarily related to utopianism), ever since Niccollo Machiavelli’s *Il Principe*:

Machiavelli frequently refers to his country as the “fatherland” when he is speaking of the land in terms of a proud and great nation. But when he speaks of a weak, passive, vulnerable state, the fatherland suddenly undergoes a rapid sex-change operation; the pronouns are suddenly switched and Italy becomes the feminized motherland. At several points in his discourse, Machiavelli characterizes Italy as

¹ There has been an ongoing tradition in utopian studies to interpret Utopia as a womb. This interpretative standpoint was probably the best reflected in 1992 edition of *Utopia*, which is annotated by Robert M. Adams’ note on “a resemblance to a womb” bore by the island of Utopia (Lewes 1993: 72).

an exposed, susceptible “she”: weak, vulnerable, meek, and submissive [...]. The imagery is chillingly explicit: the land is susceptible to rape (Lewes 1993: 70).

This symbolical cut that occurred when King Utopus decided to sever his domain off the continent, thereby enjoying a splendid isolation, is symbolical only thanks to the utopian discourse that have legitimised it as such—because it was truly both political and corporeal. Thus, it could be another argument in favour of the continuous effort to defend utopia from anti-utopian equations like “utopia equals totalitarianism equals communism equals Marxism equals socialism”, or “communism equals totalitarianism equals fascism” (Levitas 2013: 7) and move it from, using Ruth Levitas’ terms, the utopia of terror to utopia of grace.

A feminist critique of the very foundations of both the discourse and the island of utopia helps to realize that utopia is predominantly the narrative of the origin story of the idea, the man, and the world alike. More, after all, wrote about the best state of commonwealth and the island of utopia, never suggesting any innate connection in between. The cut did occur on every possible level and introduced a great deal of disturbance in the utopian rhetoric. Hence, a utopian narrative should never be read simple-mindedly as an idealistic tale of the perfect city steeped in an abundance of happiness. This story has always been two-sided which was reflected in the very introductory words of *De optimo reipublicæ*, composing the opening *Hexastichon Anemoli Poetae Laureati* that so famously introduced a pun “utopia/eutopia”:

“No place [Utopia]” was once my name, I lay so far;
But now with Plato’s state I can compare,
Perhaps outdo her (for what he only drew
In empty words I have made live anew
In men and wealth, as well as splendid laws);
“The Good Place [Eutopia]” they should call me, with good cause (More 1995: 19).

It seems unlikely, that Thomas More would have decided to focalize his narrative on the Utopia itself and let her speak before any man—from the legendary King Utopus up to a character-narrator, Raphael Hytlodæus—and considered this only as a rhetorical figure. Utopia knows herself that she can be called Eutopia only when certain conditions are met, and only when she becomes worthy of that name in “the speculum of other”—so in the eyes of those who do not believe in the “eutopianhood” as an inborn title inherited in a paternalistic, feudal lineage as well. This interpretation aligns with etymological roots of utopia which does not only transgress the word-building rules in Greek grammar but also projects on itself a female gender

identity—even in its earliest embodiment as *Nusquama Nostra* in More's correspondence with Erasmus Roterodamus. (E)utopia is a woman: it deconstructs the discourse of ideality from within the Platonic metaphysics of presence, thereby "mak[ing] anew" what have been "drawn in empty words" hereinbefore.

The Fatherhood of Utopian Logos

"Let us cut the King off here", says Jacques Derrida in the essay *Father of Logos* right after recalling a famous passage 274c-e from Plato's *Faidros*, to freeze the scene and examine a seemingly two-face nature of *pharmakon*—a kingly gift of the writing. The father, the King, the writing, the logos, and the world—these are key metaphors for this very essay and utopian discourse alike. A peculiar fondness for nonsensical paradoxes, word-plays, and puns, widely discussed in reference to More's persiflage in *De optimo reipublicæ* (Romm 1991; Nelson 2001; Blaim 2013), reveals its inescapable logocentric parentage and brings up the question of the origin of creation and the Father of Logos:

Not that logos is the father, either. But the origin of logos is its father. One could say anachronously that the "speaking subject" is the father of his speech. And one would quickly realize that this is no metaphor, at least not in the sense of any common, conventional effect of rhetoric. Logos is a son, then, a son that would be destroyed in his very presence without the present attendance of his father. His father who answers. His father who speaks for him and answers for him. Without his father, he would be nothing but, in fact, writing. At least that is what is said by the one who says: it is the father's thesis. The specificity of writing would thus be intimately bound to the absence of the father (Derrida 1981: 77).

