

**REPUBLIQUE DU BENIN**

\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*

**MINISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR ET  
DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE (MESRS)**

\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*

**UNIVERSITE D'ABOMEY-CALAVI (UAC)**

\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*

**FACULTE DES LETTRES ARTS ET SCIENCES HUMAINES (FLASH)**

\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*\_\*

**DEPARTEMENT D'ANGLAIS**

**OPTION : ETUDES ANGLAISES**

**MEMOIRE DE MAÎTRISE ÈS LETTRES**

**Theme**

**THE WORLD OF TOTALITARIANISM  
CASE: GEORGE ORWELL'S NINETEEN  
EIGHTY FOUR**

**REALISE ET SOUTENU PAR :**

HOUNMASSE Sylvia Adélia  
Jolietta

**SOUS LA DIRECTION DE :**

Taofiki KOUMAKPAÏ  
Professeur Titulaire de Littérature  
Anglaise (CAMES)

**ANNEE ACADEMIQUE: 2010-2011**

---

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to:

1. God Almighty and his Holy Spirit without whose guidance this research work would never have come into being.
2. My father who endured sacrifices in relation with my education and who paid a lot of attention to this work.
3. My mother for her love and affection.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I pay special tribute to Professor Taofiki KOUMAKPAÏ, the supervisor of this work. I am indebted to him for introducing me to the beauty of English Literature and British Civilisation.

The same acknowledgment goes to Doctor Fatiou RAÏMI for his useful advice.

I express my gratitude to my friends who speed me up in achieving this writing which was still lagging on.

My greatest gratitude goes to my lecturers during my training in the English Section and to my former Teacher da Yves CONCEICAO for all his help, his moral and material support.

To all of you, I say  
Thanks a lot.



GEORGE ORWELL

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**DEDICATION**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**INTRODUCTION**

## **PART ONE: RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND APPROACH**

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC AND RESEARCH APPROACH

- A. ORWELL'S BIOGRAPHY
- B. ORWELL'S LITRARY TREND
- C. WHY DID ORWELL WRITE *NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR*

CHAPTER TWO: ORWELL AND LANGUAGE

- A. THE MEANING OF LANGUAGE ACCORDING TO GEORGE ORWELL
- B. LANGUAGE MANIPULATION FOR POLITICAL ENDS
- C. NEWSPEAK

CHAPTER THREE: CHARACTERIZATION

- A. MAJOR CHARACTERS
- B. MINOR CHARACTERS
- C. ANALYSIS OF MAJOR CHARACTERS

## **PART TWO: GEORGE ORWELL AND TOTALITARIANISM**

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CONCEPT OF TOTALITARIANISM

- A. TOTALITARIAN LEADERS
- B. HUMAN SACRIFICE AND THE PURSUIT OF CRUELTY

CHAPTER FIVE: CLASS STRATIFICATION

- A. THE PROLES
- B. THE OUTER PARTY
- C. THE INNER PARTY

CHAPTER SIX: ORWELL AND SOCIALISM

- A. CLASS STRUGGLE
- B. LIVING WITH THE DOWN AND OUTS
- C. FIGHTING FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOCIALISM

## **PART THREE: *NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR* AND THE HOPE FOR THE FUTURE**

CHAPTER SEVEN: *NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR* AND HISTORY

- A. A LITTLE COMMENT ON THE BOOK'S TITLE
- B. THE BOOK ITSELF
- C. ORWELL'S INSPIRATIONS

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE WORLD OF *NINETEEN EIGHTY FOUR*

- A. POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY
- B. MINISTRIES OF OCEANIA
- C. THE HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

**CONCLUSION**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

# INTRODUCTION

## **Introduction**

Material things can be destroyed. People can be crushed under the weight of brutal and totalitarian forces; but a crystal spirit or the essential capacity of a human being for truth and dignity can never be destroyed. The last couple of centuries have seen significant written works that have influenced millions of people both directly and indirectly. Karl Marx set out a unique vision of a classless society where all were equal and the insidious upper classes were brought to heel for the greater good. These outstanding minds extolled the virtues of a Utopia based on ideology. However, what would happen if ideas could be crushed and the human spirit completely subjugated to a philosophy that would last forever and never be overthrown, exploiting the inevitable flaws inherent within human race?

*1984* is the story of a solitary man working in the Ministry of Truth in a totalitarian world. Winston Smith is a member of the outer party in a State where only one party exists. The Party controls every aspect of people's lives even including their very thoughts. Winston is at the heart of the ideology of the party. His job is to alter past records in accordance with party wishes. The very essence of social culture is the notion of "doublethink", the ability to hold two conflicting facts as true even where they are total opposites. This seemingly preposterous, paradoxical ability supports the general party philosophy contained within Ingsoc or English Socialism and enables the party to completely subsume any resemblance of opposition to its control.

*1984* is a world of conflict where a continuous state of war exists between Oceania (where the book is set) and one of the other two super powers, Eastasia or Eurasia. Oceania contains Airstrip One (formerly Britain) in which the population merely served the greater good of the Party and all independent thought is crushed via the all seeing telescreens (secretly manned televisions in every home and building to spy on the people). Any dissension, however small or seemingly insignificant) is immediately stamped out by the enforcers: the Thought Police.

Winston is unsettled. A middle aged man with no ties (his wife had left some years ago) he constantly thinks dangerous thoughts, struggling to

reconcile those events going on around him with what he feels is actually right and proper. He secretly struggles with the concept of doublethink, desperate to rebel but unable to see how. That is until he makes an illicit contact with Julia, a fellow party worker. They embark on an illegal affair (sex is considered a crime unless it is to procreate on behalf of the party) through a series of liaisons mainly based in a flat above a shop. As they get to know each other better, they decide to actively rebel against the party and decide to enlist the help of a senior member of the Inner Party – O'Brien. But O'Brien was not the rebel that the couple hopes. Consequently, Winston and Julia get caught.

More than anything else, *1984* seems to be famous for the expressions contained within the book finding their way into everyday language. Big Brother is synonymous with being spied on by the State as well as the populist television programmes spawned all over the world. The meaning of Big Brother is much more sinister in the book as to the idea chosen by the Party to destroy the family unit through the establishment of sex crimes and the proliferation of children spying and informing on their parents. The family unit is seen as a threat to the State, which implies its eradication and its replacement by a figurative Big Brother to love. Big Brother is at the heart of what the Party stands for.

Room 101 is portrayed as the ultimate stage in terror and has come into popular consciousness through the idea of putting everything that one despises into it.

Less used but still referred to are the terms "Newspeak" and "doublethink". The latter has been referred to earlier and while, potentially difficult to grasp as a concept, the notion is equally as significant as the figurative Big Brother. A further, more obvious example of doublethink is the three central tenets of the Party: "WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH". In a world where even the ministries have double meanings (Ministry of Truth deals with the falsification of records, Ministry of Love with torture and the Ministry of Plenty with the perpetuation of food shortages), Winston has to reconcile himself to the double standards contained within the Party objectives further fuelling his hatred of a corrupt regime.

There is even a reference to a National Lottery, which, in this case, is fixed but is used to give the proles false hope while raising revenues for the party.

The study of these concepts will be the backbone of this research work.

This work will be divided into three main parts. The first part deals with George Orwell and his literary trends, the second with Orwell and Totalitarianism and the third part with *Nineteen Eighty Four* and the Hope for the Future.

The choice of the theme : " The World of Totalitarianism, Case : George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four*" is due to many reasons among which the main ones are:

1. The lost of Human kind identity
2. Economical, political and social instabilities throughout the world
3. The sheer incompetency of our leaders to rule the world efficiently or with dignity from the highest Institution rank in a state to the family units level.
4. The origins of such instabilities
5. Language manipulation for political ends
6. And appropriate solutions to the questions raised

What is mainly concerned in this work is Political instabilities and all that it entails. The political governance have been shown in *1984* in many ways through Big Brother's political governance based on profit seeking, the minority holding all power over the majority composed of the Proles and idle class people.

With regards to this, the work is divided into three (3) parts.

- The first part deals with Orwell and his Life. Within this section there are three chapters. The first is Orwell's Biography, the second is Orwell's Literary Trend and the third is The Reason why Orwell write *Nineteen Eighty Four*.
- The second part of this work deals with George Orwell and Totalitarianism divided itself into three (3) chapters : The Concept of Totalitarianism, Class Stratification and Orwell and Socialism.
- As far as the third and last part is concerned, it deals with *Nineteen Eighty Four* and The Hope for the Future through two (two) chapters. Chapter I is : *Nineteen Eighty Four* and History. Chapter II deals with the world of *Nineteen Eighty Four*.

The writing of this work copes with many difficulties. There are no British Cultural Center in Benin to inform Students. I come up this research work by reading many articles and reviews from Google and Yahoo Sites and some books.

PART ONE

ORWELL AND HIS LIFE

## **CHAPTER ONE: ORWELL'S LIFE AND HIS LITERARY TREND**

### **A – GEORGE ORWELL BIOGRAPHY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**(June 25, 1903 Motihari – India January 21, 1950 London – GB)**

Eric Arthur Blair (later George Orwell) was born in 1903 in the Indian village of Motihari, which lies near the border of Nepal. At that time India was a part of the British Empire, and Blair's father, Richard, held a post as an agent in the Opium Department of the Indian Civil Service. Blair's paternal grandfather, too, had been part of the British Raj (British Empire in India) and had served in the Indian Army. Eric's mother, Ida Mabel Blair, the daughter of a French tradesman, was about eighteen years younger than her husband Richard. Eric had an elder sister called Marjorie. The Blairs led a relatively privileged and fairly pleasant life, helping to administer the Empire. The Blair family was not very wealthy - Orwell later described them ironically as "lower-upper-middle class". They owned no property, had no extensive investments; they were like many middle-class English families of the time, totally dependent on the British Empire for their livelihood and prospects. In 1907, when Eric was about four years old, the family returned to England and lived at Henley, though the father continued to work in India until he retired in 1912. With some difficulty, Blair's parents sent their son to a private preparatory school in Sussex at the age of eight. At the age of thirteen he won a scholarship to Wellington, and soon after, another to Eton, the famous public school.

His parents had forced him to work hard at a dreary preparatory school, and now after winning the scholarship, he was not interested any more in further mental exertion unrelated to his private ambition. At the beginning of *Why I Write*, he explains that from the age of five or six he had known that he would be or *must be* a writer. But in order to become a writer one had to read literature. But English literature was not a major subject at Eton, where most boys came from backgrounds either irremediably unlitrary or so literary that, to teach them 'English Literature' would be absurd. One of Eric's tutors later declared that his famous pupil had done absolutely no work for five years. This was of course untrue: Eric has apprenticed himself to the

masters of English prose who most appealed to him - including Swift, Sterne and Jack London.

However, he had finished the final examinations at Eton as number 138 of 167. He neglected to win a university scholarship, and in 1922 Eric Blair joined the Indian Imperial Police. In doing so he was already breaking away from the path most of his school-fellows would take, for Eton often led to either Oxford or Cambridge. Instead, he was drawn to a life of travel and action. He trained in Burma, and served there in the police force for five years. In 1927, while home on leave, he resigned. There had been at least two reasons for this: firstly, his life as a policeman was a distraction from the life he really wanted, which was to be a writer; and secondly, he had come to feel that, as a policeman in Burma, he was supporting a political system in which he could no longer believe. Even as early as this, his ideas about writing and his political ideas were closely linked. It was not simply that he wished to break away from British Imperialism in India: he wished to "escape from ... every form of man's dominion over man", as he said in *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937), and the social structure from which he came, depended, as he saw it, on just that "dominion over others" - not just over the Burmese, but over the English working class too.

Back in London he settled down in a grotty bedroom in Portobello Road. There, at the age of twenty-four, he started to teach himself how to write. His neighbours were impressed by his determination. Week after week, he remained in his unheated bedroom, thawing his hands over a candle when they became too numb to write. During spring of 1928, he turned his back on his own inherited values by taking a drastic step. For more than one year he lived among the poor, first in London, then in Paris. For him the poor were victims of injustice, playing the same part as the Burmese played in their country. One reason for going to live among the poor was to overcome a repulsion which he considered typical of his own class. In Paris he lived and worked in a working-class quarter. There, Orwell led a life that was far from bohemian; when he eventually got a job, he worked as a dishwasher. Once again his journey was downward into the life to which he felt he should expose himself, the life of poverty-stricken, or of those who barely scraped for living.

When he returned to London, he lived for a couple of months among the tramps and poor people there. In December 1929, Eric spent Christmas with his family. At his visit he announced that he was going to write a book about his time in Paris. The original version of *Down and Out in Paris and London* entitled *A Scullion's Diary* was completed in October 1930. After two rejections from publishers, Orwell wrote *Burmese Days* (published in 1934), a book based on his experiences in the colonial service.

We owe the rescue of *Down and Out in Paris and London* to Mabel Firez: She was asked to destroy the script, but she save the paper clips. Instead she took the manuscript and brought it to Leonard Monroe, literary agent at the house of Gollancz, and bullied him to read it. Soon it was accepted - on condition that all swearwords were deleted and certain names changed. Having completed this last revision Eric wrote to Victor Gollancz: '...I would prefer the book to be published pseu'donymously. I have no reputation that is lost by doing this and if the book has any kind of success I can always use this 'pseudonym again.' But Orwell's reasons for taking the name Orwell are much more complicated than those that writers usually have when adopting a pen-name. In effect, it meant that Eric Blair would somehow have to shed his old identity and take on a new one. This is exactly what he tried to do: he tried to change himself from Eric Blair, old Etonian and English colonial policeman, into George Orwell, classless anti-authoritarian.

But *Down and Out in Paris and London* is not a novel; it is a kind of documentary account of life unknown to most of its readers. And this was the point of it: he wished to bring the English middle class, of which he was a member, to an understanding that the life they led and enjoyed was founded upon the life under their very noses. Here we see two typical aspects of Orwell as a writer: his idea of himself as the exposure of painful truth, which people for various reasons do not wish to see; and his idea of himself as a representative of the English moral conscience. (Winston Smith - 1984 - last representative of moral values).

