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Abstract

Amid rising Cold War tensions in mid 90’s, many sorts of propaganda needed to emerge out of the struggle between Capitalism and Communism. As fear grew that Communism would spread further, Anti-Communist writers and artists labeled propaganda as a tool to react against various forms of Fascism, Communism and totalitarianism. George Orwell, among them, wrote his novel *Nineteen Eighty Four* in which a propagandist language usage is noticeably shown. Although the analysis of propaganda is complex and needs a deep historical research, this thesis is set to examine the experiences which lead Orwell to adopt propaganda in his *Nineteen Eighty Four* and to analyze the language that he presents and its utility in propaganda process. Equally important, this thesis aims to show to what extent this language boosts Orwell’s dedication in influencing the audience to adopt his anti-totalitarian point of view. Moreover, relating propaganda and language in a systematic reading of Orwell’s work helps to make it appear as a substantial resource for theorizing about the notion of thought control in the novel. To derive a theoretical and a practical explanation out of this modest study, I rely on the Biographical criticism, Marxist criticism and an application of Linguistic Determinism theory. All in all, this dissertation is set to put the reader in the everyday context of propaganda and literature that combines a political value.
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Introduction

With the end of World War II and all the demolition it has brought for European civilizations, a non-violent war—a Cold War— was just warming up. Soviet Union was regarded as the mould of Communism which was exemplified by the violations of Joseph Stalin and the repressive force of governments which were subject to him. The clash of ideologies between Capitalism and Communism has kept politicians, historians and even literary men on their toes. Thus, Capitalist nations —mainly in Britain— were forced to create new means and methods to fight the anxieties brought by Communist forces. One of these methods is the technique of propaganda.

During this ideological dispute, Capitalist and Communist fronts have seen the urge of adapting to the novelty of the times where economic and ideological rivalry has replaced military confrontations. This competition has emerged also in the world of literature. As a matter of fact, many writers in the modern era tried to portray propaganda in their works in order to put the practices of Communist regimes in the spotlight. This type of literature is characterized by the widespread reliance of satire as a medium for fictional literary products. Moreover, satirical literature is said to reflect certain aspects of the cultures where it is produced and thereafter, wishes to bring change into these cultures. In the same fashion, George Orwell — with an emphasis on satire— comes up with his Nineteen Eighty Four in which we find a great resemblance to the same practices of the Communist regime.

Orwell was mostly fascinated by the English language and how it helped, for ages, to portray the world as it really was. His major efforts in this exact work were best seen in mixing politics and literary imagination in order to reflect state repression
of a totalitarian system. Coming up with such dystopian novel was a result of his departure to Spain where he witnessed the Spanish Civil War and experienced a great Stalinist repression in dealing with his fellow Trotskyites and anarchists.

Since propaganda refers to any attempt to persuade anyone of any belief, this dissertation seeks to interrogate how it works in the frame of anti-totalitarian literature like in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty Four*. While many chose to provoke the effectiveness of propaganda in literary works, this study is set to explore how language can be a great instrument of persuading people and making room for massive ideological control.

Jacques Ellul along with many critics agrees on the fact that propaganda cannot be detached from technology. He defines it as a process which aims at making people accept and live with existing patterns. In his book *Propaganda- the formation of men’s attitudes*, Ellul states that the propaganda which is brought by George Orwell in his novel *Nineteen Eighty Four* must be organized in a certain arrangement that goes along with characteristics like continuity, duration and combination with different sorts of media. In his work, Ellul emphasizes the communicative role of the propaganda.

Michael Yeo in his article “Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four: Two Sides of the Same Coin*” suggests that Propaganda and surveillance in Orwell’s novel are not just randomly related but they are significantly linked to the extent that Surveillance works as a backup to propaganda, in the case of the first’s failure. Yeo believes that judging the first reactions to Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty four*, propaganda had failed in this exact work. Yet, he suggests that surveillance and propaganda in both worlds —Oceania and real world— must not be
practiced to limit the thought, but only to get information about what the people are
doing and how they are thinking with what serves their needs.

However, considering all the sayings of both critics, this thesis aims at seeing
this topic from another perspective. This work provokes many questions of which the
most significant are: what role did propaganda play in Orwell’s life and novel? How
does language operate within the process of propaganda? Analyzing some figurative
aspects of language within the selected literary work of George Orwell *Nineteen
Eighty-Four* contributes in providing an answer to these questions.

Orwell in his work tries to make a warning about the threats of communist
regimes and what it would be like if they ever get in charge. Detaching this
masterpiece explains how Orwell, through figurative language, tried to mold his
readers so that they adopt his narrative point of view—which indicates a great
opposition to Communist regime. In the light of what has been said, this paper relies,
primarily, on the Biographical criticism, Marxist criticism and the theory of Linguistic
Determinism in order to understand, first, what experiences led Orwell to write against
totalitarian regimes, and, second, to examine the language’s manipulative role that is
used by George Orwell in his work.

The division of this thesis into three chapters contributes in understanding how
propaganda works—in practice and theory—in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty
Four*. The first chapter entitled “Into the Scope of Propaganda” includes a brief
presentation for how propaganda became a tool of manipulation and deception rather
than being a tool of giving information. The chapter also focuses on the struggle
between Capitalism and Communism and the role of propaganda within this
ideological dispute. The final part of this first theoretical chapter deals with how propaganda was fused with art and literature.

The second chapter is entitled “A Historical Approach Applied to George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty Four”. Relying on the Biographical criticism, this chapter tackles the psychological experiences which faced Orwell in his life, and how these experiences contributed in building a great hatred for imperialism and totalitarianism. This part also provides an explanation for the way Stalinist regimes acted in real life. The encounters that Orwell had, along with his socialist friends in Spain, prove the reasons why he came up with a similar ideological power in his novel.

The third chapter, entitled “The Orwellian Language and Propaganda”, serves as a basic ground for propaganda in practice. It includes not only a fair analysis to language, power and ideology, but also an emphasis on the destruction of words within Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty Four. This examination shows firstly how a certain language can lead to massive ideological control over people. Secondly, it testifies the hypothesis which states that any slight change in the order and the number of a certain lexicology can bring thought manipulation upon the people who use this language.

In the long run, this memoir will encourage developing a critical thinking about literature with a political value. It also gives further clarification for the study of propaganda and puts the readers in the shoes of a propagandist writer like George Orwell, not to mention the great hope that this modest attempt will bring any improvement to my field of research.
Chapter I

Into the Scope of Propaganda

Whenever we exhibit certain terms in front of a group of people — regardless to their orientations—we expect many different reactions towards these terms. For instance, when the term ‘propaganda’ was brought up in front of a bunch of distinct people of my Algerian community, many were pleased to link it to all kinds of deception and truth manipulation without even having any exact definition for the term itself. Likewise, I was assured that propaganda as a topic maintains a great interest today, but since it remains too vague for the layman, it is still difficult to be taken from several sides. For that reason, this term will be investigated in the most neutral systematic ways; we are going to see how reading a book can drag readers falling into believing the propaganda which is set in it.

Today, truth manipulation techniques have seen enormous interest from those who desire to spread their ideologies or their way of thinking to the people. As the world is becoming smaller everyday and with the availability of every possible tool that makes ideological contact even more easier, propaganda is for sure highly present in that world. But as far as we are concerned, the major emphasis in this case is on a little ancient style of contact in which a written material is involved.

This chapter includes an introduction to propaganda studies, what defines propaganda, how it evolved from a tool of information to propagation, where propaganda places itself in the struggle between Capitalism and Communism and how it was attached to art and literature to finally serve a political ambition. So, it serves as a theoretical base for the other two chapters which form a practical explanation to the
understanding of George Orwell’s propagandist language and his ideological point of view in his novel Nineteen Eighty Four.

1. From Information to Propagation:

The term propaganda may sound familiar to any ordinary reader since it is agreed that whenever there is an attempt to propagate for a cause this means there is an aim to persuade and manipulate individuals to fulfill that cause. However, this was not always the case, at least to what was before the two world wars, when propaganda simply meant to serve as a tool of information. For that reason, this part will mainly discuss the meaning transformation of the term propaganda, starting as a tool of providing information until becoming a tool of spreading lies and corrupt ideologies.

The term’s earliest usage dates to 1622 when Pope Gregory XV came out with the Sacra Congregatio Propaganda Fide or “Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith”. Back then, the papacy aimed for snatching control of the missionary work from the Portuguese and Spanish rule, in a desperate attempt to achieve diffusion for the catholic faith through the equal adjustment of missionary activities all over the world. What followed was a set of orders to establish a solo printing press —subject to the congregation only— likely for one major aim, that is to manipulate its message within the wider world, and hence marking the first documented use of propaganda in a mere politico-religious context.

Yet, it has to be pointed out that the term propaganda was abused in its theoretical meaning, where it has been changed through the years and was mostly attached with deception, lies and reality distortion. In other words, “The word began to acquire some negative connotations over the nineteenth century owing to government distrust of secret organizations designed to sway public opinion” (Wollaeger 3). This
was greatly boosted with the coming of both world wars when propaganda was recruited to serve as a verbal weapon against views and ideologies. So, “[the term] ‘propaganda’ has a mixed quality” (385) as Douglas Walton suggest, meaning that in a modernist context, propaganda is best applied when having a great emphasis on both literature and history.

Propaganda as a concept can be seen as controversial because its meaning differed from time to time, and giving this term a theoretical definition is in itself as persuasive as creating a kind of propaganda. However, propaganda —being a type of discourse— facilitates the recognition of some of its characteristics in many common contexts. These contexts involve claims and criticism which they are best seen in political sciences. In the world of politics, it is common to criticize arguments and views by claiming them as being part of a propagandist discourse, and as lacking credible evidences to finally serve a negative evaluation (Walton 385).

Propaganda meant any persuasive attempt to falsify reality, views and even our own absorption to certain facts. So, considering this term in one’s mind basing only on what has been said about it, theoretically, means that this one has turned into a victim of propaganda itself and this point has marked the concept as being elusive as it can never earn a stable definition due to its continuous misuse in everyday conversations. That’s why in the world of politics —where propaganda is best seen— anyone can label any other one’s sayings as lacking truth or strong evidences. As we always see in television, when politicians face each other in front of a crowd to gain votes or to win support, they attack each other under the umbrella of evaluation or academic criticism.

