



SUDAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY



College of Graduate Studies

College of Languages

Department of English Language

**Portrayal of Political Allegory and Characterization in George
Orwell's Novels Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty Four**

عرض الرمزية السياسية والشخصيات في روايتي جورج أرويل مزرعة الحيوان
وأربعة وثمانون وتسعمائة وألف

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD in English Literature

Submitted By

Amir Mohammed Albloly

Supervised By

Dr. Hala Salih Mohammed Nur

February (2020)

Dedication

To the soul of my father may Allah Almighty bless him.

To my beloved mother

To my wife, and my daughter Sijud.

Acknowledgment

I owe a special gratitude to my supervisor, **Professor Hala Salih Mohammed Nur**, for guiding me through the study. She provided insightful guidance and support based on her academic intelligence and experience.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to portray the political **Allegory** and **Characterization** in George Orwell's novels "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" using the critical analytic method. By relying on some selected texts in collecting the data and previous studies as secondary resources written on both novels, the study revealed that "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" novels have a timeless feature that is still corresponding to real scenarios occurring in different parts of the world. The most obvious qualities of Orwell's novels are that they can be full of timeless characters for the past and future readers as they unveil all sorts of corruption and tyranny masked by different political regimes that ruled their people with an iron fist. Furthermore, Orwell's novels disclosed the truth of revolutions on how they begin with the slogan of reforms and how they finally go astray of achieving the goals that the revolutionists sacrificed for. Finally, the study recommends that further studies must be conducted to explore the artistic values of Orwell's novels such as the theme of colonization and racial discrimination, empathy with animals, the figurative language, the rhetorical images, and the esthetic contents.

مستخلص البحث

"مزرعة:تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى عرض القصة الرمزية السياسية والشخصيات في روايتي الحيوان" و"أربعة وثمانون وتسعمائة وألف" للكاتب جورج أورويل مستخدمًا في ذلك المنهج في جمع البيانات والدراسات السابقة بعض النصوص المختارة التحليلي النقدي. وبالاعتماد على روايتنا "مزرعة الحيوان" و"أربعة كمصادر ثانوية كتبت عن كلا الروائيتين, أظهرت الدراسة أن وثمانون وتسعمائة وألف" تتميزان بميزة خالدة لا تزال متوافقة مع بعض السيناريوهات الحقيقية والتي إن أكثر المزايا وضوحًا في روايات أورويل هي أنها حبلت بتحدث في أجزاء مختلفة من العالم بالسماة الخالدة لقراء الماضي والمستقبل لأنها تميظ اللثام عن كل أنواع الفساد والاستبداد المقنع من قبل الأنظمة السياسية المختلفة التي تحكم شعوبها بقبضة حديدية. علاوة على ذلك، كشفت روايات أورويل عن حقيقة الثورات كيف تبدأ بشعار الإصلاحات وكيف تضل طريقها أخيرًا عن تحقيق الأهداف التي ضحى من أجلها الثوريين. أخيرًا، توصي الدراسة بإجراء مزيد من الدراسات لاستكشاف القيم الفنية لروايات أورويل مثل موضوع الاستعمار والتميز العنصري، والتعاطف مع الحيوانات، واللغة التصويرية، والصور البلاغية، والمحتوى الجمالي.

List of Contents

Dedication	i
Acknowledgment.....	ii

Abstract.....	iii
Abstract (Arabic Version)	iv
List of Contents	v
Chapter One:	Introduction
1.0 Overview.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	7
1.3 Objectives of the Study	7
1.4 Questions of the Study	8
1.5 Hypotheses of the Study	8
1.6 Significance of the Study	8
1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	9
1.7 Tentative Chapters Scheme	9
Chapter Two:	Theoretical Framework & Previous Studies
2.0 Introduction	2
2.1 Theoretical Framework	2
2.1.1 Introduction	2
2.1.2 Definitions of Political Novel	5
2.1.3 Historical Development	9
2.1.3.1 Pre-modernism	9
2.1.3.2 The Modernism	11
2.1.3.3 Overview of Modernism Literature	13
2.1.3.4 Modern And Contemporary Writers	16
2.1.3.5 Post-modernism	18
2.4 George Orwell And The Views of Critics	13

2.5 The Marxist Literary Theory	11
2.6 Review of Previous Studies.....	13
CHAPTER THREE: Methodology	
3.0 Introduction	14
3.1 Methodology of the Study.....	14
3.2 Techniques of Data Collection.....	14
CHAPTER FOUR: Political Allegory in “Animal Farm” and “Nineteen Eighty-Four	
4.0 Introduction.....	16
4.1 Panorama of Animal Farm & Nineteen Eighty-Four.....	16
4.2 Allegoric Views in Animal Farm & Nineteen Eighty-Four	11
4.3 Chief Political Allegory in Animal Farm & Nineteen Eighty-Four.....	14
4.3.1 The 7 th Commandments	14
4.3.2 Song of Beats of England	10
4.3.3 Room 101	12
4.3.4 Big Brother	13
4.3.5 Slogans of The Party	14
4.3.6 The Glass Paperweight and St. Clement’s Church	15
4.3.7 The Place Where There Is No Darkness.....	16
4.3.8 The Telescreens	16
4.3.9 The Red-Armed Prole Woman	17
4.4 Methods of the Party.....	17
4.5 Lack of Privacy	18
4.6 Power of Words	19

CHAPTER FIVE: Political Characterization of "Animal Farm" and "Nineteen Eighty-Four"

5.0 Introduction01
5.1 Animal Farm's Characterization01
5.2 Animals Characterization04
5.2.1 Humans Are Animals05
5.2.2 Leaders Are Pigs06
5.2.3 Names Are Identities07
5.3 Nineteen Eighty-Four Characterization08
5.3.1 Big Brother	110
5.3.2 Child Hero	112
5.3.3 Proles.....	113
5.3.4 Winston Smith	115
5.3.5 Julia.....	118
5.3.6 O'Brien	121
5.3.7 Tomas Parsons	23
5.3.8 Mrs. Parsons	24
5.3.9 Tillotson	24
5.3.10 Ampleforth	24
5.3.11 Syme	25
5.3.12 Katharine	25
5.3.13 Mr. Charrington	25
5.3.14 Martin	26
Chapter SIX:	
Conclusion	
5.0 Introduction28
6.1 Summary.....	.28

5.2 The Main Findings	29
5.3 Recommendations	35
5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies.....	36
References	38

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Overview

This chapter brings a brief account of the life and works of Eric Blair as a person, by focusing on some decisive moments of his biography that contributed to the birth and development of George Orwell, the author. Furthermore, the chapter presents the framework of the study as a whole.

1.1 Background of the Study

Drabble and Stringer (2007) said that “Eric Blair” born in India in 1903, George Orwell was educated as a scholarship student at prestigious boarding schools in England. Because of his background, he famously described his family as “lower-upper-middle class”. He never quite fit in, and felt oppressed and outraged by the dictatorial control that the schools he attended exercised over their students’ lives. After graduating from Eton, Orwell decided to forego college in order to work as a British Imperial Policeman in Burma. He hated his duties in Burma, where he was required to enforce the strict laws of a political regime he despised. His failing health, which troubled him throughout his life, caused him to return to England on convalescent leave. Once back in England, he quit the Imperial Police and dedicated himself to becoming a writer. Inspired by Jack London’s 1903 book *The People of the Abyss*, which detailed London’s experience in the slums of London, Orwell bought ragged clothes from a second-hand store and went to live among the very poor in London.

After re-emerging, he published a book about this experience, entitled *Down and Out in Paris and London*. He later lived among destitute coal miners in northern England, an experience that caused him to give up on capitalism in favor of democratic socialism. In 1936, he traveled to Spain to report on the Spanish Civil War, where he witnessed firsthand the nightmarish atrocities committed by fascist political regimes. The rise to power of dictators such as Adolf Hitler in Germany and Joseph Stalin in the Soviet Union inspired Orwell's mounting hatred of totalitarianism and political authority. Orwell devoted his energy to writing novels that were politically charged, first with "*Animal Farm*" in 1945, then with "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" in 1949.