His next books were *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) and *Keep The Aspidistra Flying* (1936). In 1936 he opened a village shop in Wallington, Hertfordshire where he did business in the mornings and wrote in the afternoons. The same year he married Eileen O 'Shaughnessy and also received a commission from

the Left Book Club to examine the conditions of the poor and unemployed. This resulted in *The Road to Wigan Pier*. He went on living among the poor about whom he was to write his book. Once again it was a journey away from the comparative comfort of middle-class life. His account of mining communities in the north of England in this book is full of detail and conveys to the reader what it was like to go down a mine. When the Left Book Club read what he had written about the English class system and English socialism in the *The Road to Wigan Pier* they were not pleased, and when the book was published it contained a preface by Victor Gollancz taking issue with many of Orwell's main points. The Left Book Club wasn't pleased because in the second half of the book Orwell criticised English socialism, because in his eyes it was mostly unrealistic, and another fact by Orwell was that most of the socialists tended to be members of the middle class. The kind of socialist Orwell makes fun of is the sort who spouts phrases like "proletarian solidarity", and who puts off decent people, the people for whom Orwell wants to write.

Having completed *The Road to Wigan Pier* he went to Spain at the end of 1936, with the idea of writing newspaper articles on the Civil War, which had broken out there. The conflict in Spain was between the communist, socialist Republic, and General Franco's Fascist military rebellion. When Orwell arrived in Barcelona he was astonished by the atmosphere he found there: what had seemed impossible in England seemed a fact of daily life in Spain. Class distinctions seemed to have vanished. There was a shortage of everything, but there was equality. Orwell joined in the struggle by enlisting in the militia of the POUM (*Partido Obrero de Unificación de Marxista*), which was associated with the British Labour Party. For the first time in his life socialism seemed a reality, something for which it was worth fighting for. Orwell received a basic military training and was sent to the front in Aragon, near Zaragoza. He spent a couple of dull months there, and he was wounded in the throat. Three and a half months later, when he returned to Barcelona, he found it a changed city. No longer a place where the socialist word "comrade" was really felt to mean something, it was a city returning to "normal". Even worse, he was to find that the group he was with, the POUM, was now accused of being a Fascist militia, secretly helping Franco. Orwell

had to sleep in the open to avoid showing his papers, and eventually managed to escape into France with his wife. His account of the time he spent in Spain was published in *Homage to Catalonia* (1938). His experiences in Spain left two impressions on Orwell's mind: firstly, they showed him that socialism in action was a human possibility, if only a temporary one. He never forgot the exhilaration of those first days in Barcelona, when a new society seemed possible, where "comradeship", instead of being just a socialist abuse of language, was reality. But secondly he saw the experience of the city returning to normal as a gloomy confirmation of the fact that there will always be different classes, that there is something in the human nature that seeks violence, conflict, power over others. It is clear that these two impressions, of hope on the one hand, and despair on the other are entirely contradictory. Nevertheless, despite the despair and confusion of his return to Barcelona (there were street fights between different groups of socialists), Orwell left Spain with a hopeful impression.

In 1938, Orwell became ill with tuberculosis and spent the winter in Morocco. While being there, he wrote his next book, a novel entitled *Coming up for Air*, published in 1939, the year the long-threatened war between England and Germany broke out. Orwell wanted to fight, as he has done in Spain, against the fascist enemy, but he was declared physically unfit. In 1941 he joined the British Broadcasting Corporation as talk's producer in the Indian section of the eastern service. He served in the Home Guard, a wartime civilian body for local defence. In 1943 he left the BBC to become literary editor of the *Tribune* and began writing *Animal Farm*. In 1944 the Orwells adopted a son, but in 1945 his wife died during an operation. Towards the end of the war, Orwell went to Europe as a reporter. Late in 1945 he went to the island of Jura off the Scottish coast, and settled there in 1946. He wrote *Nineteen Eighty-Four* there. The island's climate was unsuitable for someone suffering from tuberculosis and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reflects the bleakness of human suffering, the indignity of pain. Indeed, he said that the book wouldn't have been so gloomy had he not been so ill. Later that year he married Sonia Brownell. He died in January 1950.

## **B – ORWELL LITERARY TREND**

Orwell is aware that the world in which we are actually living is almost as unpromising as speaking about peace. This is not a peaceful age, and it is not a critical age either. In the Europe of the years 1930's literary criticism of the older kind, criticism is really judicious, scrupulous, fair-minded, treating a work of art as a thing of value in itself.

If we look back at the English literature of the last ten years not so much at the literature as at the prevailing literary attitude, the thing that strikes us is that it has almost ceased to be aesthetic. Literature has been swamped by propaganda. This does not mean that all the books written during that period have been bad. But the characteristic writers of the time, people like Auden and Spender and MacNeice, have been didactic, political writers, aesthetically conscious, of course, but more interested in subject-matter than in technique. And the most lively criticism has nearly all of it been the work of Marxist writers, people like Christopher Caudwell, Philip Henderson and Edward Upward, who look on every book virtually as a political pamphlet and are far more interested in digging out its political and social implications than in its literary qualities in the narrow sense.

This is all the more striking because it makes a very sharp and sudden contrast with the period immediately before it. The characteristic writers of the nineteen-twenties - T. S. Eliot, for instance, Ezra Pound, Virginia Woolf - were writers who put the main emphasis on technique. They had their beliefs and prejudices, of course, but they were far more interested in technical innovations than in any moral or meaning or political implication that their work might contain. The best of them all, James Joyce, was a technician and very little else, about as near to being a 'pure' artist as a writer can be. Even D. H. Lawrence, though he was more of a 'writer with a purpose' than most of the others of his time, had not much of what we should now call social consciousness. And though the period is narrowed down to the nineteen-twenties, it had really been the same from about 1890 onwards. Throughout the whole of that period, the notion that form is more important than subject-matter, the notion of 'art for art's sake' had been taken for granted. There were writers who disagreed, of course, Bernard Shaw was one. The most

important critic of the period, George Saintsbury, was a very old man in the nineteen-twenties, but he had a powerful influence up to about 1930, and Saintsbury had always firmly upheld the technical attitude to art. He claimed that he himself could and did judge any book solely on its execution, its manner, and was very nearly indifferent to the author's opinions.

Now, how is one to account for this very sudden change of outlook? About the end of the nineteen-twenties you get a book like Edith Sitwell's book on Pope, with a completely frivolous emphasis on technique, treating literature as a sort of embroidery, almost as though words did not have meanings: and only a few years later you get a Marxist critic like Edward Upward asserting that books can be 'good' only when they are Marxist in tendency. In a sense both Edith Sitwell and Edward Upward were representative of their period. The question is why should their outlook be so different?

One has got to look for the reason in external circumstances. Both the aesthetic and the political attitude to literature were produced, or at any rate conditioned by the social atmosphere of a certain period. And now that another period has ended, for Hitler's attack on Poland in 1939 ended one epoch as surely as the great slump of 1931 ended another, one can link back and see more clearly than was possible a few years ago the way in which literary attitudes are affected by external events. A thing that strikes anyone who looks back over the last hundred years is that literary criticism worth bothering about, and the critical attitude towards literature, barely existed in England between roughly 1830 and 1890. It is not that good books were not produced in that period. Several of the writers of that time, Dickens, Thackeray, Trollop and others, will probably be remembered longer than any that have come after them. But there are not literary figures in Victorian England corresponding to Flaubert, Baudelaire, Gautier and a host of others. What now appears to us as aesthetic scrupulousness hardly existed. To a mid-Victorian English writer, a book was partly something that brought him money and partly a vehicle for preaching sermons. England was changing very rapidly, a new moneyed class had come up on the ruins of the old aristocracy, contact with Europe had been severed, and a long artistic tradition had been broken. The mid-nineteenth-century English writers were barbarians, even when they happened to be gifted artists, like Dickens.

But in the later part of the century, contact with Europe was re-established through Matthew Arnold, Pater, Oscar Wilde and various others, and the respect for form and technique in literature came back. It is from then that the notion of 'art for art's sake', a phrase very much out of fashion, but still the best available, really dates. And the reason why it could flourish so long, and be so much taken for granted, was that the whole period between 1890 and 1930 was one of exceptional comfort and security. It was what we might call the golden afternoon of the capitalist age. Even the Great War did not really disturb it. Almost every European between 1890 and 1930 lived in the tacit belief that civilization would last forever. You might be individually fortunate or unfortunate, but you had inside you the feeling that nothing would ever fundamentally change. And in that kind of atmosphere, intellectual detachment, and also dilettantism, is possible. It is that feeling of continuity, of security, that could make it possible for a critic like Saintsbury, a real old crusted Tory and High Churchman, to be scrupulously fair to books written by men whose political and moral outlook he detested.

But since 1930, that sense of security has never existed. Hitler and the slump shattered it. The writers who have come up since 1930 have been living in a world in which not only one's life but one's whole scheme of values is constantly menaced. In such circumstances, detachment is not possible. You cannot take a purely aesthetic interest in a disease you are dying from. In a world in which Fascism and Socialism were fighting one another, any thinking person had to take sides, and his feelings had to find their way not only into his writing but into his judgements on literature. Literature had to become political, because anything else would have entailed mental dishonesty. One's attachments and hatreds were too near the surface of consciousness to be ignored. What books were about seemed so urgently important that the way they were written seemed almost insignificant.

And this period in which literature, even poetry, was mixed up with pamphleteering, did a great service to literary criticism, because it destroyed the illusion of pure aestheticism. It reminded us that propaganda in some form or other lurks in every book, that every work of art has a meaning and a purpose, a political, social and religious purpose, that our aesthetic

judgements are always coloured by our prejudices and beliefs. It debunked art for art's sake. The only system of thought open to them at that time was official Marxism, which demanded a nationalistic loyalty towards Russia and forced the writer who called himself a Marxist to be mixed up in the dishonesties of power politics. Just as many writers about 1930 had discovered that you cannot really be detached from contemporary events, so many writers about 1939 were discovering that you cannot really sacrifice your intellectual integrity for the sake of a political creed, or at least you cannot do so and remain a writer. Aesthetic scrupulousness is not enough, but political rectitude is not enough either. The events of the last ten years have left us rather in the air, they have left England for the time being without any discoverable literary trend, but they have helped us to define, better than was possible before, the frontiers of art and propaganda.

## **C – THE REASON FOR WRITING 1984**

Eric Blair was a master writer and story teller. He wrote his first poem at the age of four or five, by dictation to his mother. In the last sixteen years of his life (born in 1903 - died in 1950) he wrote nine major books and 700 essays and articles.

*Quoting Orwell from WHY I WRITE, published in 1947:*

"...I write because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing. ...Of late years I have tried to write less picturesquely and more exactly. *ANIMAL FARM* was the first book in which I tried, with full consciousness of what I was doing, to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole. I hope to write another fairly soon. It is bound to be a failure, every book is a failure, but I do know with some clarity what kind of book I want to write. ..."

Not only figuratively but also literally was the writing of "1984" like a bout of some painful illness for George Orwell. Throughout its writing he was fighting tuberculosis and was at times admitted to the hospital where his typewriter was taken away from him. Undaunted he sat in bed, propped up on pillows, and wrote in longhand with ball-point pen. He was administered a newly developed drug to which he developed a severe allergic reaction. His skin flaked, his mouth became painfully ulcerated, his hair and nails fell out. After several months recuperating in the sanatorium Orwell returned to his home on the remote Scottish island of Jura, one of the most inaccessible spots in the British Isles, and finished writing "1984" in December 1948. He then went immediately back into hospital and was never again healthy enough to be discharged. "1984" was published in June 1949 and Orwell died seven months later on January 21st, 1950, at the age of 46.

In "1984" George Orwell describes how a hierarchical world tyranny is set up, how it stays in power, how it treats its people, and what life is like living under such a system. "1984" is in fact a coded blueprint for world tyranny, laying bare its structure and exposing its components.

Orwell wrote "1984" for *us, the future*, in the hope we would recognize the signs and symptoms of tyrannical world government and prevent its establishment in our world. Let's make sure he did not write in vain.

## **CHAPTER TWO: ORWELL AND LANGUAGE**

### **A - THE MEANING OF LANGUAGE ACCORDING TO GEORGE ORWELL**

George Orwell, explaining in an essay in 1947 why he became a writer, stated that when he was about sixteen he "...suddenly discovered the joy of mere words." Orwell was passionate about the usage of the words of the English language and its ability to communicate the world as it really was. His love of prose and the concrete world of objective truth reinforced this love. "So long as I remain alive and well I shall continue to feel strongly about prose style, to love the surface of the earth, and to take pleasure in solid objects." His belief in the use of words and language to communicate the tactile world led him to despise those who would use language to try to falsify reality and conceal the truth. He treated the language of orthodox politicians and political parties with contempt. "Political language, and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists, is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind." He recognised that language should be an instrument for expressing and not concealing thought. The stale political speakers who loved the use of pre-fabricated terms in their speeches were in his eyes less than human, almost brain-dead. "When one watches some tired hack on the platform mechanically repeating the familiar phrases: bestial atrocities, blood-stained tyranny, free peoples of the world, stand shoulder to shoulder - one often has a curious feeling that one is not watching a live human being but some kind of dummy ... the appropriate noises are coming out of his larynx, but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself."

The political writers and intelligentsia were the ones whom Orwell considered most guilty of this and therefore attacked most vigorously. They were the ones who were seeking to defend the indefensible. "Consider for instance some comfortable English professor defending Russian totalitarianism. He cannot say outright, 'I believe in killing off your opponents when you get good results by doing so'..." Instead he uses an inflated style and "...a mass of Latin words falls upon the facts like soft snow, blurring the outlines and covering up all the details."