From another angle, Stanley B. Cunningham suggests that “[propaganda] poses as genuine information and knowledge when, in fact, it generates little more than
ungrounded belief and tenacious convictions; it prefers credibility, actual belief states, and mere impressions to knowledge .” (139). In other words, media has a great deal in propaganda depiction for audience which it claims embracing large amounts of information and knowledge that is tinted by the truth but involves any. Garth S. Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell suggest in their book Propaganda and Persuasion that propaganda is “a deliberate attempt to alter or maintain a balance of power that is advantageous to the propagandist” (3).

Cunningham also suggests that “The truth in what we say and the virtue of truthfulness in speakers— that is, a firm disposition to utter a true statement—have traditionally been regarded as premier moral qualities” (139). Cunningham’s claim pushes for one conclusion: propaganda stands as unethical process for presenting information. A total contradiction to what Wollaeger suggests in his book Modernism Media and Propaganda 1990-1945 is that “one person’s propaganda is another person’s information . . . without completely erasing the notion that “to persuade” might simply mean “to inform” (3).

According to Jowett and O'Donnell in their analysis of propaganda and information, there is a huge emphasis on informative communication (or white propaganda) in building a propagandist discourse, which either aims to back up a partisan or can be a cause that involves competition in favor of the propagandist and not those who receive it. However, the recipient may fall into acknowledging communication in this context as being purely informative. So, there is one sort of variation between propaganda and informative communication, that is in the process of creating propaganda there is one major goal which stands only to nourish a certain ideology (31).
Later, many other historians and specialists in propaganda studies talked about the actual reliance on propaganda in world wars and how it also served as a mean of information. Dominick LaCapra states in his *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Context, Language*, that “with World War I, when newly invented propaganda techniques first harnessed the considerable power of the advertising industry to the political aims of the nation-state, the most telling saying emerged: the first casualty of war is truth” (qtd. in Wollaeger 13). Wollaeger explains LaCapra’s words saying:

Truth has died many deaths over the twentieth century, but the role played by the British propaganda campaign in World War I is fundamental to understanding the new media ecology faced by modernist writers and its effects on attitudes toward truth, factuality, and rhetoric. For when Woolf and Orwell struggle to articulate a space for the aesthetic in the culture wars of the thirties, they are attempting to find their bearings in a media environment whose rate of change, already an overwhelming fact of existence prior to 1914, had been accelerated by war. (13)

2. **Propaganda in the Struggle between Capitalism and Communism:**

Ideology clash between capitalism and communism resulted in one of the most tensed contentions of the 20th century. Fear of Communism in capitalist nations like the United States and the United Kingdom drove these governments to recruit the propaganda in order to prevent the so called dangerous Soviet thinking from approaching Europe after the end of World War II. The status of political scene in this period was so tensed between the already mentioned nations setting the stage for what is known as the Cold War.
First, to have a better understanding for this international conflict we have to know what features both ideologies and who they represent. Communism is an ideological movement in sociology, politics and economy embraced by Soviet Union leaders. Its goals serve the establishment of a communist society, mostly built upon the common ownership of the means of production and the absence of social classes. Chester Bowels defines it in his article for “Foreign Affairs” entitled *Is Communist Ideology Becoming Irrelevant?* as:

By Communist ideology I mean these three things: First, Karl Marx's theory of history which assumes that certain "laws" impel a society to move through a series of economic stages to Communism. Communism is here presented as an economic system which in theory satisfies all of a society's needs without exploiting any of its members. Second, Lenin's assumption that the pace of history can be accelerated by "political" means, principally by revolution. Third, Lenin's belief in the Communist Party as the all-wise, all-powerful --indeed, he only-- vehicle of this economic and political change. (553)

Vladimir Ilitch Lenin was the major figure that had control over the communist movement. He concentrated on the same principles Russian Social-Democratic Party had before 1917, naming the regimental organization and revolutionary spirit to result in a Leninist copy of the earlier Bolshevik squad. With his strong charisma and leading personality, Lenin had a great impression within the movement, and when revolution broke out in 1917 he was fully prepared to head the movement (Daniels 3). Since then, communism has been mostly identified with the political and economic organization of the Soviet Union to be later adopted eventually in the People’s Republic of China and some other countries.
From the other side of battlefield there was what is known as Capitalism. Capitalism is a system of indirect governance of economic relationships. It puts a great emphasis on privatization of the means of production where industry and agriculture are owned by private individuals. It supports free elections and having more than one political party, and it suggests having limits on government interference in people’s lives. Randall G. Holcombe in his article Political Capitalism defines it as:

[an] economic and political system in which the economic and political elite cooperate for their mutual benefit. The economic elite influence the government’s economic policies to use regulation, government spending, and the design of the tax system to maintain their elite status in the economy. The political elite are then supported by the economic elite which helps the political elite maintain their status; an exchange relationship that benefits both the political and economic elite. (41)

Disraeli, British politician, novelist and essayist, once said in his Contarini Fleming, "with words we govern men" (132). Communist and capitalist leaders have used words and other propaganda techniques in their efforts to gain power and govern men. Approaching propaganda in this context of cold war opens doors to speak about different propaganda tools, like Media. Governments with their easy access to media institutions have the upper hand to propagate the ongoing of information within their territories in the favor of what serves them best. Commercial press was a popular item in media world during the Cold War era along then with television.

The political dispute that occurred between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union after World War II was not only characterized by being propaganda enemies, but was also a fight for power where there was a strong
race to sell their ideologies to the world. At that time of the international crisis, media has seen an evolution in its features ranging from radio and press until the coming of television. With this major improvement of media items, the latter has gained a more prominent role, so rather than being the tongue of the state, it became the most effective weapon in the hand of both fronts of Cold War. As Susan L. Carruthers adds in her book *The Media at War*:

> Clearly, news-making is a process that cannot be explained in the singular. What counts as news, and who counts as newsworthy, differs according to context — from one historic period to another, one national context to another, and from one news outlet to the next within the same place at the same time … news [and] media are so attuned to executive power affords considerable latitude to the White House congenial ways — as we've already seen. It also helps explain why access is such a powerful tool in the administration's news-management arsenal. (41)

The Best example is seen in the arm race during this period of tension. The Soviet Union claimed the moral superiority by saying that once they launched their own nuclear program, it was only to keep pace with the same threats provided by capitalist nations like the United States. These nations showed high degree of hostility which drove the Soviet Union to act immediately. First they glorified their nuclear program as being the pride of the Soviet science and second they justified the defense of the Soviet motherland against American nuclear bullying.

Yet, before the Soviets, Americans have already made their way to find their own sense of self using culture to project power where propaganda experts showed a purged vision of utopian American society. However, Kenneth Osgood says in his
review for Laura A. Belmonte’s Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War that “Belmonte reveals, [American propagandists] faced an intractable problem … Americans disagreed over "what values, symbols, and people best exemplified 'America’ … the typical American family [will eventually tear apart]” (289).

3. Art, Literature and Propaganda:

One of the most important themes arising from the last century is the recruitment of art in shaping the identities of people all over the globe. Art and literature can be both defined as a set of experiences that an artist or a literary man goes through, and how —according to their own creativity, imagination and sometimes their commitment to a certain ideology—they portray those experiences in the form of an aesthetic piece or a literary text in this case. Hence, many important questions arose around literature and art with accusations of being —both— heavy weapons of propaganda. So, being researchers in the field of literature gives us the right to form many important questions, mainly related to history, culture and sociology. One might simply ask, when and why does propaganda get involved in literature? Which aims does it fulfill? How is it consumed, and by whom? (Foulkes 2). In the way of answering these questions, we may fall into many propaganda traces in some artistic materials and literary works where the ‘propagandist language’ is best seen.

First, Mara Ambrožicˇ and Angela Vettese note that “… art is considered as a function of the emotions and sensations it triggers in our minds … our conception of the effect of the work of art is in relation to our understanding of ourselves, of our mental reality, rather than to its influence on the outside world …” (140). Sadly, due to the enormous affection art and literature have on the human kind, many opportunists
saw of these vast ranges of human activity as the perfect swamp to throw their ideological experiments in the name of both world wars when art or literature were hugely linked to propaganda.

In *Three Guineas*, Virginia Woolf states that “If we use art to propagate political opinions … we must force the artist to clip and cabin his gift to do us a cheap and passing service. Literature will suffer the same mutilation that the mule has suffered; and there will be no more horses” (qtd. in Marcus 202). In simpler words, to include propaganda in all means of art and literature is surely unfair towards these practices. It was always believed that art—involving literature—can be a powerful item in the making of who we are, because it matches freedom of thought and imagination. Thus, combining propaganda with artistic materials will lead only to the bringing of a sterile ugly creature which will have the same aesthetic features but mostly exposed to be misused by the dirty hands that the world of politics always provides.

Propaganda as a word, says E. H Gombrich, has managed to earn a bad heritage among people so that when it comes to linking it to art, much hesitation or confusion occurs. Yet, if we attempt to forget about all these claims and take the word in its rooted meaning then it becomes easier to find at least one shared point between art and propaganda. The meeting point of poetry, the rhetoric and the art of verbal persuasion, all fail to be alike in theory but in practice the possibilities increase massively (118).

