

REPRESENTATIONS OF HETEROTOPIC SPACES IN GURPREET KAUR
BHATTI'S PLAYS *BEHSHARAM* AND *KHANDAN*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ABDÜLHÜDA ÖZTOP

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

AUGUST 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahar Öz
Director (Acting)

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztürk Avcı (METU, FLE)_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro (METU, FLE)_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt-Fenge (Ankara Uni., İDE)_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Abdülhüda Öztop

Signature :

ABSTRACT

REPRESENTATIONS OF HETEROTOPIC SPACES IN GURPREET KAUR BHATTI'S PLAYS *BEHSHARAM* AND *KHANDAN*

Öztop, Abdülhüda

M.A., English Literature

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakin Martinez-Caro

August 2019, 94 pages

Heterotopia has always caused controversy among the critics ever since Foucault's use. However, it has also been adopted to theatre and applied in exploring theatre's spatiality. This thesis aims at bringing up to the surface the spatiality of two plays *Behsharam* (2001) and *Khandan* (2014) by a contemporary British Sikh playwright Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti because heterotopic spaces in the plays enable the British audience to think about an alternate ordering of the society. The spatial dimension of these two plays provides with two distinct poles contrasting each other and contesting contemporary issues. Between the opposing poles heterotopias emerge leading to a re-thinking of the immigrants and their experiences in Britain. While in the first play heterotopias are generated around the members of an almost disentangled Sikh family, the latter grants such spaces around a Sikh family as a whole providing a comparison to a white family. Even though the heterotopias generated through the plays have common characteristics with Foucault's heterotopia, they have more in common with the later critics' concerns. Scholars such as Lefebvre, Harvey and most contemporarily Joanne Tompkins, who adjusted the term for use in theatre studies blend the term with

social and cultural politics. Therefore, it is inevitable to establish a connection between heterotopias in the plays and the social politics regarding the immigrant communities, particularly the British Sikh community. This thesis, consequently, aims to put forth the heterotopias emerging in Bhatti's recent plays shedding light onto the social and cultural politics concerning the Sikh community.

Keywords: heterotopia, space in theatre, Michel Foucault, Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti, immigrant.

ÖZ

GURPREET KAUR BHATTI'NİN *BEHSHARAM* VE *KHANDAN* ADLI OYUNLARINDAKİ HETEROTOPIK MEKANLARIN TEMSİLİYETLERİ

Öztop, Abdülhüda

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

Ağustos 2019, 94 sayfa

Mekân çalışmalarında, heterotopya Foucault'nun terimi kullanımından beri her zaman teorisyenler arasında tartışma sebebi olmuştur. Fakat o zamandan beri terim tiyatro çalışmalarına uyarlanmış ve tiyatronun mekânsallarını keşfetmede etkin bir şekilde kullanılmıştır. Bu tez de İngiltereli Sih bir oyun yazarı olan Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti'nin iki oyunu *Behsharam* (2001) ve *Khandan* (2014)'ın mekânsallarını yüzeye çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu oyunların mekânsal boyutu birbirine tezat oluşturan ve güncel meselelere meydan okuyan iki kutup oluşturmaktadır. Bu karşıt kutupların arasında heterotopik mekânlar oluşmakta ve İngiltereli izleyiciyi göçmenler ve onların İngiltere'deki deneyimlerini yeniden düşünmeye teşvik etmektedir. İlk oyunda heterotopik mekân neredeyse dağılmakta olan bir Sih ailenin üyeleri etrafında ortaya çıkmaktayken ikinci oyun benzer bir mekânı beyaz bir aile ile mukayese etme olanağıyla başka bir Sih ailenin bütün olarak etrafında sunmaktadır. Bu oyunlardaki heterotopyalar Foucault'nun ilkin keşfettiği ile ortak özellikler taşıyor olmalarına rağmen daha sonraki eleştirmenlerin çalışmalarıyla daha fazla ortak paydada buluşmaktadırlar. Lefebvre, Harvey ve güncel olarak ise terimi tiyatro çalışmalarına uyarlamış olan Joanne Tompkins gibi

akademisyenler bu terimi toplumsal ve kültürel bağlamla birleştirmektedirler. Bundan dolayı oyunlardaki heterotopyalar ve göçmen toplulukları, özellikle İngiltere'deki Sih göçmenler ile ilgili siyasi gelişmeler arasında bağlantı kurmak kaçınılmaz olmaktadır. Bu tez Bhatti'nin Sih toplumu ile alakalı toplumsal ve kültürel sorunlara ışık tutan iki oyunundaki heterotopyaları ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: heterotopya, tiyatrodaki mekân, Michel Foucault, Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti, göçmen.

to my beloved mother, Dayêcan...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez-Caro who supported and encouraged me during this process with her endless tolerance and help, and without whom I would never be able to complete this thesis. I also would like to thank the jury members Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztapak Avcı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt-Fenge.

I have to admit that I am obliged all of my friends amongst whom three need mentioning particularly; Dr. Pelin Doğan who introduced me to the plays of Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti and who always supported and sided with me whole-heartedly, Semih Murat Gönen who made me familiar with the term ‘heterotopia’ for the first time and lastly Deniz Göksu with whom I spent almost each and every day while processing on this thesis.

Finally I would like to thank my family, especially my mother, without whose support and reliance it would be impossible for me to overcome any difficulty that I have encountered throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....	7
2.1. Foucault’s Heterotopia	7
2.2. Heterotopia After Foucault	15
2.2.1. <i>Theatre’s Heterotopias</i> or Tompkins’ Formulation Based on Hetherington’s Concerns.....	18
3. HETEROTOPIAS IN <i>BEHSHARAM</i>	31
3.1. Heterotopic Space Generated Around the Migrant	34
3.2. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Jaspal.....	35
3.3. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Sati.....	45
3.4. Heterotopic Space Generated Around the Sikh Family	52

4. HETEROTOPIAS IN <i>KHANDAN</i>	56
4.1 Heterotopic Space Generated Around Family	56
4.2 Heterotopic Space Generated Around Gill Family	58
4.3 Heterotopic Space Generated Around the White Family	66
5. CONCLUSION.....	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	78
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY.....	83
APPENDIX B: TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSON FORM.....	94

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Space has always been a vital element for theatre and the contemporary British theatre plays are no exceptions. When one studies theatre, one should remember “the premise that space is a proper value of theatre, part and parcel of what it is and how it works” and it is worth pointing out that even though it has existed there since the beginning, “the function of space has gone relatively unnoticed” in the theatre studies (Rehm p. 1). Uncovered for centuries, the value of space has recently been paid attention to and studies on spatiality of theatre plays have been flourishing since it became inevitable for the critics of the field to discover the potential of it in regards to the locations where theatre plays are produced and most importantly to the spatial setting in the plays.

In a similar way, heterotopia has been a prominent term for those who study space but it has not been applied in literature as much as it has been utilized in distinct fields such as architecture and geography. Even though Foucault’s introductory exploration of the term included its connection to literary works and particularly theatres, there has been little attempt to instigate heterotopic ‘reading’ of spatiality in theatrical plays. Nevertheless, contemporary critiques including Sian Adiseshiah and Joanne Tompkins have initialized and strengthened the practice of heterotopia in theatre studies. As Adiseshiah points “[t]heatre, with its representation of differing and contradictory sites, and the stage’s reflectional qualities clearly fit the criteria of heterotopia” (Adiseshiah p. 8). And as Tompkins accentuates space’s potential to “instigate a significant interaction between theatre and culture” and such an interaction can best be brought about through heterotopias since they have the efficacy to operate “as a means of rendering more palpable both

the spatial and the socio-political possibilities that theatre presents” (Tompkins p. 15) thereby connecting theatre’s heterotopic space to socio-politics. Such an engagement of theatre with culture and socio-politics has provided the point of departure for this thesis.

Through a heterotopic analysis, this thesis aims at exploring the spatial dimension focusing on two plays by the contemporary British Sikh playwright Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti, namely *Behsharam* and *Khandan*. These two plays provide, by nature, an abundance of heterotopias, the connection of which to Sikh community and to its cultural codes is quite conspicuous throughout the plays. Therefore, in order to better understand the connection between the plays and the Sikh community it is important to have, at least, a quick glance at the immigrant minorities in Britain, especially the Sikhs.

As James Hampshire points out the United Kingdom was “a net exporter of population” between the two world wars and a great number of Britons emigrated to the United States of America during this period (p. 47). Yet, in the post-war era the country turned into an importer of population because of the loss of work force during the wars. Even in its early years, immigration policies were objected as it is revealed by Hampshire. He states that the Royal Commission on Population was formed in 1944 and ended up with an “ultimate rejection of immigration as a solution to the population problem” in the United Kingdom and he furthers that this rejection “provides an important insight into perceptions of race and Britishness in official discourse” (p. 52).

Despite the rejections, British Isles received immigrants during the 1950s from current and former colonies. During these years, the majority of immigrants were from either the Caribbean islands or from the Indian Subcontinent. The Windrush immigrants are considered to be the pioneers of this population. In the 60s and 70s the immigration kept growing while in the 80s new strict legislations were taken and gaining citizenship became more difficult for immigrants. Nevertheless, since then the population of immigrants in the United Kingdom has been increasing to the levels which cause concerns among the conservatives.

According to “Migration Statistics” taken from the House of Commons Library, “between 2017 and June 2018 there were approximately 6.1 million people with non-British nationality living in the UK” which makes up “9% of the total population” (Sturge p.3). No matter whether with British citizenship or not, the Sikh population make up a large proportion of the minorities in the UK and the number of the Sikh immigrants or those of full or partial Sikh origin has been in rise since the latter half of the previous century.

Following the British Nationality Act 1948, many Indians migrated to the United Kingdom. Despite the restrictions brought with the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962 and Immigration Act 1971, the Indian population kept increasing in Great Britain. A large proportion of Indian immigrants were either from Gujarat or Punjab and thus the great majority of Indian immigrants were followers of Muslim or Sikh religions after Hinduism. Today, the Sikhs are estimated to make up of one fourth of the Indian population in the UK. According to another report by House of Commons Library, as of 2011 the Sikhs “numbered around 432.000” in the UK making up “0.7% of the total population” (Priddy p. 5).

Sikhs in the United Kingdom do generally live in metropolitan cities. A great number of British Sikhs live in London and it makes the largest proportion of the Sikh community in the UK. Yet, Birmingham metropolitan area hosts the second largest Sikh population in the UK. In this regard, the spatial setting in Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti’s plays *Behsharam* and *Khandan* is quite important. As the plays engage themselves with the Sikh families, the spatial setting in both plays is Birmingham. The location of the first productions of the plays was again Birmingham as they were performed in one of the most famous theatres in the UK, the Birmingham Repertory Theatre. This is quite significant because Bhatti in a sense sets her plays in the heart of the Sikh community – Birmingham. Even if London is the core of the Sikh population, Birmingham is as essential as London for the community.

As this thesis concerns itself with the British Sikh playwright Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti’s plays, and, through the spatial dimension of the plays, with their engagement in the cultural norms of the Sikh community in the UK, it is crucial to

emphasize Bhatti's own controversy with the community. Although, Bhatti's debut play was *Behsharam* (2001), her second play, *Behzti* (2004), caused much controversy in the British society and as *The Telegraph* (London) reported; "members of the Sikh community staged angry protests" and "Sikhs claimed the play, which depicts a rape scene in a fictional temple demeaned their religion". As Pelin Doğan points out "the Behzti Affair has probably been the most influential censorship scandal in British theatre in the twenty-first century" (Doğan p. 6-7). Birmingham Repertory Theatre announced the cancellation of the play stating it put in danger the lives of the members of the theatre. Bhatti, herself, was also targeted by death threats and she had to hide during the following six years. She, then, appeared with her third play *Behud* (2010) which dealt with "the controversial *Behzti* Affair and Bhatti's experiences in its aftermath" (ibid, 7). In a conference Bhatti points what reaction she received from her family after *Behzti*; "I am a second generation British Asian, my parents were working class migrants who migrated in the 60s [...] I have been disowned by my family. I paid a price." (YouTube 2017, 6:22-7:14) However, she continued to write and in 2014 two new plays of hers, *Fourteen* and *Khandan*, were performed and in 2018 she produced her latest play *Elephant*.

As for the concerns of this thesis, among Bhatti's plays, *Behsharam* and *Khandan* will be analysed because the spatial features of the plays provide "heterotopias" which is adjusted theatrical use by Tompkins. After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 will offer a theoretical background for the term which is applied in this thesis. Firstly, Foucault's exploration of the term will be explained and then later scholars' disagreements, objections and contributions will be clarified. Lastly, Joanne Tompkins' contribution and adjustment of the term heterotopia will be unclosed in detail as this thesis will depart from her seminal book *Theatre's Heterotopias* (2012) in which she re-explores and adjusts the term into theatre studies. Her analysis in the book consists of different spaces; the venue where the plays are performed, the narrative spaces in the plays and the design of the stage which creates a space of its own. Despite analysing the selected plays through a close eye on the performative productions of the plays, she points out that it is

possible to establish a textual analysis of any theatre play because heterotopic spaces might be explored in “in the narrative of a text” (Tompkins p. 31). My analysis, in this regard, will focus more on such textual evidence as the stage directions in the plays because of the fact that the plays have not recently been performed in any theatre venues in the UK and even if they have been performed, I did not have the chance to spectate the performances. This study, therefore, will rather delve into the textual evidence in the plays. One other fractionation of this study will be the application of the term heterotopia to the space that the migrants create through their bodies.

Chapter 3 will offer an analysis of Bhatti’s debut play *Behsharam*’s engagement with heterotopic spaces. Since the play centres on a British Sikh family, the space around the family members generates heterotopias through which one can make connections to contemporary problems concerning the immigrants. This play provides a reading of heterotopias through the characters individually. In this regard, the main character Jaspal will be scrutinized first and a similar analysis of her sister Sati will be providing such spaces which connect the theatre to the real world outside the walls. Towards the end of the chapter, the heterotopic spaces emerging around other characters in the play will be dealt with through some minor connections to the family as a whole.

Chapter 4 will, thenceforth, investigate the family as a whole, and the heterotopias generated around the family in the play *Khandan* will be pointed out. Primarily family will be discussed as a space which can provide heterotopias concerning immigrant families in the actual world. Then, the Sikh family will be the point of focus as the name of the play itself is the Punjabi word for ‘family’ (khandan). And a similar analysis which is impossible to ignore will be devoted to the white family in the play. Even though the family is neither voiced nor present throughout the play, their absence will be analysed according to Tompkins’ formulation of the ‘presence of absence’.

I could have chosen other plays by Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti such as *Behzti*, *Behud* or *Fourteen* but these plays’ spatial dimension is not as functional as *Behsharam* and *Khandan* because this thesis’ emphasis on immigrants’ experience

in Britain sets parallel to the characters and spatiality of these two plays. Even though it would, for sure, be possible to make an analysis heterotopic spaces in other plays as well, it would not be as in depth as these two plays provide. Other contemporary plays by such playwrights as Alia Bano and Mustapha Matura would also be studied for their spatiality but Bhatti's stage directions help make it easier to surface the heterotopias in her plays. It therefore was inevitable to put Bhatti's plays under scrutiny for the purpose of this thesis study. Moreover, since there has never been an attempt to discover the heterotopic spaces in Bhatti's plays, it has been the very sparkle shedding light onto the path that this study has followed. Very rarely has the term heterotopia been applied to theatrical productions or plays, let alone in Bhatti's plays and that is why this thesis has firmly striven to reveal heterotopias in these two plays endeavouring to make connections to the actual world outside.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2. 1. Foucault's Heterotopia

In drama studies space has long become a crucial field to shed light into the depths of plays because theatre itself, one way or another, necessitates some sort of space for the actor(s)/actress(es) to perform. It should be pointed out that it is not likely to make an analysis of heterotopic space for each and every play concerning the space in the plays. Besides, there can be exemplary plays whose intentional lack of some sort of space might be open to discussion in order to help us understand the plays further. Yet, having put it forth, selected plays might have more in common to offer an understanding of how space has its impact on the plays' reception by the audience. The spatial techniques in a play might be quintessential in this sense. Nevertheless, it is not always the spatial technique in a play that reveals the play's spatiality. The stage or the set with minimal spatial techniques might as well lead to the same direction. Even characters themselves can create their own space since it is not an uncommon practice to scrutinize a play in its linguistic space or corporal space of the characters. One indispensable way to investigate a play in its spatial commodity can be its scrutiny in terms of its heterotopic spatial features, which is not, for sure, the newest method but not a profoundly old approach either.

As Eric Smith expresses, heterotopia was "first articulated as a spatial theory by Michel Foucault" in the late 1960s, "and later developed and refined by others" such as Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey (Smith p.3). Heterotopia was "borrowed from medicine by Foucault and developed by him and others to describe spaces that mirror, mimic, subvert, critique and even polemicize other spaces" and "[i]n its original medical context, heterotopia was a part out of place in a body: a

tooth in the skull, a fingernail in the hand, and the like. For his presentation to architects (later published as an article in *Diacritics* in 1986), Foucault adapted it to the discourse of space” (Smith p. 18). Even though “[i]t was a short and frustratingly incomplete introduction for the concept”, Smith, and many others alike, find the concept “auspicious” and useful. For this reason, heterotopia has since been used and applied in various fields.

Heterotopia is likely to be found in each and every theatre play because Foucault exemplifies the term heterotopia with the theatre stage itself aside with many other spaces such as cinema rooms, libraries, museums, cemeteries and so on. Foucault’s use of the term is put in contrast to utopias which “are sites with no real place” because as he acknowledges “utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces”. However, despite these unreal spaces, he mentions, “[t]here are also, probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places”. With their spatial existence, these places are described thoroughly by Foucault as follows;

places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of the society – which are something like counter sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind 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, 4 – “Of Other Spaces”)

Foucault regards that places such as theatre stages, cinema rooms, museums, libraries and many other similarly real places are spaces through which one has access to other spaces or unreal places. Thus he asserts that heterotopias do bring together two different places into one specific space. That is to say there is the place that exists in its physical form and there are other places which do not exist in reality but are in a way part of our perception or apprehension. These two places are put together in what Foucault names heterotopias as he suitably illustrates the term with the image of mirror because he proclaims “that between utopias and these quite other sites, these heterotopias, there might be a sort of mixed, joint experience, which would be the mirror. The mirror is, after all a utopia, since it is a placeless place.” (ibid. 4)

In the mirror one can see one's own self when they look at it. Yet, what one sees in the mirror is not an actual or real person but it rather is a reflection which cannot shape in flesh and bone to create an alternative 'real' image of the same person. Therefore, the reflection which is seen in the mirror is but a utopia or a placeless place. Nevertheless, "it is also a heterotopia [a real space,] in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position" which one occupies (4). So, the mirror is, in one sense, a utopia because it is not a real space but, in another sense, the mirror is a heterotopia because it does exist. In other words, the mirror offers a heterotopic space to the one who looks at it in respect to one's actual physical existence in the real world. As it is put forth in Foucault's own explanation, the mirror itself with the reflection that it holds on "makes this place that I occupy [...] at once absolutely real, connected with all space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there" (4).

Having clarified the heterotopic space with the example of mirror and the image in the mirror Foucault explains the principles of heterotopias and frames what he calls 'heterotopology', though he makes it clear that it can never be considered as a science itself. He aligns six principles for his term 'heterotopia'. Quintessentially, he introduces the first principle to accentuate the abundance of the possible locations of heterotopias suggesting that "there is probably not a single culture in the world that fails to constitute heterotopias" as they "obviously take quite varied forms, and perhaps no one absolutely universal form of heterotopia would be found" (4). For heterotopias, therefore, there is not a single, obvious, irrevocable form as it is pointed out. They might differ from society to society, culture to culture or place to place and even from a specific period of time to another. It, therefore, is difficult to speak of a fixed and rigid form which cannot change per se. Yet, Foucault points out that there might be a certain form for one type of heterotopias, which he names "crisis heterotopias".

In these crisis heterotopias, some moments of 'crisis' in human experience are to happen, as Foucault mentions, 'elsewhere'. To exemplify, he alludes to the fact that in some societies the 'deflowering' of a woman, by which he means losing

one's virginity, takes place far away from home in a different place during what is called a 'honeymoon trip'. It forms a heterotopia in which a moment of crisis happens. The elderly is iterated as another example since getting older is another state of crisis; when one gets older, they are taken care of in what is called rest homes or nursing homes. Thus, rest homes or nursing homes appear to be spaces which can be called heterotopias. Yet, many of these crisis heterotopias, except rest homes, are considered to be changing their forms into other type of heterotopia as Foucault says "these heterotopias of crisis are disappearing today and are being replaced, I believe, by what we might call heterotopias of deviation: those in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to required mean or norm are placed. (5) Besides rest homes, prisons and psychiatric hospitals are given to be examples of such heterotopias.

It will not be futile to recapitulate that the rest homes where the elderly are looked after and the psychiatric hospitals where psychiatric disorders of patients are treated function as heterotopic space whether they are heterotopias of crisis or, (as for Foucault, more possibly) heterotopias of deviation. Both spaces are to be repeated a few more times in this study as they are of crucial importance: they are either referred to as climactic conversation or put in the centre in the course of events in the plays which will be explored and scrutinized in detail. These heterotopias do have specific functions in the plays. Foucault also states it in the second principle of heterotopia by emphasizing that "each heterotopia has a precise and determined function within a society and the same heterotopia can, according to the synchrony of the culture in which it occurs, have one function or another." (5). It is comprehensively pointed out that a 'strange' example of such heterotopias is the cemetery in which each and every member of a community in a village, town or city has a connection to because they unquestionably have at least one buried relative, whether close or distinct.

The function of cemetery, as pointed in the text, was rather sacred and religious in the past centuries. That was why cemeteries were at the core of the cities in the yards of churches or next to the big cathedrals in European cities. However, during the last two centuries, this function shifted with the changing

perception of the notion of death itself since it came to happen that death started to be considered as 'illness' and thus the cemeteries are moved to the outskirts of the cities. One similar case can be said to have, through time, happened in Muslim cities of the Middle East as well because in the ancient city centres one can see cemeteries located next to mosques if not in their gardens whereas nowadays large cemeteries are insistently located outside cities, in a longer reach. Thence, it can be claimed that the function of heterotopia might change in time. That is to say, through time, heterotopias are not unlikely to evolve and they might gain different spatial meanings. Heterotopias can possibly be prone to spatio-temporal changes in meaning and function.