Orwell not only believed that there was a real danger that political writers often perverted truth, but that they even polluted the language of politics and prose in free countries. "To be corrupted by totalitarianism one does not have to live in a totalitarian country. The mere prevalence of certain ideas can spread a kind of poison that makes one subject after another impossible for literary purposes ... when the general atmosphere is bad, language must suffer ... but if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought. A bad usage can be spread by tradition and imitation, even among people who should and do know better."

The words that Orwell would later use in his own novels were to become his most effective weapons against totalitarianism. He warned his readers in his novels *Animal Farm* and *1984* of a totalitarian regime that would ultimately control its subjects' minds by the addition or replacement of words. In *1984* the controlling regime even goes as far as replacing the entire language with a new Big Brother-friendly one called "newspeak." This was to supersede modern English with a set of words capable of forming only a limited number of mind-numbing concepts.

Orwell knew that the suppression of language and ideas or concepts was one and the same, yet he also knew that it was the responsibility of political writers in free countries to keep alive the momentum of truly free uninhibited speech. This involved not only intellectual honesty and the ability to face the truth, but also clear communication through the good use of language. Orwell offered advice on how this is to be done. "What is above all needed is to let the meaning choose the word, and not the other way about. ... It is better to put off using words as long as possible and get one's meanings as clear as one can through pictures and sensations. Afterwards one can choose, not simply accept, the phrases that will best cover the meaning, and then switch round and decide what impression one's words are likely to make on another person. This last effort of mind cuts out all the stale or mixed images, all prefabricated phrases, needless repetitions, and humbug and vagueness generally."

## **B – LANGUAGE MANIPULATION FOR POLITICAL ENDS**

Most people who bother with the matter would admit that language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilization is decadent and our language. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for our own purposes.

Now, it is clear that the decline of a language must ultimately have political and economic causes: it is not due simply to the bad influence of this or that individual writer. But an effect can become a cause, reinforcing the original cause and producing the same effect in an intensified form, and so on indefinitely. A man may take to drink because he feels himself to be a failure, and then fail all the more completely because he drinks. It is rather the same thing that is happening to the (English) language. It becomes ugly and inaccurate because our thoughts are foolish, but the slovenliness of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts. The point is that the process is reversible. Modern English, especially written English, is full of bad habits which spread by imitation and which can be avoided if one is willing to take the necessary trouble. If one gets rid of these habits one can think more clearly, and to think clearly is a necessary first step toward political regeneration. Meanwhile, here is one specimen of the English language as it is now habitually written.

This passage has not been picked out because it is especially bad. It illustrates several of the mental vices from which we now suffer:

This passage has faults of its own, but, quite apart from avoidable ugliness, two qualities are common. The first is staleness of imagery; the other is lack of precision. This mixture of vagueness and sheer incompetence is the most marked characteristic of modern English prose, and especially of any kind of political writing. As soon as certain topics are raised, the concrete melts into the abstract and no one seems able to think of turns of speech that are not hackneyed: prose consists less and less of *words* chosen for the sake of their meaning, and more and more of *phrases* tacked together to raise a full

meaning of it.

Modern writing at its worst does not consist in picking out words for the sake of their meaning and inventing images in order to make the meaning clearer. It consists in gumming together long strips of words which have already been set in order by someone else, and making the results presentable by sheer humbug. The attraction of this way of writing is that it is easy. It is easier, even quicker, once you have the habit - to say *In my opinion it is not an unjustifiable assumption that* than to say *I think*. If you use ready-made phrases, you not only don't have to hunt about for the words; you also don't have to bother with the rhythms of your sentences since these phrases are generally so arranged as to be more or less euphonious. When you are composing in a hurry, when you are dictating to a stenographer, for instance, or making a public speech, it is natural to fall into a pretentious, latinized style. By using stale metaphors, similes, and idioms, you save much mental effort, at the cost of leaving your meaning vague, not only for your reader but for yourself. This is the significance of mixed metaphors. The sole aim of a metaphor is to call up a visual image. A scrupulous writer, in every sentence that he writes, will ask himself at least four questions: *What am I trying to say? What words will express it? What image or idiom will make it clearer? Is this image fresh enough to have an effect? And he will probably ask himself two more: Could I put it more shortly? Have I said anything that is avoidably ugly?*

But you are not obliged to go to all this trouble. You can shirk it by simply throwing your mind open and letting the ready-made phrases come crowding in. They will construct your sentences for you; even think your thoughts for you.

In our time it is broadly true that political writing is bad writing. Where it is not true, it will generally be found that the writer is some kind of rebel, expressing his private opinions and not a "party line." Orthodoxy, of whatever color, seems to demand an imitative style. The political dialects to be found in pamphlets, leading articles, manifestoes, and the speeches of undersecretaries do, of course, vary from party to party, but they are all alike in that one trend almost never finds in them a fresh, vivid, homemade turn of

speech. When one watches some tired hack on the platform mechanically repeating the familiar phrases: *free peoples of the world, stand shoulder to shoulder*, one often has a curious feeling that one is not watching a live human being but some kind of dummy: a feeling which suddenly becomes stronger at moments when the light catches the speaker's spectacles and turns them into blank discs which seem to have no eyes behind them. And this is not altogether fanciful. A speaker who uses that kind of phraseology has gone some distance toward turning himself into a machine. The appropriate noises are coming out of his larynx, but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself. If the speech he is making is one that he is accustomed to make over and over again, he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying. And this reduced state of consciousness, if not, is at any rate favourable to political conformity.

In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. Things like the continuance of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face.

The inflated style itself is a kind of euphemism. A mass of Latin words falls upon the facts like soft snow, blurring the outline and covering up all the details. The great enemy of clear language is insincerity. When there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms. In our age there is no such thing as "keeping out of politics." All issues are political issues, and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, and hatred. When the general atmosphere is bad, language must suffer.

This invasion of one's mind by ready-made phrases can only be prevented if one is constantly on guard against them, and every such phrase anaesthetizes a portion of one's brain.

The decadence of our language is probably curable. Those who deny this would argue, if they produced an argument, that language merely reflects existing social conditions. The defence of the English language implies using the fewest and shortest words that will cover one's meaning. What is above all

needed is to let the meaning choose the word, and not the other way.

In prose, the worst thing one can do with words is surrender to them. When you think of a concrete object, you think wordlessly, and then, if you want to describe the thing you have been visualizing you probably hunt about until you find the exact words that seem to fit it. When you think of something abstract you are more inclined to use words from the start, and unless you make a conscious effort to prevent it, the existing dialect will come rushing in and do the job for you, at the expense of blurring or even changing your meaning. Probably it is better to put off using words as long as possible and get one's meaning as clear as one can through pictures and sensations. Afterward one can choose the phrases that will best cover the meaning, and then switch round and decide what impressions one's words are likely to make on another person. This last effort of the mind cuts out all stale or mixed images, all prefabricated phrases, needless repetitions, and humbug and vagueness generally. But one can often be in doubt about the effect of a word or a phrase, and one needs rules that one can rely on when instinct fails.

We have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. Political language and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists, is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change all this in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase into the dustbin, where it belongs to.

## **C - NEWSPEAK**

Newspeak is a fictional language in George Orwell's famous novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell included an essay about it in the form of an *Appendix* after the end of the novel, in which the basic principles of the language are explained. Newspeak is closely based on English but has a greatly reduced and simplified vocabulary and grammar. This suited the totalitarian regime of the Party, whose aim was to make subversive thought ("thoughtcrime") and speech impossible.

The Newspeak term for the existing English language was Oldspeak. Oldspeak was supposed to have been completely eclipsed by Newspeak by 2050.

Newspeak is possibly an attempt by Orwell to describe a deliberate intent to exploit language decadence with the aim of oppressing its speakers. The basic idea behind Newspeak was to remove all shades of meaning from language, leaving simple dichotomies (pleasure and pain, happiness and sadness, good thoughts and thoughtcrimes) which reinforce the total dominance of the State.

In addition, words with opposite meanings were removed as redundant, so "bad" became "ungood." Words with similar meanings were also removed, so "best" became "doubleplusgood." In this manner, as many words as possible were removed from the language to reduce the need for deep thinking about language. The ultimate aim of Newspeak was to reduce even the dichotomies to a single word that was a "yes" of some sort: an obedient word with which everyone answered affirmatively to what was asked of them.

The underlying theory of Newspeak is that if something can't be said, then it can't be thought. One question raised by this is whether we are defined by our language, or whether we actively define it. For instance, can we communicate the need for freedom, or organize an uprising, if we don't have the words for either? This means that the limits of my language mean the limits to my world.

Examples of Newspeak, from the novel, include: "crimethink"; "doubleplusungood"; and "Ingsoc." They mean, respectively: "thought-crime"; "extremely bad"; and "English Socialism," the political philosophy of the Party. The word "Newspeak" itself also comes from the language.

Generically, newspeak has come to mean any attempt to restrict disapproved language by a government or other powerful entity.

### **Real-life examples of Newspeak**

Charges of Newspeak are sometimes advanced when a group tries to replace a word/phrase that is politically unsuitable (e.g. "civilian casualties") or offensive (e.g. "murder") with a politically correct or inoffensive one (e.g. "collateral damage"). The intent to alter the minds of the public through changes made to language illustrates Newspeak perfectly.

Either way, there is a resemblance between political correctness and Newspeak, although some may feel that they differ in their intentions: in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Newspeak is instituted to enhance the power of the state over the individual; politically correct language, on the other hand, is said by supporters to free individuals from stereotypical preconceptions caused by the use of prejudicial terminology. It is this attempt to change thought through changing or eliminating words that earns political correctness the connection to Newspeak. The main distinction is that politically correct language is often inspired only by politeness, while Newspeak has a more explicit limiting political motivation.

### **Newspeak words**

*Ingsoc English Socialism*

*Oldspeak*

*Thoughtcrime* (The actual Newspeak word is Crimethink).

*Miniluv, Minipax*: "Ministry of Love" (secret police) and "Ministry of Peace" (Ministry of War). Compare to abbreviations in real life such as "Nazi" and "Gestapo."

*Goodsex* (chastity) In Oceania the only purpose of sex is the creation of new party members.

*Sexcrime* (sex that does not lead to the creation of new party members)

*Free* (only in statements like "This dog is free from lice.") The concepts of "political freedom" and "intellectual freedom" do not exist in Newspeak.

*Equal* (a statement such as "All men are equal." would only mean "All men are

of equal size.") "Political Equality" doesn't even exist as a concept in Newspeak.

*Unperson* A person who had been vaporized and all records of him/her had been wiped out. All other party members that certify that the unperson ever existed, and mention his/her name is thoughtcrime. (The concept that the person may have existed at one time, and has disappeared, cannot be expressed in Newspeak.) Compare this statement to the Stalinist use of erasing people from photographs after their death.

*Overalls: Working clothes, consisting of a single piece of clothing which combines both trousers and jacket.*

*Unorthodoxy: Behaviour and beliefs which are different from what is generally accepted*

*Specious: Something that appears to be true, but is in fact false*

*Facecrime* a newspeak word that means: an indication that a person is guilty of thoughtcrime based on their facial expression.

*Vaporize* (the same as liquidate) When people disappear, they are vaporized.

The word *doublespeak* was coined in the early 1950s and it is often attributed to George Orwell and his novel. However the word never actually appears in that novel.

## CHAPTER III: CHARACTERIZATION

### A- MAJOR CHARACTERS

**Winston Smith:** Winston is thirty-nine, small and frail with fair hair and reddish skin. He wears the blue overalls that are the uniform of the Outer Party. He has a varicose ulcer above his right ankle. He is dissatisfied with life under the Party and wonders what things were like before, when people were free and had human dignity. He thinks deeply about the condition of the world. Winston has a phobic fear of rats.

**Big Brother:** The beloved leader of Oceania and symbol of the Party. Big Brother has black hair, a black moustache and piercing eyes that seem to follow you. His face and voice are everywhere on the telescreens, coins, stamps, banners, posters, cigarette packets and book covers. Winston sometimes doubts that Big Brother is a real person.

**Mr. Charrington:** The owner of the prole junk-shop Winston visits. He is an old man, with a mild, friendly face and thick glasses. He has an intellectual air. His hair is almost white but his eyebrows are still black. Later, when Winston is arrested, he sees him with black hair and no glasses, a man of about thirty-five, and he realizes that all along Mr. Charrington was a disguised Thought Police agent.

**Julia:** When Winston first meets Julia he doesn't know her name and thinks she is a typical Party follower, a mindless, well-behaved robot. She works as a mechanic on a novel-writing machine. She has short, thick, dark hair, a freckled face and is twenty-six years old. Around her waist she wears a red sash, a symbol of the Junior Anti-Sex League. Later Winston discovers that Julia merely participates in the Anti-Sex League and other community activities as a cover and that she, too, hates the Party. She is intelligent and less likely to be fooled by Party propaganda than even Winston, but she is more interested in evading authority and having a good time than trying to overthrow the government. Julia is a highly sexual person.

**Winston's Mother:** She was tall, silent and moved slowly. She had magnificent, fair hair. She disappeared when Winston was about ten or eleven

years old. Winston finds it tragic that she loved him and died loving him when he was too young and selfish to love her in return.

**O'Brien:** O'Brien has a very important, mysterious job. He is a large, well-built man with a 'coarse, humorous, brutal' face. He wears spectacles. Winston has always hoped that O'Brien may be an ally and also against Big Brother. As it turns out, he has been toying with Winston and is in charge of his torture and 're-integration' in the Ministry of Love. The two of them do have a special kind of empathy, although O'Brien can also be very cruel and is determined to force Winston to conform: "Do you remember writing in your diary," he said, "that it did not matter whether I was a friend or an enemy, since I was at least a person who understood you and could be talked to? You were right. I enjoy talking to you. Your mind appeals to me. It resembles my own mind except that you happen to be insane." (Part 3, Chapter 2, pg. 242)

**Mr. Parsons:** Parsons is not only Winston's neighbour but also works with him in the Ministry of Truth. Parsons is fattish but active. He is stupid, and incredibly enthusiastic about all political and community activities. He sweats a lot; he always smells of sweat and leaves damp patches on the handles of the table-tennis rackets at the Community Center. Winston thinks of him as 'one of those completely unquestioning, devoted drudges on whom, more even than on the Thought Police, the stability of the Party depended.' Even in the cells of the Ministry of Love, Parsons is loyal to the Party and glad to be arrested.