Seemingly, others disregarded the fusion of art, literature and propaganda, and went further in knowing what distinguishes every item, and how we can tell that a certain artistic material or literary work is serving propaganda. Williams S. Lewis states in his article *Art or Propaganda? Dewey and Adorno on the Relationship between Politics and Art*:
Saying that art and propaganda are akin does not, however, erase the difference between them. Doing so would once again shut off inquiry into the basis and, indeed, possibility of distinguishing between art and propaganda. … Also, if it is the case that good art is productive, or at least indicative of a good and open society, and that propaganda promotes or denotes the contrary, then we should seek to distinguish between the two such that the former be encouraged and the latter discouraged. (43-44)

In committed Art and Propaganda, Ira Iliana Papadopoulou and Anastasia Veneti make an illustration from the Leninist era where they found that, back within the Soviet Union, it was quite hard to distinguish education from propaganda. Illiteracy was Lenin’s nightmare and he did his best to replace it with everlasting Soviet norms. From his perspective, art and literature had to be key ingredients in the making of a new Soviet society, and in the same process, he regarded art as an inseparable part of education (7). In other words propaganda was omnipresent in the battleground where ideologies clash, and political theorists like Lenin spared no effort in implanting propaganda in the profound of his nation either to gain their support or to boost them towards winning the battle against other ideologies which arose against the Soviet Union.

Back to war time, A.P Foulkes in his book Literature and Propaganda contributes greatly in explaining how art and propaganda were regarded in the eyes of Adolf Hitler — one of the most influential figures of World War II — and juxtaposes it with the sayings of George Orwell that all art is propaganda. Foulkes notes that propaganda, in most cases does not expose itself for us walking on streets raising swastikas and repeating Nazi chants (like Sieg Heil or Heil, mein Führer). Propaganda works best when it is fused with all the values, norms and bases of a certain
community i.e. when it is camouflaged with reality itself or with what is natural in your eyes (3).

Foulkes also stresses on the amount of subjectivity in identifying art and literature with propaganda, setting two examples. The first one concerns Hitler’s indication that art has nothing to do with propaganda. Hitler’s assertion does not disagree with what George Orwell’s claim that ‘all art is propaganda’, but actually stands as a part of it. The art that Hitler had in mind was an art filled with all the values and norms of National Socialism but with the condition of being totally natural for the critical eye. The second example is that of George Orwell, corrupt art or this perfectly designed razzmatazz of mere aestheticism stands only as a reminder for Orwell that propaganda, in most cases, sneaks in every work of art or literature and starts to feed from every possible purpose whether political, social or religious, to the extent that it appears flawless for our aesthetic judgments (6).

Among the numerous writers who were labeled as propagandist authors, Aldous Huxley is a significant one. He is the English novelist and philosopher who wrote *Brave New World* in 1931. He begins his novel with a description of a dystopian place that works according to the wishes of a totalitarian government with the help of one of his major characters “the director of Hatcheries and Conditioning”. Reading the first chapters of the story will definitely push the ordinary reader to imagine a world of wonder, a hyper world where human female eggs are fertilized and babies grow in bottles. Huxley made sure to build his novel setting five social classes. Alphas are on the top of the social ladder and Epsilons are in the bottom of it.

In his work, Huxley presents capitalism, totalitarianism, mass media and technology to portray a dystopian world. As Jamie L Callahan confirms:
… the essence of Huxley’s novel is not to praise the new society but to warn of the consequences of many of changes such as technology, medicine, and popular culture. In this brave new world, totalitarianism keeps the world free from disease, hunger, poverty, war and hatred. To maintain this utopian state, a small group of Controllers eliminate most individual freedoms and redefine traditional Western values. For example, marriage is taboo, free sex is required, and pregnancy is forbidden. (2)

Language is an abstract from reality and it has been known that it can play a prominent role in persuading human opinions if it is put in an ideological context. Language and power are key ingredients in the making of Huxley’s *Brave New World*. In this exact work, we can find that it is built upon a set of codes and conventions that are supported greatly by the ideological nature of language (Rodriguez 182). Proverbs are included within these codes and “they being linguistic units correlate closely with their status as items of folkloric language” (Norrick 39). Proverbs have a set of characteristics that make them a useful tool for the type of linguistic manipulation that dystopian literature –like in Huxley’ *Brave New World*– makes use of (Rodriguez 184).

Another significant writer who is known of including propaganda in his literary productions, there is George Orwell or ‘Eric Arthur Blair’. Orwell worked for The Indian Section of the BBC’s Eastern Service and then shifted to become an editor in *The Tribune*—famous daily newspaper in India. Afterwards, He headed for England and earned his living by teaching and writing occasional articles and in the same time writing his first book *Down and Out in London and Paris* In 1929 which was officially published next the name of George Orwell in 1933 (Quinn 10).
Orwell’s major works are known of having a high awareness of social injustice and great opposition to totalitarian governments. In his article “Why I Write”, he tries to explain to the world, the purpose of his writings and what are his life experiences which influenced him to come up with later such impressive literary works. Orwell states that:

I give all this background information because I do not think one can assess a writer’s motives without knowing something of his early development ... The Spanish war and other events in 1936-37 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it. (2-3)

Some of Orwell’s major works —like Animal Farm or most importantly his Nineteen Eighty Four— are regarded as political satires of the Soviet Union. His Animal Farm, for example, was welcomed by the leftists in the West and braced as a photocopy for the Stalinists totalitarian dictatorship (Gottlieb 141). Afterwards, Orwell confirms that he has worked fiercely against any trace of what he calls the ‘Soviet Myth’ and his support of a democratic socialism is always clear in most of his literary achievements. Orwell states in his article “Why I Write” that:

What I have most wanted to do throughout the past ten years is to make political writing into an art. My starting point is always a feeling of partisanship … I do not say to myself, I’m going to produce a work of art… I write it 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. (3)
Orwell came up with his first masterpiece *Animal Farm* in 1943 and was released as an authorized work in 1945. He sets a story where all the characters are portrayed in the shape of animals. The story opens with a meeting organized by a wise old pig called Old Major in which he informs the animals of a dream he had where there is no human control over them. Also, he stresses the inevitability of working in cooperation against humans to reach what he called the ‘paradise’. In this story propaganda is highly clear and spoken through the tongues of his animal characters. It lays in words manipulation of the pig “Squealer” who speaks for another big pig called Napoleon. Using the animals’ stupidity and lack of wisdom, Squealer succeeds in implanting his propaganda and winning their support.

Orwell’s propaganda in *Animal Farm* (1945) is categorized as a huge lamp shedding light on the so called “revolutions” which turn out to be as corrupt and filthy as the meaningless preceding regimes. These Revolutions mount the ladder of power over the shoulders and elbows of their citizens. In *Animal Farm* Orwell aims for making his readers know about his point of view regarding the Russian Revolution.

More importantly, four years later, Orwell wrote his *Nineteen Eighty* four which stands as the case study of this paper. The novel is Orwell’s way of opposition to British imperialism, Stalin’s Communism and World War II. He sets the events of his story in the city of London which situates in the territory of Oceania. Orwell pictures a great oppression provided by Big Brother’s Party upon the people of Oceania. In the mid of this struggle, the characters are exposed to all means of deception and truth manipulation which are fueled by the Party’s propaganda. Orwell in the making of his work made sure to portray the Party as a manipulative force which relies on propaganda to set a continuous feeling of confusion, terror and oppression among the people of Oceania and to prevent them from developing any sense of revolt.
To sum up, Propaganda became a value-laden term since the day people decided to link it to all means of deception and manipulation. In other words, the term’s misuse in many contexts —mainly, that of war— made its meaning wrongfully shifts to express any intention of distorting truths. This was evident when the Cold War broke out between two major fronts in mid 19th century, namely Western Capitalism and Eastern Communism. In this time of an international ideological dispute, Propaganda was highly present to reach all forms of art and literature. Its presence covered some major literary works where authors chose to raise their pens and pick a side in this mere ideological conflict. George Orwell was best known of writing against Totalitarian regimes. In his Work *Nineteen Eighty Four* he made sure to implement some propagandist techniques which were mainly linked to language. Similar techniques had encountered Orwell in his many lifetime experiences. These experiences will be tackled in the next chapter to find out what pushed Orwell to stand against Stalinism and make a satirical literary work out of this opposition.
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Chapter II

A Historical Approach Applied to George Orwell’s

*Nineteen Eighty Four*

*Nineteen Eighty Four* is said to involve many aspects of propaganda. The Big Brother’s Party exploits the authority to reach a full access to all propaganda means for a massive political control. In this extreme misuse of power, the Party takes control over not only how people should behave and speak but also the way they think. In order to reach a better understanding of George Orwell’s adoption of anti-communist propaganda in his work, this chapter focuses intensively on his biography because knowing the surroundings of the author makes it always easier to decode the mysteries and hidden objectives that are first set in his literary works. The experiences that Orwell passed through in his lifetime greatly influenced his own political views.

The chapter deals with Orwell’s personal experiences with British Imperialism, Totalitarianism and Soviet Communism. The best approach to achieve these aims is the Biographical Criticism. One of the essential aims of literary criticism is to enlighten readers understanding of a certain literary text and in turn, work for the improvement of readers understanding of the world. Creative writers have the ability to observe then portray how the world functions around them in ways that many readers at first cannot really understand, but literary critics serve readers by presenting an easy language which helps them to decode the tough meanings in a random text. This exact language usually presents itself in the shape of a literary theory which urges readers to view the literary text from a different perspective.
Historicists who adopt Biographical criticism consider literary works as a reflection of an author’s experiences in a lifetime. They insist on the examination of authors’ political, economical, and sociological contexts during their lives in order to have a better understanding of the works they produced. Frank H. Ellis suggests that biographical criticism is the relation between a written work and the biographical experiences of the writer (971). N. K Denzin and Y. S Lincoln in their edited book *Handbook of Qualitative Research* add:

A family of terms combines to shape the biographical method . . . method, life, self, experience, epiphany, case, autobiography, ethnography, auto-ethnography, biography, ethnography story, discourse, narrative, narrator, fiction, history, personal history, oral history, case history, case study, writing presence, difference, life history, life story, self story, and personal experience story. (27)

In simpler words, Biographical criticism urges for the understanding of the author who is not only the one who sets the genres and conventions in his literary production, but — most importantly — the determiner of meaning in the literary work. Ordinary readers are fascinated with certain works because they prefer the way authors attach their ideas and artistic talents with stories which don’t have to be real. But for critics, they are forced to put the author’s life under the microscope. In this process many questions appear, for instance: “Did anything that happened to the author affect his or her themes or choice of subject matter? What was the author’s worldview? What aspects of this worldview seem prevalent in this story or character? How did people respond to the author’s works and life?” (Roberts 3).
One of the challenges that faced literary critics in older author-centred approaches is the difficulty to access the author’s mind, when it was hard to get meaning out of the words of the text. These texts are set to have not only one meaning but rather a series of challenging meanings. On the other side, the ‘Implied Author’ as Wayne Booth calls in his *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, was a nightmare for critics where the author is characterized or imagined by hints which he deliberately left in the text. Later, this confusion set the difference between the historical writer and the implied writer. After that, it has become easier to build a justification of a text’s meaning in the light of biographical or autobiographical information. This view is built on the principle that the author has a personal set of experiences which we find present in the work. Brian Roberts in his book *Biographical Research* asserts that, authors are regarded as unique individuals who give meanings to their works, meanings which existed before and beyond language. But, one has to keep in mind that biographies like other sorts of information about the author, are considered as texts too, which are also exposed to interpretation (4).