Rodden, (2007) pointed out that George Orwell is a prominent English writer of the first half of the 20th century. He was recognized as one of the most influential satiric writers whose works have merited detailed scholarly attention. More than half a century after they were written, Orwell's books are still much in demand. Rodden wrote in (1989) that Orwell was 'alive today' because the topics of his works are alive today, and this is equally true in the twenty-first century. Orwell is regarded as the greatest political writer in English during the twentieth century.

Rodden, (2007) added that George Orwell's world fame is due to a combination of high esteem from intellectuals and immense popularity with the general reading public. Although he died at the early age of forty-six, his last two works – "*Animal Farm*" (1945) and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" (1949) – have sold more than forty million copies and stand as the most influential books of political fiction of the twentieth century.

Orwell's creative work is multi-aspect and he is often cited by other researchers. Orwell's influence, however, is not limited to literary studies: historians, anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, psychologists, and political scientists find Orwell's books used in their research. In his works, they find answers to such questions as the psychology of management, leadership theory, sociology of revolution, political culture, the allegory of the power, social stratification and social inequality, ideology and propaganda, conformity, etc.

George Orwell is recognized today as one of the most original political writers of the twentieth century, particularly in his understanding of the evils of communism, most famously expressed in "*Animal Farm*" written in (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* written in (1949). While Orwell's anti-communism dates back to the mid-1930s, especially his experience during the Spanish Civil War, he was at first less insightful about the other great totalitarian movement of that "low, dishonest decade," fascism. Consequently, Orwell's critique of communism is both incisive and original. He was among the first writers to recognize that communism was not a revolutionary force but instead was a new, dangerous form of totalitarianism, a powerful tool for controlling the masses. Conversely, his initial comments on fascism were curiously flat and imitative of the standard left-wing interpretation—that is, fascism was nothing more than the capitalist system in extremis.

Orwell's political education was a gradual process. Five years as a member of the Imperial Police in Burma during (1921–27) left him with views that can best be characterized as vaguely radical. In fact, he was described in the early 1930s as a Tory radical, someone in the mold of William Cobbett or

Orwell's personal hero, Charles Dickens. As he admits in the autobiographical section of his analysis of poverty in the north of England, *The Road to Wigan Pier* written in (1937) that seems to have spent half the time in denouncing the capitalist system and the other half is raging over the insolence of bus-conductors.

Orwell's political education began when he ventured among the poor, the downtrodden, and the tramps after his return from Burma. His book *Down and Out in Paris and London* was an attempt to show the impact of his time among the lowest rungs of society. He wrote that he wanted to purge himself from all the evils of imperialism and thought that by immersing himself among the poor he would do so.

His first serious publications appeared in the unconventional English left-wing journal *Adelphi*, which provided an outlet for him to develop his ideas and where the evidence of his unique direct prose style first appeared. He also wrote occasional pieces for the *New English Weekly*, which, like *Adelphi*, was idiosyncratically socialist. These contacts put him in touch with individuals drawn from all parts of the leftist spectrum: anarchists, pacifists, socialists, Trotskyists, and communists. His political ideas were unformed but definitely radical and anti-capitalist.

By the time Orwell left to take part in the Spanish Civil War, in December 1936, his emerging left-wing views had been sharpened by his time among the unemployed in the north of England. In *Wigan Pier*, which appeared while he was in Spain, he elaborated on some of his unique opinions about socialism. For socialism to prevail, he wrote, it must lose its image as appealing to unsatisfactory or even inhuman types. He added that most

people regarded socialists as a collection of the strange and the odd. One sometimes gets the impression that the mere words 'Socialism' and 'Communism' draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex-maniac, Quaker, 'Nature Cure' quack, pacifist and feminist in England.

One of the most original insights from his experiences in Wigan was that for socialism to triumph, the middle classes must show empathy for, and merge their interests with, those of the proletariat. A running theme through the second part of *Wigan Pier* is Orwell's argument that the gulf between the middle and lower classes can be bridged.

Spain completed Orwell's commitment to socialism as well as sharpening his hatred of communism. There he joined the anarchist-Trotskyist party, POUM (Partido Obrero de Unification Marxista), spending six months with them, including time in the front lines. He was shot through the throat and almost died before returning to England in June 1937. (ibid)

In England, he met his anarchist Trotskyist friends in Spain declared by leftists of all stripes as enemies of the revolution and, what is worse, crypto-fascists. One of the popular communist posters during the war showed the Trotskyite POUM with a mask beneath, which was the face of fascism. He never forgave those in England who took part in this political assassination of his Spanish comrades. He returned from Spain as a dedicated anti-communist and, as he told his old friend, Cyril Connolly, for the first time he was a true believer in socialism. (ibid)

Orwell's understanding of the other great "ism" of the twentieth century, fascism, took a long time to mature than did his unique insights into

communism. Orwell never found anything appealing in fascism, which was an example of an evil political concept that threatened the very nature of democratic society. Unlike communism, which Orwell detested while recognizing its appeal to certain idealistic types, fascism had no redeeming value. As Orwell was groping toward an understanding of the complexities of socialism, he continued to accept the standard left-wing view that fascism was a logical extension of capitalism.

After returning from Spain, Orwell joined the Independent Labor Party, the most radical and pacifist of the left-wing movements in England. He agreed with their rejection of the idea of war against fascism because he believed that, in toppling the fascist system, you would only be stabilizing capitalism and imperialism, "something far bigger and in a different way just as bad.

As the war progressed, Orwell's references to fascism bear no comparison to his growing concerns about the rising threat of communism to the Western ideals of freedom. Orwell's focus shifted to concerns about the appeal of communism, especially to the intelligentsia, a natural enough reaction given Russia's major role in defeating the Nazis. He soon began developing his ideas about what the future would hold for the West, especially his growing fear that the idea of objective truth was disappearing and the dehumanization of the individual was taking hold, the very themes he would develop in his last two famous works, "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*". By the end of the war, Orwell noted that fascism had lost all concrete meaning and become a verbal means of vilifying your enemies, a point he made most clearly in his great essay "Politics and the English Language."

1.2 Statement of The Problem

It's noticeable that most of the studies that tackled Orwell's writings did not deeply reveal the allegory and characterization of Orwell writings especially in "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*". The problem this study will tackle is that George Orwell symbolized his political allegories and views through "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*" as predictive futuristic events to warn the future readers of the danger of totalitarian and dictators who abuse power and revolutions' outcomes. The ideologies of Orwell were not enough investigated so that his readers especially the future ones did not receive full grasp of Orwell purpose and messages as what was written in both novels have been reoccurring in the real life of Orwell's readers. As a result, this study will try to draw the interest from the books to reality and how "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" proved the truth of Orwell the writer who lives his writings that dated back to a long period of history and still correlated with similar scenarios in real-life situations; this is what is going to be revealed by this study.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The core purpose of the study is to achieve the following:

1. To portray the use of allegory and characterization of George Orwell novels' "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", and how they are closely related to real scenarios occurring in the world.
2. To pinpoint the timeless' features of "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" and their everlasting property of criticizing totalitarian ideologies.

1.4 Questions of the Study

This study besides seeking to achieve the main objectives were set to, it must find answers to certain questions that might be the key for unlocking the crux of the general framework designed to it as follows:

1. To what extent portrayal of allegory and characterization by George Orwell in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, is closely related to real scenarios occurring in the world?
2. In what way “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” can have timeless feature and an everlasting property of criticizing totalitarian ideologies?

1.5 Hypotheses of the Study

H¹. The portrayal of allegory and characterization by George Orwell in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, is closely related to real scenarios occurring in the world.