The third principle, being one of the most compelling of all, is that "[t]he heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (6). This principle paves the way for any engrossed scholar to investigate the theatre stage or the play itself since it is attainable and recently quite prevalent to assemble two or more sites or places into one single scene or stage in both newly written plays and in the re-staging of the plays from the olden times. Even if these distinct places are not put in one single scene on the stage, they are performed in a sequence during the stint spared for the play. Foucault, himself, touches on this as he reveals "the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another" (6). Correspondingly cinema rooms are also affirmed to be sound examples of such a principle of heterotopias. As in one screen, black and white or colourful, a number of scenes are put together in an order, one after another to produce a cinema film, it is inexorable that bounteous places are exhibited in a flow during a short amount of time. Thus, beside the theatre stage, cinema rooms and the screens likewise generate their own heterotopias which accumulate divergent places despite their actual, real place or location creating an alternate space of their own.

As for the fourth principle, Foucault focuses on the relation between heterotopias and time; "[h]eterotopias are most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies." (6) Heterochrony is indicated to show the spatio-

temporal connection of such places as he says “[t]he heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with traditional time.”

(p. 6) The impeccable examples are given as cemeteries where one loses contact with the notion of time, museums which brings together several ancient items in one space breaking temporal apprehension and libraries in which time is paused with various book pages collecting information from antiquity. However, theatre stage is also capable of setting an excellent example to this principle of heterotopia because of the fact that the stage itself does create its own temporality. The audience is to spectate what is performed on the stage and what the play produces in regard to its own temporal space.

Not only do the setting and the items that adorn the stage carve the traditional time out to engender its own temporal lapse but the costumes - and even the language as well – help fracture the time that the audience is in. Say a Shakespearean history play is being performed at the Globe Theatre at the moment; the spectators are exposed to the setting, décor, costume and the language, each of which will force and shatter the notion of time which the audience occupy. That does not necessarily mean that it is only a play of the past centuries that destroys the connection between the audience and the time outside the walls of the theatre building; a contemporary play about a science-fictional future period or even about a current situation can cause the same break since each play has its own temporal space. These observations prove the disruptive potentiality of space in shifting the temporal consciousness of the audience from one level to another.

One of the last two principles of heterotopias that Foucault introduces as a precursor in such spatial use of the term is basically concerned with the inaccessibility of such spaces, that is to say, one cannot probe into a heterotopic space as one pleases. Heterotopic spaces necessitate some sort of preliminary preparations, which he explains as follows:

[h]eterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable. In general, heterotopic site is not freely accessible like a public place. Either the entry is compulsory, as in the case of entering a barracks or a prison, or else the individual has to submit to rites and purifications. To get in one must have a certain permission and make certain gestures. (7)

As it is clarified, if one is ever to infiltrate into a heterotopic space, one has to ‘pay’ for it in one way or another. This paying does not always have to be a pecuniary matter, it can be a crime as in the example of prisons or it can be a ritualistic purification as in the example of ‘Moslems’ before entering into mosques to pray. As for the theatre, though, it is both the ticket that one might buy if it is not a free performance and the theatre play necessitates a sense of readiness in audience. This is why the audience is regularly reminded about the amount of time left for the performance to start and asked to get seated before the start of the play. Besides, it is also repeatedly asked to either mute or turn off the mobile phones before the lights are off in order to cut ties with the outside world behind the walls of the theatre building. Thus, what the audience is to pay to enter into a theatre building can be pecuniary but it can also be just a necessary feeling of readiness.

For the last principle Foucault divides heterotopias into two groups according to their function; heterotopias of illusion and of compensation. “The last trait of heterotopias is that they have a function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles”(8). One opening the doors of an unreal, temporary or escapist world, while the other creating a world parallel to that existent one. As the role of the heterotopias is either

to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory [...] Or else, on the contrary their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. This latter type would be the heterotopia, not of illusion, but of compensation (p. 8).

Brothels are given as an example to heterotopias of illusion whereas colonies are examples of heterotopias of compensation. The first is illusory for it cuts ties with the real world whereas the latter is where most missionaries, according to Foucault, went to create an alternative place in which they can practice and spread their religious views since they organised and built towns at the centre of which was their church and its bell shaped their daily life. Theatres, on the other hand, are able to offer to create both of the extremes.

It can be claimed that theatres are capable of setting an example for heterotopias of illusion as they can create an illusory world cutting the ties of the

audience with the real world outside the theatre during the performance because entering into the theatre building, after all, puts a distance between the spectators and the outside world if one remembers how theatres ask the audience to cut the connection before the play starts hindering them from keeping up with the outside world. But they can be heterotopias of compensation as well when they offer an alternative solution to any contemporary social, cultural, political, and economic or whatever problem that humanity encounters. And as part of the contemporary British drama, more and more plays dealing with such problems have flourished and keep flourishing nowadays, it can be suggested that theatre performances are producing more examples of heterotopias of compensation.

Noting that “[b]rothels and colonies are two extreme types of heterotopia”, Foucault points out, in his concluding paragraph, that a boat is a much more convincing example because “the boat is a floating piece of space, a place without a place, that exists by itself” (p. 9) It does not belong to a specific place or a port and does not possess a place of its own either but it rather floats on the water, going from one place to another, from one port to another. He expresses that this is also the reason why the boat or the ship is an intrinsic element for the welfare of the Western civilization which used the mast of the ship to build up its existence. Therefore, the ship or the boat

is closed in on itself and at the same time is given over to the infinity of the sea and that, from port to port, from tack to tack, from brothel to brothel, it goes as far as the colonies in search of the most precious treasures they conceal in their gardens, you will understand why the boat has not only been for our civilisation, from the sixteenth century until the present, the great instrument of economic development [...] but has been simultaneously the greatest reserve of imagination. The ship is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without boats, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates. (9)

As the boat floats on water from one port to another, the theatre play likewise is able to sail off from one concrete stage to another, from one language to another, from one society to another and from one specific period of time to another. Theatre play is, thence, ‘the heterotopia par excellence’ as well. And one can expand one’s search for heterotopias into each and every stage and play in order to find out the heterotopic treasure through which the actual world beyond the stage or

beyond the walls of the theatre building is explored at its extremes and given meaning or exhibited in a stark way and turned inside out with all its flaws, freckles and blemishes aside with its wonders, marvels and curiosities as well as miraculous phenomena.

Lastly, before moving on to review the later scholars who discussed, promoted and applied the term heterotopia, it is noteworthy to refer to Foucault's other isolated explanation of heterotopia in one of his excessively influential and prevalently referred pieces de résistance *The Order of Things*. Foucault indicates that heterotopias

are disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this *and* that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy 'syntax' in advance, and not only the syntax which causes words or things (next to and opposite one another) to 'hold together'. (...) heterotopias desiccate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source: they dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences (2002 p. xix)

Foucault's only two explanations of the term heterotopia paved the path for several other scholars to add more onto the use of it in spatial theory. Some of those scholars' contribution to the term helped form the method for this study as well.

2. 2. Heterotopia After Foucault

Foucault's use of the term 'heterotopia' in the late 1960s has since been the focus for discussions among numerous critics. There are those who disapprove of Foucault's exploration of heterotopia as well as those who advocate and promote his use of the term and approve the necessity for such a term to be used in spatial theory in its relation to a range of fields such as geography, architecture, sociology, cultural studies and literature.

A well-known of these critics is Henri Lefebvre and he uses his own form of the term alongside with *isotopy* and *u-topia* in his reputable work *The Urban Revolution*. (Lefebvre p. 37) The latter, a 'u-topia', he suggests, is "the non-place, the place for that which does not occur, which has no place of its own, that is always elsewhere" is a space that "can be neither read nor seen, and yet it is there in

all its glory” (p. 129) and it “combines near and distant orders” (Lefebvre, pp.129-130). An isotopy [or isotopia], on the other hand, “is a place (topos) and everything that surrounds it [...], that is, everything that makes a place the same place”, it is this “very place” which does exist and is real (38). Lefebvre, similarly, locates his “heterotopy” (or heterotopia) between these two spaces and defines it as “a *different place, an other place*” (38). In *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre defines “heterotopias” as “contrasting places” between “analogous place” and “no place” (Lefebvre 1991, p. 165).

Lefebvre’s term heterotopy coincides with Foucault’s heterotopia in respect to its location since Foucault, as mentioned before, does too locate his heterotopia between utopia, the non-place, and the real place. Lefebvre presents his heterotopy as a different place and points out that its difference is “a difference that marks it by situating it (situating itself) with respect to the initial place” and with this, an ‘incision-structure of juxtaposed places’ arises (p. 38). According to Lefebvre, it results elsewhere, “place characterized by absence-presence” and “the non-place that has no place and seeks a place of its own” and eventually finds it in a heterotopy (p. 38). It stands as “the other place, the place of the other, simultaneously excluded and interwoven” (p. 129).

Thus, as Neil Brenner and Stuart Elden mention, Lefebvre is “less polemical, in his treatment of Michel Foucault” (p. 12); he just promotes what Foucault explores in a way to develop his theorization of the term. However, unlike Lefebvre, David Harvey cannot be said to have approved of the use of the term. Harvey, in his own words, has “profound objections to Foucault’s conception [of heterotopia] precisely because of its basis on a purely Kantian (Newtonian) interpretation of spatiality” (Harvey p. 45.) In his account, Foucault’s term is “a very undialectical rendering of what space is and can be about”. (Harvey, 2001, p. 45) Harvey finds it insufficient to apply since anything or any place/space can be a heterotopia and he sees heterotopia as a ‘not-category’ (qtd. in Thrift, p. 55) and claims that “Foucault fails to develop a viable critical theory of what space and time might be about” (Harvey 2007, p. 46).

As Joanne Tompkins points out, Harvey “objects to a simplistic application of heterotopia that fails to account for its critical, disruptive, political point” (p. 22). And he also suggests that the term should not be used just to utter that there are other spaces/places or worlds than the one which we inhabit and which is visible and concrete. In contrast to Foucault’s “simplistic” use of the term, it rather should be used with an emphasis on its political function so as to challenge the socio-political matters and to improve its possible competence in the social context (Harvey 2009, p. 111). Harvey also makes an emphasis on the difference in the use of the term by two critiques, namely Lefebvre and Foucault. He articulates in his *Rebel Cities* (2012) that “Lefebvre’s concept of heterotopia (radically different from that of Foucault) delineates liminal social spaces of possibility where “something different” is not only possible, but foundational for the defining revolutionary trajectories” (Harvey 2012, p. xvii).

Edward Soja, to continue, agrees on Foucault’s discerning of the take-over of the space as he concurs with the “rebalancing of this prioritization of time over space”. (Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*, 1989, p. 11). However, in his study titled *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (1996), he assumes that heterotopia is “Foucault’s version of Thirdspace” (Soja 1996, p. 154) alleging that “Foucault first notes that our lives are still governed by “sanctified” (modernist?) oppositions (e.g. between private and public space, family and social space, cultural and useful space, leisure and work space)” (Soja 1996, p. 156). He, thus, claims that it functions as what he calls “a critical thirding-as-Othering” (Soja 1996, 157). Although Soja admits the incompleteness of Foucault’s term, he gives credit where it is due. He holds:

Foucault’s heterotologies are frustratingly incomplete, inconsistent, incoherent. They seem narrowly focused on peculiar microgeographies, nearsighted and near-sited, deviant and deviously apolitical. Yet they are also marvellous incunabula of another fruitful journey into Thirdspace, into the spaces that difference makes, into geohistories of otherness. Are they similar or are they different from the Thirdspace of Lefebvre, bell hooks or Homi Bhabha? The answer, to both questions, is yes. (Soja 1996, p. 162)
Eric C. Smith, on the other hand, favours the concept and uses it in

Foucault’s Heterotopia in Christian Catacombs (2014) pointing that the articulation of the term helps understand “the real and the imaginary” spaces

because “heterotopia describes the ways that certain spaces relate to other spaces by mimicking, mirroring, subverting, and critiquing those spaces” (Smith p. 3).

According to Smith, “the most common form” of the term is that which “describe[s] the relationship of a marginal or marginalized physical space to more hegemonic space”. (Smith p.3) He suggests heterotopias explain the hegemonic space and it is “a useful tool” for scholars to investigate “the operations of power and meaning within and between spaces” (Smith p. 19). His use of the term proves common traits with that of other several contemporary scholars, one of whom is Stephen Legg. According to Legg, too, the concept of heterotopia “attempts to mediate the utopic and the real” (Legg p. 280).

Lasty Kevin Hetherington’s interpretation of heterotopia is crucial for this study because Tompkins’ use of the term heterotopia dwells much on it. In her study *Theatre’s Heterotopias*, Tompkins points out the differences between Hetherington’s analysis and that of the other critics. She asserts that Harvey’s approach to the term heterotopia is similar to Foucault’s use. She notes that Harvey’s heterotopia is not just to solidify “the presence of other worlds, spaces or places”. It, on the contrary, has a political function and such function helps attempt to articulate the potential for social changes.

In this regard, the term heterotopia is unanimously accepted by various scholars of spatial theory to have helped and to keep helping understand the relationship between the real place(s) and the non-place(s). Heterotopia has been existent in the projects of those who are interested in theatre studies as well. Plays that have been produced in national and historical theatres in UK consist a significant part of such studies. And for this study, Tompkins’ book, *Theatre’s Heterotopias*, proves to be an outstanding and pioneering project.

2. 2. 1. *Theatre’s Heterotopias* or Tompkins’ Formulation Based on Hetherington’s Concerns

Basing her ‘method of heterotopia’ on Foucault’s exploration of the term and on such theoreticians as Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey and especially Kevin

Hetherington, each of whom either enhanced or straighten the use of it, Joanne Tompkins applies the term in her analysis of selected plays performed in specific theatre venues. In her exceptionally prominent book *Theatre's Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space* (2014), she has extended the path for heterotopia paved by the antecedent theoreticians. *Theatre's Heterotopias* "accounts for the refractive, challenging, and distorting nature of theatrical space." (Tompkins p. 15) As Laura Levin points out in her review of the book *Theatre's Heterotopias* is the first book to engage in a sustained way the idea that theatre forms part of a social group of alternative, heterotopic space." (Levin p. 261)

Tompkins states that "space in performance can instigate a significant interaction between theatre and culture" and that heterotopia has the efficacy to operate "as a means of rendering more palpable both the spatial and the socio-political possibilities that theatre presents" (p. 15). She suggests that a heterotopia in theatre can be generated when the performance takes place but she also admits that it is not solely dependent on the performance itself and acknowledges that the heterotopic space can be investigated through the textual analysis of a play too. The venue of the theatrical performance can work as what helps us understand its involvement with the social context. No matter how one investigates a theatrical work's components i.e. the performance or the venue in which that performance takes place or even the performance's text itself, theatre is always able to create a heterotopic space in the minds of the audience or the readers and each one of this audience or the readers might perceive a different heterotopic space according to their own personal experience and to concerns of the period they live in.

Theatre does not merely operate as a means of entertainment even though one cannot deny such mechanism of its. Tompkins claims that

[h]eterotopias offer a means to articulate and extend theatre's role in its socio-political context, especially in an age when theatre competes more than ever with the entertainment pleasures of cinema, television, and internet-based social networking communities, among many other possibilities. (p. 16)

Thus in its competence with contemporary world's 'entertainment pleasures', theatre conceives a role more engaged in the social and/or political context of the life outside the walls of the theatre. This, however, does not necessarily mean that

cinema or television cannot create a connection to such a context – it is just not a concern of this study. A play’s intervention with space and its invaluable capacity to render a connection between the spatiality and socio-political circumstances are to be of higher importance for this study. It is also necessary to mention that while a relationship between stage and performance forms the core of Tompkins’ study, the relationship between the space that the characters occupy and the one that appears in one’s mind as a reader or as a member of the audience will help construe the essence of this study.

Tompkins further claims that the heterotopic spaces offered by the plays and the performances can sometimes provide much more profound possibilities of the connections between the play and the actual world.

Heterotopias open up the opportunity for exploring in detail the possibilities that such connections present; they have the capacity to occupy a deeper ‘place’ than theatre already offers. They demonstrate how the layers of spatiality – both the concrete spaces that architecture provides as well as the abstract spaces and places that a specific production creates – articulate meaning in their own right, let alone through overlap between and among these layers. In so doing, they attend to spatial ordering, leaving open the chance to reveal and rethink existing structures of power and knowledge.
(17)

She suggests that heterotopia be accepted “as a bridge that connects theatre with cultural politics and practice”, and she believes “theatre’s continual presentation of a ‘possible world’ in performance can intensify the art form’s relationship with the actual world beyond a venue.” (p. 16)

Tompkins, too, underlines utopia’s significance in examining heterotopias. She analyses the term from the beginning of its existence that is “since ‘utopia’ was coined in 1518 by Sir Thomas More in his foundational narrative that is named for the word” (p. 17). Utopia and utopianism has since been present and indispensable for a range of fields including literature. This irrevocable existence of utopia, she mentions, is emphasized by Angelika Bammer as she claims that ‘utopianism has been a staple, if not a bedrock, of the western cultural tradition’ (1991, p.1) (qtd in Tompkins p. 17). Nevertheless, Tompkins points out that the concept of heterotopia is no less important than utopia and it is essential to make a clear detection of the

term to distinguish them precisely from each other. Her description of the term utopia starts again from Thomas More grand opus;

More's *Utopia* describes a society and its location in which life is ordered for the benefit of all by limiting the freedoms of the individual in favour of the greater good. *Utopia* satirizes the society of its time, contrasting the inequalities and injustices of sixteenth-century England with the egalitarianism of its fictional society [...] But a fundamental quality of this fictional - 'elsewhere' - this impossible place - was precisely the fact that it was elsewhere. (Tompkins pp. 17-18)

Heterotopia, on the contrary, "retains the quality of otherness in a way that utopia does not" and like in Smith's remark, Tompkins does too point the medical meaning of the term which follows as "the medical situation in which an organ is displaced from its usual location or position in the body (Concise Medical Dictionary). Like the anatomical abnormality of its etymological origin, heterotopia can work from within, albeit occurring where we may least expect it" (p. 18). It is pointed out that heterotopia can live at the current time in the present place as a part of the community. It thus has a function in the time, place and the society within which it exists.

Tompkins builds a significant part of the basis for her method on Hetherington's employment of the term. As Hetherington points out, it is the procedure of "alternate ordering" (2001, p. 51) and it "looks to how society might be improved in the future" (qtd. in Tompkins p.18) And for Tompkins, "heterotopia, ironically unlike utopia, has the capacity to actually build the foundations for making what Hetherington terms alternate orderings of spatial structures." (p. 20) In theatre, it helps detect the unavoidable relationship between the staged performance and the real world that has long been accepted as a stage itself as it is also declared in William Shakespeare's famous play, *As You Like It* (II.7.140).

Theatre's affinity with the real world is comparable to that with the non-real, imagined world(s) or utopia(s). Tompkins' instantiation of the relation between utopia and the theatre performance is supported with what Jill Dolan puts forth: "performance always exceeds its space and its image, since it lives only in its doing, which is imagining, in the good no-place that is theatre" (p. 13) Since there

is such a relationship between the real place and the no place, it seems inevitable for heterotopias to arise in-between. As Diana Saco, as well, defines, a heterotopia as “a kind of in-between space of contradiction, of contestation: a space that mimics or stimulates lived spaces, but that in so doing, calls those spaces we live in into question (2002, p. 14)” and it is widely accepted that “[s]uch fraying or contestation is core to Foucault’s heterotopia” (Saco qtd. in Tompkins p.21). This, one might say, can be core to its use in theatre as well.

As Foucault delineates, heterotopia is “disturbing” and this aspect of it is surely no exception for its presence in theatre. Tompkins offers that heterotopia, because of its disturbing characteristic, “*unsettles* the world as we know it, a quality that will come to be key in its use in theatre (pp. 21, 22). Kevin Hetherington also casts the same role to heterotopias for he finds them “unsettl[ing] because they have the effect of making things appear out of place” (1997, p.50). He also believes that “[t]he power of the concept of heterotopia lies in its ambiguity, that it can be a site of order just as much as it can be a site of resistance”, which causes an “ambivalence” and “[i]t is the ambivalence contained in the idea of heterotopia” (ibid. p.51). In this sense, Tompkins bases her study on Hetherington’s conceptualization of theory. It is critical to mention that Foucault’s heterotopia is slightly different from that of Hetherington because Hetherington defines heterotopia as ‘ambivalent’

whereas heterotopia for Foucault is a counter-site of resistance (1986, p 22), Hetherington sees it as not quite oppositional. Instead, for him, heterotopias ‘organize a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them. That alternate ordering marks them out as Other and allows them to be seen as an example of an alternative way of doing things’ (1997, p. viii). (Tompkins p. 24)

Furthermore, as Tompkins reveals “[h]eterotopias do not simply exist in the delineation of an alternative space: rather, their power is derived from being read *against* a context of a real or actual world” as it is mentioned in Foucault’s *Des Espaces Autres*. Yet, she adds that “[f]or Hetherington, heterotopias are not necessarily the fixed locations or entities that they are for Foucault” (ibid. pp.25-26). They are located in “Other” sites and this “otherness” is quite critical for the locating of heterotopias. (Hetherington, p.50) For Tompkins, this location of

otherness strengthens the heterotopic space “significantly” *vis-à-vis* the real site and “[t]hus, a heterotopia without such an actual point of comparison is meaningless” (Tompkins p.26). She, then, relates this to the theatre’s function against the ‘real’ world since there is, she suggests, a parallelism between heterotopic space’s relation with the real space and theatre venue’s relation with actual world beyond the theatre’s wall. While the performance in the stage temporarily seems real, it is not as continuously real as the world outside. As she conveys,

[t]o clarify, a theatre venue is obviously real even if what is staged within it is not. Many locations that are created on stage are real in that they are, in, say, naturalistic theatre, made with wood and objects that are recognizably ‘concrete’. Yet they are also unreal in that they do not exist beyond their function in a performance and they will be destroyed or repurposed when the production closes. (ibid. p. 26)

However, she also notes that, in theatre, even though heterotopias are likely to be representations of actual world outside the theatre building’s wall, they may even tend to be abstract spaces as well. She takes it forward asserting that “[h]eterotopias may, then, be the actual or imagined spaces/places (or spaces of the imagination) in dialogue with ‘real’ locations (although it is important to note that real and non-real places are not equivalent to the ‘good place’ and ‘no place’)” (ibid. p. 26).