George Orwell or Eric Blair, was born in India on 25th of June 1903, in what was then the Bengal Province of northeastern British India. Perhaps because of his indisposed health, Eric was his mother’s favorite son. At the age of four, he dictated his first poem to his mother Ida Limouzin — who had French origins — without even learning how to write. Ida is said to leave a sense of social discrimination upon her child. She introduced him to the British class system when she told him not to play with certain children who assumingly were not from the Blair’s range (Quinn 3).

At first, it has been said that Orwell’s formal education started by Anglican nuns. However, Biographer Gordon Bowker claims that this is not accurate; it was by French Catholic nuns, “The nuns, members of the Ursiline Order, had opened their school as
exiles after religious education in France had been temporarily outlawed in 1903” (qtd in Quinn, 21). Raising many controversial questions about either this incident played a prominent role for Orwell’s consideration of Catholicism which he really hated for its political retroactivity and quasi-totalitarian orientation. At the age of eight, Orwell was qualified for admission to a private academy. The preliminary component of such schools was vital in that its objective was to make students ready in order to proceed onward at 13 years old or 14 years old to a decent government funded school. Orwell studied in Eton where Aldous Huxley was one of his masters. When the plague hit schools in 1904, the Blair’s family was forced to head back to England leaving the father behind (Quinn 4).

Through Winston, the major character, in *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Orwell deliberately refuses to speak about his tough childhood. So, Winston tries his best to remember the days when there was no Party, no oppression and no thought control but his all efforts are useless. Orwell says in his *Nineteen Eighty Four*:

[Winston] … tried to squeeze out some childhood memory that should tell him whether London had always been quite like this. Were there always these vistas of rotting nineteenth-century houses, their sides shored up with baulks of timber … But it was no use, he could not remember: nothing remained of his childhood except a series of bright-lit tableaux occurring against no background and mostly unintelligible. (6)

Young Orwell’s family found themselves living on a civil servant pension. So, rather than paying 180 pounds a year for his tuition, Orwell’s educational costs got reduced to 90 pounds. This half-scholarship was not uncovered to the kid until he had as of now been at the school for a couple of years, long enough to have persevered
through the embarrassment of considering himself to be one of the poor students at a rich boys’ school. Orwell states In “Why I Write”, Orwell states that “… I barely saw my father before I was eight. For this and other reasons I was somewhat lonely, and I soon developed disagreeable mannerisms which made me unpopular throughout my schooldays” (1).

The exposure of Orwell’s embarrassing status by the headmistress and dean Cecily and Lewis Vaughan Wilkes—who accused him of lack of appreciation—, fueled his rage and hatred for this exact school where he, as a child of eight, was publicly punished in many occasions for chronic bedwetting. It was other children who got him punished because they were the ones to inform the headmistress. Somehow, Orwell depicted the devilish deeds of young boys in his work Nineteen Eighty Four when he portrayed them as the ones who denounce him as a thought criminal. Orwell recounts the events from Mrs Parsons’ house:

‘Up with your hands!’ yelled a savage voice. A handsome, tough-looking boy of nine had popped up from behind the table and was menacing him with a toy automatic pistol, while his small sister, about two years younger, made the same gesture with a fragment of wood. Both of them were dressed in the blue shorts, grey shirts, and red neckerchiefs which were the uniform of the Spies. Winston raised his hands above his head, but with an uneasy feeling, so vicious was the boy’s demeanour, that it was not altogether a game. ‘You’re a traitor!’ yelled the boy. ‘You’re a thought-criminal! You’re a Eurasian spy! I’ll shoot you, I’ll vaporize you, I’ll send you to the salt mines!’ (29)
Later, Orwell revenged for the eight years old boy he used to be by writing his essay “Such, Such Were The Joys,” attacking his English boarding school so fiercely just like he did against the totalitarian world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Quinn 6). George Woodcock clarifies this point saying that:

> Just as Orwell earlier saw the resemblance between the condition of animals and that of oppressed people, so now he saw the resemblance between the child facing the arbitrary rules of an adult world and the bewildered individual locked in the equally arbitrary system of a totalitarian society. (qtd in Quinn 6)

The expected next direction for Orwell was heading to Oxford or Cambridge. However, out of the 16 King’s scholars in his class, he failed to pass on to Oxbridge. Having an average record was not enough to get him a scholarship and his parents—or, as Jacintha Buddicom claims, Orwell’s father—was not financially ready to pay his tuition. Regardless to that, Orwell was shaky about continuing his formal education, perhaps for him; it was the just time to start a new experience. Why not to pursue his childhood dream of becoming a writer (Quinn 7).

In 1922 Orwell headed to Burma as an assistant district superintendent in the Indian Imperial Police. He worked in many country stations and in his earlier stages at this job; he performed the role of a model imperial servant. Sooner he became ashamed of his role as a colonial police officer developing great hatred for imperialism. He disgusted the British imperialism to the extent that he quit his job and decided to rebuild himself, both as a writer and as a defender of the oppressed ("George Orwell"). This was clearly present in *Nineteen Eighty Four* when Orwell created Thought Police to suppress the people of Oceania by command of the Big
Brother’s Party. Winston, the major character always fears them—for their brutality, just as the British imperial police—and tries his best not to come in their path because he knew that in the near future they will capture him. Winston knew that Thought Police are everywhere and his arrest is something inevitable. Orwell recounts in his novel that:

… at one moment Winston’s hatred was not turned against Goldstein at all, but, on the contrary, against Big Brother, the Party, and the Thought Police … He could not help feeling a twinge of panic … he knew that it was useless. Whether he wrote DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER, or whether he refrained from writing it, made no difference … The Thought Police would get him just the same. (19-24)

Orwell thought he could get rid of his guilt of being an agent for British imperial police by putting himself in the mid of miserable life that of the poor and marginalized people of Europe. He wore torn clothes, he went into the East End of London and lived in cheap rent houses with labourers. He also spent a period of time in Paris and worked as a dishwasher in French hotels and restaurants. All these experiences resulted in an aggressive reaction against the British imperialism, coming up with Down and Out in Paris and London (1933), Burmese Days (1934) and two brilliant autobiographical sketches, “A Hanging” (1931) and “Shooting an Elephant” (1936). In his “Why I Write”, Orwell explains how he came up with such writings:

I wanted to write enormous naturalistic novels with unhappy endings [like his Nineteen Eighty Four], full of detailed descriptions and arresting similes, and also full of purple passages in which words were used partly for the sake of their own sound. And in fact my first completed novel,
Burmese Days, which I wrote when I was thirty but projected much earlier, is rather that kind of book. (2)

This is proved in Nineteen Eighty Four when Orwell was excited to write about luxurious life of Party members and how the people of Oceania were restricted to use Oceania’s resources, just as a reflection to his experiences in the mines of north England when he wished that these hard workers had much control and could work together to improve their way of life. Orwell declares in his novel that:

In a world in which everyone worked short hours, had enough to eat, lived in a house with a bathroom and a refrigerator, and possessed a motor-car or even an aeroplane, the most obvious and perhaps the most important form of inequality would already have disappeared. If it once became general, wealth would confer no distinction. It was possible, no doubt, to imagine a society in which WEALTH, in the sense of personal possessions and luxuries, should be evenly distributed, while POWER remained in the hands of a small privileged caste. (240)

Orwell’s hatred for imperialism didn’t only result in his total rejection of the elite way of life but also in a political reorientation too. Martin Tyrrell asserts in his article “The Politics of George Orwell (1903-1950)” that “to Orwell, middle class is a state of mind, not a financial status … a bourgeois will talk up the differences between himself and those who have always been poor while an impoverished patrician family will frequently struggle to maintain a lifestyle it can barely afford” (2). After he got back from Burma Orwell started to label himself as a revolutionary man and continued to do so for many years. But within the 1930s, he saw himself becoming a socialist. Due to
his overwhelming libertarian thoughts, he disregarded all the popular temptations of that time, those of becoming a communist ("George Orwell").

Orwell’s attempts as a socialist writer didn’t shine until his publisher—the left wing socialist Victor Gollancz—boosted him morally and financially to study and then to depict the life of the dejected and unemployed miners in the North of England. That was in 1937 when Orwell came up with his *The Road to Wigan Pier* which accomplished two things. First, it strengthened his reputation for being a sharp pundit of capitalism and second, the book caused a great resonance upon the enormous socialist and communist faithful readers of the ‘Left Book Club’ (which Gollancz headed back then). This period of time can be labeled as the turning point of Orwell’s life which Bernard Crick—his biographer—calls ‘The Crucial Journey’ (Quinn 14).