H². “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty Four*” have timeless features and an everlasting property of criticizing totalitarian ideologies.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is stemmed from the fact that though both novels “*Animal Farm & Nineteen Eighty-four*” were written a long time ago, they still have eternal appeal and correspondence with concurrent real-life situations especially the political life of tyrant and dictator regimes across the world. Furthermore, both novels can be considered as interesting, flexible, and informing novels which reflect not only events, political regimes before the Second World War but also any political front which can be put on the focus

by virtue of *allegory and Characterization* as figures of speech which can be used to criticize the dictatorship and corrupted governments. That is, a great deal of the ideological cults, political conception and individual practices of different political parties supporters around the world are symbolically attacked and criticized by Orwell in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” for they can be as roadmaps for minorities and common masses to react against injustice, inequality and call for freedom of expression in the light of the unfair and legislative laws posed by their dictator rulers. Moreover, both novels are a gateway for such decisive and sensitive issues related to the state of people and their destiny that cannot be tackled and discussed freely owing to the regimes’ iron fist that restricts laws and all kinds of freedom.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The time framework of this study required three academic years to be completed within the duration from 31/10/2016 up to 31/10/2019. The study was conducted at Sudan University of Science & Technology in the College of Languages. The study is limited to cover both “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” two books written by George Orwell to display the political allegory and characterization manifested by Orwell throughout the stories as a whole. The researcher will mainly focus on the political allegory and characterization to assure the paradoxical slogans of revolutions and the intersection of the novels’ events with political regimes in reality according to the researcher's viewpoint.

1.6 Tentative Scheme

As for the framework of the study and the titles of chapters, they can be suggested as follows in the light of the study’ main track:

- Chapter one: Introduction
- Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework & Previous Studies
- Chapter Three: Methodology
- Chapter Four: The political Allegory of “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”.
- Chapter Five: The political characterization of “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”.
- Chapter Six: Conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Framework & Previous Studies

Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework & Previous Studies

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework of the study. It includes a review of the literature concerning political novels, twentieth-century literature. It also reviews some critics about Orwell's works and finally, concludes with reviewing the previous studies if there are any.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Introduction

Drabble & Stringer, (2007) confirmed that the twentieth century opened with an extremely enormous hope but also with some apprehension, for the new century marked the final approach to a new millennium. For many, humankind was entering an unprecedented era. H.G. Wells's utopian studies, the aptly titled *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress upon Human Life and Thought* written in (1901) and *A Modern Utopia* written in (1905), both captured and qualified this optimistic mood and gave expression to a common conviction that science and technology would transform the world in the century ahead. To achieve such transformation, outmoded institutions and ideals had to be replaced by ones more suited to the growth and liberation of the human spirit. The death of Queen Victoria in 1901 and the accession of Edward VII seemed to confirm that a franker, less inhibited era had begun.

Many writers of the Edwardian period, drawing widely upon the realistic and naturalistic conventions of the 19th century (upon Ibsen in drama and Balzac, Turgenev, Flaubert, Zola, Eliot, and Dickens in fiction) and in tune with the anti-Aestheticism unleashed by the trial of the archetypal Aesthete, Oscar Wilde, saw their task in the new century to be an unashamedly didactic one. In a series of wittily iconoclastic plays, of which *Man and Superman* (performed 1905, published 1903) and *Major Barbara* (performed 1905, published 1907) are the most substantial, George Bernard Shaw turned the Edwardian theatre into an arena for debate upon the principal concerns of the day: the question of political organization, the morality of armaments and war, the function of class and of the professions, the validity of the family and of marriage, and the issue of female emancipation. Nor was he alone in this, even if he was alone in the brilliance of his comedy. John Galsworthy made use of the theatre in *Strife* (1909) to explore the conflict between capital and labor, and in *Justice* (1910) he lent his support to reform of the penal system, while Harley Granville-Barker, whose revolutionary approach to stage direction did much to change theatrical production in the period, dissected in *The Voysey Inheritance* (performed 1905, published 1909) and *Waste* (performed 1907, published 1909) the hypocrisies and deceit of upper-class and professional life. (ibid)

Many Edwardian novelists were similarly eager to explore the shortcomings of English social life. Wells—in *Love and Mr. Lewisham* written in (1900); *Kipps* written in (1905); *Ann Veronica* written in (1909), his pro-suffragist novel; and *The History of Mr. Polly* written in (1910)—captured the frustrations of lower- and middle-class existence, even though he believed his accounts with many comic touches. In *Anna of the Five Towns* written in

(1902), Arnold Bennett detailed the constrictions of provincial life among the self-made business classes in the area of England known as the Potteries; in *The Man of Property* written in (1906), the first volume of *The Forsyte Saga*, Galsworthy described the destructive possessiveness of the professional bourgeoisie; and, in *Where Angels Fear to Tread* written in (1905) and *The Longest Journey* written in (1907), E.M. Forster portrayed with irony the insensitivity, self-repression, and philistinism of the English middle classes.

These novelists, however, wrote more memorably when they allowed themselves a larger perspective. In *The Old Wives' Tale* written in (1908), Bennett showed the destructive effects of time on the lives of individuals and communities and evoked a quality of pathos that he never matched in his other fiction; in *Tono-Bungay* written in (1909), Wells showed the ominous consequences of the uncontrolled developments taking place within a British society still dependent upon the institutions of a long-defunct landed aristocracy; and in *Howards End* written in (1910), Forster showed how little the rootless and self-important world of contemporary commerce cared for the more rooted world of culture, although he acknowledged that commerce was a necessary evil. Nevertheless, even as they perceived the difficulties of the present, most Edwardian novelists, like their counterparts in the theatre, held firmly to the belief not only that constructive change was possible but also that this change could in some measure be advanced by their writing. (ibid).

Other writers, including Thomas Hardy and Rudyard Kipling, who had established their reputations during the previous century, and Hilaire Belloc, G.K. Chesterton, and Edward Thomas, who established their reputations in the first decade of the new century, were less confident about the future and

sought to revive the traditional forms—the ballad, the narrative poem, the satire, the fantasy, the topographical poem, and the essay—that in their view preserved traditional sentiments and perceptions. The revival of traditional forms in the late 19th and early 20th century was not a unique event. There were many such revivals during the 20th century, and the traditional poetry of A.E. Housman (whose book *A Shropshire Lad*, originally published in 1896, enjoyed huge popular success during World War I), Walter de la Mare, John Masefield, Robert Graves, and Edmund Blunden represents an important and often neglected strand of English literature in the first half of the century.

Above all, the most significant writings of the period, traditionalist or modern, were inspired by neither hope nor apprehension but by bleaker feelings that the new century would witness the collapse of a whole civilization. (ibid).

2.1.2 Definitions of Political Novel

Any attempt to define a political novel will be problematic since it does not represent a distinct form of fiction. The line of demarcation between art and politics has become unusually thin in the twentieth century. A writer of political fiction may find it difficult to put life, art, and politics into watertight compartments. At an extreme level, any novel that shows the close relationship between literary imagination and sociopolitical reality can be called ‘political’. It envisions a multidimensional picture of the society with all its differences and changes.

Edmund, (1924), emphasized that “Political Fiction” is a fairly new form of literary expression which has come into vogue in the post-War period of the

twentieth century. The sensibilities of a group of responsive writers who were disturbed by the atrocities perpetrated by power-hungry fascist regimes found eloquent expression in new fictional patterns woven around political themes. Their works were characterized by an intricately patterned interlocking of political ideology and existential concerns. They focused on the impact of power politics on the hopes, fears, and angst of the post-atomic humanity. The dominant issues of the contemporary world associated with economics, war, race, gender, and justice also found ample space in their creative exuberance.

Political fiction has come into vogue in the post-War period of the twentieth century. The sensibilities of a group of responsive writers who were disturbed by the violent acts committed by power-hungry fascist regimes found eloquent expression in new fictional patterns woven around political themes. Their works were characterized by an intricately patterned interlocking of political ideology and existential concerns. They focused on the impact of power politics on the hopes, fears, and angst of the dominant issues of the contemporary world that are associated with economics, war, race, gender, and justice. A political novelist's interest in politics is a reflection of his concern for the way things would happen; in the way, he would confront and overcome problems, and the resistance he might face at amelioration. (ibid).