## **B - MINOR CHARACTERS**

**Ampleforth:** A poet who works with Winston in the Ministry of Truth. He is quite fond of Winston in his own way. Working on a definitive edition of the works of Kipling, he allows the word 'God' to remain at the end of a line because he cannot find another suitable rhyme, and he is taken to the Ministry of Love.

**Winston's Father:** He was dark and thin, wore spectacles and dressed neatly. Winston especially remembers that the soles of his shoes were very thin.

**Emmanuel Goldstein:** The leader of the mysterious Brotherhood, and the enemy of the Party. He was one of the original leaders of the revolution, but Big Brother later exposed him as a traitor and forced him into exile.

**Jones, Aaronson and Rutherford:** Among the last survivors of the original leaders of the Revolution who were all, except for Big Brother, exposed as traitors and counter-revolutionaries or wiped out. Like all Party enemies, they were arrested and then released for a while after they confessed, but eventually killed by the Thought Police. After their release Winston saw them in the Chestnut Tree Café. They were silent and unmoving, and Aaronson and Rutherford had broken noses. He saw Rutherford's eyes fill with tears.

**Katharine:** Winston's wife. They parted nearly eleven years ago and he hardly ever thinks of her. She was tall and fair-haired with strong facial features. She was very politically orthodox and not at all intelligent. 'She had not a thought in her head that was not a slogan, and there was no imbecility, absolutely none, that she was not capable of swallowing if the Party handed it out to her.' (Part 1, Chapter 6, pg. 61) Katharine hated sex, but insisted that she and Winston should try to have children for the Party.

**Martin:** O'Brien's mysterious servant. A small, dark-haired man in a white jacket, with a totally expressionless, yellow face which might be Asian. O'Brien reveals that he is one of the Brotherhood. It seems to Winston that Martin's whole life is playing a part. O'Brien tells them that sometimes the organization finds it necessary to alter someone's appearance, and Winston wonders whether Martin has a synthetic face, if this is why he shows no expression.

**Comrade Ogilvy:** A character Winston makes up. He is the perfect Oceanian citizen and even as a child had spent all his time supporting the Party. As an adult, he had designed a highly effective hand grenade and then died in action at the age of twenty-three protecting important dispatches. He didn't drink or smoke, was completely celibate and never discussed anything but the Party philosophy, Ingsoc. 'Comrade Ogilvy, who had never existed in the present, now existed in the past, and when once the act of forgery was forgotten, he would exist just as authentically, and upon the same evidence, as Charlemagne or Julius Caesar.' (Part 1, Chapter 4, pg. 40)

**Mrs. Parsons:** Mr. Parson's wife. She is about thirty, but looks older. She has dust in the creases of her face and her hair is wispy. She looks crushed and afraid.

**The Skull-faced Man:** One of Winston's fellow prisoners in the Ministry of Love. He looks ordinary and mean. He might have been an engineer or technician. He radiates murderous, unappeasable hatred. His face is so emaciated that it looks like a skull, and he is obviously starving to death. When the guards come to take him to Room 101, he hysterically begs them not to take him. He starts to scream and says he will do anything rather than go there offers to confess to anything, tells them to shoot him, tells them to cut the throats of his wife and three small children in front of him, but begs them not to take him to Room 101.

**Syme:** One of Winston's co-workers. A Newspeak specialist who is working on the Eleventh Edition of the official dictionary. He is politically orthodox and a hard worker, but, Winston thinks, he is too intelligent. Sooner or later he will get vaporized.

## **C- ANALYSIS OF MAJOR CHARACTERS**

### **Winston Smith**

Orwell's primary goal in *1984* is to demonstrate the terrifying possibilities of totalitarianism. The reader experiences the nightmarish world that Orwell envisions through the eyes of the protagonist, Winston. His personal tendency to resist the stifling of his individuality, and his intellectual ability to reason about his resistance, enables the reader to observe and understand the harsh oppression that the Party, Big Brother, and the Thought Police institute. Whereas Julia is untroubled and somewhat selfish, interested in rebelling only for the pleasures to be gained, Winston is extremely pensive and curious, desperate to understand how and why the Party exercises such absolute power in Oceania. Winston's long reflections give Orwell a chance to explore the novel's important themes, including language as mind control, psychological and physical intimidation and manipulation, and the importance of knowledge of the past.

Apart from his thoughtful nature, Winston's main attributes are his rebelliousness and his fatalism. Winston hates the Party passionately and wants to test the limits of its power; he commits innumerable "crimes" throughout the novel, ranging from writing "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" in his diary, to having an illegal love affair with Julia, to getting himself secretly indoctrinated into the anti-Party Brotherhood. The effort Winston puts into his attempt to achieve freedom and independence ultimately underscores the Party's devastating power. By the end of the novel, Winston's rebellion is revealed as playing into O'Brien's campaign of physical and psychological torture, transforming Winston into a loyal subject of Big Brother.

One reason for Winston's rebellion, and eventual downfall, is his sense of fatalism-his intense (though entirely justified) paranoia about the Party and his overriding belief that the Party will eventually catch and punish him. As soon as he writes "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" in his diary, Winston is positive that the Thought Police will quickly capture him for committing a thoughtcrime. Thinking that he is helpless to evade his doom, Winston allows himself to take unnecessary risks, such as trusting O'Brien and renting the room above Mr. Charrington's shop. Deep down, he knows that these risks will increase his chances of being caught by the Party; he even admits this to O'Brien while in prison. But because he believes that he will be caught no matter what he does, he convinces himself that he must continue to rebel. Winston lives in a world in which legitimate optimism is impossibility; lacking any real hope, he gives himself false hope.

### **Julia**

Julia is Winston's lover and the only other person who Winston can be sure hates the Party and wishes to rebel against it as he does. Whereas Winston is restless, fatalistic, and concerned about large-scale social issues, Julia is sensual, pragmatic, and generally content to live in the moment and make the best of her life. Winston longs to join the Brotherhood and read Emmanuel Goldstein's abstract manifesto; Julia is more concerned with enjoying sex and making practical plans to avoid getting caught by the Party. Winston essentially sees their affair as temporary; his fatalistic attitude makes him unable to imagine his relationship with Julia lasting very long. Julia, on the other hand, is well adapted to her chosen forms of small-scale

rebellion. She claims to have had affairs with various Party members, and has no intention of terminating her pleasure seeking, or of being caught (her involvement with Winston is what leads to her capture). Julia is a striking contrast with Winston: apart from their mutual sexual desire and hatred of the Party, most of their traits are dissimilar, if not contradictory.

### **O'Brien**

One of the most fascinating aspects of *1984* is the manner in which Orwell shrouds an explicit portrayal of a totalitarian world in an enigmatic aura. While Orwell gives the reader a close look into the personal life of Winston Smith, the reader's only glimpses of Party life are those that Winston himself catches. As a result, many of the Party's inner workings remain unexplained, as do its origins, and the identities and motivations of its leaders. This sense of mystery is centralized in the character of O'Brien, a powerful member of the Inner Party who tricks Winston into believing that he is a member of the revolutionary group called the Brotherhood. O'Brien inducts Winston into the Brotherhood. Later, though, he appears at Winston's jail cell to abuse and brainwash him in the name of the Party. During the process of this punishment, and perhaps as an act of psychological torture, O'Brien admits that he pretended to be connected to the Brotherhood merely to trap Winston in an act of open disloyalty to the Party.

This revelation raises more questions about O'Brien than it answers. By the end of the book, the reader knows far less about him than they previously had thought. When Winston asks O'Brien if he too has been captured by the Party, O'Brien replies, "They got me long ago." This reply could signify that O'Brien himself was once rebellious, only to be tortured into passive acceptance of the Party. One can also argue that O'Brien pretends to sympathize with Winston merely to gain his trust. Similarly, one cannot be sure whether the Brotherhood actually exists, or if it is simply a Party invention used to trap the disloyal and give the rest of the populace a common enemy. The novel does not answer these questions, but rather leaves O'Brien as a shadowy, symbolic enigma on the fringes of the even more obscure Inner Party.

Lingering on (loitering on) the thorny (prickly) question of totalitarianism in Europe and all around the world, what may be the reasons that lead a human being to the distortions of his own personality?

## PART TWO

# ORWELL AND TOTALIRIANISM

## **CHAPTER FOUR: THE CONCEPT OF TOTALITARIANISM**

### **A- THE TOTALITARIAN LEADERS**

The leaders of a Totalitarian state are the strangest men in the state. These men are, like all other men, unique in their mental structure, and consequently we cannot make any blanket psychiatric diagnosis of the mental illness which motivates their behaviour. But we can make some generalizations which will help us toward some understanding of the totalitarian leaders. Obviously, for example, they suffer from an overwhelming need to control other human beings and to exert unlimited power, and this in itself is a psychological aberration, often rooted in deep-seated feelings of anxiety, humiliation, and inferiority. The ideologies such men propound are only used as tactical and strategical devices through which they hope to reach their final goal of complete domination over other men. This domination may help them compensate for pathological fears and feelings of unworthiness, as we can conclude from the psychological study of some modern dictators.

Fortunately, we do not have to rely on a purely hypothetical picture of the psychopathology of the totalitarian dictator. Dr. G. M. Gilbert, who studied some of the leaders of Nazi Germany during the Nuremberg trials, has given a useful insight into their twisted minds, useful especially because it reveals something about the totalitarian leader.

<<....Hitler's suicide made a clinical investigation of his character structure impossible, but Dr. Gilbert heard many eyewitness reports of Hitler's behaviour from his friends and collaborators, and these present a fantastic picture of Nazism's prime mover. Hitler was known among his intimates as the carpet-eater, because he often threw himself on the floor in a kicking and screaming fit like an epileptic rage. From such reports, Dr. Gilbert was able to deduce something about the roots of the pathological behaviour displayed by this morbid "genius."

Hitler's paranoid hostility against the Jew was partly related to his unresolved parental conflicts; the Jews probably symbolized for him the hated drunken father who mistreated Hitler and his mother when the future Fuhrer was still a child. Hitler's obsessive thinking, his furious fanaticism, his

insistence on maintaining the purity of "Aryan blood," and his ultimate mania to destroy himself and the world were obviously the results of a sick psyche.

As early as 1923, nearly ten years before he seized power, Hitler was convinced that he would one day rule the world, and he spent time designing monuments of victory, eternalizing his glory, to be erected all over the European continent when the day of victory arrived. This delusional preoccupation continued until the end of his life.

Nazi dictator Number Two, Hermann Goering, who committed suicide to escape the hangman, had a different psychological structure. His pathologically aggressive drives were encouraged by the archaic military tradition of the German Junker class, to which his family belonged. From early childhood he had been compulsively and overtly aggressive. He was an autocratic and a corrupt cynic, grasping the Nazi-created opportunity to achieve purely personal gain. His contempt for the "common people" was unbounded; this was a man who had literally no sense of moral values.

Quite different again was Rudolf Hess, the man of passive yet fanatical doglike devotion, living, as it were, by proxy through the mind of his Fuhrer. His inner mental weakness made it easier for him to live through means of a proxy than through his own personality, and drove him to become the shadow of a seemingly strong man, from whom he could borrow strength. The Nazi ideology gave this frustrated boy the illusion of blood identification with the glorious German race. Hess showed obvious psychotic traits; his delusions of persecution, hysterical attacks, and periods of amnesia are among the well-known clinical symptoms of schizophrenia.

Still another type was Hans Frank, the devil's advocate, the prototype of the overambitious latent homosexual, easily seduced into political adventure, even when this was in conflict with the remnants of his conscience. For unlike Goering, Frank was capable of distinguishing between right and wrong.

Dr. Gilbert also tells something about General Wilhelm Keitel, Hitler's Chief of Staff, who became the submissive, automatic mouthpiece of the Fuhrer, mixing military honour and personal ambition in the service of his own unimportance.

Of a different quality is the S.S. Colonel, Hoess, the murderer of millions in the concentration camp of Auschwitz. A pathological character

structure is obvious in this case. All his life, Hoess had been a lonely withdrawn personality, without any conscience, wallowing in his own hostile and destructive fantasies. Alone and bereft of human attachments, he was intuitively sought out for this most savage of all the Nazi jobs. He was a useful instrument for the committing of the most bestial deeds.

Unfortunately, we have no clear psychiatric picture yet of the Russian dictator Stalin. There have been several reports that during the last years of his life he had a tremendous persecution phobia and lived in constant terror that he would become the victim of his own purges...>>

Psychological analysis of these men shows clearly that a pathological culture, a mad world, can be built by certain impressive psychoneurotic types. The venal political figures need not even comprehend the social and political consequences of their behaviour. They are compelled not by ideological belief, but by the distortions of their own personalities. They are not motivated by their advertised urge to serve their country or mankind, but rather by an overwhelming need and compulsion to satisfy the cravings of their own pathological character structures.

The ideologies they spout are not real goals; they are the cynical devices by which these sick men hope to achieve some personal sense of worth and power. Subtle inner lies seduce them into going from bad to worse: defensive self-deception, arrested insight, evasion of emotional identification with others, degradation of empathy, the mind has many defence mechanisms with which to blind the conscience.

A clear example of this can be seen in the way the Nazi leaders defended themselves through continuous self-justification and exculpation when they were brought before the bar at the Nuremberg trials. These murderers were aggrieved and hurt by the accusations brought against them.

Any form of leadership, if unchecked by controls, may gradually turn into dictatorship. Being a leader, carrying great power and responsibility for other people's lives, is a monumental test for the human psyche. The weak leader is the man who cannot meet it, who simply abdicates his responsibility. The dictator is the man who replaces the existing standards of justice and morality by more and more private prestige, by more and more power, and eventually isolates himself more and more from the rest of humanity. His

suspicion grows, his isolation grows, and the vicious circle leading to a paranoid attitude begins to develop.