Orwell’s *The Road to Wigan Pier* was a unique and thumping political treatise. John Rossi and John Rodden in their edited book *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell* say:

*The Road to Wigan Pier* is divided into two distinct parts. The first section is a brilliant piece of reportage on what unemployment did to the working people of the north of England. There are unforgettable portraits of poverty: the tripe shop filled with black beetles in the house where he boarded, his trip down a coal mine, a woman glimpsed from a moving train trying to clear a blocked drain. The second half of *The Road to Wigan Pier* embarrassed Gollancz. Orwell argued that in order to convince the public that socialism was the answer to England’s problems, you first had to analyze why the movement failed to attract a mass following. The answer, he wrote, lies in the flaws of the socialists themselves. They were
isolated from the working classes, and what is worse, looked down their noses at them. Unlike the working classes who Orwell argued possessed a real culture …. (4)

By the time *The Road to Wigan Pier* was in print, Orwell had taken a major step toward socialism. His experiences in Spain during the Civil War helped largely complete the process of becoming an active socialist by adding another measurement to his way of thinking—a complete doubt in communism. Orwell recalls in his “Why I Write”, “the Spanish war and other events in 1936-37 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it” (4).

Most of Orwell’s biographers agree on the point that Spain changed him forever. That tempting pre-thought of walking into a society in which working classes have the final word, and where class discrimination has vanished; sooner, became true when he first put his leg in Spain (“George Orwell”). Orwell expresses his fascination and excitement of heading to Spain in his book *Homage to Catalonia* as follows, “It was the first time I had ever been in a town [, Barcelona, ] where the working class was in the saddle. . . . I recognized it immediately as a state of affairs worth fighting for” (qtd in Quinn 15).

Orwell was, in a way, fascinated by the struggles of workers at that time, the same workers who formed the low class. He hoped that one day they can collaborate to raise the bar and fight for their rights. He made sure not to forget about them in his *Nineteen Eighty Four* and depicted them as Winston calls them “the Proles”. Winston sees them as free human beings because they are mostly ignorant and they are not
smart. They are basically workers, so they just do the work and get happy with it. They are happy and more human in the eyes of Winston just because they do not matter for the Party and they don’t get watched all the time. For Winston Being stupid and hard worker was enough to get him out of his pessimism. Orwell explains in his novel that:

Below Big Brother comes the Inner Party … Below that come the dumb masses whom we habitually refer to as ‘the proles’, numbering perhaps 85 per cent of the population. In the terms of our earlier classification, the proles are the Low: for the slave population of the equatorial lands who pass constantly from conqueror to conqueror, are not a permanent or necessary part of the structure. (263)

Later, Orwell arrived in Barcelona to serve as a journalist for the Independent Labor Party (ILP) and stayed long enough to be an active member in the Republican militia to later become a ‘second lieutenant’. He remained for six months there and by the time he got positioned in the Catalonia front, he became a member of a Trotskyist-anarchist group called POUM (Workers' Party of Marxist Unification). Later, he became invalid for war when he got some major injuries, mostly in his throat which affected his way of talking — that was clear in his speeches (Rodden 5). Tragically, “[The sniper’s] bullet miraculously passing through, perilously close to the carotid artery, without causing permanent damage, although partially paralyzing his vocal chords and his right arm. Eventually, both the voice and the arm regained their near-normal functions” (Quinn17). Despite all that, Orwell left Spain with a big impression he got from his fighting side by side with his fellow Socialists. He was almost sure that true socialism is possible, but the Communists would do anything to shatter any ‘left wing’ forces they could lay hand on (Rodden 5).
Orwell was forced to witness a bitter experience with the Stalinists in Spain, those who betrayed and killed his fellow Anarchists of the POUM. This experience fueled his hatred for Communism and Totalitarian states like Stalinist Russia. Fearghal McGarry in his article “Irish Newspapers and the Spanish Civil War” writes:

Spain has remained a battleground of ideologies. Many supporters of the Spanish Republic attribute its defeat to the failure of other democratic states to oppose fascism, a policy of appeasement which ultimately led to the Second World War; for others on the left, including Orwell, Spain came to symbolise the betrayal of socialism by the Soviet Union - a disillusioning - suppression of liberty repeated in subsequent decades in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere. (68)

In Nineteen Eighty four, Orwell saved no effort for criticizing the totalitarian regimes he encountered during his journey to Spain. Using a political irony, he portrayed all the methods and techniques of domination adopted by Stalin’s Soviet communism. Orwell presents Stalin as the Big Brother and his rival or enemy and Emmanuel Goldstein as Trotsky. Likewise, the events of the story are similar to the political atmosphere implied by Soviet communism where secret militia, torture centers, political trials and propagandist techniques are highly present. Orwell describes how it is like to live in a world like Oceania:

In Oceania there is no law. Thoughts and actions which, when detected, mean certain death are not formally forbidden, and the endless purges, arrests, tortures, imprisonments, and vaporizations are not inflicted as punishment for crimes which have actually been committed, but are
merely the wiping-out of persons who might perhaps commit a crime at some time in the future. (266)

When Orwell went back to England, he showed a large amount of strain in writing his *Coming Up for Air* (1939), in which he utilizes the nostalgic memories of a half aged man to analyze the tolerability of a past England and express his fears around a future undermined by war and fascism. When World War II broke, Orwell by that time was rejected for military service, so, he travelled to work for the Indian service of the British Broadcasting Corporation ‘BBC’ (“George Orwell”).

Orwell spent two years doing some marvelous work with the BBC; it included writing, producing and sometimes reviewing articles of war in order to broadcast them later for the Indian audience. He also worked on several cultural reportages done mostly about famous writers like T. S. Eliot. Within this important period of Orwell’s life, it is said that his work with the BBC had influenced his writing skills. Nevertheless, he acquired a different skill other than reviewing reports, which is writing with a propagandist style. The kind of reports and literary products he came with were subject to wartime censorship and they were assured to put the Allies in the center of the picture; this was the kind of propaganda which Orwell welcomed —for a sense of duty and patriotism— and even practiced in his later works like in *Nineteen Eighty Four* (Quinn 20).

In the same fashion, Winston Smith works at the Records Department of the Ministry of Truth. His job implies playing with statistics, destroying Oceania’s historical records and put instead some falsified documents. This proves the idea of censorship and propaganda which Orwell already witnessed during his time at the BBC. Winston, playing the role of a propagandist, keeps on distorting the records as
he is being conscious of what is he is doing, he knows that this is by far a great sense of censorship in favor of the Big Brother’s Party. Orwell narrates:

Most of the material that you were dealing with had no connexion with anything in the real world … Statistics were just as much a fantasy in their original version as in their rectified version. A great deal of the time you were expected to make them up out of your head. For example, the Ministry of Plenty’s forecast had estimated the output of boots for the quarter at 145 million pairs. The actual output was given as sixty-two millions. Winston, however, in rewriting the forecast, marked the figure down to fifty-seven millions, so as to allow for the usual claim that the quota had been overfulfilled. (52)

Winston, as the plot develops, gets more chances to prove his propagandist skills. He starts working on a story in *The Times* where there is an article which needs removal and replacement. The original story of this article is about an anarchist group called “order of the day” which is considered in the eyes of the Party as an act of praising the revolution. Now comes the turn of Winston when he brings a good alternative for this unwanted story. The made up story is about a disobedient Party member called Ogilvy. This imaginary member is portrayed as a regretful comrade who denounces his relative to the Thought Police after discovering that he is supposedly a thought criminal. In a way to present the love of the Party as everlasting and can never be washed, also to propagate for the loyalty to the Party as being even stronger than blood relations. Orwell continues in describing Winston’s thoughts, “Comrade Ogilvy … died in battle, in heroic circumstances …It was true that there was no such person as Comrade Ogilvy, but a few lines of print and a couple of faked photographs would soon bring him into existence” (59).
Just like he was an agent for British propaganda in the BBC, Orwell made sure to reflect this sentiment in his work *Nineteen Eighty Four*. He supplies a language which embraces several propaganda techniques. As an example, the story which Winston provided above shows a different kind of propaganda, it involves the propagation of truths as bunch of lies which come in the shape of falsified statistics, reports, and historical records. This final product is aimed for the faithful reader of *The Times* who will be bombarded by certain lies which do serve the Party. Yet, the bigger aim is not only the believing of these lies, but also the persuasion of Oceanians political opinions. This is what is known of the propagation of value-judgments.

In November 1943 Orwell decided to leave the BBC to become a literary editor of the *Tribune*, an independent left-wing socialist journal edited and associated with the British Labour leader Aneurin Bevan. At that time Orwell was a productive columnist, composing numerous daily paper articles and surveys, together with genuine feedback, similar to his exemplary expositions on Charles Dickens and a number of books about England, like his *The Lion and the Unicorn* (1941). The large points Orwell covered within these writings showed that the war seemed to mature his sense of socialism. Orwell “argues that the left wing intelligentsia failed to grasp that patriotism was the glue that bound the middle and working classes together and that it could serve as a lever for a people’s revolution” (Rodden 7).

The two years Orwell spent with the BBC have been always regarded as a waste of time for him. However, in those two years, Orwell came up with some decent works for the Indian audience. ‘The Art of Donald McGill’ is the best one of them. In this work Orwell made a great effort in depicting the true nature of English society. In addition, his job at the BBC allowed him to realize some key ideas which would later appear in his novel *Nineteen Eighty Four*. These exact experiences had contributed in
the making of his plot in *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Best examples are noticed in the brilliant carving of the Ministry of Truth, some major elements of Newspeak language and the ghastly cafeteria when the story ends (Rodden 8).

By the end of 1944, Orwell had finished writing his famous novel *Animal Farm*. The story is a brilliant depiction of the Russian Revolution and how it was betrayed by Joseph Stalin. The work was rejected by five publishers in Britain and fourteen in America where publishers mocked Orwell’s novel. Yet, the goal was fulfilled at last, the work started with 4500 copies in 18 different languages reaching even the Soviet province through a smuggled copy in Ukrainian language. This exact work summarizes Orwell’s motives of exposing the totalitarian mistreats which he experienced back in Spain (Quinn 22). Orwell states again, in “Why I Write”, that:

> When one mentions totalitarianism one thinks immediately of Germany, Russia, Italy, but I think one must face the risk that this phenomenon is going to be world-wide … Totalitarianism has abolished freedom of thought to an extent unheard of in any previous age. And it is important to realise that its control of thought is not only negative, but positive. It not only forbids you to express – even to think – certain thoughts, but it dictates what you shall think, it creates an ideology for you, it tries to govern your emotional life as well as setting up a code of conduct. (5)

Between 1947 and 1948, Orwell deeply was frustrated by the death of his wife, decided to isolate himself on the island of Jura in the Hebrides “Northern Scotland”. During this difficult time, he came up with what is called “the novel that killed him” and which his audience knows as *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Orwell was giving a surprise visit to the hospital regularly. Losing battle against his old sickness of tuberculoses, Orwell made the last touches of his novel in bed. Claims arose that the reason the story
is gloomy and surrounded by darkness and pessimism, is for the tough medical status of Orwell during that time. For this reason, Winston appeared as half aged man with a fragile health and coughs regularly. Orwell gives a detailed description for Winston in his story, “Winston wrenched his body out of bed—naked … [then] The Physical Jerks would begin in three minutes. The next moment he was doubled up by a violent coughing fit which nearly always attacked him soon after waking up” (4).