In regard to “the relation between theatre and the world outside its walls”, which is what Tompkins bases her study on, we must bear in mind that heterotopias might come to existence in assorted types concerning the social, political and/or cultural issues beyond that very specific wall of the theatre venue. Each member of the audience, or the reader in the case of my study, is likely to witness a distinct type of heterotopia or to have an unconventional spatial experience because it is noteworthy to keep in mind that “[h]eterotopias might exist in any number of varieties, depending on the social contexts in which they form and the peculiar persons or community to which they belong.” (Eric C. Smith p. 20) Any such particular ‘variety’ of heterotopia that a member of the spectators or a reader associates with enables to comprehend and to make comments on the socio-political and cultural issues which are faced with when the performance ends. This is why “heterotopias do, for the duration of the theatrical production in which they

are produced, take up space” (Tompkins p. 28) since heterotopias are neither the actual world outside nor the stage’s concrete entity.

This aspect of heterotopia forms the ground for Tompkins’ study as she investigates heterotopias capability to prompt the audience to discern and interpret the actual world. Thus, the theatre or the performance, generating heterotopias, continues to function in its cultural context out-of-doors. With its continuation in the mind of the audience within the actual world, “[h]eterotopia opposes the real in some cases while offering a means of ‘alternate ordering’ in others” (ibid. p. 28) because they, Hetherington claims, function as “spaces of alternate ordering” (1997, p. vii). Similarly, Lefebvre’s analysis of heterotopia leads to a comparable function of the term in the social context, which is what, Hetherington believes, lacks in Foucault’s treatment of it.

Hetherington’s interpretation of heterotopia is crucial for Tompkins because in her study *Theatre’s Heterotopias* she clarifies the differences between Hetherington’s analysis and that of the other scholars together with the dissent that each of these scholars put forth. She, for example, notes that David Harvey’s heterotopia was different from that of Foucault. She claims that Harvey “has argued most strongly that heterotopia not be used simply to mark the presence of other worlds, spaces or places” and instead he argued “that it be connected with what might be called a political function, such as the attempt to articulate the potential for social, however that may be conceived” and she utters Harvey’s objection “to a simplistic application of heterotopia that fails to account for its critical, disruptive, political point” (Tompkins p. 22).

She also compares Soja’s perception of the term and the difference between these two scholars’ approach towards Foucault’s utilisation of the term. She argues that “Edward Soja understands Harvey’s reservations but appreciates that ‘Foucault focused our attention on another spatiality of social life’” and this social life for Soja is an ‘external space’, “the actually lived (and socially produced) space of sites and the relations between them”. She indicates that Soja disagreed to employ heterotopias just as ‘other spaces’ because for him they ‘are not just “other spaces”’ to be added on to the geographical imagination, they are also “other than” the

established ways of thinking spatially” and thus she claims heterotopias “require an intersection with the cultural context of which they are a part, rather than a narrow metaphoric application” (ibid. p. 22). For Tompkins, Soja’s interpretation of heterotopia is, in a clear way, related to his use of the term ‘thirdspace’ which, she points, is not applicable for her study. She, therefore, does not put emphasis on Soja’s use of the term heterotopia.

The way she employs heterotopia is similar to that of Michal Kobialka, as she clarifies herself. Kobialka analyses Foucault’s heterotopia in Tadeusz Kantors’s work. Tompkins remarks that “[f]or Kantor, heterotopia can be located within the ‘space’ of the self” and it can be ‘used’ “to push the potential for theatre ‘beyond the physical aspects [...] in the direction of metaphysical theatre’ (1993, p. 339)” (qtd. in Tompkins p. 23). For her, to exploit the term so as to make a connection to the outside world and to the social issues is the essence in spatial theory in studies of theatrical productions and it is primarily put forth that “a potential outcome of a study of heterotopias is, then, more detailed examination of locations in which cultural and political meanings can be produced spatially” (ibid. p. 1). Even though Tompkins’ interest in social, cultural and political issues is obvious, it must be stated that the plays that she investigates are, by nature, spatially political since, as Michael Kirby suggests, theatre, after all, “is political to the extent that it attempts to be political” (Kirby p. 132). This might be the answer to why Tompkins is interweaving the stances of Lefebvre and Hetherington in her study, *Theatre’s Heterotopias*.

Tompkins, putting the emphasis on Hetherington’s analysis of heterotopia, scrutinizes various plays. Her investigation includes watching of the performances of the plays that she has chosen. She mentions this as well when she explains the method that she is planning to follow.

My analysis takes into account a combination of the following spaces, which intersect and interact to generate heterotopic locations: the theatre venue in which a performance takes place (or, if it does not take place in a conventional venue, the location in which it is staged); the narrative space(s)/place(s) that the playwright establishes, which are generated in the venue or even referred to beyond the limits of the performance space; the layers of design and the direction that are added to the first two types of

space which continue to accrete (and in some cases challenge or subvert) meaning. (Tompkins p. 29)

Tompkins' investigation includes the stage which generally presents the actual world, the performance which is produced on that stage, and the atmosphere which is created throughout each and every scene and act of the play by such concrete elements as the decors, adornments, actions, directions.

To investigate spatiality of a production or a performance, Tompkins says, one has to check the design of the venue or the stage, and ask what types of places/space are presented in the performance and to what end. Moreover, she asserts that reviews, posters, promotional material, the nature of the playwright, director, and/or the company which produces the performance might also help understand and investigate the spatiality of the performance or the play. These components, therefore, produce the heterotopic space in theatre. Nevertheless, as it is remarked clearly, one must remember that “[s]ometimes a heterotopic space becomes apparent only for a short time, whereas in other instances it may be staged for a much more significant part of a performance” (ibid. p. 29). And it depends on how the spectator, or the reader in this study, might receive it.

Accentuating that “[a] heterotopic experience is more likely to emerge and affect an audience member when that person remains attentive to and welcoming of the theatrical – and other – conditions taking place and being generated around them”, Tompkins stresses that it is highly probable to witness heterotopic moments and spaces throughout a play but “[i]t requires effort as does any thorough interpretational reading frame” (ibid. p. 30). In order to find out and pursue the clues of the existence of a heterotopia, or a heterotopic space or moment in a specific play, there are a great number of practical questions that, she claims, should be asked concerning the play or the production so that it might be easier to detect such spatial functions of theatre plays and performances. The questions that Tompkins, herself, poses at the selected plays in her book are as follows:

What space(s) and place(s) contribute to a production's diegesis and how are they operating? Do they overlap and intersect to suggest the potential for collapsing time and space? Do the locations in the performance require disentangling to even identify (since theatrical worlds often intertwine, sometimes in very confusing manners)? Or do they create rigid contrasting

zones? What is their function *vis-à-vis* contemporary social or cultural politics? Do these spaces and places provoke connections for their audiences to other possibilities, whether implicit or explicit, or do they simply reproduce the social and political norms? In addition to strictly spatial considerations, I also stress how such spaces intersect with (or contradict) the actors' embodiment(s), the dialogue, the narrative, the sound. What is the role of the venue in which the performance takes place? Do the production's locations 'fit' in this venue? What is the potential for an alternative and /or resistant reading of the spatial practice in this performance? (ibid. p. 30)

Since Tompkins utters that a heterotopia "requires a spatio-centric analysis, but it also accommodates and incorporates other theatrical elements of any production" and thus these questions are, for her, the 'background work' or the 'mathematical figurings' to bring light onto heterotopic interpretations of the spaces in the theatrical productions. However, she keeps up with the reality that "[t]he answers to such questions do not in themselves determine whether a production is heterotopic" but instead these answers might rather "provide information about how space operates, from which an interpretation can be built about the worlds that the production establishes, as well as the crucial relationships between these worlds". Tompkins' analytical reading frame obviously draws connections between the spatiality of a play/performance/production to its social/political contexts (ibid. pp. 30-31). She, then, compares the worlds that emerge from the spatial abundance in terms of heterotopia within the theatrical productions and builds up her own interpretation of the heterotopic space.

Amongst these questions that Tompkins addresses, I might emphasize that there are some which might provide tenets for my reading of the spatiality in the plays. The first and the foremost one is that which is concerned with contributions of the space and the place to the texts. Another question that will be concentrated on is about the function of these spaces concerning contemporary social or cultural politics. Thus, the connection which the plays help draw in the minds of the spectators in relation to any possible other ways of solutions to such political issues will be another focal point. Such theatrical elements as the narrative, the voice, the music and songs that are used in the plays will also be prioritized in regard to their contributions to forming of heterotopic spaces. And finally, the venues that the

plays are performed for the first time are to be stressed regarding their relation and interventions to such mentioned politics. Akin to Tompkins' reading, the one that is aimed for this study will also involve into the social, cultural and political contexts of the plays i.e. the issues related to the migrants in the United Kingdom, the policies that are implemented and the way they are perceived in the society.

In its relation to social and political matters Tompkins' employment of heterotopia is fundamental for this study. Even though she mainly investigated the plays that she has chosen with a close eye on the performative productions of the plays, she lays the way open for the textual analysis of any play. She suggests that "[h]eterotopia may be embedded in the narrative of a text" and she adds that it might "be enhanced by a production team of designer, director, actors, composer, lighting technicians, and so on". However, she also makes it clear that "[o]f course, one person's perception of the heterotopic may not 'translate' in the same way to another" (ibid. p. 31). She, thenceforth, elucidates her own terminology to construct heterotopias.

According to Tompkins, 'good place' and 'no place' are not enough to identify the spatial poles in theatrical performances. These terms seem to be too broad and not practical enough for theatrical use. Thus she articulates the need for a beneficial adaption of the two terms and gives preference to the adoption of two modified terms. Despite "retain[ing] the structure" of the two poles, she "modifie[s] the terms to 'constructed space' instead of 'good place' and 'abstracted space' instead of 'no place'" (ibid. p. 32). She strongly suggests that these two terms are much more applicable to theatrical productions than good place/no place and real place, and if applied in theatre, between these constructed and abstracted spaces can a heterotopic space be easily registered. Tompkins explains more thoroughly these two terms i.e. constructed space and abstracted space that she conceived for theatre studies.

By 'constructed' I mean the spatial environment that one usually confronts as a production begins, whether determined by a venue/location, its (initial) set, by expectations, and/or by setting(s) required by the narrative/action. 'Abstracted' space that is produced by the other dimension of utopics is a sometimes oppositional but certainly contrasting spatial environment that may be located in a geographically determined place; it may take on more of

an abstract quality (a state of mind/being) that is nevertheless rendered spatial in performance. Abstracted spaces may not necessarily be abstract per se. (ibid. 32)

She favours the word space instead of place in theatre studies because she claims what is analysed is the play's space rather than geographical places with coordinates. Constructed and abstracted spaces come to exist in a play, on a stage and in the mind of the audience. According to Tompkins, a heterotopia ensues when the two poles come together that is to say when constructed space and abstracted space assembles, there arises heterotopic space and it brings about an alternative zone to the 'status quo' that the audience of the performance or the reader of the text is exposed to in the real world. For this study is to inspect the plays through the model that Tompkins builds, it is fundamentally substantial to accentuate that her "heterotopic model extends the three component parts (constructed space, abstracted space, heterotopic space) to account for what this might mean in a cultural context and beyond performance" (ibid. p. 33). In this regard, the cultural, social and political contexts in which these plays were produced will also generate profound relevance.

It is also critical that one should remember the way heterotopias come into existence. They are likely to be literal spaces as well as abstract spaces. It can come as a scene in the play, it can be visible through some certain decors and adornments or it can just fade in as one's personal experience of outside world lets. It can even be the "absence of a space" in that the absence might be as decisive as an existing space, a concrete space. Absent or existent, space is always imperative for theatre.

Space in theatre can function not just at the level of an individual audience member's reactions but also in terms of a larger community response. Theatre assumes and builds on the connection between space and the collective experience in which its world-making takes place. Theatre's ability to play with an infinite number of spaces in front of a collective audience makes it an ideal context with and through which to examine heterotopia. The potential existence of a paradoxical world on stage wherein both the actual and 'conjured' locations coexist offers the opportunity to practice – to 'rehearse', as it were – potential socio-political alternatives to the larger space-time reality. (ibid. 37)

Having noted the importance of space in theatre and the significance of heterotopic space in it, it must be remarked that a moment in which a heterotopic space occurs in a play, as Tompkins utters “is not going to transform the world” for sure. Nevertheless, one must also remember “that it can prompt a rethinking, however minor initially, or a personal reaction to a larger social issue that can foster changed attitudes and responses” (ibid. pp. 37-38). Such moments of heterotopic spaces are abundant in the plays that this thesis is to investigate in the following chapters. Some of the social and the cultural issues that are encountered in today’s UK are too palpable to ignore in those plays and so are such heterotopic spaces.

In this regard, Tompkins’ project paves the way to analyse such issues or problems and as she makes obvious such intention of hers in the book and states clearly that her project

aims to connect theatre practice and criticism to social history and geography with a view to more fully articulating theatre’s role in culture. A heterotopic reading strategy enables us to better understand the concrete space(s) of both theatre and its social context, not to mention the performative relationship between them. (ibid. p.38)

It is the ultimate function of a heterotopia as it causes to “rethink theatre’s function and its social space, however widely we may choose to define that context”.

Whether it be Foucault’s juxtaposing space, Lefebvre’s *different place* or Soja’s *thirdspace* or Hetherington’s *alternate ordering space*, a heterotopia calls into question the social, cultural or political norms in the *real* world. As theatre has the potential to “shap[e] cultural formation and cultural change”, it is highly possible to detect such potential through the spatiality of the theatre play.

Following the lead of aforementioned spatial theoreticians, I aim to investigate the spatiality of Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti’s plays *Behsharam* and *Khandan* so as to bring light onto the heterotopic spaces in these plays. I believe the heterotopias that are produced throughout these plays have the power to affect the perception of the social norms, especially those that are cast over the migrants and those that migrants cast over one another. The aim of the following chapters, thenceforth, will be to detect and to interpret such explicit or implicit spatial features i.e. heterotopias that are arisen conspicuously throughout the plays and are, in that sense, unmatched among her other plays.

CHAPTER 3

HETEROTOPIAS IN *BEHSHARAM*

This chapter will explore the heterotopic space which is formed in and around the lives of the migrants i.e. those characters in Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti's play named *Behsharam*. It is anticipated that these heterotopic spaces which are most likely to have been instigated by the act of migrating from a specific space to another prompt the British audience to put into consideration the situation of the Sikh families. In the play, the Sikh family members of which have either migrated from India or been parented by those who migrated from India is to construe the centre of this analysis. It can be claimed that heterotopic spaces are generated around the immigrants and these heterotopias enables the audience, specifically the British, to see and to comprehend the situation in which immigrant are stuck while trying to attach to the country of arrival.

No matter whether they are a part of this family or not, it is noteworthy that every character in the play necessitates a second adjective next to the word 'British'. To exemplify; one might need to define the characters as British Indian, British Sikh, British Jamaican or Black British. It must also be mentioned that there is no single white character in the play although the play is totally set in Birmingham. It does not necessarily mean that this is the reason why this play makes it possible to investigate the characters heterotopically. Neither does it mean that this study aims to involve in the fight to arrange composed adjectives, names or identity markers for those who perform Britishness in their specific way. It is just to say that these characters naturally have their own distinct and unique way of living, use of language and daily practices and that, for this study, it is crucial to scrutinize such aspects.

To be able to make a well-developed scrutiny of the play *Behsharam*, it is also crucial to have a look at the plot. It will, for sure, help understand what route the action of the play follows. Throughout the play, one is exposed to a Sikh family's experience and break-up in the British city of Birmingham. There is the father whose name is not uttered even for a single time and who is just mentioned as Father or Dad. His mother Beji is also important since it is possible to claim that she is the one who is clung to the Sikh traditions; not the ones related to the religion but rather the cultural ones. The father has two daughters namely Jaspal and Sati. After the birth of the latter who is the younger daughter, the Father divorces his wife, Mummy 1 and marries another woman, Mummy 2 in order to have a son to ensure the continuation of his blood which apparently is believed to be done through sons not through daughters. The father and Mummy 2 achieve it and they manage to have a son. However, left by her husband just because she could not give birth to a son, Mummy 1 loses her psychological well-being and goes insane. She blames herself for this and harms herself and eventually she is sent to a psychiatric hospital where she is taken care of.

The play which consists of one act with thirteen scenes starts in 1998 and Sati, the younger sister, is about 20 years old. But after a couple of scenes, the action goes back to 1994 when she is a 16-year-old child. It is conveyed that she has not been informed about her mother's situation when she is sixteen years old. She lives with the Father, Beji and Mummy 2. She is told that Mummy 1 is in India travelling across the country for a pilgrimage which composes of visiting each and every gurdwara, "the place of Sikh worship" (A Popular Dictionary of Sikhism), in India and Pakistan. And it is revealed that she has been 'travelling' for the last seven years. Sati is the only member of the family who does not know about what happened to her biological mother because when she was sent to a psychiatric ward Sati was just child. She, therefore, does not have any remembrance of her mother.

Everyone in the family, including her elder sister, Jaspal, deliberately hides what happened to Mummy 1 from Sati as they think it would hurt her, which might lead to similar psychological problems as her mother's or which might push her into the same situation as her sister Jaspal, who is considered to be *behsharam*

(shameless) by everyone in the family except Sati. Jaspal, on the other hand, cannot stand what has been done to her mother and leaves the family so as to become a well-known singer just as her mother wanted her to be. She performs music and that is why she is accused of being the behsharam (shameless) daughter.

Beji, the grandmother, thinks that Jaspal brought 'sharam' (shame) onto the family because she left home, involved in prostitution and now she lives with a black guy. Jaspal, however, does not care about what her family thinks of herself. She lives a life away from her father and grandmother. The only family member that she sees is her sister Sati. Yet, her relationship with Sati is also problematic because she heavily smokes and has several other unhealthy habits. She, thus, escapes her responsibilities not only towards her sister but also towards her boyfriend Patrick with whom she shares the same flat.

For the larger part of the play, the relationships between Sati, Jaspal, the Father, Beji and Patrick are given light onto. The audience, or the reader, is exposed to the distorted nature of their relationships. One might see the spoiled familial relations in all aspects. The play goes on with these relationships to a certain climactic point where all characters are gathered in a room where they are obliged to confront each other and the truth about Mummy 1 is disclosed to Sati at once.

The play's temporal setting, then, goes back to where it starts i.e. 1998. Sati's visit to Jaspal in one of her performances at a show brings the two sisters together. Sati wants the family, her mother, Jaspal and herself, to get united but she finds out that it is too late for such a reunion because her mother has already passed away. Nevertheless, Jaspal and Sati seem to be hopeful of their future and they, in a way, promise to look after each other because even though Jaspal has cleaned herself from her bad habits, it is Sati now having smoking addiction as did Jaspal.

Bitter but hopeful at the end, this play provides a great deal of heterotopic analysis of the space throughout. Thus, the stage directions which shed light on the spatiality of *Behsharam* play a crucial role in this study. However it is not only these directions because the characters themselves are of great importance as they seem to create their own space throughout the play.

3. 1. Heterotopic Space Generated Around the Migrant

Migration, for human beings, is a process in which people move from a place to another or are displaced from one to another. And this displacement might leave unique impact on each person because migration requires crossing one or more boundaries at the same time. With the word boundary, I do not solely mean the concrete and visible ones which shape the political map of the world. In its dictionary explanation migration is described as “[a] change in permanent residency” and it might involve a geographical move that crosses a political boundary” or “an international boundary, from one country to another” (The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology).

An international boundary is obviously the one separating sovereign states and, of course, when migrants came from India to the United Kingdom, they had to cross one. A political boundary, however, depends on the definition of the word ‘political’; it might be a boundary that separates any two distinct spheres where a change is visible not only in politics but also in culture, way of living, language and the like. Thus, it is quite accurate to say that when one crosses an international boundary, it is supremely possible that one crosses a political boundary as well as the international one at the same time.

In this study, the act of migration will be treated as a phenomenon that leads the one who migrates to establish a space of one’s own after crossing the boundary no matter whether international or political. When one leaves the place/space of origin and relocates in the place/space of arrival, one is to create space for oneself. For what this study concerns, it does not necessarily mean that the migrant has to build a place which consists of bricks, cement and concrete but it rather means that the migrant is to establish a space where there is enough room to move forth and back between the norms of the cultural/racial/religious origin and those of the place of arrival. It, thus, makes it a necessity to prefer the word ‘space’ over the word ‘place’. Such a constraint was put forth as a requirement by Joanne Tompkins too. However, the concern that was identified was more about the “theatre’s manipulation of space” on its stage (Tompkins 2006, p.1). In another study of hers,

Tompkins elucidates that the term 'place' has long been used by spatial theoreticians as "a geographical site" (Tompkins 2012 p. 4). And since this thesis study does not intend to intervene with the field of geography or the spatiality of some certain locations but it rather analyses the abstract heterotopias generated in the minds of audience or reader and those that intercepts with the migrants' lives, this is why it can best be explained with the term 'space' rather than 'place' or 'site'.

The heterotopic spaces that are created throughout the play *Behsharam* draw parallels to the spaces that the migrants occupy individually. One can easily detect these conspicuous parallelisms that produce heterotopias which opt into the problems that are encountered today. One of the various possible ways to detect these heterotopic spaces is to scrutinize the characters who ardently shape the spaces that they occupy with an unintentional gargantuan effort to survive while the norms of their culture of origin and those of the place that they are re-located in collide with each other. It, then, is of acute importance to investigate the characters and the spaces that they produce in order to get over the problems.