This parental, father-and-son relationship between the logos and its source, origin, and subject draws a perfect analogy to the subtle though discursively legitimizing relation between utopia and its founding father, the one who severs the island from the continent, who speaks for his citizens, and who answers for them. A phrase "founding father" has domesticated in American political discourse as a proper name for those who have laid foundations for the United States of America; however, quite similarly, it may describe the very act of placing a cornerstone of utopia. Without the persistent, continuous attendance (or, as one could say, surveillance) of the father, utopia is not utopia at all, but a mere imaginary place located "*in illo loco*, »ex-isting« out there apart from the world and cohabiting the vast and largely unknowable cosmological space of the extra-ordinary" (Hutchinson 1987: 176). Utopian domain of

the father of logos who “is always suspicious and watchful toward writing” may be, therefore, associated with Foucault’s model of panopticon, wherein the watchman can see everything but cannot be seen by anyone. This “powerful and virtual omnipresent gaze”, as Luis Marin calls it (1993: 402), or “all-pervading gaze”, as Hanan Yoran prefers (2005: 24), resonates in another passage from *Father of Logos*, where Derrida recalls the famous Plato’s metaphor of the cave and sun from the *Republic* (VII, 515c ff.) and associates it with the simultaneously pervading and evading face of the Father of Logos:

Now, about this father, this capital, this good, this origin of value and of appearing beings, it is not possible to speak simply or directly. First of all because it is no more possible to look them in the face than to stare at the sun [emphasis—K.M.M.] (Derrida 1981: 82).

Correspondingly, in *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault describes Jeremy Bentham’s vision of panoptic prison, which by reversing principles of dungeon (to enclose, to hide, to deprive of light) “arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately” as “full lighting and the eye of a supervisor capture better than darkness, which ultimately protected” (Foucault 1995: 200). “Visibility is a trap”, concludes Foucault, and delivers, thereby, a perfect commentary on the nature of Derridian father who remains a “hidden illuminating, blinding source of logos”. A sun that punishes with blindness. In Tommaso Campanella’s *The City of the Sun*—which remains an obvious reference when it comes to exemplifying the similarities between the sun, the father, and utopia—the supreme ruler of the City (“he is head over all, in temporal and spiritual matters”, (Campanella: 2006: 9) is addressed to only as the Metaphysicus or HOH, safely concealed under the solar symbol ☉. Even though HOH is nameless as any entity hiding beneath a cognomen, a trigram (which conceals must not be named, as it has been in case of Judeo-Christian tetragrammaton יהוה, YHWH) or a symbol, he reserves to himself the ultimate right of giving names—and thus, the control over the logosphere of Civitas Solis. Good people of *The City of the Sun* sincerely believe that “that sun is the father, and the earth the mother”—and this principle, although obviously inspired by a great many factual mythologies, translates the relationship between *signifiant* and *signifié* into a dichotomic parentage of father and mother. Clearly, this striking resemblance reveals a common philosophical grounding for the metaphysics of presence and logocentric utopia, bridged by the idea that paradigmatic, oppressive discourse le-

gitimizes any number of symbolical cuts, not only the cut between the island of Utopia and the continent of *empeiria* but also all the other cuts that lead to the further divisions, separations, and segregations, so useful when it comes to governing the society by the rule *divide et impera*.