In this fair analysis, this paper by now must have clarified several points concerning the causes and lifetime experiences which led George Orwell to adopt a propagandist style in his Nineteen Eighty Four. Biographical criticism supplied a sufficient analysis for why Orwell embraced such great hatred for British imperialism first, then for totalitarian regimes like Soviet communism. His days in Spain and his direct involvement in the Spanish civil war shaped his moral and political views towards Stalin who tried to maintain an ideological control over his people using torture and other aggressive ways. We find that these psychological experiments are present in Orwell’s novel as they fuel one of the major themes in this exact work which indicates power abuse at its best. The resemblance of this act of power abuse by Big Brother’s Party will be seen closely in the next chapter which will include a Marxist study to the ideological power in the story along with a linguistic study for the propagandist language that Orwell brings in his novel.
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Chapter III

The Orwellian Language and Propaganda

The broad view which has been presented in the first and second chapter — mentioning propaganda traces in both contexts, that of war, of art and literature and Orwell’s lifetime experiences with propaganda — delivers a great assistance in grasping the theoretical essence of propaganda. The next chapter serves as a zooming lens to propaganda in practice, more like an analysis to language, power and ideology. In this essential part, there will be much concentration on how these three serve propaganda and fuel ruler/ruled conflicts. Moreover, this chapter will investigate how ideology — like that of Big Brother — can bring maintain thought control over the helpless citizens — like people of Oceania. This is one of the main themes which are brought by George Orwell in his Nineteen Eighty-Four. This exact theme will be testified according to the Marxist criticism and to The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis which is known as ‘Linguistic Determinism’.

Orwell, who is known of his anti-totalitarian views, came out with some writings where he expresses his total rejection to systems which braced Communism and fascism, systems which, according to him, were corrupt and oppressive. This aggressive criticism is best seen in some of his works like Animal Farm and most importantly Nineteen Eighty-Four. Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four was published in 1949, just when the Cold War was warming up. Many like to suggest that this exact work is a standard for what is to be the best example of the Stalinist era, depicting the helpless versus the tyrant who performs assaults against the truth and the free will of individuals.
The story takes place in London in the nation of Oceania where a random worker called Winston works for the Party. Being the major character of the story, Winston never misses a chance to speak about how he’s being oppressed and watched all the time by the Party through monitors and telescreens. Wherever he walks, a watching figure comes in front of him, presented as the Party omniscient leader “The Big Brother”. Falling in the hands of the rigid control of Big Brother and his Party fellows, Oceania drives Winston to adopt great hatred for The Party. The Absence of free will, sex and individuality all contribute in explaining Winston’s bizarre behavior of revolt and rejection. Eventually, Winston’s building of criminal ideas in his head pushes him to break the rules and purchase a diary in which he can express his anger and frustration freely knowing that bracing such ideas is a serious crime in Oceania.

Winston becomes a careful observer and starts to give much attention to another character called O’Brien. Winston believes that this last can be stitched secretly to the Brotherhood (the famous organization in opposition to the Party). However, at the end of the story, he comes out as a spy for the Party. In the same process, Winston lays his eyes on a beautiful girl with a dark hair who works in the “Ministry of Truth” the same place where he works. However, at first, his paranoid behavior drives him to conclude that she might be working in favor of the Party against him. As the story keeps progressing and as Winston starts a love affair with Julia, their fortunes change sadly just when the story is about to end. Under the roofs of Mr. Charrington (the shopkeeper), soldiers of Thought Police break in and separate the couple, then they are both taken to the Ministry of Love where Winston eventually crashes out and fails to resist O’Brien’s torturing techniques. O’Brien reaches Winston’s weakness point so that at this stage, Winston accepts to give Julia up and buy out his freedom by having his heart filled with love to The Big Brother only.
In view of the several propagandist traces which Orwell’s work involves, this last will be testified according to the Marxist criticism. But, one must keep in mind that whenever there is an attempt to analyze propaganda in a socio-political context, there must be also an analysis to the ideologies of the ones who are in charge, those who hold the ropes of the puppet and those who can leave an impact on public opinion (Douglas 384).

In His Nineteen Eighty-Four, Orwell turns towards the issue of power abuse within Socialist regimes and presents it as an aggressive political satire. He fears the emergence of a new elite which will cross the limits to secure its place by any possible mean. Keeping track of the Marxist thinking also requires speaking about “ideology” and “false consciousness”. Anyone may regard ideology as the set of background ideas or principles that one can develop and practice at the same time.

Ideology can be seen in the way one behaves according to his own beliefs or what his mind implies to him, in parallel with the way the world must function and how people must function within it. Marx Dobie Ann in her Theory Into Practice suggests that:

An ideology can be positive, leading to a better world for the people, or it can be negative serving the interests of a repressive system. The latter rarely presents itself as an Ideology, however. Instead, it appears to be a reasonable, natural worldview, because it is in the self-interest of those in power to convince people that it is so. Even a flawed system must appear to be a success. (86)

The dominant or the powerful dictates the favorable ideology that serves best his interests. This means that people are expected to accept a system which is originally
unfavorable for them. This system presents itself as the reasonable way for things to be, and at this stage people will develop what is called “false consciousness”; it is the Marxist’s duty to unmask these ideological fragilities of a tyrant system (Dobie 86).

Ben Grono claims that George Orwell has always believed that the boundaries of language are almost the same boundaries of thought. He has always been aware of the significant role of language in human society. Mysterious and coded language can easily corrupt public language and eventually can make it hard for the people to come out with strong arguments or explanations for the way things are carried to them (55).

Anton Pelinka also tries to spot the relationship between language, politics and ideology as it is quoted in Ruth Wodak’s “Language and Ideology”:

… Language reflects power structures — and language has an impact on power structures. … and [it] can also be seen as a driving force directed at changing politics and society. Language is an in-put as well as an out-put factor of political systems: It influences politics — and is influenced by politics…. Language can be an instrument for or against enlightenment, for or against emancipation, for or against democracy, for or against human rights. Language can be used by totalitarian regimes and it can be used as a mean of resistance against these regimes (qtd. in Wodak 1).

In Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, language and ideology work in parallel for the discouragement of rebellion and the stimulation of control. The Doublethink and Newspeak are two fashions of thought manipulation. Doublethink is the ability to have two contradictory ideas in one’s head, and to be convinced that they are both authentic. It is a psychological technique that justifies people’s willingness to welcome a control over the flow of memories and ideas in their heads, or as Wendy Hassler-Forest
dictates, “[it] stems from the assumption that all that the Party says is true, even if the Party contradicts itself. This means that when such a contradiction becomes apparent, one of two “truths” must momentarily be forgotten” (8). In the novel, Orwell explains it through Winston as:

To know and to not know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy is impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy. To forget, whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again, and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself (35).

In addition, there are many examples in the story in which we can trace how Doublethink is implanted within the Oceanian community, since it is a crucial element for the Party to take control over people. The most obvious example is how the names of ministries collide with their purpose of existence. There is The Ministry of Peace whose it’s only function is to declare war. The Ministry of Love which handles punishments and torture operations over those who stand against Big Brother’s Party and there is The Ministry of Plenty which keeps an eye on the shortage of life means supplies. Next, there is The Ministry of Truth which distorts the facts about Oceanian history, the place where Winston and Julia work. These two major characters can easily lay hands on historical documents. For example, Winston finds out that the war between Oceania and Eurasia is made up just to convince the people that they are
always at a state of war and in peace at the same time, this incident drives Winston to question a lot of things about the credibility of the Party.

Another example of Doublethink is when Winston is dragged to the Ministry of Love to be tortured after getting caught by the Police of Thought with Julia. He sits in his cell thinking continuously about what O’Brien had said to him previously in some sort of a flashback. Without delay, Winston resists the fact that O’Brien can float or fly but the idea of using Doublethink — just to convince himself that what is happening is real — becomes tempting for him because it makes everything true but also not true:

Anything could be true. The so-called laws of Nature were nonsense. The law of gravity was nonsense. ‘If I wished,’ O’Brien had said, ‘I could float off this floor like a soap bubble.’ Winston worked it out. ‘If he THINKS he floats off the floor, and if I simultaneously THINK I see him do it, then the thing happens.’ Suddenly, like a lump of submerged wreckage breaking the surface of water, the thought burst into his mind: ‘It doesn’t really happen. We imagine it. It is hallucination’ (Orwell 350).

It is obvious that there is great contradiction in setting up such slogans as Freedom is Slavery”, “War is Peace” and “Ignorance is Strength”. Because people of Oceania in the first place, can no longer maintain a control over their mental senses; they cannot distinguish what is accurate and what is falsified. The Party’s insistence of using Doublethink to corrupt people’s minds makes it clear for any reader that there is a tremendous urge for achieving the ultimate power and control by any possible means. As Orwell states in his novel, “If one is to rule, and to continue ruling, one must be able to dislocate the sense of reality. For the secret of rulership is to combine a belief in one’s own infallibility with the Power to learn from past mistakes” (271).
The Big Lie theory is also present in Nineteen Eighty-Four, and it greatly boosts the notion of Orwell’s Doublethink. According to this theory if one wrong is reverberated many times then people will accept that wrong as right” (“The Big Lie”). It is a technique which is deeply soaked in the propaganda, it encourages “colossal untruths” without denying the fact that “[people also] could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously” (Hitler 196). In the novel, Orwell points to the Big Lie theory in many occasions; especially when he states that:

The key-word here is BLACKWHITE. Like so many Newspeak words, this word has two mutually contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent, it means the habit of impudently claiming that black is white, in contradiction of the plain facts. Applied to a Party member, it means a loyal willingness to say that black is white when Party discipline demands this. But it means also the ability to BELIEVE that black is white, and more, to KNOW that black is white, and to forget that one has ever believed the contrary. This demands a continuous alteration of the past, made possible by the system of thought which really embraces all the rest, and which is known in Newspeak as DOUBLETHINK (268).