Some of the characters, thenceforth, will be the focus of point in this study and among the characters in the play, Jaspal, the elder sister, stands prominent and it is certain that no analysis without Jaspal would be possible. Sati, on the other hand, will provide for one of the other foci of this analysis as she is at the centre of the play. The Father and Beji, the grandfather, could also be investigated individually but for the benefit of this study both characters will be scrutinized together with the other characters while inspecting the family as a heterotopic space.

3. 2. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Jaspal

Jaspal, the elder daughter, has problematic relationships both with the members of her family and with her boyfriend. The reason for Jaspal's psychological weakness is, of course, her memories of Mummy 1, her biological mother. When the Father divorces Mummy 1 and brings Mummy 2 on the ground

that Mummy 1 cannot give him a son who would provide the continuation of his blood, Jaspal witnesses the mental breakdown of her mother. In the play, it is revealed that one day, Jaspal finds Mummy 1 drenched in blood in one of the rooms upstairs because she has cut her genitals with a pair of scissors in order to find and bring out the son that, she thought, was stuck inside (XI, p. 78). Having witnessed such a mental breakdown in her mother, Jaspal loses ties with her family. Her respect for her father and for her grandmother is totally lost. She leaves the house after her mother's admission to a psychiatric hospital. She gets involved in prostitution for her survival and to afford the drugs she is addicted to.

However, her mother's situation is not the only reason for Jaspal. The impetus behind her leave is her zeal for getting involved in entertainment and becoming a famous singer, as her mother would wish. The culture of the community that she was born into does not let her do what she wants or become who she wishes to be. Even though it is written in the Sikh scriptures that women are equal to men and can do what men do, Darshan S. Tatla from Coventry University's Centre for South Asian Studies claims, like several other scholars, that Sikh women, when compared to Sikh men, are left with "less freedom and choice of out-of-home activities" in practice when it comes to work, jobs or professions "as is common with South Asian societies" (Tatla p. 277). This proves to be correct for Jaspal too since she is a female member of a Sikh family.

She wants to be like the American singer Karen Carpenter and she sings her songs. Nevertheless, her family, especially Beji, finds shameless such women who sing songs in front of crowds, who have any kind of intercourse with men without the permission of the family and who live with men before marriage. Jaspal, thus, creates a space for herself where she can act as she wishes and this space from time to time produces heterotopias for those who read in between lines. This space that she creates and occupies is visible even in the very beginning of the play. The stage directions that are given are quite explanatory in this sense. The first stage direction elucidates where Jaspal is located and what kind of space she created for herself. It is revealed that she is in a show as a singer but she uses the nickname Kiran Carpenter instead of her own name Jaspal. She pretends to be like Karen Carpenter

whom, she claims, her mother fancied a lot. The space which is described is indeed relevant to the community which Jaspal's family belongs to.

1998. The sound of applause. A room upstairs in a seedy pub/club in a hopeless Birmingham suburb. Cabaret night. Red velvet curtains are behind a small raised platform on top of which there is an empty microphone. (I, p. 15)

The temporal setting, the end of the second millennium, is of great importance for the Sikh community in the United Kingdom. During the 90s the Sikh community struggled to gain some minority rights related to education. Until the latter half of the decade the community did not have their own minority schools recognized by the government. But a campaign started in 1997 and lasted for two years resulted in victory and the first Sikh religious minority school was recognized and began to be supported by the government (Smithers *The Guardian*).

Birmingham is, on the other hand, another key element in terms of the spatiality in the opening of the play since the city, after London, has long been a centre for the Sikh community to dwell in and the religious festival of Vaisakhi's celebrations have been the most important and the largest Sikh celebrations in the UK and the one in 1998 was also noted to be the largest celebration outside Punjab region.

The descriptive directions which introduce us Jaspal should also be pointed out since it gives clues about how the character seems and what kind of a person she is. In the play, the sound of applause increases when Jaspal comes in. There is

more applause as JASPAL, a damaged-looking Asian woman in her late twenties, comes out wearing a long sequinned fuschia pink dress. Silhouette/shadow of a band. Intro to 'Yesterday Once More' and she starts to sing with the attitude (though not voice) of a diva. (I, p. 15)

The "damaged-looking" image of Jaspal is crucially important when it is used with "Asian woman" as it is later revealed in the play that she suffered from lots of things including her broken relationships and her addiction and such. Despite her weary look she seems to enjoy the show, singing one of the songs of the Carpenters¹ "Yesterday Once More" with the band "Asian Invasion" that she takes the stage together. The name of the band is also crucial since it was a heated debate

¹ The Carpenters: An American band formed by Karen and Richard Carpenter and got popular in the 70s and 80s until Karen Carpenter's death (www.richardandkarencarpenter.com/biography/htm).

in the UK that the conservatives have been worried about the increasing numbers of the immigrants in the country and a possible Asian invasion or Asian-ization of Britain ever since the first group of the immigrants arrived in the UK in the post-war years. The performance that Jaspal and The Asian Invasion present is disrupted because “*suddenly the sound system fails, microphones screech and the singing and music become inaudible.*” Yet, “*JASPAL does her best to carry on but to no avail.*” She eventually “*looks pissed off and walks off the stage*” (I, p.15). She goes to her dressing room which is described as “*a small poky room with a huge old-fashioned dressing table which has three mirrors on it*” (II, 16).

To employ Tompkins’ terms, the constructed space is apparently the “seedy pub/club in a hopeless Birmingham suburb” as it is to be set on the stage. The abstracted space, whereas, is the contrasting atmosphere created through the song that Jaspal sings as the song is very cheerful and buoyant. The heterotopic space appears between these two spaces and prompts us to think about the suburbs of British metropolitans where the immigrants are generally located. If a place is “hopeless” it is not surprising that it might be “seedy” as well. Thus we are encouraged to think of these places and their destinies. The heterotopic space generated through this scene is crucial for us to take into consideration the actual world outside. Such social matters are brought out so that the audience or the reader can ponder on and think of alternate orderings of the actual world no matter how impossible it is to make a change in the actual world.

Following this scene, Jaspal encounters her sister Sati after four years. Jaspal gets “*silenced by the sight of SATI at the door*”. Sati is described as “*a young pretty Asian girl, dressed in trendy clothes. She is about twenty*”. They get nervous in the silence and Sati lights a cigarette offering one to her sister too.

JASPAL: I’ve stopped.

SATI: What?... Since when?

JASPAL: Since after... never mind. I’ve stopped.

SATI: Oh.

JASPAL: I didn’t know you’d started.

SATI: Oh yeah. It’s been a while... soon after... well I started just as you stopped. How about that? (II, 16-17)

Jaspal reveals that Sati has “picked up bad habits” and Sati referring Jaspal’s addictions four years ago says “[m]aybe it runs in the family” (II, p. 18). Their

encounter follows such heavy atmosphere filled with silence or contentious dialogues. The pause that they give after saying “since after...” and avoiding to name what happened four years ago is quite important and the reason for it is revealed later in the play.

As Sati lays her eyes on Jaspal, she breaks the silence that has reigned for a while saying “Look at you. You’ve turned yourself into her, [Karen Carpenter]” (II, p. 18) because she knows how much Jaspal wanted to look like Karen Carpenter. She reveals that she has been following Jaspal for a long time and tries to gain her sympathy as she says “You should have won [Stars in Their Eyes²]. You looked great, they did a good job on you didn’t they? I mean the hair and the make-up and everything... it was so... believable” (II, p. 19). However, Jaspal seems untouched and she shows no emotion but Jaspal still manages to ask Sati what she has come for. Sati talks about her eagerness to unite the family again, two sisters and their mother but the answer she receives is “four fucking years” that has passed since their last encounter which caused everything to be revealed and the family to break up leaving no room for them to live together.

Even before the final break-up of the family when she conveys the truth to Sati, Jaspal has her own space that she has created for her own survival. As mentioned before, she leaves home so as not to obey the rules that her father, her grandmother and her stepmother want her to follow. These rules in a way limit her. However, in the space that she creates she cannot manage to achieve her goals at first and she is accused of being a “behsharam kuthee” or a shameless girl for her bad habits. That is why she gets angry when Sati comes and tries to make up for all that has been lost but she does so by judging her sister.

JASPAL: And don’t think you’re putting me on any guilt trip.
Because I won’t have it. I’ve got no bad habits now. None. I’ve read the books, I’ve done the steps, I’ve even Feng Shui-ed my flat. I’m me, right, ME? (II, p. 19)

Yet, Sati’s answer Jaspal’s reaction is tough as she asks “Is that why you pretend to be Karen Carpenter?” Even though she points that “it’s entertainment” and she uses

² Stars in Their Eyes: “a musical talent show in which amateur lookalikes and sound-alikes impersonate their favourite singing stars” (www.imdb.com/title/tt0200379/).

the name because “people like it”, it is conspicuous that she creates a space in which she could act as an independent woman.

The constructed space here is the fact that Jaspal cannot live as herself but she rather needs to use a different name to live peacefully and the abstracted space would be that space where one lives in one’s own peaceful world with one’s own identity. When these two spaces appear together, the heterotopic space emerges making us to think about the actual world with such an alternate ordering through which one can live as one wishes. The reader, thereby, is spiritually stimulated to consider the real space outside where countless people have to live according to some norms no matter which society they belong to and it becomes necessary for the reader to probe so that they can develop such a space at least in their minds.

Moreover, when Sati appears she fears losing this space of hers and she gets mad at her sister;

JASPAL: You walked out and you left me. You left me. You turn up here, at one of my *performances* and expect me to hug you and kiss you and be all happy and excited. Well I’m not. I did everything for you, everything. You never even bothered about me. No one ever bothered me except when they wanted to call someone slug or slut or whore or prostitute. I’m dead to you Sati. Look at me, the living dead. Just get out, get the fuck out, I can’t stand looking at you anymore. (II, p. 20)

She shows the door to her sister and Sati leaves the dressing room and she “*is left on her own.*” However, “*she calms down and looks around the room. She catches sight of herself in the mirror, looks towards the door and goes out after her sister*” because she cannot make it (II, p.21). The scene ends and the temporal setting changes in the following scene, going back to 1994.

As the temporal setting is drawn backwards to her mid-twenties 4 years ago in 1994 in the third scene, Jaspal is presented to us when she is a heavy smoker and a drug addict and she prostitutes herself in exchange for drugs and weed. She lives with her Jamaican boyfriend, Patrick but she has sex with the drug dealer Stan to get some more drugs and she does it in Patrick’s flat on the bed she shares with him as it is revealed in the following stage direction;

1994. Day One, Jaspal and Patrick’s flat. The Carpenters’ ‘Top of the World’ plays, and transforms into the music on Jaspal’s sound system. Very messy bedsit – two chairs and a beanbag in the middle of the room, there is

a bathroom area and a kitchen area. The place is dank and the colours are garish and mismatched. It is like no-one has cleared up for three weeks. There is a messy, hacked coffee table, covered with tobacco, rizla papers, bits of food, papers, old makeup and empty takeaway containers. JASPAL is partially dressed, having just had sex with STAN, a punter friend and dealer. (IV, p. 26)

The reason why the place she lives in is “mismatched” and “messy” and not cleaned for some time is actually because she apparently does not feel she belongs to this place i.e. the flat that she shares with another migrant. After leaving the house, or better to say the familial space that she was born into, she does not feel a sense of belonging to any place. However, this does not either mean that she feels she belongs to the space where she was born into. It can be claimed that she lives in what Homi Bhabha calls “hybridity” or “the third space” (Bhabha 211). She does not have a place in her family because the culture of the country of origin still rules the family to some extent. Yet, she does not have a place in what is known to be the second space. She therefore is in a space of her own but she is not settled. And this is why she does not care about the space she physically occupies.

The constructed space is obviously the flat that Jaspal lives ever since she left her family. She has chosen to live here with her boyfriend Patrick. The abstracted space, on the other hand, is the place one would suppose she must have been living in. One would expect it to be a better place where Jaspal could live however she pleases. Yet, she lives in a dirty place where the only thing she does is to instigate her addictions. The heterotopic spaces once more surface between these two spaces and it is, in a way, a space of considering the possible results of such actions. When one makes decisions to initiate a life purified from restrictive social norms, one should think to improve oneself and the life that one lives instead of such addictions which can most possibly lead to the destructive consequences.

As the play continues, what we are exposed to see of Jaspal is the only thing which she does in the flat i.e. building “spliffs” or in other words rolling rizla papers filled with weed that she frequently smokes since she is an addict. While alone in the flat, Jaspal makes deliberate movements talking to herself, which hint at her psychological condition. She sings along to the words of the song that plays in the background. She then talks to the singer.

JASPAL: [...] You might be a skinny bitch Karen, but you know how to carry a tune. Mummy 1 would have liked this. She liked entertainment didn't she? She loved you Karen. She'd have been proud of me, if I was a bit more like you. (IV, p.27)

As mentioned before, she wants to be like Karen Carpenter. That's why she chooses the name Kiran Carpenter. While she listens to the song and talks to the singer on the track, her boyfriend Patrick comes into the living room and realizes what she does. He looks at her as if she has a mental problem. Then he tries to talk to Jaspal but she scolds and rebuffs him at a frequent level. She always behaves rudely, shouts at Patrick, and also at Sati. The reason why she is so angry and harsh at people is her weakened psychological health. She escapes from her responsibilities and avoids talking to people about serious matters. However, she always covers this situation finding such excuses as "My head hurts.", "I can't [talk]. I've got a period pain." But Sati reveals later to us that "That's [her] answer to everything" (VI, p.39). With explanations of such kind, she manages to fend off any unwanted conversation and she keeps smoking the papers full of weed that she rolls.

Each time she offers Patrick another "fag" to smoke, he tries his best not to join her but with her insistence, he fails to resist and generally ends up saying "Let's make this the last time alright. I need to clean myself up" (IV, p.30). She, therefore, harms not only herself but also people around her because apparently Patrick tries to clean himself off this addiction as he has plans to progress in his boxing career in order to become a well-known boxer like his favourite one, Muhammad Ali. However, he is interrupted several times by Jaspal no matter how hard he tries to help her quit this addiction. Not only does he fail to help her quit but also he fails resisting her offers. He obviously does what she wants each time because he loves her and he does not want to break her heart and that is why he surrenders whenever she persists on something, which harms him, his plans and his career.

It is not only Patrick that Jaspal is being harsh on; she cannot get on well with her only sister, Sati, who is the sole family member that visits her and sees her every now and then even though she is very busy with working at the shop that

Uncle Comrade owns and with the college and courses that she has to continue so as to graduate and get a degree. As Sati visits Jaspal one day after the school and the shop, she tries to talk about the situation at the house complaining about Mummy 2's attitude toward her and her only friend, a cardboard cut-out of the football player in Arsenal, Ian Wright. He is the "third son of Jamaican immigrants" (Arlidge, 2002) and a football player who started his career at the age of 22 and "accepted an offer from Arsenal" (Wright, 2018) which made him famous and he is an important figure in this play. Sati keeps talking to him every day and behaves as if it is a real person, a real friend of hers. The temporal setting is again four years back; "1994. Day three, early evening. Jaspal's flat. Jaspal sits opposite the IW cut-out. She beholds him suspiciously." Sati tries to explain Mummy 2's hateful attitude toward Ian Wright the cut-out and asks Jaspal;

SATI: Do you think it's because Ian's black?

JASPAL: I expect there is a connection.

SATI: It's not just Mummy 2. It's Dad and Beji as well. They pretend they don't mind Ian but they do. I've heard them say things. (VI, p. 39)

Jaspal, in a reluctant manner, asks what they talk about and when she hears that they talk about the black people and they always express distaste for the black people, she just warns Sati and says "You shouldn't listen to their shit" so as to stop the conversation which disturbs her. Sati pauses for a while after Jaspal's reaction but since she wants to talk to her, she moots another related topic saying "Sometimes they say things about you" and this time Jaspal listens to her more interestedly after having asked what they say;

SATI: Beji says you go out with a black bastard.

JASPAL *laughs as she continues to build a spliff.*

SATI: Why do Indian people hate black people?

JASPAL: I don't know do I? Some black people hate Indians as well y'know... do we have to talk about this. It's so depressing.

SATI: That's your answer to everything. (VI, p. 39)

She thus curtails every conversation repulsing Sati's eagerness to start a chat so as to spend some more time with Jaspal. Nevertheless, what is more important than Jaspal's attitude here is the momentarily space that is created in this scene.

It will once again be very useful to apply the terms employed by Joanne Tompkins the constructed space and the abstracted space, since this scene provides

both, leading to a heterotopic space to come into existence. The constructed space is the one that Sati utters. The reality that her family members, her father, grandmother and stepmother apparently have hatred towards the black people, another minority group in the United Kingdom, is the constructed space. The abstracted space is the perception that all the immigrants or minorities are the same and they aim and serve for the same purpose living in harmony. Here appears the heterotopic space which leads us to rethink what we see of the immigrants in the United Kingdom.

The minorities in Britain are naturally not the same since they come from different backgrounds and thus they might have different interests. In the play *Behsharam* it is obvious that there might be racist perceptions between members of the South Asian community or the Sikh community in particular, and the black people in the country. The conversation between Jaspal and Sati reveals that especially the older members of the family have preconceived opinions about the black people. What Jaspal puts forth is that the black people have similar opinions towards the Asians as well and this fact is supported with what Patrick says to Jaspal about the opinions of his friends and family members. In this vein, the heterotopic space that appears between these two abstracted and constructed spaces proves to be inviting us to re-think the flaws in the society or in the racial, ethnic or religious communities. It is not irrelevant to make such a claim when it is considered that the playwright, Bhatti, herself, is a part of the Sikh community. However, it should be highlighted that this claim is not to say that such racist utterances cannot be attributed to every single member of the given communities. It is to say that one can easily see the possible divisions and disagreements and even prejudices between minorities; it is not always the white vs the minority, sometimes it is minority vs another minority as well as minority vs a smaller minority.

The space that emerges around Jaspal through her actions, behaviours and conversations creates heterotopic spaces which lead the British audience to think and re-think about not only the world that she is stuck in but also the actual world behind the walls. There are lots of such real characters around, who are not noticed, not given importance, not taken care of and not seen worth enough to ponder on

and to start a change. It is quite significant that Jaspal's in-between situation generates such heterotopic spaces. And it is noteworthy that she is not the only character around whom heterotopic spaces come into existence. Her sister, Sati, will be the next character to focus on.

3. 3. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Sati

Like her elder sister, Sati creates a space for herself among the people surrounding her and leaving her no space to move accordingly. The space that she has to create to find her own way out produces numerous heterotopias for the reader or the audience from time to time. As she is a daughter to a family who gives more importance to sons, she is oppressed by her father, her grandmother and by her stepmother, Mummy 2. Even her elder sister Jaspal as well oppresses her to some extent.

She is a young girl in her early twenties at the beginning of the play but the temporal setting brings us back to 1994 when she is only sixteen years old. It is conveyed in the play that when her mother, Mummy 1, gives birth to her, her father wants to divorce Mummy 1 since he thinks she could not give him a son and instead she has given birth to two daughters. As a member of a community which gives much more importance to boys than to girls, he marries another woman, Mummy 2, so that he can have a son in order for his blood to continue. However, things do not get simpler from then on, it rather gets tougher. The family extends with a son but forges ahead towards devastation at the same time.

In this family, she is not taken care of as her father never shows an intention to look at her let alone listen to her and her stepmother does nothing but limit her and direct her life. She, therefore, is forced to create herself a space. In this space she goes to college and works at the shop and interestingly makes an irreplaceable friend out of a cut-out. In the third scene, when she is again in Uncle Comrade's shop, she plays with Ian Wright cut-out as she often does. The stage direction in this scene provides us with an abundance of heterotopias.

1994. Day One, The Shop. Early evening. The radio is on, 'Whatta Man' by Salt 'n' Pepa and En Vogue plays. Half-empty boxes of tinned produce

adorn the dingy space. There are Boots carrier bags everywhere. Sati, sixteen, wears an old shalwar kameez and trendy Nike trainers. She stands behind the shop counter. She vaguely looks over to the shop entrance and when she feels the coast is more or less clear she begins to construct a kind of love seat next to the counter. She creates seats out of boxes of tinned beans and spaghetti hoops, a small step ladder and a shop stool. She sprays some body spray on herself. She then takes a deep breath and goes to fetch the piece de resistance – a life-size cardboard cut-out of Ian Wright in Arsenal strip. The cut-out is bendy and can be manipulated into different positions. SATI sits IW on the side of the seat closest to the counter, and sits down next to him. (III, p. 22)

First of all, it is necessary to mention the song that plays on the radio since it gives clues about what Ian Wright means to Sati. The lyrics of the song follow as “What a man, what a man, what a man / What a mighty good man / I want to take a minute or two, and give much respect due / To the man that’s made a difference in my world” and it is important because it most probably is played intentionally in the very scene where Sati is seen with Ian Wright cut-out for the first time. It therefore shows how much value she gives to Ian Wright. It makes a difference in her world because the cut-out is the only thing that she talks to for no one in the family cares to listen to her or to show respect to her. They even do not tell her about what happened to her mother and she has to count the days to meet her mother again.

Beside the lyrics, the carrier bags that are randomly put everywhere on the stage are also very noteworthy. It is pretty well-known that the pharmacy-led health and beauty chain Boots’ white carrier bags have the advertising slogan in blue and it reads as “Let’s feel good” and it is pretty unlikely that the slogan would not be seen when there are so many bags. It is quite ironic that in such a messy or “dingy” place finding beauty bags that suggest feeling good. Another contorted element in the scene is the costume that Sati wears. She has her traditional Indian clothing which is the shalwar kameez but she wears a pair of Nike trainers as well. This mismatch might lead us to consider the boundary between the traditional and the modern or in this case the eastern and the western. Thus such a heterotopia is capable of challenging and contesting the codes that might be pre-assigned when one thinks of a character as a stereotypical example.