The dictator is not only a sick man; he is also a cruel opportunist. He sees no value in any other person and feels no gratitude for any help he may have received. He is suspicious and dishonest and believes that his personal ends justify any means he may use to achieve them. Peculiarly enough, every tyrant still searches for some self-justification. Without such a soothing device for his own conscience, he cannot live.

His attitude toward other people is manipulative; to him, they are merely tools for the advancement of his own interests. He rejects the conception of doubt, of internal contradictions, of man's inborn ambivalence. He denies the psychological fact that man grows to maturity through groping, through trial and error, through the interplay of contrasting feelings. Because he will not permit himself to grope, to learn through trial and error, the dictator can never become a mature person. But whether he acknowledges them or not he has internal conflicts, he suffers somewhere from internal confusion. These inner "weaknesses" he tries to repress sternly if they were to come to the surface, might interfere with the achievement of his goals.

It is because the dictator is afraid, albeit unconsciously, of his own internal contradictions, that he is afraid of the same internal contradictions of his fellow men. He must purge and purge, terrorize and terrorize in order to still his own raging inner drives. He must kill every doubter, destroy every person who makes a mistake, and imprison everyone who cannot be proved to be utterly single-minded. In Totalitarian states, the latent aggression and savagery in man are cultivated by the dictator to such a degree that they can explode into mass criminal actions shown by Hitler's persecution of minorities. Ultimately, the country shows a real pathology, an utter dominance of destructive and self-destructive tendencies.

## **B- HUMAN SACRIFICE AND THE PURSUIT OF CRUELTY**

We are living in a world in which nobody is free, in which hardly anybody is secure, in which it is almost impossible to be honest and to remain free. (George Orwell, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, 1937)

The decline of utopia and the rise of its nightmare cousin is parallel to the history of this surrealist century, which is at once the partial fulfilment of nineteenth-century dreams and their negation. (Chad Walsh, *From Utopia to Nightmare*, 1962)

As a literary device and as a literary genre, utopian fiction occupies a strange yet undeniably important position in the history of western literature. For in a utopia the author manages to combine fact, fiction, fantasy and science fiction. Indeed, within the confines of a utopia, anything goes. An author presents a clear vision of what sort of society he wishes to see develop in the future. What he changes in that vision is a product of both his experience and the imagination which that experience has helped to produce.

Every utopia, rooted as it is in time and place, is bound to reproduce the stage scenery of its particular world as well as its preoccupations with contemporary social problems. Here analogies to the dream and the psychotic fantasy may be telling. Observers of paranoid behaviour report that though the disease remains relatively constant, the mysterious, all-seeing forces that watch and persecute their patients change with time and technology. They may be spirits, telephones, radios or television sets in successive periods. Utopias are not an illness; but to a larger degree they avail themselves of the existing equipment of a society, perhaps its most advanced models, prettified and rearranged. Often a utopian foresees the later evolution and consequences of technological development already present in an embryonic state; he may have antenna sensitive to the future. His gadgets, however, rarely go beyond the mechanical potentialities of his age.

Having established that utopias are, more or less, products of the age in which they appear, we must ask ourselves why utopias are written in the first place. Why would an author write a utopian novel? What conditions must exist for him to even contemplate the idea? In general, utopian novels or better yet, a utopian frame of mind, or method of analysis, only appears as a

result of bad times. Think about it. If everything were as one wanted, why would there be a need to produce an account that could improve upon it? Is it possible to perfect, perfection? An experience of bad times produces visions of the future in which the evils of society have been eliminated, or transcended, usually for the benefit of all humanity. In 1516, More completed his most important work called simply, *Utopia*. More portrayed both an England he came to distrust, and an island called Utopia with all those social evils removed. What More had identified in England had been transcended. More observed an England in which wealth and personal gain had come to mean more than Christian devotion or charity. In *Utopia*, he writes:

Is not this an unjust and an unkind public weal, which giveth great fees and rewards to gentlemen, as they call them, and to goldsmiths, and to such other, which be either idle persons, or else only flatterers, and devisers of vain pleasures; and of the poor ploughmen, colliers, labourers, carters, ironsmiths, and carpenters: without whom no commonwealth can continue? But after it hath abused the labours of their lusty and flowering age, at the last when they be oppressed with old age and sickness, being needy, poor, and indigent of all things, then forgetting their so many painful watchings, not remembering their so many and so great benefits, recompenseth and acquitteth them most unkindly with miserable death. And yet besides this the rich men not only be private fraud, but also by common laws, do every day pluck and snatch away from the poor some part of their daily living. If we consider and weigh in mind all these commonwealths, which nowadays anywhere do flourish, we can perceive nothing but a certain conspiracy of rich men procuring their own commodities under the name and title of the commonwealth.

It was Sir Thomas More who thrust the words *utopia* and *utopian* into the canon of modern language. The word *utopia*, in More's hands, is actually a play on words. In Greek, the word *topos* means "place." But the prefix *ou* or *eu*, rendered in modern English as "u" has a double meaning: *ou* means "no" while *eu* means "good." In other words, *utopia* meant a "good place": it embodied a vision of the world with all its social evils removed. But as fiction *utopia* has also come to mean "no place" or simply "nowhere."

A little less than 400 years after More penned *Utopia*, English and American authors were struggling with their own vision of a perfect republic. In 1891, the English socialist and designer, William Morris (1834-1896), produced his best known work of fiction, aptly titled, *News From Nowhere*. In Morris's mind, the society of the future will have no need for government. The Houses of Parliament are no longer the seat of government but a repository for human excrement. Almost twenty years earlier, the English author and painter, Samuel Butler (1835-1902), wrote *Erewhon* (1872), a satire in which conventional practices and customs are all reversed. Crime is treated as an illness and illness as a crime. And then there was the American Edward Bellamy (1850-1898), whose novel *Looking Backward* of 1888, took the now classic utopian format of a man who goes to sleep and wakes up 100 years in the future. And what account of late 19th century utopian literature could fail to mention H. G. Wells's (1866-1946) classic, *The Time Machine*? And if we are looking for yet one more precedent, in 1623, an Italian philosopher by the name of Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), a heretic who was confined for 27 years in Naples, and who later fell victim to the rack for seven years, published his utopian fantasy *Civitas Solis* (*The City of the Sun*).

Morris, Campanella, More, Bellamy, and Wells are just a few representatives of the utopian mentality in western thought. But the first utopia was perhaps written by Plato, the student of Socrates and teacher of Aristotle. Plato's *Republic* stands forever regarded as the first utopia in history. Although the dialogue is really concerned with the education or culture required to produce the perfect society, there is enough of utopianism within it to allow it to qualify as representative of the utopian frame of mind.

All of these utopias share one thing in common; they were written at times when society seemed to be crumbling. Plato, for instance, wrote at a time when Greek direct democracy had become all but obsolete. The Classical Age of Greece had come to an end, an age which began with a war and ended with yet another war. Educated Greeks began to doubt that virtue alone would lead to the good life. For how could one seek virtue in the demos when no one knew what virtue really was? In addition, how could one praise the Athenian city-state and its direct democracy, when it was that direct democracy which had condemned Socrates the most virtuous Athenian to

death? And Sir Thomas More, the victim of psychological tensions in his personal life, and political tensions in his public life, could no longer reconcile the two. Reconciliation was attempted in his book, *Utopia*, but its ultimate fruition perhaps came with his trial and beheading at the hands and executioner of his good friend, King Henry VIII. Or Campanella, a victimized heretic, confined to a life of physical and psychological torture; it's no wonder at all that he wrote a utopia full of illumination. After all, he spent 27 years in prison. And Morris, Bellamy and Butler all writing their utopian fantasies at a time when crass materialism and the cash nexus seemed to subdue and dominate mankind. For the English writers Morris and Butler, the problems they identified in English society centred on the failure of Victorian culture to combat the materialism which that culture had produced and sustained. A liberal political economy of laissez faire had not delivered on its promise completely. True, the wealth of the nation had substantially increased but a great part of the population, the "great unwashed," as they were referred to, still lived in appalling social conditions. For Bellamy, the situation was a bit different. He discovered that the great dream of the American republic had also not delivered on its promise of slow but steady improvement. More than one hundred years after the founding of the republic, materialism, the cash nexus, deceit and corruption had become the centrepiece of a society supposedly built upon the twin pillars of civic duty and republican virtue.

The experience of all these writers shaped their utopian fantasies and visions. Illusory or not, they held on to the promise of a better world. So they postulated worlds with strong governments or worlds without governments at all. There were utopias in which wealth was equalized as there were utopias in which wealth was abolished outright. And there were utopian worlds with God as the mediator as much as there were utopias within which there was little room for God or gods of any kind.

Utopians' experience shaped their predispositions and their aspirations. It appears that these utopias were produced at a time, within an experience in which society seemed to be losing ground rather than moving ahead toward some higher goal. For Plato, it was awareness that the virtues which had made the Athenian city state great, could no longer sustain that city state. For Thomas More, it was the fact that because the wealthy were only

interested in increasing their wealth, the common lot of mankind were doomed to subservience and suffering. And for William Morris, it was industrial capitalism, the great degrader of mankind, which had stripped away man's dignity. Art, thought and creativity were sacrificed to make way for the middle classes and all they represented.

In the twentieth century, a new literary device and technique developed a device born not only of apparent advancement, but also the clear experience of disillusionment, bitterness, fear, terror, depression and dejection. The world appeared as a broken watch. Observed from a distance, all looked well. But hold the watch to the ear, and one heard nothing.

In 1932, the English author Aldous Huxley (1894-1963) gave us his vision of the world in his novel *Brave New World*. Only this time, the vision was not utopian but anti-utopian or, for lack of a better expression, dystopian. Huxley warned his readers of moral anarchy in a scientific age, an age identified by the letters, "A.F.," After Ford. This is, of course, deliberate on Huxley's part - the machine technology of Henry Ford's (1863-1947) perfected assembly line that had not only produced the marvels of mechanized production but the mechanized man and woman of the twentieth century. He depicts a gray, repulsive utopia a dystopia in which Platonic harmony is forcibly introduced by the scientific breeding and conditioning of a society of human robots, for whom happiness is synonymous with subordination. The fate of us moderns is painfully apparent in Huxley's hands.

This much having been said, there is something of a tradition now, of both utopian and dystopian writing. The entire tradition of the dystopia, a tradition pretty much born in the 1920s and 30s which hopefully tells you something, found its most eloquent spokesman in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell (1903-1950). As a dystopia, Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* stands as a monument to both hysteria and calm introspection, that is, if such a thing can be imagined. The novel embodies both myth and reality.

Orwell's own brand of socialism was not Marxist, or Leninist, nor was it philosophical or even economic. Socialism, for Orwell, meant decency and social justice. The class system of social distinctions ought not to be destroyed rather, all men and women should become even more aware of their class and their relationships with other classes. "All that is needed," wrote

Orwell, "is to hammer two facts home into the public consciousness. One, that the interests of all exploited people are the same and the other, that socialism is compatible with common decency."

Orwell's most important book, at least it is the one at the front of our minds, is *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, although Orwell's personal favourite was *Animal Farm* (1945). Published in 1949, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has given us the common images and vocabulary of Big Brother, doublethink and Newspeak. It is also now possible to speak of something being Orwellian. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also gave us a model of totalitarian society, a vision of power, control and authority used in the name of social harmony. We must ask ourselves whether *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is myth or reality. That is, was Orwell describing something which he saw in his own lifetime, or, was he projecting a warning of things to come? In the year 1984, the press ran wild with updates and stories about Orwell. His picture appeared on the cover of *Time Magazine* as well as academic journals. How much of what Orwell had written about had become a reality? Was Orwell right? It seems that the entire literate world waited thirty-five years for 1984 to roll around just to see. Numerous popular and academic treatments of Orwell were published in the years leading up to 1984.

At the end of 1948, the book publisher Frederic Warburg received a manuscript of George Orwell's last novel. That novel was *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Warburg summed up his impressions of the novel with the following words: "This is amongst the most terrifying books I have ever read." This view has been echoed by many critics and students. Orwell's bleak portrayal of a totalitarian regime was a major factor in the novel's now classic status

Orwell drafted his earliest notes for what became *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* in 1943, under the proposed title of "*The Last Man in Europe*." What he had in mind was a book in two parts. Already established as early as 1943 was the notion of the "Two Minutes' Hate," and a future society based on organized and systematic lying and deception. Throughout the 1940s, Orwell was haunted by a recurrent fear that history was vulnerable to alteration for political ends. History, in other words, will be rewritten by those who are in power. And so, Winston Smith, the main character of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*,

works in the Ministry of Information where his job is to *correct* history by rewriting it.

By the spring of 1944, Orwell had reviewed two books that both defended and attacked laissez-faire capitalism. Those two books were Friedrich Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* and *The Mirror of the Past* by K. Zilliacus. Of both books, Orwell wrote: "Capitalism leads to dole queues, the scramble for markets, and war. Collectivism leads to concentration camps, leader worship and war." The only way out, according to Orwell, was a depressing compromise in which "a planned economy can be somehow combined with the freedom of the intellect, which can only happen if the concept of right and wrong is restored to politics." There is no sign of this compromise in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell depicts a clearly repressive society. "By bringing the whole life under the control of the State," Orwell wrote in 1944, "Socialism necessarily gives power to an inner ring of bureaucrats, who in almost every case will be men who want power for its own sake and will stop at nothing in order to retain it." This inner ring of bureaucrats, of course, became the Inner Party of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Orwell's vision of repression and the even stronger image of Big Brother was clear in his mind as early as 1944. After all, the great purge trials of the 1930s and 1940s were now part of history, a history Orwell knew quite well as a journalist. "Out in the street," he wrote, "the loudspeakers bellow, the flags flutter from the rooftops, the police with their tommy-guns prowl to and fro, the face of the Leader, four feet wide, glares from every point." Imagine all those huge paintings of Stalin and Hitler that seemed to adorn every street corner of Germany and the Soviet Union, and you'll know where Orwell obtained his imagery (on Stalin and Hitler).