Orwell’s Newspeak, on the other hand, represents the language of Oceania. It takes the process of thought manipulation one step further, as he claims that “if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought” (137). Carving out Newspeak, Orwell aimed for showing the reader that any random abuse of language either by government or by media can result in some serious issues like achieving — what Marxists know as — “false consciousness”, people will unquestioningly be familiarized with their government’s falsified truth and will mindlessly accept its propaganda as some sort of common reality (52).
In the novel, Newspeak’s grammar is divided into three different groups of vocabulary words. The A vocabulary is meant only to express simple, advantageous thoughts, mainly involving specific objects or physical actions. It contains everyday words and phrases, “… for such things as eating, drinking, working …” (378) and so on. The B vocabulary "consisted of words which had been deliberately constructed for political purposes; words [of ideological significance] , that is to say, which not only had in every case a political implication, but were intended to impose a desirable mental attitude upon the person using them” (Nutting 131). For example, “goodthink” which has almost the same meaning as “orthodoxy, alongside with series of compound words like “Thought Police,” for instance, is squeezed into “thinkpol”; “the Ministry of Love” becomes “miniluv.” For The C Vocabulary, it includes words that mainly have a link to science and to technical domains and disciplines. It is created to guarantee that technical knowledge stays fragmented among many fields, so that no one can have access to too much knowledge (SparkNotes Editors).

From a linguistic standpoint, we can say that dystopian literatures, like George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, often provide an extra clarification for how culture or society molds a certain language and how this culture/society is effected by the language it has produced. So the relationship between a society and its language goes both ways. This strong nexus of “language/society” greatly explains the principles of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (named after the American linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf). Some of these principles claim that certain proprieties of a given language have consequences for patterns of thought about a certain reality, meaning that language embodies an interpretation of reality and language can influence thought about that reality (Jhon A Lucy 294).
Linguistic determinism as Helen De Cruz defines is a set of cognitive processes and thoughts that have a causal association with the structure of a language. This structure does not only affect our way of thinking about the world; it actually shapes and determines how we think about the world (327). Also, we find that “Speakers’ thoughts and perceptions are determined or conditioned by the categories that their language makes available to them”, regardless to the nature of this language, either they welcome it or not, they are exposed to “an odd conception of bilingualism: namely, that bilinguals [can] operate with two quite different world-views, switching from one to another as they switched language” (Armstrong 16). Phillip Wolff and Kevin J. Holmes also try to explain more linguistic determinism:

In linguistic determinism, the shaping role of language is held to be so strong that it can even overwrite preexisting perceptual and conceptual capabilities … Whorf argued for what has come to be known as linguistic determinism, the view that language determines the basic categories of thought and that, as a consequence, speakers of different languages think differently. (254)

The language brought by Orwell in his Nineteen Eighty four resembles in a way the language which we find today in many political contexts. The well chosen lexicology that politicians provide to their supporters make anyone fall into being affected by it. Like for instance when the elections arrive, candidates choose carefully the words which they feel can make people believe them. This process can go further just when individuals start using words from this language to express their minds. This impact is quite illustrated and explained through the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and linguistic determinism. It reinforces the idea that there is always a room for deception and thought manipulation which ‘symbolized language’ can always provide.
In the case of George Orwell’s dystopian *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, we find that Newspeak language stands as a good example of linguistic determinism, a language which is carved to control the minds of people of Oceania. We notice that a part of the Party’s concern was given to language and its “efficiency”, but in fact the whole process was set to eliminate some significant words which can make it easy for people to launch a rebellion against the Party. This is one attempt out of many which Orwell sets to drag his characters into adjusting to a certain culture through language. This language involves a short list of abbreviations, signs and stitched words derived from the Standard English language.

Lexis of Newspeak is derived from the English language but for any random reader it feels like it is nothing more than a sterile language which gives no room for aesthetic flexibility or showing a creative sense of thinking. Syme—Winston’s friend—who is a philologist and a specialist in Newspeak states “Don’t you see the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it” (Orwell 55). In simpler terms, if someone cannot find a word to express a thought, a concept or even a certain emotion then simply what he is aiming to utter—regardless to what language he is using—does not exist. As an illustration, if any random individual from the Ocaenian community—for example Winston—seeks freedom but in his culture there is no such word which embraces the meaning of liberty, then he happens to confirm the theory of linguistic determinism i.e. Language has made him incapable of imagining himself as a free man. Thus, it has affected the way he regards the concept of freedom, in this case, it doesn’t exist or maybe Winston simply is not worth of it.
Living in an idealistic world free from thoughtcrime as being claimed by Party members, Winston feels the inevitability of questioning the reason behind the prohibition of using his thought to understand the world. Later in the story, He purchases a diary from Mr. Charrington’s shop and challenges the Doublethink ideology set by the Big Brother’s Party by filling his diary with all the questions and conclusions he wishes. As a matter of fact, this incident is similar to the one which encounters officer Leo Demidov in the movie “Child 44”. The story is about an officer from Stalin’s dystopian Soviet Russia. Demidov is portrayed as the perfect officer who obeys his masters and applies Stalinists rules and concepts literally. Suddenly, he initiates a series of investigations about child murders in a country where this sort of crime doesn’t exist, and this is claimed by almost all characters of this story who keep reciting an expression which was carved by Stalin himself “there is no murder in paradise” — just like in Nineteen Eighty Four where there is no word expresses freedom or liberty. Anyone who says or even imagines the opposite gets hanged to the extent that the father of one of the murdered children cannot admit the fact that his boy was killed because he grew believing in the previous expression. Later, officer Demidov along with his wife get charged for treason only for believing that there is a serial killer in the streets. Finally, he gets demoted and exiled but decides, with just the help of his wife, to continue pursuing the case and rescinding the famous expression “there is no murder in paradise”.

Both examples justify the notion of thought manipulation through language, which is reinforced by the theory of linguistic determinism. Hence, “The language people speak helps determining the very way they think about their physical and social world” (Gumperz & Levinson 234). Aspects of this language or Newspeak in our case will only allow thoughts that correspond to the culture to be posed by oppressive
regimes like Big Brother’s Party who made sure to disengage people’s minds from any sort of liberty and free thinking.

Regardless to its deterministic qualities, Orwell, in his making of Newspeak, relied on Standard English language. It came up in the shape of simplified and short English, more similar to another version of English language called “Basic English” which was brought by C.K Ogden. Newspeak and Basic English are two versions which have many common features, most importantly their ability to control the mind subliminally through their abstract vocabulary i.e. their broad and simple terminology. As an example, words like ‘should/shall’ are taken away for their so called dangerous ability of giving speakers much freedom to express their minds (Fink 38).

Syme a less important character in the novel—who works in The Research Department and who is also portrayed as an orthodox man—gives his feedback to Winston’s articles in ‘The Times’ journal and explains in the same time how Newspeak language is set up in his department. He suggests that there is no need to enlarge the number of words by adding other sophisticated words which carry many complex aesthetic meanings:

It's a beautiful thing, the Destruction of words. Of course the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives, but there are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. It isn't only the synonyms; there are also the antonyms. After all, what justification is there for a word, which is simply the opposite of some other word? A word contains its opposite in itself. Take ‘good,’ for instance. If you have a word like ‘good,’ what need is there for a word like ‘bad’? ‘Ungood’ will do just as well — better, because it's an exact opposite, which the other is not. Or again, if you want a stronger
version of ‘good,’ what sense is there in having a whole string of vague useless words like ‘excellent’ and ‘splendid’ and all the rest of them? ‘Plusgood’ covers the meaning or ‘doubleplusgood’ if you want something stronger still. Of course we use those forms already, but in the final version of Newspeak. (66)

Being the primary source of Newspeak in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Ogden’s Basic English has drew attention to the fact that Orwell may had an intent of mocking Standard English in the shape of parody. As he expresses in his article “Why I Write”, “I have not written a novel for seven years, but 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.”(5) Orwell here refers to his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* which was destined to appear as a mockery to Ogden’s Basic English and even the Standard English. The simplifications which were brought by the linguist Ogden appears sarcastic within Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but these simplifications always give the impression of cognitive enslavement, a major feature of linguistic determinism theory. Steven Blakemore in his “Language & Ideology in Orwell’s 1984” supports this idea:

… [Orwell’s] ultimate goal is to destroy language itself, and this is implicit in "the Principles of Newspeak" which he adds as an appendix to the novel. Newspeak provides a "world view," but it makes all other world views impossible because reality is only grounded in the Party's semantic vocabulary. Hence the citizens of Oceania cannot think in any terms other than what the Party invents or legitimizes. (355)
Orwell’s fascination with Ogden’s Basic English resulted in three categories of vocabulary — together they form The Appendix — named respectively as A, B and C vocabulary as explained above. Orwell tells how a totalitarian regime like the Big Brother’s Party suppresses people of Ocenania by making a major manipulation in their vocabulary. This modification appears in the shape of reduction and even elimination of certain concepts. Hence, words like terrible, abhorrent, and evil are replaced by one single expression: double-plus-ungood. This modification in the largeness of English vocabulary clarifies two major points. First, it contributes greatly in explaining the notion of linguistic determinism in the novel, and second it confirms the aggressive criticism which Orwell had for Standard English. In his famous essay “Politics and The English Language” Orwell lists some of the weaknesses of English language saying that:

Most people … would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot … do anything about it … The first [weakness] is staleness of imagery; the other is lack of precision. The writer either has a meaning and cannot express it, or he inadvertently says something else, or he is almost indifferent as to whether his words mean anything or not. This mixture of vagueness and sheer incompetence is the most marked characteristic of modern English prose ... I list below … various of the tricks by means of which the work of prose-construction is habitually dodged: DYING METAPHORS … OPERATORS OR VERBAL FALSE LIMBS … PRETENTIOUS DICTION … MEANINGLESS WORDS …. (Orwell 3)

George Orwell starts his criticism by citing the distinction between ‘fesh and dead metaphors’. He argues that old metaphors are overused, tasteless and barely
capable of turning reader’s imagination. He adds that most writers misuse these metaphors and they tend to put them in contexts which do not reflect their real meanings. Second, Orwell gives his remark for phrases which adds unnecessary words or information to make longer sentences with extra syllables. This provides an appearance of symmetry and phrases that are put in place of simple verbs or single nouns, for instance expressions like: militate against / make contact with / have the effect of … etc. Third, he talks about “pretentious diction” which are words used to “dress-up” simple statements, giving the impression of a great deal of knowledge or scientific impartiality instead of the biased judgment, these words are similar to: phenomenon, element, individual, objective, categorical, effective … etc. Fourth, Orwell expresses his frustration with “meaningless words” or words that do not “point to any discoverable object”. He cites words like romantic, values, democracy, socialism, freedom … etc. The use of such meaningless words allow literary and political critiques and writers to misuse them and wrongfully interpret them due to their variability of meaning.

While taking a good look at Newspeak language in Nineteen Eighty-Four one can find that ‘meaningless words or dying metaphors’ do not take apart in the A and C vocabulary.. For instance in A vocabulary there are only specific words which refer to advantageous thoughts and everyday actions, “but in comparison with the present-day English vocabulary their number was extremely small, while their meanings were far more rigidly defined” (Orwell 378). Then, in C vocabulary we find a certain terminology which is mainly linked to science and other disciplines. However, in the B vocabulary we can trace some cases where dying metaphors and meaningless words are present. Words like (blackwhite, Ingsoc, bellyfeel …etc). As Ed George explains:
words which Orwell judged meaningless in ‘Politics and the English Language’ as democracy, justice, and science, while freedom and equality, to which Orwell similarly objected, are purged of all political and intellectual senses. In Newspeak the terms of everyday life are deprived of all ‘ambiguities and shades of meaning’ so that they cannot be used ‘for literary purposes or for political or philosophical discussions’. (11)

Due to their supposed manipulative impact, metaphors were appreciated by Orwell in the making of his novel. Orwell’s use of metaphors showed a great skill in setting a style which enhances the general meaning or “themes” of his Nineteen Eighty Four. For instance there is the theme of ‘dehumanization’ or depersonalization of the Party which means as a concept, “[the] Rhetorical practices that metaphorically liken human beings to nonhuman animals or inanimate objects” (Bar-Tal, Graumann and Strobe 172). This theme is boosted using a set of metaphors which we can find in three representations of the Party through the voice from the telescreen. First examples is, “Inside the flat a fruity voice was reading out a list of figures … The voice came from an oblong metal plaque like a dulled mirror … The instrument (the telescreen, it was called) could be dimmed, but there was no way of shutting it off completely (4). The second example is, “Behind Winston’s back the voice from the telescreen was still babbling away about pig-iron and the overfulfilment of the Ninth Three-Year Plan (5). The final example is, “the voice continued inexorably … In a lucid moment Winston found that he was shouting with the others” (19).

These representations of an absent and unconscious voice which speaks continuously through the ‘telescreen’ contributes greatly in the realization of two major points. The first point is the impersonality of the Party and the second point is
the total surveillance of people of Oceania. In the world where Winston is living, everyone is being watched and addressed directly, like what happened with Winston, “‘Smith!’ screamed the shrewish voice from the telescreen. ‘6079 Smith W.! Yes, YOU! Bend lower, please! You can do better than that. You’re not trying. Lower, please! THAT’S better, comrade. Now stand at ease, the whole squad, and watch me’” (46). In Oceania everyone is being forced to listen to the loud repeated voices coming from the telescreens which reinforce the Party’s propaganda and thought control. As it is illustrated above, this control is practiced through a series of commands and loud voices which intrude on people’s lives.

As has been noted, Orwell showed a great cleverness in the making of his deterministic language. Many political words which we find in Orwell’s Newspeak language and precisely in the B vocabulary are set according to a metaphorical basis. There are some good examples of that like the word bellyfeel—which means the acceptance of an idea by trusting your guts—, blackwhite—which means to believe black is white then to forget that black is white when you are asked to—or the word ‘prolefeed”— “…meaning the rubbishy entertainment and spurious news which the Party handed out to the masses” (Orwell 385).

Taking the word prolefeed for instance, we find that it describes the intended and superficial literature, music or cinematography that was manufactured to distract provincial ‘proles’ from their exhausting lives. But, if one attempts to decode the word ‘prolefeed’ into ‘food for proles’ he will find that the provided product (the Party’s pornography as an example) accepts the process of “consumption” which is accurate in literal English and equals the process of “absorbance”. This point matches one of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s in their work Metaphors We Live By. They claim that “Ideas are Food” i.e. available for mental consumption. In the same token, they
suggest some other examples which we often encounter in literary works, like: “That's food for thought … What he said left a bad taste in my mouth … Now there's a theory you can really sink your teeth into … We don't need to spoon-feed our students …” (47).

Lakoff and Johnson also claim that metaphors in a way or another do contribute in the structure of our everyday experiences and that this structure is reflected in our culture. This result is presented as cultural metaphors which “are propagated by ritual” (142). Therefore, the modification done by eliminating a single word from the standard form of the metaphor —usually two words or more — which Orwell practices in his novel Nineteen Eighty Four fulfills the theory of linguistic determinism. This means that, any trace of vocabulary reduction automatically refers to an attempt of thought control.

After all, we can say that, if by any chance people--- like Winston and his Oceanian fellows--- were exposed to a language which has been set according to the desires of those who brought it — like the Big Brother—, these people are expected to be ideologically manipulated and they are likely to fall in what is known by false consciousness. The techniques which are used by Orwell to portray truth distortion in his work — namely Doublethink and Newspeak— are not only perfect examples of a totalitarian practice, but also great linguistic instruments which indicate that the slightest change in a certain lexicology —either by adding, eliminating or bringing new words— can be referred to as an attempt of thought control.
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General Conclusions

During the mid 90’s, there was a new urge of power possession from the countries which had just flicked the dust of World War Two over their guns. The attacks going both ways between Capitalist and Communist nations caused the emergence of new thinkers and writers which chose their pens to be their weapons. Some of these writers chose to write about the maltreatments of the Communist regime against the people, they also made sure to put the techniques of total control which were used by the Communists in the spotlight. George Orwell in his *Nineteen Eighty Four* succeeds to make his readers adopt his anti-communist point of view by setting up a figurative language that portrays how propaganda fuels power control in a similar world to that of the Soviet Union.

The use of propaganda in satirical literature like in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty Four* proves its high impact on the audience. Even though propaganda is attached to all means of deception and truth falsification, it is said to play a prominent role, in humanities particularly. Its presence in art and literature in many occasions is a sign of its serious ability to shape people’s identities. It has been a valuable weapon in the struggle between capitalist and communist nations where it has served not only as a tool of information but also as a tool of ideological fight.

In the process of scrutinizing the presence of anti-totalitarian propaganda in George Orwell’s novel, it becomes clear that the reason to come up with such satirical work is due to major incidents which encountered Orwell in his life. Starting from his first education to later stages where he’s being at the college then after in his job as an imperial policeman for the British Bureau, to finally ending up fighting for Socialists
in Spain, all contributed in his hatred to all what Communism represents. Noticeably, he has mastered the implementation of every major experience he had in his novel *Nineteen Eighty Four*, likewise, the job he had at the BBC in India justifies why he made his major character Winston work as a propagandist reviewer for the Big Brother’s Party. So, the biographical analysis of this work offered a decent explanation for what led Orwell to build his story in the same fashion of some major parts of his life.

Furthermore, the language which was brought by Orwell in his *Nineteen Eighty Four* corresponds to the idea that a certain arrangement of words do contribute in the ideological control which the oppressor practices. The thought manipulation which propaganda provides through words, fuels the spread of a corrupt ideology and this brings people who are exposed to this lexicology to fall in what Marxists call “false consciousness”. By the end of the story, Winston confirms the idea which implies that when thought or ‘ideology’ corrupts language, language can also corrupt the thought. At last, he submits to the Big Brother’s Doublethink and praises the Party with the help of O’Brien torture techniques.

The obsession with Standard English made Orwell deliberately misuse it for the sake of showing the brilliant techniques of Doublethink enforcement. This idea matches the theory of Linguistic determinism which suggests that any change in the structure of a certain language is regarded as an attempt of thought manipulation. As a matter of fact, most of the words we find in Newspeak language are perfectly selected to indicate a massive ideological control which the Party aims to impose on the people of Oceania. A big number of these words are metaphors. These metaphors are simplified to the basic form; this new category makes it hard for people of Oceania to
express themselves freely. This restriction of thinking confirms the theory of Linguistic Determinism.

Given these points, it must be stated that this exact work of George Orwell has to be, by now, a rich source to any later attempt of using propaganda in any artistic material. The reader of this novel will understand that Orwell was on a mission to expose Communism and to contribute in the prevention of its spread. He states in his *Nineteen Eighty Four* that “The object of terrorism is terrorism. The object of oppression is oppression. The object of torture is torture. The object of murder is murder. The object of power is power. Now do you begin to understand me?” He seeks no love from his audience but only to understand that what is coming in the future might bring horror to their front doors i.e. wars that can leave people poor and frightened. Orwell also predicts an age when surveillance and technological control will be practiced extensively. This is near to be true because many people in UK or USA are claiming to be watched over their smart cell-phones or as Orwell calls in his novel “telescreens”.
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