Edmund, (1924), is perhaps the earliest critic who tried to give a satisfactory definition. In his pioneering work, *The Political Novel: Its Development in England and America*. Political Novel is a work of prose fiction which leans rather to "ideas" than to "emotions"; which deals rather with the machinery of law-making or with a theory of public conduct than

with the merits of any given piece of legislation; and where the main purpose of the writer is party propaganda, public reform, or exposition of the lives of the personages who maintain government, or of the forces which constitute government.

Besides this definition viewed as an axis, Edmund traces the history of political fiction in his work. He looks upon the political novel as a modified form of the historical novel and the political novelist as one disinclined to use common humanity and its emotions as his raw materials.

Howe (1957), commented on the concept of the political novel as the fiction in which political ideas play a dominant role or in which the political milieu is the dominant setting. The identification of the ideas and the milieu which govern the political nature of a novel depends on the perspective adopted by the reader. Crystallization of this awareness is manifested in Howe's enigmatic assertion that he meant by a political novel any novel he wished to treat as if it were a political novel. But the uniqueness of his theory lies in his critical belief that a political novel requires the intermingling of the political ideas and the emotions of characters who uphold these ideas.

Prescott (1952), classified the political novel into two distinct categories. He opined that there are two principal varieties of political fiction: novels about characters involved in politics so politics themselves; and novels designed to persuade their readers to share their author's political convictions, novels which are primarily propaganda pamphlets.

Alter, (1984) divided the political novel into two classes: the conventional political novel and the adversary political novel. The former presumes that all is well with the Republic in spite of the troubling agitation of the surface.

And the latter presents a Republic which is rotten to the core. Alter considers characters as a medium that leads one to reflect life on the ultimate purpose and meaning of individual life. He attempts to give a comprehensive definition to political fiction when he stated that the novel's great strength as a mode of apprehension is in its grasp of character, and the political novel at its best can show concretely and subtly what politics does to character, what character makes of politics.

According to Boyers, (1985) a political novel should have something to do with ideas about the community and the distribution of power. There are certain generic constraints identified by the critics of political novels. In a political novel, personal conflicts are organized into political conflicts. Political novelists are concerned with actual or threatened disappearance of established forms. Characters in a political novel regard their fates as intimately connected with the social and political arrangements. The common world that is attempted to be created in the novel is a projection of hope and a movement towards the world that might exist in the mind of the protagonist.

The last but not the least, Boyers, (1985) concluded that modern political novelists devised new artistic strategies for presenting the dismal realities of the postwar world, for they found the existing ones not powerful enough to depict the intensity of their emotions. The new strategies invented were employed to demystify and shock the readers out of their complacency. Quite a few authors belonging to this school of fictionalization experimented with diverse stylistic techniques. Political novels usually embody an absent cause which implies that while a novel may offer us an awareness of what we need

to know, it will never project that knowledge. The awareness of this 'absent cause' is evoked by the appeal such novels make to the political unconscious.

2.1.3 Historical Development

2.1.3.1 Pre-modernism

Drabble and Stringer, (2007) claimed that despite the reforms of the 19th century, there was little protection of the poor against the exploiter, of children, the old, the sick, disabled and unemployed. Under Campbell Bannerman, and after his death in 1908, under Asquith, the reforms came. From the start, the new liberal government, including radicals and liberal imperialists, embarked upon a program of social legislation. Between the years 1906 and 1909, free school meals were made available to poor children, a school medical service was founded, a Children's Act was passed, miners were given a statutory working day of eight hours, trade boards were set up to fix wages, and the labor exchanges were created to reduce unemployment.

Further reforms followed, the old Chartist demand of payment of members was carried, and some working-class men could afford to sit in Parliament; it became legal for trade unions to use their funds to support Parliamentary candidates; a National Insurance Bill was passed, to give relief to the sick, and unemployed out of funds contributed by workers, employers and the state.

In spite of all these reforms, there were strikes of miners and railwaymen; the Suffragettes were fighting for women's rights; Nonconformists were demanding the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, and the time to satisfy Irish Nationalists had come.

In the last half of the 19th century, Britain had grown rich on free trade, its people were not yet convinced of the advantage of change, and the Conservative party was split. Balfour, the Prime Minister, had to resign, and at the election of 1906 the Liberals, as champions of free trade gained more seats than the Conservatives.

Interestingly, the last two decades of the 19th century had been a period of revolutionary scientific discovery, invention, and the new science and technology, as well as other movements of the period, were reflected in literature: Huxley's agnosticism in the novels, poetry of Thomas Hardy, socialism in Morris's *News From Nowhere* and the early plays of Bernard Shaw, Imperialism in the poetry of Kipling, while Oscar Wilde mocked middle-class standards and the young Wells wrote optimistically about *The First Men in the Moon*.

In the middle of the 19th century, had been the leading power in the world for half a century. However, all that has changed in the beginning of the 20th century, and Britain lost her material supremacy against the gigantic powers of U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., being a small, crowded island with few natural advantages, dependent on imported food and raw materials, which were, in fact, the consequences of the two World Wars, especially the recent one. (ibid).

Ink,(2010) remarked that the 19th century Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution in Britain, can be posited along with the beginning of an 'Age of Revolutions', starting with those in America and France, and then pushed forward in other countries partly as a result of the upheavals of the Napoleonic Wars. Our present or contemporary era begins with the end of

these revolutions in the 19th century and includes World War I, World War II, and the Cold War.

2.1.3.2 The Modernism (1910-1945)

Ink, (2010) added that in its origins, the modernist period in English literature was first and foremost a primitive answer to the Victorian culture and principles, which had prevailed for most of the nineteenth century. Indeed, a break with traditions is one of the fundamental constants of the modernist attitude. Intellectuals and artists at the turn of the twentieth century believed the previous generation's way of doing things was a cultural dead end. They could foresee that world events were increasing into unknown territory. The stability of Victorian civilization was rapidly becoming a thing of the past. The assassination of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria was essentially the triggering event of the First World War.

In his view, the modern period has been a period of significant development in the fields of science, politics, warfare, and technology. It has also been an age of discovery and globalization: it is during this time that the European powers and later their colonies began their political, economic, and cultural colonization of the rest of the world. By the late 19th and early 20th century, modernist art, politics, science and culture had come to dominate not only Western Europe and North America, but almost every civilized area on the globe, including movements, thought of as opposed to the West and globalization.

Ink, (2010) remarked that "Modernism" was set in action, in one sense, through a series of cultural shocks; the first of these great shocks was the Great War, which ravaged Europe from 1914 through 1918, known now as

World War One. At the time, this “war to end all wars” was looked upon with such terrible horror that many people simply could not imagine what the world seemed to be plunging towards. The first hints of that particular way of thinking called Modernism stretch back into the nineteenth century. As literary periods; modernism displays a relatively strong sense of cohesion and similarity across genres and locales.

Hence, the modern era is closely associated with the development of individualism, capitalism, urbanization and a belief in the positive possibilities of technological and political progress. The brutal wars and other problems of this era, many of which come from the effects of rapid change and the connected loss of strength of traditional religious and ethical norms, have led to many reactions against modern development: optimism and belief in constant progress has been most recently criticized by ‘postmodernism’, while the dominance of Western Europe and North America over other continents has been criticized by postcolonial theory. (ibid).

Consequently, the concept of the modern world as different from an ancient or medieval one rests on a sense that ‘modernity’ is not just another era in history, but rather the result of a new type of change. This is usually conceived of as progress driven by conscious human efforts to better their situation. Advances in all areas of human activity politics, industry, society, economics, commerce, transport, communication, mechanization, automation, science, medicine, technology, and culture appear to have transformed an ‘old world’ into the ‘modern’ or ‘new world’. In each case, the identification of the old Revolutionary change can be used to demarcate the old and old fashioned from the modern. (Ibid).