Orwell's bleak vision of totalitarian society came not only from his awareness of actual regimes in Italy, Spain, Germany and the Soviet Union, but also from his reading of James Burnham's book of 1946, *The Managerial Revolution*. Burnham presented a future in which technocratic managers and experts would take over from politicians and politics would become nothing more than a struggle for power. The struggle would take place between three continents: Europe, Asia and America. In 1944, however, Orwell had already

envisioned a world of two or three superstates which are unable to conquer one another.

Orwell resumed work on *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in 1947 with his personal experience of totalitarian regimes and Burnham's book in his mind. But his world view was also shaped by a novel written by the Russian author, Yevgeny Zamyatin (1884-1937). The novel *We* (written 1920/21, published in Russia in 1952) was set in the 26th century in an urban, totalitarian society.

Orwell was sending out a warning against something he believed could arrive, "even in Britain, if not fought against." Orwell dated his book in 1984, it is a point in the future. He may have been trying to tell his readers strive to avoid this! But what the reader experiences both then and now is that this society has already arrived. Although *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is derived from the novels of Huxley and Zamyatin, and what he knew of actual events in Spain, Italy, Germany and Russia, Orwell also drew his stage settings from what he observed firsthand in post-war England. Much of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is set in a gray, gritty, depressing London of shortages, inconveniences, ruined buildings and occasional bombings. Many of the specifics of the novel relate to the years 1941-1943, when Orwell was employed by the BBC. For example, the images of the canteen at the Ministry of Truth, where Winston Smith is employed, are drawn directly from the BBC canteen. The Ministry of Truth itself 1000 feet high, is an exaggerated version of the wartime British Ministry of Information. Even the fictional Big Brother may have been drawn from the head of the Ministry of Information, Brendan Bracken, who was known to his employees as B.B.

Much of the bleak quality of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has also been attributed to Orwell's poor health. He outlived the publication of the novel by a mere seven months, having died of tuberculosis in 1950. And between 1939 and 1946, Orwell suffered the experience of standing by as several members of his family died. His father died of cancer in 1939. His mother died in 1943, his sister Marjorie in 1946 and his first wife Eileen in 1945. All these circumstances no doubt added to the gloom and despair usually associated with Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

The world of Airstrip One, England, is a world of poor food, dingy apartments and two way television screens. This is made even more apparent

because the novel is written from the standpoint of one man, Winston Smith. The reader must experience the world through his eyes, and his eyes alone. The only variation is a short part titled "*The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*" by Emmanuel Goldstein, the Trotsky-like figure who is daily the object of the two Minutes' Hate. Orwell also included an Appendix to the novel, "*The Principles of Newspeak*." This section gives a detailed explanation of Winston Smith's work at the Ministry of Truth.

The Inner Party wants to suppress all dissent labelled "thought crime" by eliminating all words from the language that could express dissent. Think about it if you were to suppress dissent by modifying the language, what words might you eliminate? For O'Brien, a member of the Inner Party, "it is intolerable to us that an erroneous thought should exist anywhere in the world, however secret and powerless it may be."

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the proles make up about 85% of the total population. They live in poverty and ignorance and are considered harmless by the Inner Party and the Thought Police. Still, the proles retained the decent human values of friendship and family that the Party had done its best to eliminate in its own members. And Winston Smith confides in his diary, "if there is any hope, it lies with the proles." In Orwell's eyes, the proles constitute not just a force, but a natural force, capable of overwhelming the Party. Neither proles nor Winston's search for his own past provides an escape since "nothing was your own except the few cubic centimetres inside your skull."

If you ever do manage to read *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, you will come away from the novel saddened, angry and perhaps even full of doom for the generation that had to live through the totalitarian regimes of the 1930s and 40s.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: CLASS STRATIFICATION**

### **A- THE PROLES**

Prole is a Newspeak term in George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to describe the proletariat class.

#### ***Proles as a social class***

According to this dystopian vision of the future world, the society was divided into 3 distinct classes: Inner Party, Outer Party, and proles. This division exactly corresponds to "the High, the Middle, and the Low" which had different names throughout the ages of known history. In the novel, 85% of the Oceania (former Britain, Ireland, Australia, and the Americas) population is proles. They were poorly educated, they worked tough physical jobs, they lived in poverty, they had plenty of children and usually died at the age of sixty.

#### ***The Party's control over proles***

Proles were still free. As the Party's slogan put it: "Proles and animals are free." This is a sharp contrast to the control of the members of Inner and Outer Parties. The Party members were constantly monitored by telescreens, a TV-like box that could receive and send information simultaneously. These telescreens were placed everywhere, in both private and public places. However, prole quarters were more or less free of telescreens. That is mostly due to a fact that proles were not considered to be human beings by the Inner Party members. They did not have the intellectual power to understand that they are exploited by the Party (as a source of cheap labor) and were unable to organize resistance. Their functions were simple: work and breed. They did not care much about anything else than taking care of home and family, quarrelling with neighbors, watching some films and football, drinking beer, and above all buying the lottery tickets. They were not required to express their support to the Party. They were only required to show primitive patriotism. The Party created special meaningless songs, novels, even pornography for the proles. Proles did not have to wear a uniform; they could use cosmetics; they had a free market where Outer Party members could get

some deficit product (in the novel it's shoelaces and razor blades); they were free because they posed no danger to the Party.

### ***Proles as the only hope***

One of the recurring themes in the novel is if proles revolted they could establish something like a utopia. It's a struggle between a wild hope carried by Winston Smith, and his realization that proles were incapable of such act. Winston admired proles because as he said, "Proles remained human." That means that they preserved emotions which Party members had to avoid because they were in constant surveillance of telescreens. Every "non-patriotic" emotion involuntarily expressed by a Party member resulted in "vaporization" (i.e., total deletion from all the records). Thus Winston believed that if there were any hope, it lay with proles. Proles preserved the essence of life, human emotions, and even English language (Oldspeak) and the Party could not control it. However, the proles would never revolt because they would never gain consciousness. Winston as well as O'Brien recognized that proles were not capable of organizing a revolution. It is also important to note, that nobody (even Winston) had any thoughts that the Party could collapse by itself. It had too tight control over the Party members who had already lost their human feelings (Winston himself recognized that he no longer felt compassion; children reported their parents to the thoughtpolice on a daily basis; sex became a "duty to the Party" with the only purpose to produce children).

### **B- THE OUTER PARTY**

In the world of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, The Party which controls Oceania is split into two halves: the Inner Party and the Outer Party.

The protagonist of the novel, Winston Smith, is a member of the Outer Party as are most of the other characters we meet, though he does interact with a few proles. The Outer Party represents the middle class in Oceanic society, bureaucrats who do most of the actual work in the Party government and its four ministries. Its members can be identified by their blue coveralls.

Interestingly enough, from a certain viewpoint, the members of the Outer Party, and not the "proles", are probably the worst off of the three

classes. They lack the relative personal freedom of the proles, as they are under constant supervision by the Inner Party, and do not have the small comforts of the Inner Party such as pleasant food and more comfortable homes.

### **C- THE INNER PARTY**

The Inner Party represents the aristocratic political class in Oceania, and have a much superior quality of life to that of the proles or Outer Party members. For example, the telescreens (two-way televisions used for propaganda and surveillance purposes) in their homes can be turned off. They also have access to spacious living quarters, personal servants, convenient transportation, and relatively pleasant food and drink (in contrast to the proles' beer and the Outer Party's low quality Victory Gin). Inner Party members are always identified by their black overalls. Members are selected at a young age according to a battery of tests, and not family heritage, as any loyalty to anything other than The Party and Big Brother, including the family, is strongly discouraged.

In the novel, O'Brien is the only character we meet who is a member of the Inner Party.

## **CHAPTER SIX: ORWELL AND SOCIALISM**

It is now more than 60 years since Orwell's two political works fiction, *Animal Farm* and *1984*, were published, and yet they remain popular best-sellers and an integral part of school curriculae throughout the English-speaking world to promote social justice, freedom and common decency. The gloomy messages of state repression still manage to evoke public distrust in the motives of ideological revolutions, resentment against invasions of individual privacy by governments and the association of any invasion of privacy or restrictions on freedom of expression with totalitarian regimes. The language of the novels which illustrates so starkly the potential perversion of the English language by totalitarian regimes has ironically become a part of it. There is no need to explain the meaning of many popular phrases and words from these books to the average man on the street as they have become permanently ingrained in the culture and politics of English-speaking western countries. For example: "Some (animals) are more equal than others," "Big Brother is watching you!", "Doublespeak" and "Thought Police" all encapsulate dark images of the potential abuse of power and manipulation of the public by corrupt Governments. In fact, the expression "Orwellian" is all that is needed to instantly evoke the dark images of totalitarian regimes depicted so well in his books. Since the publication of these books, civil liberties groups, cold war warriors, libertarians and objectivists have used them as intellectual ammunition against Government intrusions of privacy and curtailment of freedoms.

### **A- CLASS STRUGGLE**

Eric Blair (George Orwell) was born in 1903 in India, where his father worked for the Civil Service. The family moved back to England in 1907. Orwell came from what he described as a "lower-upper-middle class" background. His parents couldn't afford his primary education at a "public school" and he was accepted as a promising pupil of talent at reduced fees. However, Orwell complained about constant bullying by both pupils and schoolmasters due to his poorer background and lower social status. "All through my boyhood, I had a profound conviction that I was no good, that I was wasting my time, wrecking my talents, behaving with monstrous folly and

wickedness and ingratitude, and all this, it seemed, was inescapable..." This and other experiences during his lifetime would convince Orwell that there existed in his country an unfair hierarchy based upon social status and wealth. Nevertheless, he managed to win a scholarship to an exclusive public school, Eton, which he entered in 1917.

His political thoughts were influenced by the times. This was the period following World War One, when young men returning from the war were angry at their elders' incompetence for having led them to such mass slaughter. Everywhere there was a mood of rebellion against the old class system, which was inextricably linked in the minds of many with capitalism. "One day the master who taught us English set us a kind of general knowledge paper of which one of the questions was, 'Whom do you consider the ten greatest men now living?' Of sixteen boys in the class fifteen included Lenin in their list. This was at a snobbish expensive public school, and the date was 1920, when the horrors of the Russian Revolution were still fresh in everyone's mind. ... Hence, at the age of seventeen or eighteen, I was both a snob and a revolutionary. I was against all authority ... and I loosely described myself as a Socialist. But I had not much grasp of what Socialism meant, and no notion that the working class were human beings ... Looking back upon that period, I seem to have spent half the time in denouncing the capitalist system and the other half in raging over the insolence of bus-conductors."

After leaving school he followed in his father's footsteps and served with the Indian Imperial Police Force in Burma. During his five-year service he became convinced that the British Empire was run by a non-productive corrupt upper class that exploited her colonial possessions for financial gain and left the native population and England's own working classes in poverty and squalor. "... the Empire was under-developed, India slept in the Middle Ages, the Dominions lay empty, with foreigners jealously barred out, and even England was full of slums and unemployment. Only half a million people, the people in the country houses, definitely benefited from the existing system."

## **B- LIVING WITH THE DOWN-AND-OUTS**

After leaving the Burmese Police in 1927 Orwell returned to England and for the next few years voluntarily lived in poverty amongst the down-and-outs. Orwell felt that he had been part of an oppressive regime for the last five years and this left him with a bad conscience. "I was conscious of an immense weight of guilt that I had got to expiate. I felt that I had got to escape not merely from imperialism but from every form of man's dominion over man. I wanted to submerge myself, to get right down among the oppressed, to be one of them and on their side against their tyrants." At that time he still did not have any defined ideas concerning socialism or any other economic theory.

During this time, he developed his skills as a writer. In 1933, his first book, *Down and Out in Paris and London*, an account of his time living in poverty, was published. After several rejections, the left-wing publisher Victor Gollancz picked up this book because of its social importance. This was the beginning of a fruitful relationship for Orwell. In 1936, on assignment from Victor Gollancz, Orwell travelled through the industrial north to the small coal-mining town of Wigan Pier. Here he lived with a working class family and went down into the coal-mining pits in order to experience coal mining first hand. Again, he was struck by what he perceived as an unjust divide between the living standards of the different classes. He felt himself, as middle class, awkward amongst them. Here he developed a kind of new socialist utopian ideal that would mean the abolition of class differences. Simultaneously he expressed the beginnings of a dislike of the insincerity of other left-wing intellectuals, especially Marxists. "Sometimes I look at a Socialist, the intellectual, tract-writing type of Socialist, with his pullover, his fuzzy hair, and his Marxian quotation, and wonder what the devil his motive really is. It is often difficult to believe that it is a love of anybody, especially of the working class, from whom he is of all people the furthest removed. ... The Socialist movement has not time to be a league of dialectical materialists."

## **C- FIGHTING FOR SOCIALISM**

As been said, at the end of 1936 Orwell travelled to Spain to fight for the communist republicans in the civil war against the fascists. This

experience was to shape more than anything else both his future political direction and his sworn ideological enemies. By accident Orwell joined one of the factions of the communist republicans the POUM (The Marxist Workers' Party). Orwell was now willing to sacrifice his life for his socialist ideals. This war was not only about what he saw as a social revolution of the working classes, but also an all-important fight against fascism. Before leaving for Spain he had declared that "The choice is not, as yet, between a human and an inhuman world. It is simply between Socialism and Fascism, which at its very best is Socialism with the virtues left out."