To fully realize the relevance of logocentric fatherhood in utopia, one must bring forward a political and economic face of the nameless father who gives (away) the names. Jacques Derrida says, mainly, that *logos* is indebted to the father who etymologically conveys the meaning of the chief, the capital, and the good(s)—all crucial to understanding the way the father can become the founding father himself. The Father of *Logos* understood as the good, *agathon*, rules in all early modern utopias—or at least that is usually assumed. A suspicious assessment of the perfection of utopian “inner world of idolum” (Mumford 1928: 13) has marked its presence already in the ending parts of More’s *De optimo reipublicæ*, wherein a heterodiegetic narrator confronts character-narrator’s (i.e. Hythloday’s) account of his journey to the island of Utopia with words:

When Raphael had finished his story, I was left thinking that not a few of the laws and customs he had described as existing among Utopians were really absurd. These included their methods of waging war, their religious practices, as well as other customs of theirs; but my chief objection was to the basis of their whole system, that is, their communal living and their moneyless economy. This one thing alone utterly subverts all the nobility, magnificence, splendour and majesty which (in the popular view) are the true ornaments and glory of any commonwealth [...]. Meantime, while I can hardly agree with everything he said [...], yet I freely confess that in the Utopian commonwealth there are very many features that in our own societies I would wish rather than expect to see (More 2003: 106-107).

This short passage is indeed, perfect, but for deconstruction. On the one hand, it challenges the paradigmatic statement of utopia being eutopia in the all-pervading eyes of Hythloday, the traveller, and clearly confronts the narrative created by Utopian father of *logos*, the founder of utopia, King Utopus. On the other hand, while doing so, it uses the very same paradigmatic subject, seizing the opportunity of dropping the last words in the whole book and introducing a narrative perspective external (heterodiegetic) to the inner world of Utopia—and, thereby constructing a binary opposition of the internal and the external, easily translatable to the postcolonial juxtaposition of the centre and peripheries. Utopia is peripheral in the vision of Hythloday’s interlocutor because even though *De optimo reipublicæ* is written in the form of a dialogue, it clearly exposes the danger of subjecting the dialogue, i.e. the conversation of two *logoi* (διά-λογος), with a concealed paradigmatic monologue—of

one voice and one logos (μονο-λογος)². And this very threat or a general problem of utopia, which is always to come, may be regarded as a key argument in favour of defining eutopia and dystopia not as, respectively, visions of happy and blessed or unhappy and unblessed commonwealth, but as two interpretations of the very same discourse tragically trapped in the logocentric discourse of the father of logos, a demigod wielding the power of inscription.

Father of Logos and Lord of Logos

A polyphonic discourse shaping the narrative space of More’s *De optimo reipublicæ* along with a two-faced nature of the father of logos and an ambivalence of *pharmakon* seems to correspond well with a non-dichotomic approach to eutopias and dystopias. The difference between these two could be, mainly, assessed from the narrative perspective, disregarding the auctorial intention some researchers would like to appeal to and contributing to a more world-conscious analysis of utopian narratives. Thus u-topias, no-places, would become e-utopias (“positively valorised no-places”) or dys-topias (“negatively valorised no-places”) depending on a given interpretation that would revolve around the world-building and world-controlling discourse of the Father or the Lord of Logos, respectively. Both presence and relevance of the latter symbolic figures are unquestionable in the history of eutopian and dystopian narratives across media—fathers, brothers, kings, priests, presidents, architects, judges, and other white men all represent the same “supermale authority of the patriarchal state” (Ferns 1989: 374).

(E)U-/DYSTOPIAN NARRATIVE	FATHERHOOD/LORDSHIP OF LOGOS
Thomas More, <i>De optimo reipublicæ</i>	King Utopus
Tommaso Campanella, <i>Civitas solis</i>	HOH
Francis Bacon, <i>New Atlantis</i>	The Fathers of Salomon’s House
Evgenij Zamyatin, <i>We</i>	The Benefactor
George Orwell, <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	Big Brother

² This idea was greatly inspired by Bernhard Waldenfels’ phenomenological analysis of xenological differences between the monologue of one logos and the dialogue of two logoi (Waldenfels 2002: 92).