Sati's outfit which seems to be a combination of the symbols of both her country of origin and country of residency is not the only thing that is squeezed between two poles. She, herself, is squeezed in between her father/grandmother and her sister, Jaspal. The space that her family occupies and the one that rules the country they live in lead her to the necessity to create a zone for herself. Interestingly, she tries to hide this space that she created for herself and for Ian Wright from the people around her. When, for instance, she is in the shop, she spends time pretending to have a nice conversation with Ian Wright and the moment she hears that "[b]ell rings to indicate shop door is opening" she gathers herself and "as she hears the bell, SATI pushes IW to the floor and scrambles across the love seat regaining her position behind the counter [because] PATRICK enters. He is a young, Jamaican male, carrying a big gym bag" (III. p. 22). She, therefore, is not who she shows to the others. She behaves differently when she is alone with IW. When someone interrupts, she becomes another person all of a sudden; she keeps pretending to be the person that all people around her know her for. The reason for this is the restriction that is imposed on her by the people around her. Not only her consanguineous family members but also her step mother tries to control her life and give it a direction as she pleases. She reveals this to Patrick when she tells what Mummy 2 does to her. She wants Patrick to tell it to Jaspal when he gets home;

SATI: Hey tell Jaspal that Mummy 2 keeps trying to fix me up.

PATRICK: Yeah?

SATI: She's a right bloody kuthi [*bitch*]. I've told I'm not interested, but she won't listen. She got me to meet this BMW dealer the other week. And when they left us on our own he started crying, he told me he was in love with his brother-in-law. He pleaded with me to refuse him.

PATRICK: What happened?

SATI: I pretended I was deaf and dumb. [...] (III, p. 24)

In this excerpt, a sound example of heterotopia comes into existence and it is an abstract one though. The constructed and abstracted ones are also abstract spaces. The constructed space is the one that pictures in our minds when Sati tells it. Since we do not witness what she has experienced, we are bound to accept what she tells. She is forced to accept the meeting for a possible arranged marriage that Mummy 2 wants to carry out. The meeting is the constructed space. The abstracted space, on

the other hand, is the one that emerges in the mind when we think of Sati as a sixteen-year-old girl forced to accept a meeting for an arranged marriage. The heterotopia of this scene emerges out of the cracks and puts forth the fact that the tradition of arranged marriages is still being carried out among the Sikh community both in India and, as seen in the play, in the United Kingdom. The minority groups do continue the cultural and traditional practices even if they are not in accordance with the international laws that are enforced by the government so as to protect children as well as keep vindicated, for those who are not under the age limit of marriage, the right to choose whom to marry.

Moreover, with the same constructed space, one sees the abstracted space that is created by the BMW dealer who had to see Sati and who is not very different from Sati since he does not have any choice except to follow the cultural rules of the community that he and his family is a part of. When Sati conveys that the candidate did not want to be a part of such a meeting since he is a homosexual and he is in love with his brother-in-law, a similar heterotopic space surfaces. This time it involves the situation of the non-heterosexual individuals in the community. Apparently the play reveals that the diversity of sexual orientation and the gender identity-based cultures are ignored as the LGBT individuals or those who cannot be defined with the heterosexual norms are not allowed to live outside the cultural norms of the community they belong to. They have to obey the rules reigning their family and surroundings and are oppressed by the community, which leads them to hide themselves. It is obvious that the relation that the candidate mentions he has with his brother-in-law is a hidden one since they cannot live and act according to the norms of the gender identity that they belong to. They rather have to carve out a space out of the status quo which is a heteronormative one. They, therefore, have created this space in which they can act 'freely' to a certain limit which would not make them palpably visible in the family or among the surroundings. So the heterotopia generated by this scene enables us to think and re-think of the silent LGBT individuals who are unvoiced not only in the Sikh community but also in the whole world if one considers the number of countries that have the existing laws that are enforced to protect the individuals with diverse gender identities.

In addition, Sati talks to IW when she is alone with him once more. She tells him how Mummy 2 behaves her and expects that everything be over when Mummy 1 turns back;

Evreyone's got problems Ian, everyone. I mean Mummy 2's not the easiest person to get on with, (*imitates Mummy 2*) Sati choose a boy before I choose one for you... I mean I don't understand why she's so keen, she's not exactly over the moon being with my dad. (*Pause.*) Poor dad. It must be terrible being hated by your mother [...] Mummy 1'll sort Mummy 2 out for a start [...] No more (*imitates*) 'educating your daughter is like watering another man's fields.' [...] 'Bad girl, sisters are supposed to look after their brothers'. It's not like I'm going to forget. (V, p. 38)

After she finishes, “*Bad Girl*’ by Donna Summer starts playing.” And it is quite notable that the song creates a heterotopic space as well because it follows as “Now you and me we’re both the same / But you call yourself by different names” This is attention-grabbing not only because it is a lilting song but also because it makes a point: Mummy 2 sees Sati and especially her sister Jaspal as ‘bad girls’ because Sati does not take care of her sister and Jaspal sleeps with strangers for money. Yet, it is revealed in the play that Mummy 2 sleeps with Uncle Comrade because he pays for her son Raju’s dancing lessons. It, therefore, creates a heterotopic space in which one might think of the labelling of women. One fact is that in patriarchal societies women can also internalize the patriarchal norms and sadly it is Mummy 2 who internalized the patriarchal norms of her community in this play. She keeps saying the same things as what Beji says about Jaspal. One difference between the two, though, might be that Beji does not utter such words for Sati. Nevertheless, it is only these two women that talk about Jaspal accusing her of being a “bad girl”, “behsharam” or wishing that it would be better if she died in a car crash. It is ironic enough that none of the male characters talk about what Jaspal does while these two women are constantly critical of Jaspal and behave as the spokespersons of the patriarchal norm. For this reason, Sati always feels obliged to hide that she visits her sister Jaspal from time to time. The heterotopia, then, is generated through this scene and it prompts us to re-think of the patriarchal norms.

On one occasion, when Sati visits Jaspal, another heterotopic space surfaces as she again talks to IW. She first tries to communicate with Jaspal but to no avail. Jaspal does not care about what Sati says and quits the conversations as soon as

possible. When Sati tries to explain the situation she is in and advises her to give up her addiction, Jaspal shouts at her and then goes to the toilet “leaving SATI alone on the sofa” as usual. Sati then gets prepared to go and talks to IW cut-out again clearly putting across everything that she knows having heard what has been talked in her parents’ conversations;

SATI: It’s because I’m a girl. That’s one thing I know for certain. I heard them all saying things, I remember hearing the fights. If I’d been a boy, dad would never have divorced Mummy 1, never married Mummy 2. There would be no Raju. Jaspal most probably would never have got a boyfriend and Mummy 1 would never have gone to India. If I’d been a boy they’d have had more children – another girl, another boy, another girl, another boy. We’d be like an Indian Brady Bunch. Beji would love dad, dad would be rich and not read poems about dying and I might be an apprentice at Highbury, not just a fan. Jaspal would clean her room and Beji wouldn’t drink whisky in Uncle Comrade’s stock room. It’s an adverse situation Ian. Like when Graham Taylor became England manager. Only there’s no-one to sack. Anyway whatever happens, I’ve got you. I’m going to come and see you at The Pallasades. See you in flesh. It’s going to be a really special day. (VI, p. 44-45)

She clasps Ian Wright and “*solemnly turns and leaves the flat.*” This soliloquy-like utterance of Sati about her family provides us with heterotopic spaces as well. To draw Tompkins’ terms to the scene again, the situation that, she says, she is in is the constructed space i.e. the reality that she ascertains; her family being shattered after her birth. The abstracted space, though, is determined through the if-clauses which start with “if I’d been a boy”. She wishes to have been born a boy because she has realized the possibility that her family would have been following a totally different direction from the one that they are in now if it was a son that her mother gave birth to instead of her. Between these two spaces that the scene provides a heterotopia comes into being by itself. This heterotopic space stimulates us to think about the social or cultural constructs in her society, that is, the inequality between genders, the prevalence of male dominance and preferring sons over daughters.

It is necessary to mention that the patriarchal male dominance in Sikh community is shown in the play. Nevertheless, it does not mean that this is a characteristic which is solely attributed to the Sikh community. There are, of course, a great number of male dominant societies and communities. It is just the fact that this play is involved with the patriarchal norms of the Sikh community

which the playwright herself is a part of. It might be considered as a criticism from within since Bhatti might have observed it much better than any other outsider, so to speak. Therefore, as a person who self-proclaims to be a Sikh and to be proud of it, Bhatti reveals such patriarchal codes of the community that she belongs to.

One last scene which provides a heterotopia of its kind around Sati is related to what she says in the previous quotation. As she talks to Ian Wright, the cut-out, she tells him she would see him when he comes to Birmingham. She, of course, refers to the real Ian Wright. She is apparently a fan of him as she is interested in football. And it is therefore very important for her to meet him when he comes to Birmingham. Even though she plans her encounter with him, she cannot go to see him because her grandmother gets involved in trouble and she receives a call from the police just before she is trying to close the shop and leave to see him. She tells everything that she experiences to her father after she takes her grandmother and it is told with full of emotions.

SATI: (*Points to BEJI who is sitting on the floor, looking away.*) She's been shoplifting, Dad. Your mother has been stealing goods. Vitamin pills, hair accessories and over the counter medicines. They caught her dad, they caught her today, the Boots store detectives have had their eyes on her for months. They caught her dad and I had to deal with it because you were sitting here trying to finish your stupid poem.

FATHER: Beji?

SATI: I had somewhere to go Dad, something to do, it was important. And I had to go and deal with it. (*Gestures to Beji again.*) She pretended she couldn't speak English. She'd been swearing at the interpreter, reduced her to tears. I had to go Dad, I had to go and translate... It was horrible.

I'm 16 dad, I'm only 16... (XI, p. 74)

The way she emphasizes that she is only a sixteen-year-old person is quite influential for it helps generate a heterotopic space through which we can consider the relations in the family. The constructed and abstracted spaces here might be a bit difficult to determine. Yet, it can be said that what Sati experiences is basically the constructed space since it is visible on the stage and one can see, in the course of the play, the situation that Sati passes through.

The abstracted space, on the other hand, is the one that appears when one thinks of a sixteen-year-old girl who is expected to be a school girl, having friends,

playing with them, going to school, studying lessons and making plans about her future career. In between these two spaces appears a heterotopia which exhorts us to think about the role of family and the ruined relations in immigrant families as such families, to a large extent, suffer from economic problems. It must be pointed out clearly that it is, once more, not to say that this is unique to the immigrant families but to the concerns of this study and as the plays involve mainly immigrant families, the focus is on the problems faced by such families.

The heterotopic space in this scene thus primarily includes re-thinking of the familial relations and orderings in families, particularly the ones in immigrant families. It is also pivotal to remind that Bhatti's plays necessitate re-thinking of family which is to be exemplified in the following part of this chapter.

3. 4. Heterotopic Space Generated Around the Sikh Family

The heterotopic space which comes into existence around the other members of the family and the family as a whole also functions significantly. It will be meaningful to investigate these heterotopias before moving to the next chapter which will mainly concern itself with heterotopias of such kind in Bhatti's other play, *Khandan*. However, the only family in the play *Behsharam* provides numerous scenes where heterotopias are inevitable to form. Jaspal and Sati are the most important two characters whom this study analysed individually since the plot is shaped around them. Yet, apart from the two, the other characters such as the Father, Beji and Patrick can also be investigated for the heterotopic spaces that is produced around them. It, nevertheless, is best to include all of them in this part instead of tackling them individually.

To start with, the image that they present as a family is quite attention grabbing and it shows the spoiled relationships that they have. When they are present at one scene all together it is obvious that they are indifferent to each other. Early in the play when temporal space moves backwards, one sees them in the shop; while Sati watches a football programme, her father is lost in his notebook and Beji is busy with make-up stuff. They "*seem to be in their own worlds*" and

when Sati makes comments about the football players her father tells her to ask Uncle Comrade for money and Beji tells her how the lipstick would make her beautiful saying “Remember is not what you feel like but what you look like. That is the important thing” (V, p.34). In the meantime, Sati tell her father to ask for the money himself and to “stop being immature”. They, thus, seem quite indifferent to each other. This indifference provides the constructed space while presupposed idea that the father should be the one who works and Beji should be the one to tell Sati not to give importance to beauty brings about the abstracted space. The heterotopic space, whereas, is generated between these two poles questioning the ways in which the family functions.

The father and Patrick’s conversation in the dole office, on the other hand, produces another constructed space as the father tells lies to Patrick about his family since he does not know who Patrick is. He tells him that his elder daughter, who is Patrick’s girlfriend, is a doctor and his younger daughter is a very successful student, whom Patrick knows as well. Besides this constructed space, the abstracted space comes into existence and it is the fact that Patrick is not yet aware of; the man he talks with is his girlfriend’s father. The heterotopic space exposes the father’s dream family and shows us that the father as well is a victim of the social norms that rules his life and family just like his daughters and his first wife. It is revealed that he would like to have a parallel version of his family in which he would be living happily with his daughters and wife. However, since he had to meet the expectations of the community that he belongs to, he had to bring a second wife so that he would have a son. At the end of the play, when left alone on the stage, he breaks down saying “I feel shame. So much shame. I want my girls. Where are my girls?” He, therefore, is no different from the female characters that are apparently victimized; the patriarchal norms prey on men as well. Yet, it should be clarified that he does not end up in a psychiatric ward like the wife he left because he wanted to have a son.

Another heterotopic space emerges through the end of the play. When all characters are gathered at the dole office where Patrick and the father is already

present waiting to receive the payment of unemployment, a heterotopia makes us realize that the dole office hosts or serves only to immigrants.

SATI enters with BEJI. They both carry lots of Boots bags, crammed with toiletries and make-up. SATI drags along the IW cut-out. SATI's make-up is by now dishevelled, she is still in her shalwar kameez and JVC shirt. BEJI has her head covered and her head down. [...] SATI starts emptying contents of Boots bags on to his lap. (XI, p. 73)

When the father, Sati, Beji and Patrick are all in the scene, Jaspal enters rushing toward Patrick to tell him she decided to clear herself off and she realizes everyone is there. Therefore the family unites in the dole office. This union in the dole office supplies the constructed space whereas the abstracted space is the ironical fact that throughout the play the characters come together in the house, in the shop, in Patrick's flat several times and in Jaspal's show in the first and the last scenes but the very truth that everyone hides from Sati is revealed to her when everyone is at the dole office.

This heterotopic space encourages us to think about the role of the dole office in the lives of the unemployed and among these unemployed, obviously, immigrants. It is not likely that all these characters are gathered in such a place for nothing. The gathering at the dole office apparently lays bare the current situation when one considers the statistics revealed by Centre for Social Investigation; "the second group most likely to be found poor are Sikhs (27 per cent)" after the Muslims (Heath and Li p. 2).

To conclude this chapter, it is quintessential to point out that the play *Behsharam* makes it possible for heterotopias to emerge around the characters specifically Jaspal and Sati. When one investigates each character in detail, one realizes that the characters are stuck between two poles. One is the space that they occupy and the other is generally a space which contradicts to the first one. Tompkins names these spaces as constructed and abstracted spaces. Between these two spaces a heterotopia come to exist and it also is generally abstract per se as it is expected to emerge in the mind of the British audience. The British audience can either be a member of the immigrant community or of any of the minority groups and it can also be a member of the larger white citizens who are familiar with the immigration or immigrants. The heterotopic spaces in this play, thereof, encourage

the British audience to think about the immigrants' lives and the circumstances that surround them and it is anticipated that an alternate ordering of the society is put into consideration by the audience.

Heterotopias of such kind, concerning families of the immigrants and the space that surrounds that will be foregrounded in the following chapter which bases its analyses of heterotopias in another prominent play by Bhatti, namely *Khandan*. It is very significant that while *Behsharam* involves individuals, *Khandan* is rather concerned with the family as a whole even though it might give insight into individuals and the heterotopic space generated around them.

CHAPTER 4

HETEROTOPIAS IN *KHANDAN*

4. 1. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Family

This chapter will be analysing the heterotopic spaces that emerge around the family in Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti's play, *Khandan*. The name of the play, "khandan" is the Punjabi word for "family" and it mainly draws to the centre a Sikh family which has plenty of features that are quite different from those of the family in the previous play. It should be admitted that even though the Sikh family is basically the point of focus, there is another family which must not be forgotten about. Heterotopic spaces come into existence around both families and these heterotopias prompt the British audience to think about the positioning of the immigrant family in the society and their integration into the British society. It, thus, is expected that the heterotopias in this play urges the British audience to think of an alternate ordering in which the immigrant families are much more integrated because it seems in the play that in the reality there are examples which prove the opposite.

Unlike the *Behsharam* in which characters are all immigrants, this rather new play of Bhatti includes white characters as well. Among the members of the family the mother, the son and the daughter-in-law live in the same house. They are named relatively Jeeto, Pal and Liz or Elizabeth. Jeeto is a first generation immigrant, she migrated together with her husband from India to the United Kingdom in the 1960s whereas Pal is a second generation immigrant who was born and raised in Britain. He is married to a white woman, Liz. There are also Cookie and Major. Cookie is daughter to Jeeto and sister to Pal and she is Major's wife.

It might be helpful to recount the events briefly so as to comprehend better the heterotopic spaces of the play. The two-act play consists of several scenes; four

scenes in the first act and seven scenes in the second act. It starts with a Christmas setting and spots light on the lives of the members of the family. Pal is trying to undertake a new job and he neglects his wife Liz who wants to get pregnant and have a baby. Jeeto also wants them to give her a grandson. Even though Cookie is married with children, Jeeto is not content with her other grandchildren since they are girls not boys and besides they are her daughter's children. She wants her son to have sons, which she believes will provide the continuation of the blood of the family.

Pal and Liz cannot have babies so they try in vitro fertilisation (IVF) but the process is too long for Pal to put up with. Because of his prioritizing of business over IVF process, Liz leaves him. Therefore, he does not take any account of it while busy with the business that he plans to set up. One day, he is left alone with Reema, a distant relative, who came from India because her husband left the house for some reason. While Pal grouches about Liz, they get closer to each other and cannot prevent a sexual intercourse. Later it is revealed that Reema is pregnant and Jeeto lets Liz know about it. Reema gives birth to a boy, which quite pleases Jeeto and Pal fails in his business losing a great amount of money. The play ends up with Reema's relinquishing and abdication of the child in order to set off for a new, independent life and Pal's bankruptcy which causes them to sell their house and move to a small council flat.

This family in a way acts as a heterotopic space itself for it brings up two distinct poles in one space itself. It, therefore, is indispensable to see the family as a heterotopia of its own kind. In comparison with the previous play *Behsharam* which centres on space around individual characters and which enables us to consider the migrant as a heterotopic space, this play, *Khandan*, helps explore family as a heterotopia. The Sikh family – or to some extent the families – in this play stands prominent.

It is doubtless that the space around this family provides the larger amount of the heterotopias to be analysed in this chapter. Nevertheless, the family of the daughter-in-law will also be able to present heterotopias. Even though the events evolve around the Sikh family, Liz or Elizabeth and her family stand prominent as

well despite the fact that her family is not given any space or voice throughout the play. This presence of absence will also be analysed. These two families and the heterotopic spaces generated around them will be discussed thoroughly in two separate parts.

4. 2. Heterotopic Space Generated Around Gill Family

The very beginning of the play is quite striking for it generates the first and one of the most efficacious heterotopias of the play. The first scene which introduces us Jeeto, Liz and Pal respectively is set in the house and seems as a representation of what it is like to be a British Sikh family because the setting witnesses a clash of the two cultures, that is to say, the English or Christian culture and the Indian or Sikh culture are intertwined and mingled in such a way that it is difficult to pull out one from the other.

The space that is created seems like what is considered to be westernized and non-western at the same time. The setting of the stage is given quite clearly, which urges the one who looks at it to ponder on it and to see the contrasting image of the same space.

A few weeks before Christmas. A large bright nouveau rich living room space in neutral colours opens out into a modern well-equipped country style kitchen fitted with a breakfast bar. The atmosphere is regal, comfortable, vast, blank. Huge stainless steel pans sit on the hob. A mahogany sideboard, dining table and chairs occupy part of the living room area and a DFS leather extendable armchair is plonked in the middle. Small, decorative tables are scattered around. Family photographs in gold frames adorn the walls alongside images of the Golden Temple and assorted Sikh Gurus. There is a plush burgundy carpet and a large plasma screen in one corner. (I, 1, 307)

The house that the family lives in is apparently a combination of two cultures since it is both adorned with the pictures that represent the Sikh culture and decorated in a very western way and the stage direction describes it as “nouveau riche”. It obviously is a mismatched decoration. Highly western urban style house with furniture of such kind is filled with the Punjabi materials and special pans brought

from India to cook the traditional tea “chah” in the traditional way as it is done in the country of their origin.

The constructed, the abstracted and the heterotopic spaces come into existence at the house where the immigrant family lives. The furniture provides us with the constructed space but the pictures of family members and the “gurdwara” creates the abstracted space where one is expected to think of the Sikh people or maybe the Indian immigrants in general. Between these two spaces it is easy to detect a heterotopic space through which we are forced in mind to think of the immigrant community and their integration to the country where they live in, which is the United Kingdom.

In the second scene, the stage direction support a better understanding of such heterotopia formed around the family and this heterotopic space obviously concerns itself with the elements of mentioned religions i.e. Christianity and Sikhism. It follows as; “*New Year’s Eve. The same living room is lavishly adorned with Christmas decorations, crammed full with cards and a lit up B&Q tree looms at the back.*” (1, II, 318) When one thinks of the pictures of the family members, the father with Sikh turban who passed away some time ago and the picture of the Golden Temple of the Sikhs in India, it is inevitable for one to see the juxtaposition of religions in the living room of the house where the immigrant family creates the space they live in. The heterotopia that is produced through the mismatch in the scene inverts the pre-assumptions considering religions. It vaguely seems to be capable of turning the perception of the impossibility of coexistence of the religions upside down.

Likewise, another such mismatch is visible with Jeeto as well. It can actually be said that she always appears on the scene with an atmosphere of mismatch and incongruity. When this character enters the house, it is inevitable to see this fact as the stage direction reveals it.

JEETO, 60s, a portly, kind-looking woman with dangerous eyes walks into her home. She wears a bright blue tabard on top of an old flowery shalwar kameez. Carrying a leather handbag over her shoulder, she absent-mindedly holds a wad of letter which she has just picked up. JEETO sings /hums ‘Challa’, a famous Punjabi folk song, this morphs into the ‘Oh na na na’ chorus from Rihanna’s ‘What’s My Name [...] (I, 1, 307).