To cut it short, the writer who adopted the modern point of view often did so quite deliberately and self-consciously. Indeed, a central preoccupation of modernism is with the inner self and consciousness. In contrast the romantic world view, the modernist cares rather little for nature, being or the overarching structures of history. Instead of progress and growth, the modernist thinkers see a growing alienation of the individual. The machinery of modern society is perceived as impersonal, capitalist, and antagonistic to the artistic impulse. War most certainly had a great deal of influence on such ways of approaching the world. Two World Wars in the span of a generation effectively shell-shocked all of western civilization. Much of the modern world has replaced the Biblical-oriented value system, re-evaluated the monarchical government system, and abolished the feudal economic system, with new democratic and liberal ideas in the areas of politics, science, psychology, sociology, and economics. (Ibid).

2.1.3.3 Overview of Modern Literature

Ink, (2010) pointed out that the modern period mainly is the time of the United Kingdom's development, the state has ameliorated in many fields as it takes various changes; science, trade, even politics. However, the most prominent change was the Capitalist tendency as a new aspect of the state and in the economic system, as well as in political one. Nevertheless, Literature of the modern period takes its place overall.

Modernism as a literary movement reached its height in Europe between 1900 and the mid-1920s. 'Modernist' literature addressed artistic problems similar to those examined in non-literary forms of contemporary Modernist art, such as painting. Gertrude Stein's abstract writings, for example, have

often been compared to the fragmentary and multi-perspective Cubism of her friend Pablo Picasso.

The general thematic concerns of Modernist literature are well-summarized by the sociologist Georg Simmel: The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture, and the technique of life.

Modernist literature attempted to move from the bonds of Realist literature and to introduce concepts such as disjointed timelines. Modernism was distinguished by an emancipator meta-narrative. In the wake of Modernism, and post-enlightenment, meta-narratives tended to be emancipatory, whereas beforehand this was not a consistent characteristic. Contemporary meta-narratives were becoming less relevant in light of the implications of World War I, the rise of trade unionism, a general social discontent, and the emergence of psychoanalysis. The consequent need for a unifying function brought about a growth in the political importance of culture. (Ibid).

Green, as cited by Ink (2010) remarked that modern literature can be viewed mainly in terms of its formal, stylistic and semantic movement away from Romanticism examining the traditionally mundane subject matter – a prime example being *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* by T. S. Eliot (1915). Modernist literature often features a marked pessimism, a clear rejection of the optimism apparent in Victorian literature in favor of portraying alienated or dysfunctional individuals within a predominantly urban and fragmented society.

Green, as cited by Ink (2010) confirmed that many Modernist works, like *Eliot's The Waste Land* written in (1922), are marked by the absence of any central, heroic figure at all, as narrative and narrator are collapsed into a collection of disjointed fragments and overlapping voices. Modernist literature, moreover, often moves beyond the limitations of the Realist novel with a concern for larger factors such as social or historical change, and this is particularly prominent in a stream of consciousness writing. Examples can be seen in the work of *Virginia Woolf and James Joyce* written in (1882-1941).

Since we are exploring Literary Modernism, which is a subset of a larger artistic movement called Modernism that embraces painting and music. In the literary realm, it's responsible for some seriously odd literature produced roughly between the end of World War I and the beginning of World War II.

Green, as cited by Ink (2010) concluded that on the other hand, there are some famous names associated with Modernism, mostly written in Britain or who are more associated with that part of the movement. *Ulysses* by James Joyce is one of the most significant books to come out of Literary Modernism. When we think of Literary Modernism, really the king of it is James Joyce. He's Irish, so right off the bat, we've got one of these interlopers. His book, *Ulysses*, is considered one of the most significant books that have ever been written. Another person who's also famous and also an interloper, not British, is T.S. Eliot. He's an American. He's a poet and what he is most famous for is a poem called *The Waste Land*. He also wrote *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*. He has a lot of great poetry. He won the Nobel Prize.

Modernist literature involved many authors and critics such as George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" written in (1945), Virginia Woolf, T. S. Eliot, Gertrude Stein, H.D. (Hilda Doolittle), Dylan Thomas, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Ezra Pound, Mina Loy, James Joyce, Hugh MacDiarmid, William Faulkner, Jean Toomer, Ernest Hemingway, Rainer Maria Rilke, Franz Kafka, Joseph Conrad, Robert Musil, Andrei Bely, W. B. Yeats and so on.

2.1.3.4 Modern and Contemporary Writers

Drabble and Stringer, (2007) outlined the modern contemporary writers of the 20th century as follows:

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), invented the phrase 'the white man's burden', using it to describe both the strain and the duties of Empire. He was born in India and educated in England; he was a prolific poet, short story and novel writer. In his novels, Kipling is best known for *Stalky and Co.* written in (1899), *Kim* (1901) and his short stories; *Departmental ditties* written in (1866). Kipling makes an interesting contrast to Joseph Conrad (1857-1924). Both produce works based on Empire and the exercise of power, but Conrad's awareness of the extent to which power corrupts, and the sense of corruption in his work, far exceeds that found in Kipling. Conrad's most famous novels are *The Nigger of the Narcissus* written in (1898), *Lord Jim* written in (1900), *Heart of darkness* written in (1902).

David Herbert Lawrence born in (1885-1930) in England. He was a man on a confessed mission to liberate society from its social and moral chains, he was a poet as well as a novelist, but he is still most widely known for his prose work. The novels most often set for examination purposes are *Sons*

and Lovers written in (1913), The Rainbow written in (1915) and Women in Love written in (1921), as well Lady Chatterley's Lover written in (1928).

E.M. Forster was born in England (1879-1970) and educated at public school then Cambridge, though he lived to 1970, his novels on which his fame was written before the First World War. These are where Angels Fear to Tread written in (1905), A Room With A View written in (1908), and A Passage to India written in (1924). He is also the author of the highly acclaimed critical work, Aspects of the Novel written in (1927). (ibid).

Virginia Woolf was born on the 25th of January (1882-1941) in London, England. She was an essayist, novelist, publisher, critic, especially famous for her novels and feminist writings. Considered to be one of the leading figures of the modernist literature of the twentieth century, her most notable works are the novels Mrs. Dalloway, Orlando, To the Lighthouse, The Waves and the feminist essay A Room of One's own. Woolf was an active figure in the London literary society during the interwar period and was a member of the Bloomsbury Group. Virginia Woolf died on the 28th of March 1941 in East Sussex, England, at the age of 59. (ibid)

2.1.3.5 Post-modernism

Alegre, (2017) remarked that the history of the post-war novel in English, and also that of drama and poetry, cannot be understood without reference to the coexistence in the first half of the twentieth century of Modernism and the more traditional approaches to literature inherited from the Victorian period.

The Modernist writers reacted against realism in fiction and the remains of Romantic sentimentalism in poetry by introducing technical innovations that could be used to look at reality from the irrational, the subconscious, the anti-sentimental, or the highly individualistic. In drama, the revolution followed other lines, with G. B. Shaw's introduction to the English stage of the naturalistic drama developed by Ibsen. Modernism can be said to enter the English stage precisely at the time of Shaw's death in 1950 when Samuel Beckett's plays challenged the hegemony of naturalism and the artificial, well-made play.

After 1945, when novelists faced the task of explaining the new historical reality and the position of the individual in the new post-war order, most realized that this entailed making a choice between traditional literary models that seemed more suitable for transmitting an accurate portrait of the individual in a changing society, and experimental, Modernist models that seemed more suitable for explaining the disjunction between the individual consciousness and the problematic flow of contemporary history.

Post-modernism was born out of this dilemma. Post-modernism can thus be said to be a new cultural atmosphere in which the writer is inevitably aware of this open choice between tradition and experimentalism, rather than a continuation of Modernism or a reaction against it. Post-war novelists cannot escape the shadow of either Modernism or Victorianism and must accommodate both in their work. Some have produced a new synthesis which is what is characteristic of post-modernism, while others have openly acknowledged their allegiance to either literary tradition or experimentation.

As far as the post-war novel is concerned, the post-modernist synthesis was relatively slow to come, if it came at all, for there seemed to be a need to first define the new contours of social reality after the war before resuming the project of Modernism. (ibid).

In the period between 1945 and 1955, a nostalgic look at the lost pre-war past was combined with a look at the new reality faced by the generation growing up in the 1940s, often in provincial surroundings.