Aldous Huxley, <i>Brave New World</i>	Mustafa Mond
Alan Moore, David Lloyd, <i>V for Vendetta</i>	Chancellor Sutler
<i>Matrix</i> , dir. Lana & Lilly Wachowski	The Architect
<i>Equilibrium</i> , dir. K. Wimmer	The Father
<i>Deus Ex: Human Revolution</i> , prod. Square Enix	The Illuminati
Margaret Atwood, <i>The Handmaid's Tale</i>	God the Father
Lois Lowry, <i>The Giver</i>	The Elders
Philip Pullman, <i>His Dark Materials</i>	The Authority
Marcin Przybyłek, <i>Gamedecverse</i>	Emperor / ImBu
Suzanne Collins, <i>Hunger Games</i>	President Snow
<i>Bioshock: Infinite</i> , prod. Irrational Games	Father Comstock
<i>Fallout 3</i> , prod. Bethesda Softworks	President Eden
<i>Star Wars: The Clone Wars</i> , dir. Dave Filoni	The Father (of the Force)
<i>Black Mirror: Fifteen Million Merits</i> , dir. Euros Lun	Judges Hope, Chairty and Wraith
<i>Revolution</i> , prod. NBC	President of the Monroe Republic
<i>Dominion</i> , prod. SyFy	Vegas Lord of the City
<i>The 100</i> , prod. The CW	President Dante
<i>Helix</i> , prod. SyFy	Brother Michael
<i>Ergo Proxy</i> , dir. Shūkō Murase	Lord Regent/Proxy One

Table 2. Utopian and dystopian narratives juxtaposed with the logocentric instances

As clearly shown in the table above, a recurrence and reappearance of father figures has become a hallmark of, particularly, dystopian narratives, ranging from anti-logocentric or anti-metaphysical identities like Mustafa Mond, God the Father, or The Architect up to straightforwardly ironical President Eden, The Benefactor, or The Authority. The ruling figure in utopia undoubtedly has two faces: one of the loving, though patronising Father, and the other one which represents the imposing and sinister Lord. Any effort of juxtaposing the two of them would, however, result

in establishing yet another binary opposition—which seems futile, as it would deprive the utopian narratives of their ironical ambivalence that they have born since the very inception of the genre. If one decides to interpret Tommaso Campanella's *Civitas solis* as twisted, totalitarian theocracy with the literal embodiment of the metaphysics of presence atop the feudal hierarchy—it should not be opposed, as any vote in favour of paradigmatic treatment of this storyworld as eutopian would prove the contrary even more. Therefore, the Lord and the Father of Logos are not *different*, but they are products of Derridian *differance*—as they remain indistinguishable when only heard of, but never met, spoken to, or confronted with the power of the scripture, always open for subversive interpretations.

As a result, the Father/Lord of Logos must be constantly “suspicious and watchful towards writing”. He incinerates books and libraries (Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*) or works of art (Wimmer's *Equilibrium*), twists the meaning of words (Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*) and replaces them with meaningless digits (Zamyatin's *We*). A famous confession from Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, “We're destroying words—scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone”, clarifies the intention of this “cutting to the bone”, being yet just another cut in dystopian logosphere that leads to a deprivation of context and ennoblement of speech over the scripture. The *pharmakon* of the Lord of Logos is a poisonous gift, inasmuch as any other overdosed or misprescribed medication—or maybe, as one could say, it does not bring any solace to its users as it is prescribed by the giver instead of being inscribed by receivers, according to their will, needs, and expectations. As Derrida phrases:

[this—K.M.M.] medicine, this philter, which acts as both remedy and poison, already introduces itself into the body of the discourse with all its ambivalence. This charm, this spellbinding virtue, this power of fascination, can be—alternately or simultaneously—beneficent or maleficent (Derrida 1981: 70).