Her outfit is pointed out since it is most probably expected that one would think her clothes are mismatched as one sees her. She wears both a shalwar kameez and a leather handbag. She, therefore, juxtaposes on her body two items which might connote two contrasting cultures; one is the Punjabi traditional cloth while the other would rather be associated to western/postmodern fashion. One might claim that her body becomes a space for her where she can perform her 'self' and exhibit it. This does not mean that she does it intentionally for some purposes. But this is how heterotopias work as well – a heterotopia is not always generated intentionally. In this instance, her body is what includes the constructed, the abstracted and the heterotopic spaces all at once, at the same time: at the same spatiality and temporality. It strongly prompts us to think about the politics of integration or assimilation of the immigrants into the local community and some of the responses of such local communities.

Jeeto, generally seems not to have accepted to be assimilated into the British society as she is never pleased with the white people whom she always call 'goreh' and she frequently exhibits her discontent about the white. She, in a sense, filled with this discontent because of her experiences when she arrived in the 60s. Pal and Cookie, on the other hand, seems to be second generation immigrants well integrating into the country since both of them are introduced as a part of the working class. Pal is in his mid-30s and as he enters to the scene and the stage direction conveys "*he's a powerfully built leonine alpha male. Buoyant, lively and slightly drunk, he wears a high street suit*" (I, 1, 312). He performs the practices that his mother, Jeeto, attributes to the English society – despite her mother's disapproval he goes to pubs, drinks beer and besides, unlike Jeeto, he finds no harm working with some white businessmen to whom he wants to sell the shop left from his father. Similarly and more profoundly, his sister Cookie can be placed to such a place between her mother/her culture and Britishness. She also drinks but she has to try her best so as to hide it because her mother does not want them to live like the 'goreh' (or white).

COOKIE SAMRA, early 40s, ferocious, rough, hard-faced and immaculately made up, sits at the table, texting avidly on her iPhone. COOKIE drips with gold, and wears an expensive, ultra fashionable

shalwar kameez. She puts the phone down, wanders over to the kitchen area, opens the fridge, stares into it. She has a quick look around carefully removes a bottle of wine. COOKIE hurriedly unscrews it, takes a long sip and puts it back.

COOKIE walks back to the table, opens her designer handbag, takes out Gold Spot mouth freshener, sprays it into her mouth and retouches her lipstick. Her phone rings, she scans the caller's name, takes a deep breath, sits back on the dining chair, answers the phone, talks quietly. (I, 2, 319)

She talks to the caller explaining why she cannot meet. In this scene, thus, it is revealed that Cookie also has habits which would not be accepted by her mother. Like her brother, she drinks alcohol and hides it and she apparently has an extramarital relationship and because she is married to Major with two children, she hides from the family members as she tells lies to Liz about the person she talks to when Liz enters. Pal and Cookie's daily practices and their relationships contradict what their mother would want them to do.

Such difference between the mother and the children stands prominent since it creates a heterotopic space through which we are led to think about the first and the second generations as well as the future ones. The scene in which these realities about Pal and Cookie are revealed provides us with the constructed space and Jeeto's expectations from them stand for the abstracted space. Between the two spaces a heterotopia appears and it reveals the difference between the integration of the first generation immigrants and that of their children, the second generation. It, of course, does not mean that when an immigrant drinks beer or wine, that an immigrant turns integrated into the English society. Yet, the way it is revealed and contrasted to Jeeto's view of such practices, it sounds and stands prominent. When one thinks of the first generation immigrants, one should admit that the influence of the country of origin is highly visible whereas one cannot say the same thing for the second generation immigrants who, for some, are considered as 'hybrid' or a mixture of two distinct spaces or spheres.

There is yet another significant difference that provided in the play by Pal and Cookie, the latter in particular. It is what these two characters think of the community and the country of origin from where their parents emigrated. That is to say, Pal and Cookie seem to be looking down on the people living in India or in

Punjab in particular. When Jeeto tells Pal that Reema has bought flight ticket to England and that she will spend some time with them, Pal's reaction is straightforwardly strict and he utters his annoyance about the situation. He tries to persuade his mother not to accept Reema and complains about his possible responsibilities if she comes; "[...] what happens when she arrives? I'm the one who'll have to buy her a bus pass, teach her how to use a till, take her up Pilmark..." (I, 1, 316). Such similar attitude is visible with Cookie as well. When she talks with Liz, she tells her not to tire herself to make Reema feel comfortable.

COOKIE: Stick some Indian films on for her. That'll keep her happy. Oh and get some cream cakes, they like cream cakes for some reason. If there is any in the shop past the sell-by date she can have them.

[...]

COOKIE: I can't be dealing with this Indian timing.

LIZ: Traffic innit?

COOKIE: Suppose she'll wanna sightseeing at the weekend. Buckingham Palace and all that shit.

LIZ: Dunno.

COOKIE: They all wanna go there. And Madame Tussauds. Five quid for a diet coke it was when that Jiti came. I can't be dealing with it. I told Mum I'm not taking her. You lot'll have to do it. (I, 2, 320)

Apparently, Cookie's view concerning the Indians is the result of a stance. In other words, she puts a distance between herself and the people of her country of origin. It is most obvious with her use of the pronoun "they" when she talks about the Indians. She avoids saying "we" because such an inclusion would remove the distance, and she no longer associates herself with the people from her country of origin. However, such exclusion causes a heterotopic space around these two members of the family, Pal and Cookie. With this heterotopic space, we might think of the positioning of the second generation in the British society and their closeness/distantness to their country of origin and to the society which their parents belonged to.

Furthermore, the heterotopic spaces which emerge around this Sikh family increases plentifully when Reema comes from India. She becomes an important part of the family's destiny. She is actually living in India but her husband Jiti leaves her because he is a drug addict and he has no intention to quit it. He, therefore, runs away to live freely so that he can continue his addiction without

rendering an account of what he does. Left by her husband, it is revealed that Reema is attacked by some men who come to ask for the debt that her husband had. When they attack her, her father-in-law, Chacha, tries to protect her with a rifle but he is beaten up and Reema takes the rifle that Chacha brought and kills one of the men with it. After this event, Chacha decides to keep Reema away from the village where she is not safe because she is a widow now. This is why he sends Reema to the United Kingdom which they regard as a safe place for women.

However, she does not feel safe in this new environment, she is seen as an outsider and is not welcome at first by Pal and Cookie who are themselves considered to be outsiders by some conservatives such as Liz's parents as the play reveals later. Jeeto is the only one who does not have any objection to hosting her in their house. She seems to understand the concerns of Reema and Chacha because, one can suppose, she knows what it is like to live in India as a woman left by her husband. She was born in India and she always gives examples from her mother country comparing it to the United Kingdom. Even though she seems not to be content with the life she had to build in England, she considers her arrival as her second birth.

JEETO: You know I was born twice. Once when I came out of my mother.
And then when a 747 landed at Heathrow Airport in 1969.

Reema makes tea. JEETO eyes her gravely.

JEETO: It will be the same for you. (I, 2, 333)

Her conversation with Reema reveals a heterotopic space for us to put into consideration the migrants' reasons for moving to England. In order to put forth the two poles that lead to this heterotopic space, one can consider what Jeeto says as the constructed space because it is laid by the migrant herself. The abstracted space, however, would be a linguistic one when she declares her arrival in the airport as her re-birth. Between these two spaces the generation of a challenging space is inevitable. This space is a heterotopic one which leads us to take notice of what the United Kingdom signifies for the immigrants. It certainly is not to say that all migrants feel the same about the country of arrival i.e. the UK. Yet, it is to say that there is a reason or there are reasons for migration. It is clearly seen throughout the play that the characters consider the UK as a safer place and the country of freedom

when they compare it to India. This is, especially, expressed by female characters, namely Jeeto, Cookie and Reema. Therefore, such a heterotopic space pushes us to think about such reasons for migrants to move into the UK. However, it is better to clarify that this does not necessarily put forth the prioritization of one country over the other.

It is also noteworthy that Reema has her own plans about her life in the UK. She seems to be eager to live as an independent woman and decide her own destiny and she shows this as her main reason for moving from India. What is more attention grabbing is her proposal to Pal in order to be free from the circumstances that surrounded her after her sexual intercourse with him. She apparently did not want to give birth to the child and it can be said that she sees it as an obstacle in her way to her long-wanted freedom. She proposes Pal to leave the baby boy, in exchange with some money to buy a ticket to America, with him and his mother Jeeto who has always wished a grandson to continue their blood. She also mentions that this might result in the return of his ex-wife, Liz. Hearing this, Pal accepts her offer but because of the bankruptcy that he had recently experienced has nothing but a biscuit jar that he uses as a money box and saves money in for difficult days. He tells her she can have it if she wants. Reema hesitantly makes her decision.

REEMA: You... you make sure you look after him...
After a few moments, she composes herself and hands PAL the baby. She opens the jar and frantically stuffs the money in her pockets. She exits. PAL is left with the baby in his arms. (II, 6, 396)

This scene also secures a heterotopic space; the constructed space is formed when Reema hands the baby to Pal receiving the money in return. The abstracted space is her will to live as an independent woman, which is, she points several times, her main reason to migrate to the UK. The heterotopia that emerges in this scene requires us to ponder on the situation that Reema is in, that is to say, the choice that an immigrant woman is left to make for her freedom. It can be claimed that this is strongly felt in her conversation with Pal when she says “freedom in your country, real freedom, it costs” (II, 6, 394).

Moreover, another heterotopia concerning the immigrant family as a whole appears when the family moves from their house which they had to sell because Pal

went bankrupt. The house which was depicted in the beginning of the play as a fully furnished with a nouveau riche living room is gone because Pal had to sell it after he went bankrupt.

The stage is transformed into a grubby, grim council flat. A vast expanse of space, bare and soulless. Someone left the dirty mattress they died on in a corner. Bits of litter here and there. Chintz curtains hang at the back, they are closed and covers a massive window. The layout of the space is the same as JEETO's house but the décor is a thousand times cheaper. The kitchen area is old-fashioned, modest. A suitcase and a black bag are on one side of the room. PAL and COOKIE enter through a door, with more black bags, a broom and cleaning materials. They put them next to the suitcase and black bag. COOKIE contemplates the space as PAL unpacks. (II, 7, 396)

This new council flat which is given a detailed depiction would form the constructed space while the previous house of the Gills which one can easily compare to this flat would be the abstracted space. An image of the old big house and this council flat would make a heterotopia come to exist. This heterotopic space is capable of leading us to think of the impossibility for the immigrants to turn back to their country of origin. As it is revealed in the play, the family has a house and a land in India which they keep in order to use when needed. After Pal's economic fall, the first thing that Jeeto suggests is to sell the house and keep their lives safe and sound in the United Kingdom. Staying in England is more important than the land they own in India and thus they accept to live in a small council flat. In a way they prefer staying in England no matter what to turning back to India. This might be assessed in regards to the reasons for the Indian people to migrate to the UK. The Sikh family does not even think of moving back to India as they want to secure the recognition that they received in England. Such heterotopic space, therefore, prompts the British audience to think about the point of no return for the immigrants after such a long time spent in a new place having set a way of existing in the lands where they were welcomed as well as seen as point of controversy.

Lastly, the linguistic space in the family is also a heterotopic one since it brings two languages together. The characters speak a mixture of two languages juxtaposing a Punjabi verb next to an English noun or vice versa. Even though the language that dominates the whole play is English, it is not rare that the Punjabi

language feels its presence throughout the play. One can realise there are even fully Punjabi sentences. It is generally Jeeto who sets fully Punjabi sentences since she represents the first generation of immigrants. So does Reema as she has just arrived in the United Kingdom. She is obviously the other character who has an advanced conduct of the language. However, Pal and Cookie barely speak any Punjabi. They do understand when their mother addresses them in the Punjabi language and they use numerous words related especially to food but they are not seen to speak their mother's language fully.

The juxtaposition of two languages generates a heterotopic space of its own kind i.e. a linguistic one. It can be claimed that such a linguistically formed heterotopic space is capable of pushing us to re-think of the integration process of the immigrant families. It is not a surprising fact that the first generation immigrant can find some difficulty in getting used to an environment which culturally, socially, traditionally and linguistically different from that of their country of origin. Unlike this first generation, their children, the second generation, might tend to assimilate into the local community, culture and language reaching a more achieved integration. This might be an overgeneralization but it still might shed light on the difference between the attitudes of the first and the second generation immigrants. The members of the first generation immigrants seem to be strongly attached to the Indian values finding difficulty in adapting to the cultural differences in England.

4. 3. Heterotopic Space Generated Around the White Family

The Sikh family in the play *Khandan* is obviously quite significant with its representation of heterotopic spaces which has led us to think about alternative re-orderings concerning the immigrants. Yet, there is another family in the play which deserves attention. Similar to the Sikh family, the English family generates heterotopic spaces that engage with the relation between the immigrants and the English people and with the perception of the white English people as well as with that of the immigrants, particularly the first generation immigrants. It then would

make this thesis incomplete to fail to notice and to point out such spaces generated around the only English family not only in *Khandan* but also in all other plays of Bhatti since there is no other English family either in *Behsharam* or in her other plays.

Despite being unvoiced and not appearing on the stage, the English family creates heterotopias of such kind which engage with one type of the English perceptions of the immigrant. This English family has a relation with the Sikh family around which the play generates its plot. Pal the only male member of the Sikh family is married to a white woman named Liz or Elizabeth whose family is the only white family in Bhatti's plays as mentioned before. Liz is a woman at her 30s and she is very eager to have a baby but her husband's and her efforts prove useless. She is introduced to us as "*white, loud, big hearted and exuding cheap glamour breezes*" and she appears for the first time on the stage "*wearing fashionable too tight clothes*" (I, 1, 308).

In the initial scene of the play, she tries to speak with her mother-in-law, Jeeto, but she is not listened to as Jeeto pays no attention to what she says. Liz tries to show Jeeto the calendar that some kids made and gave her as a gift. She is apparently seen to be very content with what she received from children. One can say it is because her desire to have a child of her own and maybe to receive such presents from her child. While she tries to explain what she feels, Jeeto warns her for she has forgotten to perform a ritualistic movement.

JEETO: Nee Koorih! [*hey you girl!*]

LIZ stops, sighs, covers her head with a scarf and goes over to touch

JEETO's feet [*in the way Punjabi daughter-in-law would touch her mother-in-law's feet*].

JEETO: Chah!

LIZ nips back out. JEETO picks up the photo, looks longingly at it again.

Puts it back in the bag. LIZ returns holding a few more supermarket carriers. (I, 1, 308)

It is seen that Liz is accustomed to performing such a ritual as she understands what her mother-in-law expects her to do the moment she addresses to her. Even though she is not content with what she does i.e. performing a Punjabi tradition, she fulfils what she needs to do and touches Jeeto's feet, she feels she is obliged to perform this Punjabi tradition because she is married to a man who is the only male member

of the Sikh family. Her obligation and discontent makes the heterotopic space more visible and it appears between the two poles.

As to Tompkins' terms; the constructed space, on the one hand, is what is being performed, that is to say, touching the feet of an older member of the family. In this regard, the way the play contests the culture and tradition and the fact that the white woman performs such tradition. The abstracted space, on the other hand, emerges when Liz stops and sighs; one would expect her to resist what she is told to do as her sighing shows that she is not very content with what she has to do to show respect to her mother-in-law. It, in a way, exhibits her disapprobation. However, she unwillingly continues and performs the Sikh tradition and an obvious heterotopia emerges thereof. This heterotopic space prompts us to ponder the condition in which Liz's encounter with the Sikh traditions is noticeable. It can be deduced that as a white woman who tries to integrate to the Sikh family and their tradition, Liz experiences another type of encounter. The approval of her entrance into the family requires her to perform such tasks that she is not used to at all, neither is she delighted with it.

Notwithstanding her encounter with the Sikh traditions in respect to family, Liz is to reveal some clues about her own family. When she talks to her husband, Pal, about the economic crisis that the Gills experience, she reminds her husband that she could ask her mother and father for some loan so as to start the IVF procedure because she looks forward to having her own baby and to taking care of it. As she really wants to experience how it feels to be a mother she insists on asking her parents to give them financial support so that they see the doctor and accelerate the medical process. However, her husband reminds her of the fact about her parents as he says, "they don't want no brown babies going around their house!" This fact is conceded by Liz too as she falls quiet and quits insisting on the loan. They decide to try on their own as they have been doing.

In this sense, the play exhibits the reaction of a conservative English family to the union of their daughter with a 'brown' man. It does so through this very scene when Pal reveals the fact and Liz is left with no choice to accept. The scene therefore produces a heterotopic space. In order to pinpoint this heterotopia, one

should detect the constructed and the abstracted spaces between which the heterotopia emerges itself. The constructed, space in this scene, is the fact that a Punjabi, 'brown' man is married to a white English woman and the abstracted is that the parents of the white woman would show no interest in helping their daughter to have babies with an Indian man. It, then, is not any difficult to locate the heterotopic space which brings to the light the reactions of white people towards the immigrants or the people of colour. This heterotopia is strong in nature to urge us on valuing the racist perspectives concerning any racial indicators like skin colour. One who detects this heterotopia is sure to ponder on racism and the attitude of the majority towards the minority.

Furthermore, when Liz arrives at Gills' flat and talks with Reema upstairs, Pal, Cookie and Major enters the living room respectively. After Jeeto reveals Liz's presence, they get surprized and Pal is both upset and excited. Then Major makes it clear that they have not seen Liz's car outside the building and he asks where she has parked her car before coming in and points that if they had seen the car they would know that she is there. Jeeto reveals how she got there but what Cookie reveals is something to ponder on.

JEETO: Her father is outside waiting in his car.

MAJOR: We could have given her a lift.

COOKIE: Yeah, her mum and dad are only up the road. We see them in Asda all the time. They never say hello. (II, 4, 372-373)

It is obvious that Liz's parents do not want to have any kind of relationship with an immigrant family as Cookie unveils the fact that they do always avoid greeting them whenever they come across at the supermarket. Once more, it can be claimed that this fact which is uttered by an immigrant provides us a heterotopia. The constructed space is what Cookie discloses i.e. white English couple bypassing the immigrants. The abstracted space is the one that comes to mind in expectation of a better integrated British society as the play apparently points an unintegrated part of the British society. Between these two poles, one can find the heterotopic space which is an abstract space in nature like a great amount of the rest of the heterotopias in Bhatti's plays. It leads us to think of a re-ordering of the British society in which the minority groups are admitted. This, of course, is never to say

that the immigrant groups or the minority groups, particularly the Sikh community is not integrated into the British society. It is just meant to point that the play reveals that one should be in hope of a better integrated society.

The play's anticipation of such society and its insistence on the solid discordance between the minority group and the white majority is ascertained several other times. For instance, when Pal and Liz encounter at Gills' flat after their separation, Liz uncovers her parents' attitude towards her relationship and she also wonders what they think of the co-existence of the white people and the people of colour. It additionally is worth reminding that she does this when Pal is trying to communicate with her.

PAL: (*Gets up.*) Liz...

LIZ: (*interrupts.*) My dad said they should have kept the Asian kids separate from us at school, on the other side of the classroom, you know like the men and women are at the Gurdwara. (*A beat.*) But no one could keep us apart.

PAL: Never. (II, 4. 376-377)

In this poignant scene of farewell, Liz's reason to tell what her parents have always thought about their relation is apparently her broken-hearted situation. Yet, she helps detect a heterotopic space with what she reveals. The constructed space, on the one hand, is the fact that Liz and Pal received education together. The abstracted space, on the other hand, is what her parents think about the mixed-race education that they have received. The approach of Liz's parents proves solemnly to be a discriminative one. Therefore, the heterotopia that this scene generates pushes us once more to think about the discrimination, disintegration in the society because no matter how hard both groups try to integrate and accept each other, there certainly are such conservative people with racist and discriminative thoughts and stances. It is inevitable to imagine an alternate society each and every part of which is well integrated and is not discriminated against.

It is noteworthy to admit anew that Liz's parents are never voiced and thus they never speak of themselves. What is known about them is rather other characters' account. It is either Cookie or Liz or another character that puts forth the details presented about the English family. It, therefore, is important to point out that these heterotopic spaces emerge despite the absence of the English family because the absence, as Tompkins claims, is as significant as the presence.

Yet, the only member of the English family who is given voice in the play is Liz and it can be claimed that what is known about her is rather reliable in nature as she appears in scenes and speaks of herself giving her own reactions. Her attitude towards the Sikh family and culture is notable. When she enters into the Gill family she tries hard to be accepted and she becomes a member of the family. She learns about the Sikh traditions, culture and cuisine. As mentioned before, she also performs Sikh rituals even though she is not very keen on. Moreover, as she reveals, she does all these things challenging her own family.

LIZ: I turned my back on my family for you.

PAL: I know.

LIZ: I learned to goon the atta, make tharka, do gidha with Mum. Daddy always said I was more Indian than you. (*A beat.*) Can I please have a photo of him?

Cookie finds one on the sideboard, hands it to her. LIZ looks at it.

LIZ: I still miss him so much. (II, 4. 377)

It is mentioned several other times that Daddy was really respectful and kind to Liz as he considered her to be more Sikh than his own children, Pal and Cookie. It is obviously acknowledged almost in every scene that Liz has become a part of the Sikh family and she knows more about the traditions especially the cuisine. Whenever she is on the scene, someone asks her to prepare some tea or some Punjabi bread, etc. Thus, Liz's entrance into the family provides another heterotopic space as well. In this scene, the constructed space is Liz's presence on the stage with her skin colour which is different from that of the other members of the Sikh family and her clothing as she seems quite distinct from the rest with her outfit. The abstracted space, whereas, is what she performs in the family. That is to say, she is the one who always cooks 'chah' and takes part in every custom of the Sikh family so devotedly that her father-in-law appreciates it as it is conveyed. The heterotopia that emerges here puts forward one thing which can be considered to have been rather overlooked; the white people who are not conservative and are more open to immigrants or outsiders as some conservatives consider.