Novels such as Evelyn Waugh's *Brides head Revisited* (1945) and L. P. Hartley's *The Go-Between* written in (1953) analyze the present by looking backward, searching for the flaws that cause the desolation of the individual speaking in the present.

This return to a personal past shows, above all, why innocence has been the main casualty of war and suggests that despite its apparent placidity, the best that the pre-war world could offer in social terms was inherently corrupt.

The idea that civilization contains the seeds of corruption is perhaps best expressed in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* written in (1954). In this novel, Golding does not examine a particular moment of the recent past, but childhood, as the site where adult civilized values are implanted, only to find their sheer brutality. The early 1950s brought a new interest in the present, possibly as a reaction against the nostalgic backward look at an essentially phony world from which many –above all, the lower middle and working classes– were excluded. Leaving aside the beginnings of the post-colonial novel, what happened in the 1950s novel is that the margins of culture moved to the center, expressing a generalized discontent, which was paralleled in the

plays of the Angry Young Men and some of the poetry of The Movement. (ibid).

At the time, this discontent was defined as political discontent, but it would seem now, rather, to be lower-middle-class frustration at being denied a place in the vanished world of the upper classes portrayed by pre-war Literature. Thanks to the new educational opportunities opened up by post-war Labour governments, new lower middle class and working-class writers, who often came from places other than London, found themselves in a cultural world in which they were simultaneously strangers and also the rising new stars.

William Cooper's *Scenes from Provincial Life* written in (1950) was the mirror in which the new writers found an appropriate model to narrate the discontent of the post-war generation. Novels such as Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim* written in (1954), John Waine's *Hurry on Down* written in (1953), John Braine's *Room at the Top* written in (1957), Allan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night, Sunday Morning* written in (1958), Keith Waterhouse's *Billy Liar* written in (1958), or David Storey's *This Sporting Life* written in (1960), dramatize the position of the individual who is aware of the new chances for upward social mobility and who either benefits from them –hence Jim's luck– or sees them slip from his grasp, whether by choice or because the social structure is still too rigid.

The period 1945-1960 also saw the entrance of fantasy into the English novel on a large scale. The novels of these years preceded the new wave of fantasy writers in the 1960s, including J. G. Ballard and Michael Moorcock, who questioned the boundaries between fantasy and the mainstream or realistic novel.

Orwell's political dystopian fantasies, "*Animal Farm*" (1945) and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" written in (1949), Mervyn Peake's Gothic Gormenghast trilogy (Titus Groan, written in 1946; Gormenghast, written in 1950; and Titus Alone, written in 1959), John Wyndham's science-fiction novel *The Day of the Triffids* written in (1951) and J. R. R. Tolkien's trilogy *The Lord of the Rings* (*The Fellowship of the Ring*, written in 1954; *The Two Towers*, written in 1954; and *The Return of the King*, written in 1955) exemplify this trend.

Durrell's *Alexandria Quartet* (*Justine*, written in 1957; *Balthazar*, written in 1958; *Mountolive*, written in 1959; and *Clea*, written in 1960) and his *Avinyon Quintet* (1974-85) question the very idea of the chronicle by returning repeatedly to the same events, which are narrated in each volume from a different character.

The reality, Durrell suggests, cannot be apprehended from a single point of view and is necessarily mediated by the consciousness through which it is filtered—a point that had already been made by the Modernists.

As Durrell's work shows, the experimentalism derived from Modernism found a new, if a minority, vein in the novel of the late 1950s, especially in the novels of Samuel Beckett and Nigel Dennis. Experimentalism greatly expanded in the 1960s and 1970s without, however, displacing the work of realists such as Graham Greene from its position of pre-eminence. At what precise moment the Modernist experiments in technique became post-modernist is a matter of dispute. Writers such as Henry Green, Lawrence Durrell, and Wyndham Lewis seem to bridge the gap between the two periods, whereas others alternate realism with experimentalism. (ibid).

Anthony Burgess's *The Clockwork Orange* written in (1962), Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* written in (1962) and John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* written in (1969) are outstanding novels outside the realistic framework, but they were written nonetheless by novelists who were also proficient in the writing of more traditional realistic novels. Some novelists heavily influenced by the French "nouveau roman" –Andrew Sinclair, Julian Mitchell, Christine Brooke-Rose, John Berger– chose experimentalism rather than realism in the 1960s and 1970s.

Nonetheless, it could be said that the distinguishing mark of the English post-modern novel is its reluctance to abandon realism and its interest in creating a synthesis with other narrative modes, such as fantasy, autobiography, and historiography. At any rate, it is essential to understand that the coexistence of widely diverging novelistic genres is the main characteristic of the post-war English novel and, perhaps, of post-modernism itself.

This may be due to a pragmatic approach to the world of literature, an approach that precludes confrontations of the kind that took place between the Modernists and the Edwardian traditionalists. Possibly, novelists are aware, above all, of the increasing popularity of the audio-visual narrative media, which compete with the novel and would rather secure a place in the cultural marketplace for the novel in general than for any particular kind of novel.

Despite the constant warnings about decaying standards, the investigation of the English novel during the period 1975-1990 reveals a healthy state of affairs. It may be true that there are not as many memorable characters as in

the Victorian novel, but there are certain novels that are memorable for their complex architecture and, often, for their wry humor.

Nothing much can be said to unify the work of contemporary English novelists except the writers' reluctance to see their work as part of any identifiable school, movement or trend.

Alegre, (2017) finally, concluded that the post-war English novel is polyphonic, as it gathers many different voices. If there is anything that defines the English novel of the last fifty years it is its protean essence: thanks to its flexibility, the novel can now accommodate the experiences of different social classes, different genders, different nationalities, and different literary projects, from realism to experimentalism.

2.4 George Orwell and the Views of Critics

Orwell's use of fantasy suggests that far from being escapist, fantasy can be a way of expressing the anxieties caused by history in an alternative way.

Generally, criticism on “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” focus the analogy of the themes of these works on Communism, facing them as an alert against the way that Communism was taking in the Soviet Union, which was, more and more, restricting civil rights in the name of the maintenance of the regime.

If for Kubal, (1972) “*Animal Farm*” is Orwell’s best artistic achievement, a successful attempt to unify Orwell’s political thought and artistic purpose, most of criticism highlights the association of the themes to an anti-Communist intention, reinforcing the link of the animals of the fable to Lenin, Trotsky and Marx. In the article of the *New Statesman* and *Nation of*

September 8, written in (1945), Kingsley Martin, (1945) wrote that his (Orwell's) latest satire, beautifully written, amusing and, if you don't take it too seriously, a fair corrective of much silly worship of the Soviet Union.

To Martin, (1945) Orwell is leaving the realm of idealism and is getting to an age of cynicism. That can be accomplished in the construction of the character donkey Benjamin. The article finishes with the question: What will Mr. Orwell do next?. Cyril Connolly, in the *Horizon*, writes that "*Animal Farm*" breaks down the artificial reserve with which Russia is written about or not written about comparing the style of Orwell to the penetration and verbal economy of Swift. Northrop Frye, in the *Canadian Forum*, of December 1946 writes that, besides the references to the Russian revolution, the fable also corresponds to the German invasion, in spite of "the end being a fantastic disruption of the sober logic of the tale. Even 21st-century reviews still enhance the allusions of "*Animal Farm*" to the Soviet Union of the mid-forties. Hitchens, in his *Why Orwell Matters* (2002), stated that:

The aims and principles of the Russian revolution are given face-value credit throughout; this is a revolution betrayed, not a revolution that is monstrous from its inception. The details are sometimes uncannily exact, from the fate of the Third International to Stalin's eventual compromise – via Moses the fabulist raven – with the Russian Orthodox Church. (Hitchens, 2002, p. 187).