Such is also the nature of dystopian opiates of the masses, introduced to the logosphere to simulate an otherwise inaccessible state of openness and keep people subjected to the Father of Logos as not only the source and origin of *logoi* but also the philtre or charm of either beneficent, or maleficent effect Derrida elaborates about. Soma in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, Can-D in Philip K. Dick's *Three Stigmata of Palmer Eldritch*, mascóns from Stanisław Lem's *The Futurological Congress*, anti-stirrings pills in Lois Lowry's *The Giver*, morphling in Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games*, Proziium in Kurt Wimmer's *Equilibrium*, The Bliss from James Dashner's

Maze Runner, Aqua-Cola in George Miller's *Mad Max: Fury Road*, or fruits of the New Babylon in Brandon Sanderson's *Firefight*—they all in fact filter the reality concealing everything unfitted to a master plan of the Lord of Logos.

The Father/Lord of Logos, though omnipresent, remains disembodied. He reveals himself through the media (*V for Vendetta*), haunting his subjects from behind the curtain. He is the h(a)unter who resides in the centre of the panopticon, surrounded by screens which allow him to communicate with his subjects and commute around his domain without being directly involved in its affairs. He is at the same time the and at the very centre of logosphere, where “the substitution of contents, elements, or terms is no longer possible” and “the transformation of elements (which may of course be structures enclosed within a structure) is forbidden” (Derrida 2002: 352). The charm he casts over his subjects exposes, therefore, an added value in a form of telepresence in a spectral medium, a “teletechnological *différance*”, as Derrida calls the phenomenon in *The Specters of Marx*. As he clarifies this notion in the passage introducing the famous concept of hauntology:

this element itself is neither living nor dead, present nor absent: it spectralizes [emphasis—K.M.M.]. It does not belong to ontology, to the discourse on the Being of beings, or to the essence of life or death. It requires, then, what we call, to save time and space rather than just to make up a word, hauntology. We will take this category to be irreducible, and first of all to everything it makes possible: ontology, theology, positive or negative onto-theology (Derrida 2006: 63).

Dystopian Father of Logos is tele-present in that very way, in a visible spectrum of mass-media, reaching with his voice—that may not be scripted—ears and minds of all his subjects. “Attention Dunwall Citizens”, announces the Propaganda Officer in the gameworld of *Dishonored* many a time, transmitting the voice of Lord Regent via the network of loudspeakers, thus keeping the world narrated and explained. Throughout the gameplay the player seizes to be amazed by this recurring, repetitive voice and adapts to it, learns to treat it as an irreplaceable part of the environment—a similar phenomenon occurs in any other dystopian society treated with omnipresent telescreens, as Orwell calls them. In Kurt Wimmer's *Equilibrium* giant telescreens broadcast the word of The Father, head of the Tetragrammaton (יהוה, YHWH)—and continue to do so even after his death, in a time out of joint, allowed to interfere from the otherworld with the world of the living. The only cure, the *pharmakon*, which once has been taken from the people of Libria, is art—and a famous scene showing a Tetragrammaton agent (played by Sean Bean) shot in the head with a bullet that

had pierced through the volume of William Butler Yeates's poetry—presents a powerful metaphor of how the logos may be subjected to the will of the spectral, h(a)unting Father/Lord.