He fought on the Aragon front for only six months, his time being cut short when he was shot straight through the neck by a sniper. Astonishingly, he survived his injury and was sent to a sanatorium to recuperate. It was during this time that he was diagnosed with TB, an illness that would eventually kill him in 1950. Shortly after his release from the hospital, the communist-led Government in Spain under the influence of Moscow passed a law making POUM illegal and by implication all its members criminals. "These man-hunts in Spain (of those of dissenting opinions or affiliations) went on at the same time as the great purges in the USSR were a sort of supplement to them." He and his wife amazingly managed to avoid arrest and flee the country. This experience left him with a deep mistrust and hatred of communism and fascism. He deeply resented how these ideological regimes had misrepresented the truth of the Spanish Civil War and how intellectuals of both the right and left had been a party to it. This also became a general hatred of the suppression of objective truth by totalitarian regimes. From the totalitarian point of view history is something to be created rather than learned." Orwell boldly declared that from 1936 onwards everything that he wrote would be dedicated towards waging war on totalitarianism.

PART THREE  
*1984* AND THE HOPE FOR THE  
FUTURE

## CHAPTER SEVEN: 1984 AND HISTORY

*Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a political novel that George Orwell wrote in opposition to totalitarianism. It tells a story set in a dystopia in which an omnipresent state wields total control.

Along with Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is one of the most famous and most cited works of dystopian Novel in literature. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and its terminology have become a byword in discussions of privacy issues. The term "Orwellian" has come to describe actions or organizations reminiscent of the society depicted in the novel.

### A - A LITTLE COMMENT OF THE NOVEL

Originally Orwell entitled the book *The Last Man in Europe*, but his publisher, Frederic Warburg, suggested the change. (Crick, Bernard. "Introduction," to George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984)). Published on June 8, 1949, the bulk of the novel was written by Orwell on the island of Jura, Scotland in 1948, although he had been writing small parts of it since 1945.

The original working title of *The Last Man in Europe* was a natural evolution of the theme of the novel itself. When the publishers requested a new title Orwell did not object. It has been suggested that he had originally chosen to call it *Nineteen Eighty*, but as his writing dragged on due to the advance of his tuberculosis he changed it to *Nineteen Eighty-Two* and then to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Some have suggested that Orwell simply switched the last two digits of the year in which he wrote the book (1948). Other theories link it to Jack London's novel *The Iron Heel*, in which the power of a political movement reaches its height in 1984. Further suggestions are that it refers to a poem that his wife, Eileen O'Shaughnessy, had written, called *End of the Century, 1984*. The only real knowledge is that the working name was *The Last Man in Europe* because it related to the storyline of the book, and that the publishers wanted to change the name for purposes of mass marketing.

## **B – ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK**

The novel focuses on Winston Smith, who stands, seemingly alone, against the corrupted reality of his world: hence its original working name of *The Last Man in Europe*.

The world described in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* contains striking and deliberate parallels with the Stalinist Soviet Union and Hitler's Nazi Germany. There are thematic similarities: the betrayed-revolution, with which Orwell famously dealt in *Animal Farm*; the subordination of individuals to "the Party"; and the rigorous distinction between inner party, outer party and everyone else. In the book, people are encouraged to be engaged in group activities a sort of collectivism. There are also direct parallels of the activities within the society: leader worship, such as that towards Big Brother, who is as much a reference to the non-existent character; Joycamps, which are a reference to concentration camps or gulags; Thought Police, a reference to the Gestapo or NKVD; daily exercise reminiscent of Nazi propaganda movies; and the Youth League, reminiscent of Hitler Youth.

There is also an extensive and institutional use of propaganda; again, this was found in the totalitarian regimes of Hitler and Stalin. Orwell may have drawn inspiration from the greatest propagandists of the time, the Nazis; compare the following quotes to how propaganda is used in "Nineteen Eighty-Four":

Some Nazis citations:

- “The broad mass of the nation ... will more easily fall victim to a big lie than to a small one.” — Adolf Hitler, in his 1925 book *Mein Kampf*
- “If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it.” — Nazi Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels
- “Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country.” Nazi Reich Marshal Hermann Göring during the Nuremberg Trials

## The book citation

- “The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the government of Oceania itself, 'just to keep the people frightened'.”
- “To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed.”

Winston, a member of the Outer Party, lives in the ruins of London, the chief city of Airstrip One; a front-line province of the totalitarian superstate Oceania. He grew up in post-Second World War Britain, during the revolution and civil war. When his parents died during the civil war, he was picked up by the growing Ingsoc (newspeak for "English Socialism") movement and given a job in the Outer Party. Like the rest of the population, Winston lives a squalid and materially deprived existence. He lives in a filthy one-room apartment in "Victory Mansions", and is forced to live on a diet of hard bread, synthetic meals served at his workplace, and vast amounts of industrial-grade "Victory Gin." He is deeply unhappy in his life and keeps a secret diary of his illegal thoughts about the Party. Winston is employed by the Ministry of Truth, which exercises complete control over all media in Oceania: his job in the Ministry's Records Department involves doctoring historical records in order to comply with the Party's version of the past. Since the perception of the past is constantly shaped by the events of the present, the task is a never-ending one.

While Winston likes his work, especially the intellectual challenge involved in fabricating a complete historical anecdote from scratch, he is also fascinated by the *real* past, and eagerly tries to find out more about the forbidden truth. At the Ministry of Truth, he encounters Julia, a mechanic on the novel-writing machines, and the two begin an illegal relationship, regularly meeting up in the countryside (away from surveillance) or in a room above an antique shop in the Proles' area of the city. As the relationship progresses, Winston's views begin to change, and he finds himself relentlessly questioning Ingsoc. Unknown to him, he and Julia are under surveillance by the Thought Police, and when he is approached by Inner Party member O'Brien, he believes that he has made contact with the Resistance. O'Brien

gives Winston a copy of "the book", a searing criticism of Ingsoc that Smith believes was written by the dissident Emmanuel Goldstein.

Winston and Julia are apprehended by the Thought Police and interrogated separately in the Ministry of Love, where opponents of the regime are tortured and executed. O'Brien reveals to Winston that he has been brought to "be cured" of his hatred for the Party, and subjects Winston to numerous torture sessions. During one of these sessions, he explains to Winston the nature of the endless world war, and that the purpose of the torture is not to extract a fake confession, but to actually change the way Winston thinks. This is achieved through a combination of torture and electroshock therapy, until O'Brien decides that Winston is "cured". However, Winston unconsciously utters Julia's name in his sleep, proving that he has not been completely brainwashed. Room 101 is the most feared room in the Ministry of Love, where a person's greatest fear is forced upon him as the final step in the re-education. Winston is dreadfully afraid of rats, and a cage of hungry rats is placed over his eyes, so that when the door is opened, they will eat their way through his skull. In his absolute terror, he tries to think of the one thing he can say to stop the punishment, and he realizes what it is. He says, "Do it to Julia!" At the end of the novel, Winston and Julia meet, but their feelings for each other have been destroyed. Winston has become an alcoholic and we know that eventually he will be killed. The one thing Winston had held on to when facing his inevitable end was that when he was killed, he would still hate Big Brother. This would be his victory, showing that the party's power was not absolute. However, the novel's conclusion reveals that the torture and 'reprogramming' have been successful; Winston realized one truth above all, 'He loved Big Brother'.

At the end of the novel there is an appendix on Newspeak (the artificial language invented and, by degrees, imposed by the Party to limit the capacity to express or even think "unorthodox" thoughts), in the style of an academic essay.

## C - ORWELL'S INSPIRATIONS

In his essay *Why I Write*, Orwell clearly explains that all the "serious work" he had written since the Spanish Civil War in 1936 was "written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism". So *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be seen as a cautionary tale against totalitarianism, and in particular the betrayal of a revolution by those claiming to defend/support it (as Stalin did 1928 onwards). However, as many reviewers/critics have stated, it is not read as an attack on socialism as a whole, but on totalitarianism and potential totalitarianism.

Orwell had already set forth his distrust of totalitarianism and the betrayal of revolutions in *Homage to Catalonia* and *Animal Farm*. *Coming Up For Air*, at points, celebrates the individual freedom that is lost in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Another similarity is that Big Brother bears a resemblance to Stalin. Orwell based many aspects of Oceanian society on the Stalin-era Soviet Union. The "Two Minutes' Hate", for instance, being based on Stalinism's habitual demonization of their enemies and rivals, and Big Brother himself bears a resemblance to Stalin, they both have the same description and the cult to Big Brother's personality is taken from the cult at Stalin's personality. The motif of "Two plus two makes five" is taken directly from a Soviet propaganda poster during Stalin's industrialization drive. Also, the biggest enemy of the Party, Emmanuel Goldstein, is an obvious reference to Leon Trotsky, who had the same description of Goldstein, and was showed by Stalin as a treachery of the revolution (just as Goldstein), but the most evident reference to Trotsky is the fact that Trotsky's real last name is Bronstein.

Orwell's biographer Michael Shelden recognizes, as influences on the work: the Edwardian world of his childhood in Henley for the "golden country;" his life in the Indian Burma Police and his experiences with censorship in the BBC for models of authoritarian power; Jack London's *The Iron Heel* (1908); Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1930); Yevgeny Zamyatin's Russian novel *We* (1923), which Orwell first read in the 1940s; James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (1940).

His work for the overseas service of the BBC, which at the time was under the control of the *Ministry of Information*, also played a significant role as the basis for his Ministry of Truth.

The *Ministry of Information* building, Senate House was the Ministry of Truth's *architectural* inspiration.

The world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also reflects various aspects of the social and political life of both the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Orwell is reported to have said that the book described what he viewed as the situation in the United Kingdom in 1948, when the British economy was poor, the British Empire was dissolving at the same time as newspapers were reporting its triumphs.

In many ways, Oceania is indeed a future metamorphosis of the British Empire (although Orwell is careful to state that, geographically, it also includes the United States. It is, as its name suggests, an essentially naval power.

The party newspaper is *The Times*, identified in Orwell's time and to some degree even at present as the voice of the British ruling class.

It is natural that such comparisons and references would crop up in a book by Orwell, a man who started as a loyal servant of the British Empire in the Colonial Police at Burma, became bitterly disillusioned with the Empire and seeker after a revolution, and rediscovered his British patriotism during World War II.

## CHAPTER EIGHT: THE WORLD OF *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR*

### A- POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

Not all boundaries are given in detail in the book, some are speculation. At the end of the novel, there are news reports that Oceania has captured the whole of Africa, though their credibility is left uncertain.

The world is controlled by three functionally similar totalitarian superstates engaged in perpetual war with each other:

- Oceania (ideology: Ingsoc or English Socialism),
- Eurasia (ideology: Neo-Bolshevism), and
- Eastasia (ideology: Death Worship *or* Obliteration of the Self).

In terms of the political map of the late 1940s when the book was written, *Oceania* covers the greater part of the British Empire (or the Commonwealth), and the Americas, *Eastasia* corresponds to China, Japan, Korea, and northern India. *Eurasia* corresponds to the Soviet Union and Continental Europe. North Africa, the Middle East, southern India, and South East Asia form a disputed zone which is used as a battlefield and source of slaves by the three powers. Goldstein's book explains that the ideologies of the three states are basically the same, but it is imperative to keep the public ignorant of that. The population is led to believe that the other two ideologies are detestable. London, the novel's setting, is the capital of the Oceanian province of Airstrip One, the former Great Britain.

The world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is built around an endless war involving the three global superstates, with two allied powers fighting against the third. The allied states occasionally split with each other and new alliances are formed, but as Goldstein's book explains, this does not matter, as each superstate is so strong it cannot be defeated even when faced with the combined forces of the other two powers. The war rarely takes place on the territory of the three powers, and actual fighting is conducted in the disputed zone stretching from Morocco to Australia, and in the unpopulated Arctic wastes. Throughout the first half of the novel, Oceania is allied with Eastasia, and Oceania's forces are engaged with fighting Eurasian troops in northern Africa. Mid-way through the novel, the alliance breaks apart and

Oceania, newly allied with Eurasia, begins a campaign against Eastasian forces in India. During "Hate Week" (a week of extreme focus on the evilness of Oceania's enemies), Oceania and Eurasia are enemies once again. The public is quite blind to the change, and when a speaker, mid-sentence, changes the enemy from Eurasia to Eastasia (speaking as if nothing had changed) the people are shocked as they notice all the flags and banners are wrong (they blame Goldstein and the Brotherhood) and quite effectively tear them down.

## **B – MINISTRIES OF OCEANIA**

*Oceania's four ministries are housed in huge pyramidal structures, each roughly 300 meters high and visible throughout London, displaying the three slogans of the party on their façades.*

*The Ministry of Peace*

*Newspeak: Minipax.*

*Concerns itself with conducting Oceania's perpetual wars.*

*The Ministry of Plenty*

*Newspeak: Miniplenty.*

*Responsible for rationing and controlling food and goods.*

*The Ministry of Truth*

*Newspeak: Minitrue.*

*The propaganda arm of Oceania's regime. Minitrue controls information: the political literature, the Party organization, and the telescreens. Winston Smith works for Minitrue, "rectifying" historical records and newspaper articles to make them conform to Big Brother's most recent pronouncements, thus making everything that the Party says true.*

*The Ministry of Love*

*Newspeak: Miniluv.*

*The agency responsible for the identification, monitoring, arrest, and torture of dissidents, real or imagined. Based on Winston's experience there at the hands of O'Brien, the basic procedure is to pair the subject with his or her worst fear for an extended period of time, eventually breaking down the person's mental faculties and ending with a sincere embrace of the Party by the brainwashed*

*subject. The Ministry of Love differs from the other ministry buildings in that it has no windows in it at all.*

*The ministries' names are ironic : the Ministry of Peace makes war, the Ministry of Plenty administers over shortages, the Ministry of Truth spreads propaganda and lies, and the Ministry of Love inflicts misery.*

### **C- THE HOPE FOR THE FUTURE**

In "Towards European Unity"; Orwell settles the bases of real chances for « Socialist Federation of Western Europe". The word Socialist for Orwell is bound up with liberty, equality and internationalism. This means that people are free and happy and the main motive in life is not the pursuit of cruelty, money, or power as the followers of the well known sentence: Who desires peace prepare for war. Orwell's vision is hopeful albeit limitrophe when we assist more and more to the word: globalism.