Criticism on "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", although normally more diversified, does not leave the association to anti-Communism behind. Fredric Warburg, in a piece of criticism of 1949 on "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", written in (1949), stated that this is amongst the terrifying books he has ever read. The savagery of Swift has passed to a successor who looked upon life and found it

becoming more and more intolerable. Warburg sees “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” as a continuation of “*Animal Farm*”, “a picture of a man unmanned, of humanity without heart, ... the Soviet Union in the nth degree. For Harold Nicolson, (1949) in the *Observer*, as cited by Trilling, in June (1949), “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” can be approached either as a novel embodying a political argument or as an indictment of materialism cast in the fictional form. The society pictured in this “cautionary tale”, for Nicolson, is the world against which Mr. Orwell warns us which emerged after the atomic war of 1950, mainly inspired by the atomic bombs on Japan. In the *Nation* of June 1949, Trilling wrote that:

we are being warned against the extremes to which the contemporary totalitarian spirit can carry us, not only so that we will be warned against Russia, but also so that we will understand the ultimate dangers involved wherever powers move under the guise of order and rationality. (Trilling, 1949, p. 215).

Recent reviews keep following the same trend. Hitchens, once more, links *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to Stalinism:

In truth, the idea that two and two make five, for instance, was suggested by multiple sources. Stalin’s propagandists were fond of saying that they completed the First Year Plan in four years; this was sometimes rendered for the simple-minded as $2+2=5$. (op.cit, 2002, p. 189).

Much can be seen in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” that may help understand the social and political situation of our contemporary times, increasing in impact if read taking into consideration the possible links between them.

Hitchens, (2002) maintained that it is possible to have at least a superficial idea of the depth of the set of works of George Orwell, and the ways followed by him, which molded his political concepts and provided him with experience to produce masterpieces as “*Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-four*”. The difficult times of a middle-class child who very early had to face humiliations to keep himself in a good and expensive school worked as a trigger to awake Orwell’s views on the weak one, be it a person or a whole country. His journeys among the poor and the increasing sense of injustice that the society gave him granted him with an approach to socialist ideas, which soon moved Orwell to action, to a war that, in the end, opened his eyes to the injustice of political extremes. With this, the fear was not that the poor ones would not have food on their tables: the fear became bigger, the fear of political regimes that would not just discharge the poor, but all the citizens who did not accept the ruling political ideology. The message for “justice and liberty” was not just a matter of diminishing the differences among social classes anymore: it became a matter of intellectual survival. (ibid).

The most elaborate studies of Orwell available, are the books by John Atkins, Christopher Hollis, and Richard Rees. The latter two writers were personal acquaintances of George Orwell, and their books contain the first-hand memory of some value which no doubt will assist in the writing of a definitive study someday. Perhaps we have been too close to Orwell, since his death a decade and a half ago, to have the kind of perspective which leads to a major work of criticism being written about him. So far the criticism is potential, not actual. Yet he is an important writer; perhaps the major English writer of the 1940s and early 1950s, though this is an extreme claim to make. His place in literary history today is by no means settled, and there are good

reasons why this should be so. For in considering the ultimate reputation and relative worth of a man of letters, the local and topical is inevitably separated from that which is more universal, more appealing to all ages and conditions of men. "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" gained the great successes because of the immediacy of their appeal, for they were published just at the point where the full chaos and danger of the postwar world, with its confrontation between former allies of East and West, was becoming clear? Or do these books have a more timeless appeal? Just as Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* contains much local satire of English political and religious controversy of the early part of the eighteenth century, so Orwell's writing contains similar material. But what of its universality? This is the question which a critic must answer at some point when dealing with Orwell. But another way, was Orwell a brilliant but ephemeral journalist, or did the body of his work have more solidity than is represented by even brilliant journalism, which after all, by definition appeals to the moment and not to the long view of history? (ibid)

Orwell was written about during his lifetime, and John Atkins attempted to summarise some of the views expressed about him in his book, *George Orwell: A Literary and Biographical Study*, which is a rather ambitious work, and this may be consulted. Lionel Trilling, in his well-known essay, *George Orwell and the Politics of Truth*, said with economy and restraint what many have said about Orwell that he was an honest and honorable man as well as an honest man of letters. The entire point of the essay, which Professor Trilling originally wrote as an introduction to *Homage to Catalonia*, may be summed up in the words of one of his students which Trilling himself described Orwell as a virtuous man. For Professor Trilling, Orwell was not a

genius. He was a committed man, in the sense that he lived his vision, as have Thoreau, Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, and perhaps Henry James, among major American writers of the past century. Orwell was more modern than these; he was "engaged" in the sense that some of the Existentialists have been engaged and committed to political thought and action for the betterment of human life, whether or not they believed at the time that betterment was possible. (ibid).

All of Orwell's writings, as Professor Trilling and others have indicated, were directed to political ends which would have as their final result the promotion of human decency. Perhaps there is a lack of really enlightening critical writing about "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" and other works of Orwell because he was so clear and precise as a writer. Valuing clarity, simplicity, and precision of expression over anything else in the technical craft of writing, Orwell may have said what he had to say in such a forceful way that interpretation was not as necessary as it might be in dealing with more complicated, allegorical, "literary" writers. Sir Richard Rees was a close friend of George Orwell, and it has been said that he is one of the characters, Ravelston, in *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*, though this has not been proved. (ibid).

Significantly, the title of Sir Richard's book is *George Orwell: Fugitive from the Camp of Victory*. For Orwell, the just man would not be found in the camp of victory, perhaps because in a state of perfect justice, there would be no camps of strong and weak. Thus, the interpretation of Orwell by Sir Richard involves his always standing up for the weak against the strong, which has occasionally led to the misrepresentation of his real political position.

It is worth mentioning here that the critical axioms with which the reader should approach Orwell seem reducible to the following:

Firstly, Orwell's biography is very important, as he was above all a writer who lived his work.

Secondly, Orwell's work is a "seamless garment" in which every part of it has a bearing on every other part, and all of his work leads up to "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" and serves as the best background we have for the interpretation of that great political satire.

And thirdly, Orwell's purpose in writing was not only to record what was happening in the world and to project ahead to make men realize what was likely to happen; it was as much or more his purpose to change the world. He hoped that if he painted political evil vividly enough, men would turn from that evil.

"*Animal Farm*", as a political allegory, of course, needs more interpretation than does "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" in terms of the historical meanings of particular characters and events. The difference between the two best-known and most powerful works of Orwell is that they are not only of different literary kinds; the beast fable and the anti-utopian fiction but also "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" seems to have universal satirical meanings. Both books deal with what Orwell called "the central question - how to prevent power from being abused." Orwell has no easy answers to this overwhelming question. But he could at least ask it in such a way that his contemporaries could see the absolute importance of the question, and this he did, in language too clear for conventional criticism. (ibid).

Surprisingly, Orwell was not a genius, said Trilling, but what genius is? the sense in which he used the term, he does not say. He does credit Orwell not only with great imagination and decency, but with a sense of actual participation in the world of affairs so that, unlike many liberal intellectuals in Trilling's view, Orwell knew what he was doing when he wrote of government and administration, of Communism, Nazism, and other political forms. Trilling establishes Orwell's relation to Communism and his disillusion with it - this is also important as one considers what precisely Orwell was satirizing in 1984. In his final estimation of Orwell as a decent man, and an honest one, Trilling echoes the view held by most who have written about Orwell or known him-indeed, his essay helped to formulate this view.

Lionel Trilling's well-known essay, "George Orwell and the Politics of Truth," is part of an introduction to *Homage to Catalonia*, and thus deals with "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" only indirectly. The suggestion of Professor Trilling is really that Orwell was a very unusual man in his political outlook and his essential decency-in fact, that he was a sort of modern-day saint, who not only wrote of his vision, but lived it, like Mark Twain, Thoreau, Whitman, Henry Adams, and Henry James.

As have been pointed out by the above critics, everything which Orwell ever wrote as preparation for "*Nineteen Eighty-four*". However, in addition to certain essays which have been mentioned in the biographical or the critical commentary sections of this study, two of Orwell's books stand out as worthy of consideration in this context: *Down and Out in Paris and London* written in (1933), and *Coming up for Air* written in (1939). These books are rather

different in purpose and in-kind, the first being a somewhat fictionalized autobiography and the second a novel. (ibid)

2.5 The Marxist Literary Theory

Nouasri, (2015) stated that the “Marxist” approach to literature is based on the philosophy of Karl Marx, a German philosopher and economist. His major argument was that whoever controlled the means of production (the factories) in a society controlled by society. Marx noted a disparity in the economic and political power enjoyed by the factory owners and not allowed to the factory laborers.