Finally, the Father/Lord of Logos may not exist without his counterpart, let it be an enemy of the state, a rebel residing in the outlands, or, as in the feminist critique of utopia, a motherland subdued to the patriarchal white male supremacy. It is no coincidence that revolutionary movements, as well as their instigators and leaders, come in all dystopian narratives from without the borders of dystopia: from the peripheries, i.e. a space surrounding the logocentric *topos*. This surrounding heterotopian space may be, contrary to the (phal)logocentric no-place of (e)u-/dystopia, associated with *Χώρα* (gr. *khōra*)—understood by both Jacques Derrida and Julia Kristeva as a moving, transformative force (Kristeva 1984: 25) that escapes centralised metaphysical structuration. In Derrida's own words, *khōra* is “a secret without secret [that—K.M.M.] remains forever impenetrable on the subject of it/her” (Derrida 1995: 94). Thus, *khōra* denotes “the place of absolute exteriority” (Derrida 1998: 19) which does not allow “to be dominated by any theological, ontological or anthropological instance” (Derrida 1998: 20). This seems to fit well not only most of dystopian narratives (which usually bifurcate into two plotlines, one set within the borders of dystopia and another one—beyond) but also, as Alec Charles reminds, a feminist reinterpretation of *khōra* as *écriture féminine* (Charles 2012: 497), which turns out to be yet another scripture the Father/Lord of Logos may be suspicious and watchful about. If one takes also into account that *khōra* may indicate “the call for a thinking of the event to come, of the democracy to come” (Derrida 2005: XV), its *par excellence* deconstructive and subversive potential may be clearly seen in strong female heroines leading revolutionary movements in so many recent young adult dystopias, like in the case of Katniss Everdeen in Suzanne Collins' *The Hunger Games* or Beatrice Prior in Veronica Roth's *Divergent*, to name just a few. However, as Chris Ferns has observed, also male protagonists of classical dystopian narratives usually feel insecure about their masculinity, not to mention that they are usually assisted by a woman able to see through the veil of lies woven by the Father/Lord of Logos. Anti-patriarchal and subversive discourse is, then, the most important aspect of dystopian narrative that do not only project an unhappy world triggering a warning for the current civilisation (as, one could say, any more ambitious science fiction novel) but also—if not even predominantly—teaches a critical approach to any authoritarian instance threatening the society with, at first, totalising, but then totalitarian lordship.

Closing remarks

So why did King Utopus cut off his domain from the mainland? Was it truly necessary to introduce a hiatus between the new and the old, the ideal and the real, the fantastic and the mundane? Maybe it is the nature of the Father/Lord of Logos to impose a binary opposition in order to legitimize his power/knowledge and leave aside continental jurisdiction or ethics. Maybe he wants to become the source of logos, to conceal himself as the very origin of utopian discourse, and to spread a poisonous *pharmakon* to befuddle his subjects. After all, who can counter the metaphysical indicative sentence “War is Peace” from within the world subjected to the originary falsehood?

The answer to these questions lies probably in a non-transitive “middle voice” of *différance* and the subversive power of *khōra*, which altogether help to find utopian impulse even in the darkest of dystopian storyworlds. Utopia is a mother, a *khōra*, who, as Luce Irigaray phrases it, by “giving life to one who has the right to power, [...] wins the right to be perfectly happy” (Irigaray 1985: 107). She may be found in a dystopia, on heterotopian outlands of the city where fatherless scripture can rebel against the almighty Father/Lord of Logos³. Utopia that speaks for herself, in the fatherless voice and scripture, does not need any patronising instance to guide those who want to believe in her.

The Father/Lord of Logos, despite all his willingness, cannot be the one giving birth to an idea. He can only put it, literally, in motion, be *deus absconditus*, a master of puppets pulling the strings from behind the curtain—but hardly ever he can be the executor himself. Therefore, he *needs* someone to join his mockery of a dialogue and let him witness the word of the Father which is uttered usually during a solemn, almost ritual confrontation that occurs in the end of the most of dystopian narratives between the Lord of Logos and the rebellious figure, whom one could call a Scriptor, to honour the relevance of secret diaries or notebooks that have helped unravel the founding lie of dystopian logosphere⁴.

³ A recent example—the sisterhood at the place of the former oasis on a desert in Frank Miller’s *Mad Max: Fury Road*.

⁴ It was one of the points of Andrzej Drózdź’s acclaimed book *Od Liber Mundi do hipertekstu: książka w świecie utopii* [*From Liber Mundi to Hypertext: The Book in the World of Utopias*] wherein he analyzed how the book understood as an idea or a metaphor (and, therefore, as a holy or hermetic Scripture as well), has penetrated utopian discourse and literature alike throughout the centuries.