I will rather suggest a large scale federation which embrace each continent and more over, the whole world.

A lot of preconditions have to be fulfilled for those visions to be materialized. First every country on this earth though economically poor or militarily mighty must be independent. After that, the only purpose of our authorities and political leaders in countries is to bring the rest of the populations to love each other and to be in perpetual quest of good living and better life for all the humans.

States have to avoid the choice of communism for a model of society. This outmoded socialism is the one debated in *1984*, and *Animal Farm*. It is a society painting stained by injustice, freedom privation, intimidation, murder, crimes, and hypocrisy. A Society where lies sound truthful and murder respectable.

To sum it up, it is a world of authoritarian and totalitarian thinking. Some authors are fighting to educate the world in order to establish peace, social harmony and to guaranty a good living for every body. Unfortunately, throughout our societies, it is effective to see that for some inner interests or others factice deeds, people choose to be subject to mere ashamed situations.

These gloomy behaviours have been spawned everywhere. Not only that this is a political game but it is also a social and human daily life game.

Amongst hopes gained in the world, we can enlist the democratization of Eastern Europe and of BENIN, the fall of the Berlin Wall.

In fact, the Berlin Wall was a barrier constructed on 13 August 1961 by the German Democratic Republic (East Berlin). This Wall called the Wall of Shame or either the Iron Curtain completely cut off West Berlin from surrounding East Germany and from East Berlin. The Soviet dominated the Eastern bloc and the West Germany was Fascist. The fall of the Wall of Shame come into being on November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1989.

In 1990, our country Benin tries to weaken its political instability by broking the path with the Marxist-Leninist regime. While rejecting the communist regime, our Country is thus adopting the democratic system. It was a step towards human's freedom.

In fact, the West African State of Benin was declared independent on August 01, 1960 after decades under French colonial rule. In the early years after independence, the country was marked by instability and bitter rivalry between the ethnic communities and political parties. This rivalry generally resulted in deadly violence. There had been succession of military and civil governments that could not last enough to implement any policy.

Amidst this instability, Mathieu Kerekou, after a military coup on October 26, 1972, put in place a revolutionary regime with support of the working class and the young elite. However, quickly the situation deteriorated. In a Keynote speech on November 30, 1975, Mathieu Kerekou declared Marxism-Leninism as the official ideology of the State. Multiparty system was banned. Civil liberties such as freedom of speech as well as freedom of association were prohibited. PRPB (Party of People's Revolution of Benin) became the only political party. On the economical front, most companies were nationalized and became State properties.

In late 90's, the country's economy was ruined and the government could no longer pay the salaries of the civil servants. The civil unrest caused by this economic collapse forced the regime to restore democracy and rule of law.

Since 1990, Benin has proven to be one of African most stable countries with regular and peaceful change of government through fair polls.

However, most of Beninese think that the political establishment is yet to deliver the promises of democracy, rule of law, and economic development since corruption and lack of effective policy concerning the improvement of people's living conditions have become one of the most standing issues in Benin politics.

March 2006 marked the end of Mathieu Kerekou's second term after he came back into power in 1996 by defeating his main rival, the former President Nicephore Soglo who had been in office from 1990 to 1996. Beninese took many by surprise by choosing Boni Yayi as his successor. In fact, till then Boni Yayi had been an unknown figure on the political landscape. To many, both domestic and foreign analysts, the election of Boni Yayi was due to the lack of credibility on part of traditional political actors who were perceived as the ones responsible for the surge of corruption mainly Mathieu Kerekou rule. Many hoped that Boni Yayi would provide a strong leadership in fighting corruption and promoting the rule of law. There were tremendous support for him throughout the country.

At the beginning of his first term, Boni Yayi has shown commitment to fight corruption and promote good governance, accountably, and transparency but just months after his inauguration, the relations between the Government and the Opposition became tense. Both are focused on the next presidential elections scheduled to take place in March 2011 and there is no show on the part of Benin political leaders of interest in concerns of the ordinary citizens. The Opposition leaders accuse Boni Yayi of mismanaging and misguiding the country by inciting ethnic tension between the North and the South. News has come out that the Opposition is trying to cast doubt on the ability of the Government to keep its promise and make the country an emerging economy. Boni Yayi first term has come to its end. We are just coming from the ballots. And the Constitutional Court confirmed the re-election of Doctor Thomas Boni Yayi. Hope that his second term of five years be a very good one for the development of our Country Benin.

It's now conspicuous that the task has not reached its end. There's still so much to be done.

To begin, our daily duty towards humans and the environment is a certain dignity of being.

The rich countries will have to avoid any form of dominion over the poor countries. It will be senseless to make a single confusion. The task will be less important only when the humans understand that there is no link and no confusion to be made between the following (two) concepts which are Democracy and communism. The two concepts as developed till now are totally different although many Head of States are likely to make communism sound democratic or define any form of their political systems as a democratic one.

The first thing to do is to secure the political field of our Country, then of our Continent, then of the other Continents and of the whole world. It's only when the political field of our country is enough secured that we can feel enough strong to deal with the other problems our Society is suffering from. Another way is possible but in that case, we shall be dealing the most of the time with the questions of peace than with questions of real development.

Actually, it's high time we said that Humanity is craving for a real development. Instead of wasting our time debating over the everlasting problem of political intrigues, we better find ways and means that lead to development. Our duty and the tasks of the Head of States and Authorities in any States are then to be bound with success.

None of the following fields is not to be let down. The following are: the social, educational, agricultural, environmental, economical, sanitarian, industrial, cultural.... . There's so many to do.

Today in BENIN, there still exist many villages deprived of pure water, electricity, hospitals and sanitary, schools.... Some efforts have been done in creating schools, electric generators, some hospitals, adjudication of water, enhancement of salaries wedges, more and more of free education at primary school and a little bit at the secondary school for girls, gratuity of surgical fees for women that are given birth and others...but these efforts are still insufficient.

If we want to resolve the questions of hunger, poverty or even diseases in our country, we first have to resolve the problem of employment. As an Authority, I will have to create enough employments, enough possibilities to find jobs so that the youth anyway finds its way. In other words, it is compulsory to educate children by enabling them going to school and make them being aware of the numerous chances they'll get in the future while being at school and being well educated. That, in this world, only your employment will provide you a safe life and success. Work will prevent you from being a thief, a murderer and from other screws.

The question of employment is so important as far as the population's living standard is most of the time very low. Another crucial thing to do is to produce enough qualitative crops so as to cover people's needs in foods. In the same way, it will be intelligent to enhance the industrial production so as to secure economic development and enable the rise of standard living and then avoid economic repression. The agricultural production entails the industrial production.

It is above all better to become economically independent and self sufficient or a kind of self made country.

I am a little proud to see that in my country, a few years ago, some effort have been made in creating more and more governmental and Non Governmental Organizations and Associations which are trying to finds new possibilities of development and creating new employments, a little bit of better living conditions and security . Here are some Organizations such as Social Watch, CARE International, FNPEES, International Criminal Court, PNUD, UNICEF, EMPOWER and others.

The state leaders also must ensure peace among people and must assist and give moral, material and financial supports to people in need. The "State" must seek ways and means to create jobs and encourage people to work for their own success.

The "State" must also succeed in creating many other Organisms such as the International Criminal Court to establish social security and succeed in eradicating poverty among the population.

We must be the consciousness-raisers; succeed in sensitizing all the social levels of the Country, from the cities into the countryside, and teach people how they can become petty self made men.

As a result, we have no right to destroy the progress already engaged or achieved. We have to build the new string after the old rope. We should not be dystopian but constructive and progressive in our mind and we have to avoid any kind of violence and social unrest within our societies.

Finally, to effectively fight against evil, it must first be crucial to know its origins and classify it. To build a good society will require that men in that society know their rights and duties and they can apply.

Thus, after analyzing men psychology in the world, I come to the end that there exist four (04) types of men.

The first class of man is the people illiterate and totally ignorant.

The second category is that people just illiterate but enough awakened on social issues, social standards, moral values, hygiene and health questions.

The third Class enlists that men very literate and totally ignorant and unable to debate on the smallest rule of social life, social standards, moral values, hygiene and health questions.

The fourth category of people are perfectly literate and also master the issues of social standards, moral values, hygiene and health and master as well how to connect different knowledge to innovate for the greater interest of the Society.

And it is precisely this fourth type of men that the world is seeking. This is the kind of man who knows the limits of his and overcome all difficulties. This is a man of integrity and dignity. It is simply a man with a Crystal spirit as Orwell has said.

After that, I could say that the human race has really to get to work hard to avoid falling into the screws of any kind. Because only good work can ensure good life. We have now to stay awake to stem the evil in all its forms. These are not empty words. It is a project entirely feasible. We can do it. We can avoid murder consciousness-raisers. We won't make only theoretical ideas but the case is to be pragmatic.

## CONCLUSION

This is quite simply a stunning book written by one of the most talented authors of modern times. *1984* was written in 1948, a terrifying vision of a totalitarian future dominated by one Party. The Party runs by one obscure and powerful figure, Big Brother.

The dialogue is riveting and very frightening. The exchanges between O'Brien and Winston are the most intense piece of live theatre.

The concept of Newspeak is dealt with in detail, basically the reduction on the language until people cannot commit crime because there is no way of expressing that crime. Bad becomes ungood, excellent become doublegood or doubleplusgood. Orwell has invented many words/phrases for the book: doublethink and facecrime are just two examples of this special language which does not allow any anti-Government feelings to be expressed. The book contains predictions of future life, many of which have more or less occurred exactly the way Orwell described them.

Without wanting to reveal too much, Winston works for the Party and his job entails rewriting history to fool the masses (or proles as they are referred to in the book) into believing that Big Brother, the almost god-like leader, is always right. For instance, when the chocolate ration was lowered, it was Winston's job to rewrite newspaper articles so it appeared that the rations had in fact increased. We join Winston Smith, at the Ministry of Truth (where he works) which concerns itself with the reshaping of the past to suit the Party's needs. He is an outcast, a rebel, yearning for something more than the monotony of life, clinging onto the belief that there was once, hidden in the past, obscured in the lies, a better, purer world.

Winston is discontented with the lies and confusion going on, but doesn't have the guts to do anything about it. His flat has a small area that cannot be viewed by a telescreen and at this area of his room, he writes a diary condemning Big Brother and the Party. In this alternate reality, no one escapes the eye of the party. People are kept under 24 hour surveillance by the telescreen, the shutter of the telescreen which as well as transmitting images to the home, monitors all those within its field of vision, leaving anyone under the scrutiny of the Thought Police, punisher of anyone who dares to show a heretical motive. The diary extracts are some of the best bits

of the book. Political gems such as "If there is a hope, it lies in the proles" are present in this area.

Winston suspected that a young woman (Julia) is spying on him and is sure to denounce him to the Thought Police. He has good reason to be suspicious because his mother and father and many friends and comrades have disappeared after someone has denounced them. However, one day as they are walking towards each other she falls. As he helps her up, she passes him a note. Later he plucks up the courage to read the note which simply says "I love you". Still not sure if this is a trap he risks speaking to her. They arrange to meet secretly several times in the countryside and fall in love. The human side of the story is excellent as we delve into Winston's forbidden love affair with Julia, fellow worker and we learn of his horrifying and inescapable fate. Orwell's characters are brilliant, from Winston, the shy obedient party member who yearns for a better life to O'Brien. Unfortunately, O'Brien was not the man he thought. O'Brien was nothing but an enemy; an Inner Party member.

The book remains one among the greatest work of prose. It's cynical and twisted vision of a future society under the complete and unbending control of an unstoppable dictatorship, and the fact that Orwell manages to explain this in a way that seems entirely possible is very interesting.

It is by far the greatest book ever written on the subject of a totalitarian future. It goes so deep and is so immensely planned and carried out that it convinces you of the fact that we are always only a step away from Orwell's dark prediction. It still reminds us of the dangers of humanity hungry for power. This is a book that you will read and read again and again, and a book that with every new read, will only give you the sensation of getting more aware of the danger of totalitarianism.

The man was a genius and some of his ideas were incredibly accurate.

Of course, in hindsight, there are many facets of the book that have since actually happened. Many highly placed politicians have been influenced by Orwell's book and, I suppose, the list of examples to underline the book's events is extremely long. Rogue states such as Korea and Iraq, the former USSR, the evil dictatorship of Pol Pot in Cambodia, all echo regimes akin to that in *1984*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### GEORGE ORWELL'S BOOKS

1. Orwell, George, *Burmese Days*, Gollancz, London, 1934
2. Orwell, George, *A Clergyman's Daughter*, Gollancz, London, 1935.
3. Orwell, George, *Keep The Aspidistra Flying* Gollancz, London, 1936.
4. Orwell, George, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, Gollancz, London, 1937
5. Orwell, George, *Homage to Catalonia*, Gollancz, London, 1938.
6. Orwell, George, *Coming Up For Air*, Gollancz, London, 1939.
7. Orwell, George, *Animal Farm*, London, Gollancz, 1945,
8. Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Gollancz, London, 1949.

### OTHER SOURCES

1. Crick, Bernard, *George Orwell* (London, 1980).
2. Gross, Miriam (ed.) (London, 1972), *the World of George Orwell*.
3. Sandison, Alan (London 1974), *the Last Man In Europe: An Essay of George Orwell*.
4. Slater, Ian (New York, 1985), *The Road To Airstrip One*.
5. Woodcock, George (London, 1966), *The Crystal Spirit: A study of George Orwell*

#### Auteurs Critiques

- Bernstein, B., *Class, Codes and Control*. 1973
- Casey, John, *The Language of Criticism*, London: Methuen, 1960
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of things*, New York: Pantheon. 1972
- Atkins, JOHN: *George Orwell*, London. 1954

### WEB SITES

- Google: Novembre 2008
- Wikipedia: Février 2010