In this regard, among the plays of Bhatti, *Khandan* stands prominent for it not only provides insight into the nature of a Sikh immigrant family in Britain but also shed light onto an English family even though some members of it are not

present in the play and are just mentioned in conversations. Through its intervention with the Sikh family's effort to survive and create a space of their own in Britain and with the perception of the white family, the play becomes a solid ground in which heterotopias emerge and prompt the audience or the reader to think and re-think about the contemporary British society with every piece which it consists of. No matter absent or present, the Sikh and white families in the play are key figures as they provide the scenes that generate the heterotopic spaces which require the audience to put into consideration the social and cultural differences and distinct perceptions that make up the British society today.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis has analysed the heterotopic spaces generated through the plays *Behsharam* and *Khandan* by the British Sikh playwright Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti. The heterotopic spaces in these two plays intervene with the situation in which the characters almost all of whom are immigrants are stuck. In the way they create the heterotopias *Behsharam* and *Khandan* seem to involve themselves in the same social context while they do so in distinct ways. The first play is open to investigate Sikh characters individually whereas the second is more concerned with a Sikh family as a whole. This study, therefore, necessitates analysing the two plays accordingly while drawing the term heterotopia to a position where it is easier to make a connection to the social, cultural and political conditions present at the space they occupy.

In this regard the theoretical framework of this thesis explores the term which was initially propounded by Michel Foucault. Since it is quite critical to comprehend Foucault's use of the term as it was not probed adequately at first, the first part of the chapter which deals with the theoretical framework concerns itself with Foucault's heterotopia and it examines it critically. Foucault suggests that there are heterotopias which are emergent between two poles of space. The best example, as he puts forth, is the ship which is described to have a place but not belonging to any place at the same time. To draw the attention to the utopics, it is suggested to be a space between the real place and no place. It, therefore, has the potential to mirror the both at the same time.

The second part of the chapter which deals with the theoretical background is reserved for the later theoreticians and critics who probed the term in depth.

Critics like Henri Lefebvre appreciated the term and developed it into a “different place” or to “an other place” as he points out that a heterotopia is a contracting space, that is to say it is in opposition to the place that it occupies. Edward Soja, on the other hand, points to a relation between the heterotopic space and rather the third space which was point of focus for some critics. Most distinctly, David Harvey criticizes Foucault’s use of the term heterotopia and finds it weak and uncertain for its inability to intervene with the social context. For Harvey, heterotopia should be a space that helps improve or make a change in the social norms and presuppositions that rule the social issues.

The following part of this chapter has been devoted to Joanne Tompkins’ adjustment of the term and its employment for theatre studies. She claims that heterotopias occur quite frequently in theatre plays assuring Foucault’s exemplification of the term. She, however, promotes David Harvey’s concerns about situating heterotopias in a context that makes it possible to draw connections to social matters. She suggests analysing heterotopic spaces in theatre plays might be able to lead us to draw connections between what is performed on the stage which is a reflection of the real world and the actual world outside the theatre venue. Her adjustment further includes a change in the appellation of the poles that heterotopia emerges in between. Instead of real place she uses the term ‘constructed space’ as the space in a play or on the stage is rather a constructed one which can be related to the real space outside. She also prefers ‘abstracted space’ over ‘no place’ or ‘good place’ which, she claims are not terminologically applicable in theatre studies. Tompkins asserts the use of such terms as constructed and abstracted with which one can mark the heterotopic space is better capable of serving the theatrical purposes. She also suggests that heterotopia should be used in the social context so as to push and encourage the audience to think and re-think about the real world behind the theatre wall noting that it might help better the real conditions even if it cannot make an entire change in the society that we belong to.

Following the theoretical framework, Chapter 3 investigates the heterotopic spaces that are generated around the characters in Bhatti’s debut play *Behsharam*. Since the characters in the play are very distinct from each other and are exposed to

different forms of isolation, the heterotopias come into existence around these immigrant characters individually. This chapter, therefore, has discussed the migrant's heterotopic features as an individual as each character seems to be providing us with heterotopias concerning the lives of these immigrants.

Among them, Jaspal is especially essential as she lives in isolation not only because she is an immigrant passing through her own fight for survival but also because she is abandoned by her family after her mother's death. She embarks on a new lifestyle which is not approved by her father and her grandmother, the only remaining elder members of her family. She is subjected to harsh discrimination from her family members except her sister. Therefore, one part of Chapter 3 has been devoted to the analysis of the heterotopias generated around Jaspal since they are crucially important in regards to their quality which urges us to think about the social norms that rule the lives of a specific people belonging to a minority group in a space that they have migrated into, that is to say, the members of the Sikh community in Britain.

Another subheading has investigated a similar form of heterotopic space which emerges around Sati, Jaspal's sister as she herself is exposed to isolation no less important than what Jaspal receives. She is a focal character through the play as her birth is pointed to be the source of the problems that the family faced. Her father divorced her mother after Sati was born and his main reason is that the mother could not give birth to a son. Sati, left alone after her mother's death and her sister's leave, experiences the restrictions that her stepmother puts according to what she calls the Sikh culture and traditions. This thesis has managed to analyse certain types of heterotopias which are emergent when Sati is on the scene because they are of value in terms of shedding light onto the positioning of the women and the hierarchical structure of the family in the Sikh community since male members of the family are prioritized over the female members.

Other characters in the play are also quite essential in respect to the heterotopias which promote a re-thinking of the structure of the Sikh family as an example of immigrant family which has been put to scrutiny more in detail in the following chapter. The heterotopic spaces around the grandmother in *Behsharam*

has been investigated because it helps extend our understanding of the immigrant woman who is in between the two spaces or spheres which are dominated by distinct cultures and social norms. The heterotopia emerging around the father, on the other hand, has been analysed so that it might advocate the desperate position in which men are located. Especially male immigrants, like all other characters, have to experience a similar in-betweenness if not the same. Thus the way the social and cultural norms are problematized is put forth and shed light onto so that one should ponder and think critically of what these norms result in, particularly those in which the immigrants are to face difficulties both as individuals and as groups or families while living in a space that, the conservative white people claim, belongs to them both culturally and historically.

In this regard, Chapter 4 has analysed the other play *Khandan* which concerns itself more with what the immigrant family has to encounter as a whole. Even the name of the play is the Punjabi word for family. Therefore, the first subheading of this chapter has suggested that immigrant family is likely to be approached as an entity functioning like a heterotopic space itself. Through this approach in the following part of this chapter the Sikh family, the Gills, in the play has been analysed because there are numerous heterotopic spaces emerging in or around this family. These heterotopic spaces are very appropriate examples which induce us to evaluate the immigrant family together the changes that they are to face because the immigrant family do certainly commence to follow a different path in terms of the cultural or social norms of their country of origin. The moment the immigrant family begins a life in the country of arrival, it turns into an undetachable part of that country. It is, thenceforth, not possible in any way to detach and shatter it and disconnect these parts. When the 'brown' Indians migrate to England or are born there, they apparently are a part of the country.

Eventually this chapter has also put effort into shedding light on the only white family in Bhatti's plays. As a family, they are also attention grabbing even though they are not given as much voice as the Sikh family. There is rather less mentioning of the family but each time the conversations between the characters reveal the family's attitude towards the Gill family, a heterotopia is to emerge and it

definitely gives insight into the perceptions of the conservative white people and their reception of the immigrants. In this sense, it has certainly widened depth of this analysis of spatiality of the play. This spatiality is emergent rather linguistically as the family is not voiced but introduced through the characters' conversations.

It must be admitted that the performances of these two plays receives more attention in the British stage but not in other countries. The reason for this is of course the number of the people with full or partial Sikh origin. Since Britain hosts a great proportion of the Sikh diaspora, the plays find their place in the British stage. It, therefore, is vital to mention the heterotopic feature of the British stage for these plays – it, in a way, acts as a heterotopia itself if one remembers that one of the best examples of heterotopias is theatre stage by nature. In Tompkins' terminology the British stage forms the constructed space and the representations of the actual world on the stage form the abstracted spaces and in between the two theatre's heterotopias emerge with their full strength to urge the audience to find a way out challenging and contesting the actual world and initiating a sparkle to change or to find an alternate ordering.

In the last analysis, this thesis has attempted to ascertain that the spatial term heterotopia, as instigated by Michel Foucault, developed for usage in socio-political context by David Harvey and adjusted for theatrical purposes by Joanne Tompkins, is essentially applicable to Bhatti's plays *Behsharam* and *Khandan*. Such representations of heterotopic spaces in these plays give insight into the immigrants' social presence, cultural distinctness and its contestation of the white British perception about the immigrants. In this sense, Bhatti's plays prove that theatre's potential in its heterotopicality has the capacity to create an atmosphere for the audience and enables the audience to think of an alternate ordering of the society. For these plays, the target audience is the British audience and the alternate ordering is that of the contemporary British society whose current situation seems problematic in Bhatti's plays as the exploration of the heterotopic spaces in these two plays unveils.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bhatti, Gurpreet Kaur. "Behsharam" in *Plays One*. London: Oberon Books, 2014, pp. 13-86.

Bhatti, Gurpreet Kaur. "Khandan" *Plays One*. London: Oberon Books, 2014, pp. 303-401.

Secondary Sources

Adiseshiah, Siân. "Utopian Space in Caryl Churchill's History Plays: Light Shining in Buckinghamshire and Vinegar Tom." *Utopian Studies*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2005, pp. 3–26.

Bammer, Angelika. *Partial Visions: Feminism and Utopianism in the late 1970s*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Bhabha, Hommi K. "The Third Space: interview with Homi K. Bhabha", in *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd, 1991, pp. 207-221.

Brenner, Neil & Stuart Elden. "Introduction. State, Space, World: Lefebvre and the Survival of Capitalism" in *State, Space, World: Selected Essays/Henri Lefebvre*. Eds. Neil Brenner and Stuart Elden. Trans. Gerald Moore, Neil Brenner, and Stuart Elden. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009, pp. 1-51.

Doğan, Pelin. *Censorship in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Century British Drama: Representation and Responses*. PhD dissertation. Ankara: Ankara University, 2017.

Dolan, Jill. *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theatre*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Foucault, Michel. *Of Other Spaces*. Trans. Jay Miskowiec in *Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité*, 1984.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2002.

“Gurdwara.” *The Popular Dictionary of Sikhism*. 2nd ed. London: RoutledgeCruzon, 2005, p. 35.

Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso, 2006.

Harvey, David. “The Kantian Roots of Foucault’s Dilemmas” in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Eds. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007, pp. 41-47.

Harvey, David. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Harvey, David. *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. London: Verso, 2012.

Heath, Anthony and Yaojun Li. “Review of the relationship between religion and poverty: An analysis for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.” CSI Working paper, 2015-01.
<http://csi.nuff.ox.ac.uk/>

Hetherington, Kevin. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. London: Routledge, 1997.

- Hetherington, Kevin. "Moderns as Ancients: Time, Space and the Discourse of Improvement," in *TimeSpace: Geographies of Temporality*. Eds. J. May and N. Thrift. London: Routledge, 2001, pp. 49-72.
- Kirby, Michael. "On Political Theatre." *The Drama Review: TDR*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1975, pp. 129-135. *JSTOR*.
www.jstor.org/stable/1144954.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. D. Nicholson-Smith. Cornwall: Blackwell, 1991.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Urban Revolution*. Trans. R. Bononno. Minnesota: University of Minneapolis Press, 2003.
- Legg, Stephen. "Beyond the European Province: Foucault and Postcolonialism," in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Eds. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007, pp. 265-289.
- Levin, Laura. "Theatre's Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space by Joanne Tompkins (review)." *Modern Drama*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2016, pp. 260-263.
- "Migration." *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. 1st ed., New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 384.
- Priddy, Sarah. "Contributions of Sikhs to the UK." House of Commons Library, Number CDP-0101, 2019.
- Rehm, Rush. Introduction. *The Play of Space: Spatial Transformation in Greek Tragedy*. Ed. Rush Rehm. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, pp. 1-34.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Cynthia Marshal. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Smith, Eric C. *Foucault's Heterotopia in Christian Catacombs: Constructing Spaces and Symbols in Ancient Rome*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.

Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Sturge, Georgina. "Migration Statistics: Briefing Paper." House of Commons Library, Number CBP06077, 2019.

Tatla, Darshan S. "Sikh Diaspora." *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World*. Ed. Melvin Ember et al, Vol. 1, Overviews & Topics. New York: Springer, 2005, pp. 273 – 285. Print.

Thrift, Nigel. "Overcome by Space," in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Eds. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007, pp. 53-58.

Tompkins, Joanne. *Unsettling Space: Contestations in Contemporary Australian Theatre*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Tompkins, Joanne. "'Place' and Practice of Site-Specific Theatre and Performance," in *Performing Site-Specific Theatre: Politics, Place, Practice*. Eds. Anna Birch and Joanne Tompkins. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012, pp. 1 -17.

Tompkins, Joanne. *Theatre's Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

Online Sources

Arlidge, John. "Is this Mr. Right?" *The Guardian*, 13 Jan. 1999: Web. 19 May 2019
<https://www.theguardian.com/football/2002/jan/13/sport.comment5>

Bhatti, Gurpreet Kaur. *YouTube*, uploaded by Nano GoleSorkh, 30 July, 2017
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U_qp4e2b2Zs

The Carpenters. Richard Carpenter,
<http://www.richardandkarencarpenter.com/biography.htm>

Salt 'n' Pepa. Lyrics to "Whatta man" Genius, 2019
<https://genius.com/Salt-n-pepa-whatta-man-lyrics>

Smithers, Rebecca. "Battle won as Sikh school joins state sector" *The Guardian*,
29 Nov. 1999: Web. 11 April 2019
<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/1999/nov/29/religion.news>

Summers, Donna. Lyrics to "Bad Girls" AZLyrics, 2019
<https://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/donnasummer/badgirls.html>

Stars in Their Eyes. iMDB, <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0200379/>

The Telegraph. "Play seeks new venue after Sikh protests closed show" 21 Dec.
2004: Web. 11 April 2019
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1479519/Play-seeks-new-venue-after-Sikh-protests-closed-show.html>

Wright, Ian. "Earning My Smile" *The Players' Tribune*, 27 Nov. 2018: Web. 19
May 2019
<https://www.theplayerstribune.com/en-us/articles/ian-wright-earning-my-smile>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

Önceki yüzyılda teorisyenlerin zaman mefhumuna verdiği değer ve öncelik son yüzyılda sıklıkla mekân kavramı üzerine evirildiği söylenmektedir. Mekân çalışmaları oldukça yoğun bir şekilde teorisyen ve eleştirmenler tarafından değerlendirilmekte, hali hazırda var olan anlamı üzerine tartışmalar sürmekte ve de bunun dışında yeni anlamlar da yüklenmektedir. Bu yüzyılda mekânın kavram olarak zaman kavramının önüne geçeceğini ünlü teorisyen Michel Foucault da bir yazısında belirtmiştir. Foucault'nun ölmeden önce geliştirmekte olduğu kavramlardan biri olan 'heterotopya' (heterotopia) da mekân ile alakalıdır. Bu tezde de Michel Foucault'nun kavramsallaştırdığı ve döneminde ve sonrasında aynı kavramı ele alan teorisyenlerin geliştirdiği ve de Joanne Tompkins'in tiyatro çalışmalarına uyarladığı heterotopya kavramı Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti'nin *Behsharam* ve *Kahndan* adlı iki oyununda incelenmiştir. Bu çalışma ile günümüz İngiltere'sindeki özellikle Sih topluluğu gibi göçmen toplulukları ile alakalı güncel durum ve sorunları yüzeye çıkarmak amaçlanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada heterotopya kavramı ve bu kavramın nasıl geliştirildiği üzerinde önemle durulmuştur. Bu sebeple tezin ikinci bölümü heterotopya kavramı ve onu geliştiren teorisyenlerin heterotopya kavramına katkılarını ayrılmıştır. Foucault'nun heterotopyası bir alt başlıkta ayrıntılı bir şekilde tanıtılıp incelenmiştir. Bunu takip eden ikinci bir alt başlıkta Foucault'dan sonra heterotopyayı çalışmalarının temel unsurlarından biri haline getirip mekân çalışmalarına katkı sağlayan Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja ve David Harvey gibi teorisyenlerin katkılarında bahsedilmiştir. Bu bölümün son alt başlığında ise

heterotopyanın tiyatro çalışmalarına nasıl uyarlandığı ve de seçili oyunlarda nasıl incelenebileceği ifade edilmiştir.

Bu bağlamda heterotopya kavramının taşıdığı yüksek öneme bölüm alt başlıklarında olduğu gibi gelişim sırasına özen göstererek değinmekte fayda vardır. Daha önceleri terim olarak farklı alanlarda kullanılmış olan heterotopya mekân çalışmalarına Michel Foucault sayesinde yerini bulduğunu iddia etmek yanlış olmayacaktır. Foucault'nun ölümünden sonra yayımlanan “Öteki Mekânlara Dair” adlı eserinde ilk kez kavramsallaştırmaya başladığı heterotopya o zamandan beri mekân teorisyenleri arasındaki tartışmaların odak noktası olmuştur. Zıt kutupları bir araya getiren somut bir mekân olduğu kadar soyut bir mekân olarak da karşımıza çıkabilen heterotopya çok sayıda bilim dalında yoğun bir biçimde ele alınmaktadır.

Henri Lefebvre gibi bir takım mekân teorisyenleri Foucault'nun heterotopyasının oldukça önemli bir kavram olduğunu ifade etmekle birlikte geliştirilmesi gerekliliğine de değinmişlerdir. Edward Soja ise bu kavramın mekân çalışmalarında yine epeyce yer edinen ‘üçüncü mekân’ kavramının sadece başka bir biçimi olduğunu iddia etmiştir. David Harvey gibi politik açıdan daha etkin olan bir kısım teorisyenler ise Foucault'yu ve kavramsallaştırmaya çalıştığı heterotopyasını ziyadesiyle ‘apolitik’ bulmuşlar ve bu sebeple heterotopya kavramını politik anlam yükleyerek ele almışlardır. Örneğin Kevin Hetherington heterotopyanın sadece coğrafya veya mimari gibi alanlarda kullanılan somut bir kavram olarak kalmanın ötesine geçmesi gerektiğini vurgulamıştır. Bu soyut anlam ve politik bağlam ile birlikte kullanıldığında heterotopya sosyoloji, felsefe ve edebiyat gibi alanlarda benzersiz yorumlama olanakları oluşturmakta ve güncel veya tarihsel olarak kıklü sorunlara yeni yaklaşım olanakları sağlamaktadır.

Bahsi geçen teorisyenlerin ışığından hareketle günümüzün kabul görmüş akademisyenlerinden biri olan Joanne Tompkins heterotopya kavramını yeniden yorumlayıp biçimlendirerek tiyatro alanında kullanıma uygun hale getirmiştir. *Tiyatronun Heterotopyaları* adlı kitabında Tompkins seçmiş olduğu oyunları belirlemiş olduğu sınıflandırmalara göre incelemiştir ve bunu yaparken de heterotopya kavramını tiyatro çalışmalarına uygun hale getirmiştir. Örneğin mekân teorisyenlerine göre heterotopyanın bir araya getirdiği kutuplar ‘gerçek mekân’ ile

var olmayan mekân' yahut 'iyi mekan' ile 'bulunamayan mekan' iken Tompkins tiyatro çalışmalarında bu kavramların yetersiz kalacağını belirtmiştir. Bu vesileyle gerçek mekânı yani sahnedeki mekanı 'yapma mekan' diye çevirebileceğimiz 'constructed space' ile yenilerken var olmayan mekanı da 'soyutlanmış mekan' yani 'abstracted space' ile güncellemiştir. Bu şekilde bir isimlendirme ve kullanımın tabiatı göz önünde bulundurulduğunda tiyatroya daha uygun olduğunu ifade etmiştir. Heterotopyaların ise bu iki mekânı bir araya getiren veya bu iki mekan arasında ortaya çıkan ve tiyatro çalışmalarında çoğunlukla soyut olan bir mekan olduğunu ileri sürmüştür. Tompkins bu heterotopyaların politik yanının ağır olduğunu ve tiyatro sahnesi dışında tüm çarpıcılığı ve çarpıklığıyla var olan temel sorunların yeniden değerlendirilmesinde kullanılabilecek bir araç olduğunu belirtmektedir. Her ne kadar var olan gerçek toplumsal sorunları topyekûn bir biçimde ortadan kaldırmalarını beklemenin yanıltıcı olacağını belirtse de heterotopyaların izleyici veya okuyucular üzerindeki etkisi sayesinde bu sorunların çözümlenmesinin ilk adımlarının atılmasını sağlayabilecek güçte olduğunu iddia etmektedir.

Tompkins'in şekillendirmiş olduğu tiyatronun heterotopyalarının kimi tiyatro eserlerinde yoğun bir şekilde ortaya çıkması söz konusudur. Güncel bir İngiltereli Sih oyun yazarı olan Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti'nin oyunları da bu eserler arasında hemen yer edinebilecek eserlerdendir. Zira Bhatti oyunlarında temel olarak göçmenleri ele almaktadır; göçmeler arasında ise özellikle tarihsel olarak Hindistan ve Pakistan'da meskûn olan fakat son yarım yüzyılda önemli bir bölümünün İngiltere'ye göç ettiği bilinen Sihler dikkat çekmektedir. İngiliz yaşam biçimi, İngiliz toplumu ve İngiliz yasaları ile kültürel ve tarihsel olarak bağlı oldukları Sih yaşam biçimi, Sih toplumu ve Sih dini kuralları arasında sıkışıp kalmış olan bu göçmen topluluğu oyunlardaki heterotopik mekânların temel kaynağını oluşturmaktadır. Sih bireyler, Sih aileler, Sih tapınağı olan 'gurdwara' gibi topluluk ortak alanları ve Sih guruları oyunlardaki temel unsurlar haline gelmekte ve oyunlar her ne kadar İngilizce olarak kaleme alınmış olsa da tüm göçmenler arası sohbetlerde Sih toplumunun ortak dili olan Pencapça varlığını hissettirmektedir.

Tüm bu iki kutupluluk ve iki farklı kültür arasında sıkışmış olma durumu heterotopik alanların oluşumunu kolaylaştırmakta ve sağlamlaştırmaktadır.