This typology of (e)utopias and dystopias understood as such, depending on the extent of metaphysical presence of the Father/Lord of Logos, however, it is no typology at all, as it deconstructs itself by shifting paradigms and allowing no preconceived genre patterns to influence one's interpretation—allows to abandon a recurring debate on the formal differences between various genological reiterations of utopia⁵. The anti-logocentric approach would favour more world-centred approach to utopia which would be viewed as neither a fictional account of the travel to a better or worse no-place nor a particular political or sociological discourse pivoted around the transformative potential of utopian ideas—but a living world, just like the world one knows on beforehand from her experience and tends to call it paradigmatically the “real” one. Finally, a critical capacity of deconstruction would utterly match anti-utopian discourse occurring in so many dystopias—but it will not produce simultaneously any more genres or subgenres that distract the interpreter from what is the most relevant in utopian and dystopian studies: which is, as simple as its etymology suggest, the common-wealth.

⁵ The same that Lyman Tower Sargent so assiduously wanted to end, but after all proposed even more severe genological classification (Sargent 1967, 1975, 1994).

Works Cited

- Bammer, Angelika (2004), *Partial Visions. Feminism and Utopianism in the 1970s*, London: Routledge.
- Blaim, Artur (2013), *Gazing in Useless Wonder. English Utopian Fiction 1516-1800*, Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Charles, Alec (2012), 'The Meta-Utopian Metatext: The Deconstructive Dreams of Ulysses and Finnegans Wake', *Utopian Studies*: 23 (2), pp. 472-503.
- Derrida, Jacques (1995), *On the Name*, edited by Thomas Dutoit, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1998), 'Faith and Knowledge' transl. by Samuel Weber, in: Jacques Derrida and Gianni Vattimo (eds.), *Religion*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-78.
- Derrida, Jacques (2002), *Writing and Difference*, transl. by Alan Bass, London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques (2005), *Rogues*, transl. by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (2006), *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, transl. by Peggy Kamuf, London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques (1981), *Dissemination*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ferns, Chris (1989), 'The Value/s of Dystopia: The Handmaid's Tale and the Anti-Utopian Tradition', *Dalhousie Review*: 69: 3, pp. 373-382.
- Hutchinson, Steven (1987), 'Mapping Utopias', *Modern Philology*: 85 (2), pp. 170-185.
- Irigaray, Luce (1985), *Speculum of the Other Woman*, transl. by Gillian C. Gill, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia (1984), *Revolution in Poetic Language*, transl. by Margaret Waller, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lewes, Darby (1993), 'Nudes from Nowhere: Pornography, Empire, and Utopia', *Utopian Studies*: 4 (2), pp. 66-73.
- Marin, Louis (1984), *Utopics: Spatial Play*, London: Macmillan.

- Marin, Louis (1993), 'Frontiers of Utopia: Past and Present', *Critical Inquiry*: 3 (19), pp. 397-420.
- More, Thomas (1995), *De Optimo Reipublicae Statu, Deque Nova Insula Utopia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- More, Thomas (2003), *Utopia*, edited by George M. Logan, Robert M. Adams, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mumford, Lewis (1928), *The Story of Utopias*, New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Nelson, Eric (2001), 'Greek Nonsense in More's Utopia', *The Historical Journal*: 44 (04), pp. 889-917.
- Romm, James (1991), 'More's Strategy of Naming in the Utopia', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*: 22, (2), pp. 173-183.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower (1967), 'The Three Faces of Utopianism', *Minnesota Review*: 7: 3.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower (1975), 'Utopia—The Problem of Definition', *Extrapolation*: 16.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower (1994), 'The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited', *Utopian Studies*: 1 (5).
- Waldenfels, Bernhard (2002), *Topografia obcego*, transl. by Janusz Sidorek, Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Yoran, Hanan (2005), 'More's Utopia and Erasmus' No-place', *English Literary Renaissance*: 1 (35), pp. 3-30.