Oyunlar ele alındığında üçüncü bölümün incelediği Behsharam oyunundaki heterotopyaların çoğunlukla göçmen bireyler etrafında oluştuğu görülmektedir. Bu ortak payda göçmenleri dahi birer heterotopya olarak inceleme olanağı sağlamaktadır. Fakat Tompkins'in biçimlendirdiği şekilde heterotopyalar incelendiğinde iki kutuplu sistemlerin oluşan tezatlar içerisinde yarılarak heterotopik mekânların görünür olduğu gözlemlenmektedir. Birbirine zıt veya zıt olmasa dahi organik bir biçimde uyuşmadığı görülen kutuplar yani yapma mekânlar ile soyutlanmış mekânlar arasında fitraten ortaya çıkan heterotopik mekânlar izleyicileri, özellikle İngiliz tiyatro severleri, göçmenler ve onların yaşamları ile alakalı tüm sorunları bir kez daha düşünmeye itmektedir. Sadece göçme eyleminin ve yeni bir mekâna yerleşme çabasının yarattığı travmanın göçmen bireyler üzerindeki etkisi hissedilmekte ve izleyici eğer tam ya da kısmi olarak göçmen bir aileden gelmiyorsa dahi duygudaşlık kurmaya teşvik edilmektedir. Göçme eylemini birebir kendisi yaşamasa dahi ikinci nesil göçmenler de birinci nesil olan ebeveynlerinin yaşamış olduğu travmadan paylarına düşeni almaktadırlar.

Behsharam oyunundaki göçmen aile bu bağlamda incelendiğinde heterotopik mekânlar varlıklarını oyun boyunca hissettirmektedir. Anne, baba ve babaanneleri Hindistan'dan göçmüş fakat kendileri İngiltere'de doğmuş olan Jaspal ve Sati bu oyunun odağını oluşturmaktadır. Dolayısıyla oyundaki heterotopyalar en çok bu iki karakter etrafında ortaya çıkmaktadır. Adı bilinmeyen ve sadece 'baba' olarak isimlendirilen babaları İngiltere'ye göçmüş olmalarına rağmen Sih toplumunun İngiliz toplumundan farklılaşan geleneklerine göre erkek çocuk sahibi olamamanın hissettirdiği zorunlulukla iki kız çocuğunun annesi olan Mummy 1 ile boşanır. Erkek evlat ümidiyle Mummy 2 ile evlenir. Sonunda bir erkek evladı olsa da aile bireyleri arasındaki yıkım başlar. Mummy 1 ikinci defa kız çocuğu doğurup yine erkek evlat sahibi olamamanın sonucunda mental bir kopuş yaşar ve kendine zarar vermeye başlar. Büyük kızları Jaspal onu evin bir odasında içinden erkek bir evlat çıkaracağını ümit ederek genital bölgesini makas ile keserken bulur ve sonrasında psikiyatrik bir hastaneye yatırılır. Bu durum Jaspal'da da kopmalara

sebepler olur ve o da ailesinden uzaklaşır. Evden kaçar, sigara, alkol ve uyuşturucu gibi bağımlılıklar edinir ve bunları maddi olarak karşılayabilmek için bedenini satmaya başlar. Babaannesi Beji ise bu durumdan Jaspal'ın babasını yani oğlunu sorumlu tutar ve ona karşı nefret söylemlerine başlar. Yıllar boyu annesinden uzak, ablasından ayrı, babası ve babaannesi ile birlikte büyüyen Sati ise üvey annesi Mummy 2'nin baskıları altında büyür. Biyolojik annesi Mummy 1'in başına neler geldiği ondan saklanmaktadır. Böyle çarpık bir aile içerisinde büyüyen Sati de ablası Jaspal gibi bu aile içerisinde farklı bir mekâna konumlanmıştır.

Jaspal bir yandan ailenin utanmaz kızı olarak kendi içinde mücadele ederken bir yandan da bağımlılıklarından ötürü mutlu olmadığı bir hayat yaşamaktadır. Babası, babaannesi ve üvey annesi ondan bahsederken sıklıkla, oyuna da adını veren, "behsharam" (utanmaz) kelimesini kullanırlar. Jaspal tüm 'utanmaz'lığıyla eğlence sektöründe çalışma umidini canlı tutup annesinin de çok sevdiği bir zamanların en ünlü Amerikan şarkıcılarından biri olan Karen Carpenter şarkılarını söyler. Birlikte yaşadığı erkek arkadaşı Patrick'i de kendisinden uyuşturucu madde aldığı torbacıyla aldatır. Aldığı maddelere ödeyeceği parası olmadığı için satıcı ile cinsel birliktelik yaşar. Onu düzenli olarak ziyaret eden kız kardeşini de sürekli azarlar ve hor görür.

Ablası tarafından azarlanan, kendini melankolik şiirlere kaptırmış olan babası tarafından hiç sevilmeyen, gizlice ve yoğun alkol tüketen babaannesinin bakımını üstlenen, para kazanmak için bir yandan çalışan ve üvey annesi tarafından görücü usulü ile evlendirilmeye zorlanan Sati ise karışık duygulara sahiptir. Ailesinden hiç kimse ile sağlıklı iletişim kuramadığı için Ian Wright adında siyah bir futbolcunun kâğıttan yapma oyuncuğu ile dertleşir, tüm sırlarını ona anlatır ve bir anlamda ona aşk duygusu besler. Böyle aile bağlarının yıpranmış olduğu bir ortamda bu bireylerin her birinin etrafında heterotopik mekânların ortaya çıktığı rahatlıkla gözlemlenmektedir. Dolayısıyla tezin üçüncü bölümünde oyundaki en önemli karakterler olan kız kardeşler Jaspal ve Sati'nin çevresinde olduğu görülen heterotopyalar iki ayrı alt başlıkta incelenmiştir. Bu heterotopyaların ise izleyiciyi Sih toplumundaki kültürel kodların tamamen farklı kültürel kodlara sahip olan

İngiltere’de yaşayan göçmen bireyler üzerinde nasıl etki yarattığını düşünmeye itme potansiyeline sahip olduğu iddia edilmiştir.

Oyuna bir yerde adını kazandıran karakter Jaspal’ı ele alacak olursak ailesinin görece yoğun bir şekilde bağlı olduğu Sih toplumsal yapı ve kültürel kodlar ile göçmüş oldukları ve kendisinin de doğup büyüdüğü İngiltere’nin toplumsal yapısı ve farklı kültürel kodları arasında sıkışıp kalması birçok heterotopik mekânın ortaya çıkmasına sebebiyet vermektedir. Örneğin; Jaspal’ın kendi bireysel dünyasını oluştururken kendi isminden fedakârlık etmek zorunda kalması önemli bir durumdur. Jaspal oyunun ilk sahnesinde bir şarkıcı olarak bir müzik programına katılmaktadır ve dış ses Jaspal’ı Kiran Carpenter olarak tanıtır. Müzik kariyerini icra etmek için daha önceleri yaşamı olan bir şarkıcının isminin benzerini kullanmak zorunda kalması onun kendi ismi ile yani Jaspal olarak müzisyen olamayacağı olarak yorumlanabilir. Bu durumda Jaspal hayallerini gerçekleştirebilmek için kendinden yahut ailesinin kendisine vermiş olduğu isimden feragat etmek zorunda hissetmektedir.

Böyle bir ortamda Tompkins’in de öngördüğü gibi heterotopik mekânlar peyda oluvermektedir. Jaspal’ın Kiran Carpenter’ı takma isim olarak kullanıyor olması elbette ki yapma mekânı oluşturmaktadır çünkü sonuç itibariyle sahnede oluşturulmuş, inşa edilmiş yani yapma bir durum söz konusudur. Hâlbuki izleyicinin Jaspal’ı Jaspal olarak biliyor olması durumu ise soyutlanmış mekânı oluşturmaktadır. Birbirine tezat oluşturan bu iki durum arasında bir heterotopya yer bulmaktadır. Bu heterotopya tabii ki izleyicinin zihninde oluşur ve izleyiciden izleyiciye farklılıklar da gösterebilir. Her ne kadar farklılaşsa da böyle zıt durumları açığa çıkararak heterotopik bir mekânın izleyiciyi maruz kaldığı bu durumun üzerine düşünmeye itecek olması kaçınılmazdır. Bu heterotopya göçmen kadının veya gencin hep hayalini kurduğu amacını gerçekleştirmesi için kendisinden vazgeçme veya en azından kişiliğinin önemli bir parçasından olma durumunu gözler önüne sermektedir. Bu sebeple bu sahnedeki heterotopya izleyiciyi göçmenin veya göçmen kökenli bir bireyin karşılaşmakta olduğu sorunlarla başa çıkmasındaki zorlukların ne denli büyük olduğunu anlamaya ve duygudaşlık kurmaya itilmektedir.

Öte yandan Jaspal'ın erkek arkadaşı Patrick ile olan ilişkisi Jaspal'ın diğer tüm davranışları ve seçimleri gibi ailesi tarafından onanmamaktadır. Sati'nin bu onanmamayı ortaya çıkarırken babalarının ve Beji'nin Patrick ile ilgi bildikleri tek şeyin sadece siyah tenli bir insan olduğunu ve teninin renginden ötürü onu istemediklerini dile getirmesi çarpıcı bir sahne yaratmaktadır. Sati bunu Jaspal'a aktarırken Jaspal bu tarz ciddi ve sıkıcı konularda konuşmak istemediğini vurgular fakat Sati'nin ısrarı üzerine gözlemlemiş olduğu başka bir durumu dile getirir. Kendi ailesi gibi Hindistan asıllı göçmenlerin siyahlara karşı nefret duygularının ne yazık ki siyahların Hindistanlılara karşı olan nefret duygularının birbirinden farksız olduğunu dile getirir. Bu sahneye de güncel İngiltere toplumuna yaptığı atıftan ötürü büyük önem yüklemek mümkündür. Göçmen topluluklarından veya azınlıklardan bahsederken tüm azınlıkların benzer özellikteki kültür ve değerlere sahip olduğu, benzer bakış açıları ile hareket ettikleri ve de birleşik veya bir bütün olarak değerlendirilmeleri gerektiği gibi pek de yerinde olmayan bir bakış açısı daha önceki on yıllarda farklı sosyologlar tarafından dile getirilmiştir. Tabii ki bunu eleştiren ve bu bakış açısına tepki gösteren düşünürler de bulunmaktadır.

Bu sahnedeki sergilenen veya dile getirilen gerçek yine yapma mekânı oluşturmaktadır. Diğer taraftan soyutlanmış mekân ise izleyicinin bu durumdaki eleştirel tavrı görmesidir. Ne yazık ki göçmen topluluklarının da birbirlerine karşı ön yargı ile yaklaşıyor olması ve zaten hali hazırda vardıkları ülkede yerleşik halk tarafından türlü ön yargılarla mücadele etmek durumunda kalmış olmaları gerçeği bir yana dursun onların da birbirlerine karşı çeşitli ön yargılara sahip olduğu gerçeği ortadadır. Ve bu kutbun içerisinde yine izleyicinin, özellikle İngiltereli izleyicinin fark edeceği bir heterotopya oluşmaktadır. Bu heterotopya izleyiciyi göçmenlerin arasında da farklı bakış açılarının olduğu, birbirlerine karşı çeşitli ön yargılara sahip olma ihtimallerinin bulunduğu ve tüm göçmen veya azınlık topluluklarının tek vücut olarak algılanmasının yanıltıcı olduğunu düşünmeye teşvik etmektedir. Zira bu sahnedeki heterotopya göçmenleri yekpare bir azınlık olarak görmek yerine farklı inanç, mezhep, etnisite, cinsiyet, cinsel kimlik, cinsel yönelim gibi unsurlara sahip olan ve toplumun içerisinde özgün bir konuma sahip

olan bir topluluk olarak deęerlendirmenin ne kadar önemli ve yerinde olduğunu göstermektedir.

Öte yandan Jaspal'ın kız kardeři Sati de bulunduęu konum itibariyle etrafında heterotopik mekânların oldukça yoğun bir şekilde olduęu karakterlerden biridir. Örnek vermek gerekirse Sati'nin üvey annesi Mummy 2 tarafından görücü usulü ile görüştüğünü anlattığı sahne oldukça çarpıcıdır. Sati görüşmek zorunda kaldığı adamın kendisine aslında onun da görücü usulü bir evlilik yapmak istemediğini anlattır. Hatta bir kadınla evlilik yapmayı asla düşünmediğini çünkü aslında ablasının eřiyle yani eniştesiyle eşcinsel bir ilişkisi olduğunu anlatır. Sati ise bu duydukları karşısında sağır ve dilsiz taklidi yaparak adama herhangi bir şey söylemez. Sati'nin anlatımın temel alındığı bu sahnede yine yapma mekân ve soyutlanmış mekânlar ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu iki mekân arasında bir değil iki defa heterotopik mekânlar oluşmaktadır. Buradaki yapma mekân Sati'nin anlattığı görücü usulü görüşmedir. Soyutlanmış mekân ise Sati'nin yaşının henüz on altı olduğuna dair daha öncesinde bilgi edinmiş izleyicinin zihnindedir. Heterotopik mekân ise yine izleyicinin bu tezatlığı fark etmesiyle zihninde oluşan soru işaretlerinin tümüdür. Belki Sih toplumu gibi birçok Güney Asya toplumunda norm olarak kabul ediliyor olsa dahi İngiltere gibi on sekiz yaşının altında olan bireylerin evlilik müessesesinden uzak tutulduğu bir ülkede dahi bu kültürün devam ettiriliyor olması izleyiciyi düşünmeye sevk etmektedir. Denilebilir ki buradaki hedef izleyicinin yine İngiltere'deki göçmen Sih topluluğuna bağlı izleyici olma olasılığı çok yüksektir. Bu heterotopya ile onların Sih toplumsal normlarını düşünüp var olan toplumsal düzene meydan okuyarak alternatif bir toplumsal düzen üzerine yoğunlaşmalarının beklenmesi ihtimaller dâhilindedir.

Yine aynı yapma mekân ile aynı soyutlanmış mekân arasında yer bulan bir diğer heterotopya ise Sati'nin anlatımında saklı kalan görüşmenin öteki ayağında bulunun erkektir. Sati'ye anlattığı kadarıyla kendisinin de bu görüşmeye zorlandığı anlaşılmaktadır ve hatta gizli bir şekilde aşk yaşadığı eniştesinin de benzer bir görüşmeye zorlanmış olduğu ve sonucunda da evlenmiş olduğu çıkarımında da bulunabilir. Bu anlamda sahnenin ürettiği heterotopya izleyiciyi benzer bir şekilde sadece Sih toplumuna özgü olmayan ve birçok diğer toplumda da karşılaşılan farklı

cinsel yönelimlere sahip bireylerin ötekileştirilmesi hususunda kafa yormaya itmekte olduğu görülmektedir. Bu heterotopya da göçmen topluluklarının farklı bireylerden oluştuğunu ve tek bir çatı altında yekpare olarak varsayılmalarının yanıltıcı olacağını da kanıtlamaktadır.

Oyundaki diğer karakterlerin de görüldükleri sahnelerde heterotopyaları sayıca arttırdıklarını söylemek yanlış olmaz. Örneğin babaanneleri Beji'nin güzellik mağazasından sürekli olarak güzellik ürünleri aşırması veya üvey annenin aynı zamanda akrabaları olan çalıştıkları dükkânın sahibi ile evlilik dışı ilişkisi heterotopik açıdan yorumlanmaya uygundur. Ancak yalnızca oyunun son sahnesinde tüm aile bireylerinin ve Patrick'in işsizlerin ödenek aldıkları bir devlet dairesinde bir araya gelmeleri ziyadesiyle önemlidir. Baba, babaanne, Jaspal ve Patrick, her biri yetişkin ve çalışabilir durumda olmalarına rağmen işsizdirler ve dolayısıyla işsizlik maaşı almaktadırlar. Bu yüzden bu devlet dairesinde bir sebepten bir araya gelirler ve Sati'den sakladıkları gerçeği burada ortaya çıkarırlar. Annesinin Hindistan'da değil de bir ruh sağlığı hastanesinde bulunduğunu öğrenmesi aile bireylerinin ilişkilerinin yıkımına yol açar. Bu sahnedeki heterotopya ise yalnızca bu çarpık ilişkileri değil aynı zamanda göçmenlerin ekonomik durumunu düşünmeye de teşvik eder.

Sonraki bölümde ise Bhatti'nin nispeten daha güncel olan oyunlarından *Khandan* benzer bir şekilde ele alınmıştır ve İngiltere toplumundaki göçmen ailelerin sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik olarak hayatta kalma mücadelesine değinilmiştir. Aynı zamanda İngiliz toplumundaki beyazları temsil eden bir ailenin, oyunda açığa çıkarıldığı kadarıyla, göçmenlere bakış açısının sorunlu yapısı da ele alınmıştır. Bu anlamda dördüncü bölüm *Khandan* oyununda aile yapısının da heterotopik incelemeye uygun olduğunu göstermektedir ve oyundaki göze çarpan iki aileyi kendileriyle birlikte oluşan heterotopyalarla incelemektedir. Adını da Pencapçadaki 'aile' anlamına gelen 'khandan' kelimesinden alıyor olması tezin bu iddiasını kuvvetlendirmektedir.

Kahndan oyununun bel kemiğini oluşturan Gill ailesi bir göç dalgasıyla Jeeto ve eşinin İngiltere'ye yerleşmesi ve Birmingham'da hayat kurmaların üzerine kurulmuştur. Ailenin İngiltere'de doğan çocukları Pal ve Cookie artık otuzlarında

birer yetişkindirler. Cookie Major ile evlidir ve iki kız çocuğu vardır. Pal ise beyaz tenli olması Jeeto tarafından sık sık dile getirilen Liz ile evlidir ve henüz bir çocukları yoktur fakat Liz tüp bebek yöntemiyle bir bebek sahibi olma hayaliyle yaşamaktadır. Liz'e karşı pek hoş bir tutum içinde olmayan Jeeto da onların kendisine bir erkek torun vermelerini büyük bir hevesle beklemektedir. Zira hali hazırda sahip olduğu iki kız torunu Sih toplumsal normlar çerçevesinde kendisi için pek büyük önem atfetmemektedir.

Oyunun ilk sahnesinde Gill ailesinin yaşadığı evin betimlenmesi heterotopik mekânlar üretmekte oldukça zengin bir ev olduğunu göstermektedir. Pal ve Liz bu evde yaşadıkları için ev hem Sih yaşantısına uygun hem de batılı yaşam tarzına uygundur. Evin salonunun duvarlarında asılı olan Sih gurularının portreleri ve Sih tapınağının büyükçe bir fotoğrafının hemen a ilerisinde bulunan süslenmiş çam ağacı yeni yıl partisi için alınmış olan hediye kutuları yapma mekânı üretmeleri açısından önemlidir. Soyutlanmış mekân ise göçmen topluluklarının yerel halk ile bütünleşmesi olarak belirlenebilir. Sih toplumunun ne kadar İngiltere toplumuna entegre olduğuna dair herhangi bir saptama yapmaya gerek olmadan Sihlerin artık Birleşik Krallık vatandaşı olmaları ve 1960'lardan itibaren yoğun şekilde Londra ve Birmingham gibi metropol şehirlerde meskun olmaları itibariyle artık İngiltere'nin ayrılmaz parçası olduğunu göstermektedir.

Bununla birlikte Bhatti'nin oyunlarındaki nadir beyaz karakterlerden olan Liz'in anne ve babası her ne kadar oyunda kendileri görünmeseler de sıklıkla isimlerinin geçmesi itibariyle büyük önem taşımaktadır. Liz'in anne ve babasının kızlarının bir Hindistanlı olan Pal ile evlenmesinden duydukları rahatsızlık gözler önüne serilmektedir. Cookie'nin ortaya çıkardığı kadarıyla bu beyaz çiftin Cookie ve eşi Major'ı markette her gördüklerinde kafalarını çevirip selam vermekten kaçınmalar bu çiftin göçmen bir aileyle pek ilişki kurmak istemediklerini göstermektedir. Zaten Liz ve Pal'in tüp bebek süreçlerinde ihtiyaç duydukları parayı anne-babasından isteyebileceğini söyleyen Liz'in bu önerisini Pal reddeder. Sebebi anne-babasını 'kahverengi' torunlar edinmek isteyeceklerini ve bunun için maddi yardımda bulunacaklarını zannetmiyor olmasıdır. Yine elbette buradaki yapma mekân bu beyaz çift hakkında dile getirilenlerdir ve soyutlanmış mekan ise

göçmenler kadar yerli halkın da bütünleşmeye açık olması gerekliliğidir. Buradaki heterotopya ise İngiliz toplumundaki sorunlu yapının kaynaklandığı benzer önyargıların üzerine düşünülmesine teşvik etmektedir. Dolayısıyla benzer sorunların yaşanmadığı alternatif bir İngiliz toplumu arzusu varlığını hissettirmektedir.

Sonuç olarak bu tezdeki iki oyundaki heterotopik mekânların incelenmesiyle günümüz İngiliz toplumundaki göçmen topluluklar hakkında var olan benzer tüm ön yargıların tekrar tekrar düşünülmesi gerektiği görülmektedir. Bhatti'nin *Behsharam* ve *Khandan* oyunları İngiltere'deki Sih göçmen ailelerin yapısını ve yaşantısını ele almaları itibariyle önemli iki oyundur ve bu iki oyundaki heterotopyaların incelenmesiyle oyunların güncel sorunlara nasıl değindiğini ifade etmek hedeflenmiştir. Bu bağlamda heterotopyaların bu oyunlarda olduğu gibi var olan düzene meydan okuyor olmaları ve bu düzenin sahip olduğu tüm norm ve dayatmaların izleyicideki tarafından en azından bir kez daha düşünülmesi gerekliliğini ortaya koyduğu iddia edilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın daha başka birçok tiyatro eserinde doğal olarak bolca bulunan ve gerçek hayattaki sorunlu toplumsal yapıların sahneye taşınmasıyla ortaya çıkan zıt kutuplu tezatlıklar arasında oluşan heterotopik mekân incelemelerine ışık tutması temenni edilmektedir.

TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Abdülhüda

Adı / Name : Öztop

Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : Representations of Heterotopic

Spaces in Gurpreet Kaur Bhatti's Plays *Behsharam* and *Khandan*

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master

Doktora / PhD

1. Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.

2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. *

3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.

A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date