He believed that the means of production (i.e., the basis of power in society) should be placed in the hands of those who operated them. He wrote that economic and political revolutions around the world would eventually place power in the hands of the masses, the laborers. To read a work from a Marxist perspective, one must understand that Marxism asserts that literature is a reflection of culture and that culture can be influenced by literature. Marxists believe literature can instigate revolution. Meanwhile, the political economist *Friedrich Engels* (1820 -1895) as cited by Nouasri, (2015) found out that he had been at similar perspectives of Marx. That's why they both decided to the contribution to explain the principles of communism (later called Marxism) and to manage an international movement.

The Marxist theory also considered a sociological approach to literature that viewed works of literature or art as the products of historical forces that can be analyzed by looking at the material conditions in which they were formed. In Marxist ideology, what it often classify as a world view (such as Victorian age) is actually the articulations of the dominant class, harsh, iron-fist

government Marxism approach generally focuses on the clash between the dominant and repressed classes in any given age and also may encourage art to imitate what is often termed "objective" reality. The Frankfurt School is also associated with Marxism and rejected realism.

Marxism developed primarily as a way of examining historical, economic, and social issues, the Marxist tendency does not deal explicitly with theories of literature; consequently, there is no one orthodox Marxist school (as there is an orthodox Freudianism), but rather a diversity of Marxist readings. Thus, in the preface of the book of Terry Eagleton *Marxism and Literary Criticism*, Eagleton writes ironically that no doubt we shall soon see Marxist criticism comfortably wedged Between Freudian and mythological approaches to literature, as yet one More stimulating academic 'approach,' one more well-tilled field of inquiring students to tramp.

2.6 Review of Previous Studies

1. Khalida, M. (2013), *The Use of Personification in George Orwell's Novel Animal Farm*. M.A Dissertation: Kasdi Merbah University

This study attempts to investigate the use of personification in George Orwell's novel, "*Animal Farm*". It also sets to cast light on the author's motives behind the use of such a figure of speech personification. This investigation aims at laying a finger on Orwell's overuse of personification in the novel, focusing on its meaning and usage. The present work is divided into four chapters. Firstly, it presents a theoretical background where the focus is on some of the linguistic devices; metaphor, simile, metonymy, irony, synecdoche, allegory, and personification. The metaphor is a general term, which is used to refer to different figures of speech. Personification, which is our main concern in this inquiry, is one of these figures. Then, it highlights the theories of personification and its specifications. Also, it reflects the analysis of the novel, and a corpus-based investigation of personification in "*Animal Farm*", trying to find out Orwell's motives behind the use of such a linguistic device.

Finally, it attempts to apply the linguistic device "personification" in the novel "*Animal Farm*" and to find out a suitable way to display the use of personification in Orwell's "*Animal Farm*". Orwell uses personification in the novel "*Animal Farm*" to portray people of power and the common people during the Russian Revolution and to describe his feelings at that time. All in all, this inquiry reveals that this linguistic device operates actively and that the decoration's view needs more reconsideration.

2. Harry Sewlall. (2002), George Orwell's Animal Farm: A metonym for a dictatorship. Research Article. Literator: Journal of Literary Criticism and Linguistics. ISSN: 0258-2279

George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" is traditionally read as a satire on dictatorships in general, and the Bolshevik Revolution in particular. This article postulates the notion that the scheme of the book has attained the force of metonymy to such an extent that whenever one alludes to the title of the book or some lines from it, one conjures up images associated with a dictatorship. The title of the book has become a part of the conceptual political lexicon of the English language to refer to the corruption of utopian ideology. As an ideological state, Animal Farm has its vision, which is embedded in its constitution; it has the vote, a national anthem and a flag. It even has its patriots, double-dealers, social engineers and lechers. In this way, the title "*Animal Farm*", like Joseph Heller's *Catch-22*, or Thomas More's *Utopia*, functions metonymically to map a conceptual framework which matches the coordinates of the book. The article concludes with a look at contemporary society to show how Orwell's satire endorses the words of Lord Acton, namely, that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

3. Rashid Hussain (2014): George Orwell's Animal Farm. Review Article published in the International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention: ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714.

This research article is about the imagination of George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" which has been established between November 1943 and February 1944. In "*Animal Farm*", the surface animal story casts a satiric light on early

twentieth century's socio-political world itself. The meaning of this approach is intrinsic to the animal world created by Orwell. Such a world is self-contained; it reflects nothing specific outside of itself. We might find meaning in the very characters themselves as they help to illuminate the types they represent; or in certain passions and appetite conveyed that can be quite independent of anything political or in the psychological manipulation of tone group by another. There might be meaning in the very transformation of animals into human types that are in the artistry it takes to make these animals convincing: in this approach the meaning is aesthetic or meaning for some might be found in being a spectator to life on "*Animal Farm*".

4. Sana Nawaz & et al (2015): Allegory & Satire on Animal Farm By George Orwell. Research Article published in the International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection: ISSN 2309-0405. Vol. 3, No. 5, 2015

This research paper highlights the allegorical and satirical significance of the novel "*Animal Farm*" by George Orwell. This expresses the ideas of a faulty system, political corruption and the circumstances of the Russian revolution in 1917. Though it seems a simple and plain story of animals, about their suffering and struggles classless society. "*Animal Farm*" is an animal story outwardly but inwardly this novel is an allegory and a satire about the Russian revolution of 1971 with false qualities of class struggle.

5. Dinesh Kumar (2014): Vision of Society in George Orwell's Animal Farm. Review Article published in the International Journal of Research (IJR), ISSN: 2348-6848. Vol-1, Issue-7, August 2014

This article views how Orwell highlights all the unsavory features and sore-spots of society. He picks up the dangerous portents of contemporary reality

and exaggerates them for the sake of urgent attention and effect. Cruelty, fraud, and deception are bad enough. But the totalitarian umbrella that shelters these vices and gives legitimacy of truth to lies is worse still. So, as a humanist, Orwell views with concern the totalitarian trends in modern society.

Orwell firmly believes that if totalitarianism is allowed to grow unchecked, it would swallow the freedom and dignity of the individual. After experimenting with different set-ups e.g. imperialism, capitalism, etc, he realizes that socialism is the only remedy for the intolerable conditions he has described in his books. So, whether it is *Burmese Days*, *The Road to Wigan Pier*, “*Animal Farm*” or “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, Orwell's works expose the evils of exploitation, authoritarianism, and totalitarianism. That is why, there is a continuous fight in his works against oppression, tyranny, injustice, and inequality. In *Animal Farm* there is a bitter disillusion with the political revolution which involves savage suppression of individual liberty. His “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is, in some ways, an extended metaphor of *Animal Farm* which witnesses a gradual suppression of the individual's personality.

Orwell is a great champion of the underdogs. His purpose, in the novel always remains to associate himself with the oppressed half of humanity. His task has been to plead for the amelioration of the poor working class. But he is hard-headed enough not to be taken in by any utopias. He tells us in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” “if there is any hope it lies in the Proles”. As an agent of British imperialism, Orwell had experienced, for some years, the tyranny and cruelty of an oppressive system in Burma, the reaction of which is plain to be seen in his book *The Road to Wigan Pier*.

6. Didem Baysoy, (1996). Orwell's Animal Farm As A Political Satire. PhD Thesis, Near East University: Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

George Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" is one of the greatest modern political allegories, telling the story of an innocent revolution turning into dictatorship and betrayal. Though the novel seems like an allegory of the Russian Revolution of 1917, in fact, it deals with any kind of revolution; its consequences, and criticizes totalitarianism of any kind. Orwell also pointed out that the failure of such revolutions often lay within the revolutionary process since its leaders ignore those whom the revolutions were meant to serve. In the end, those for whom the revolution was intended are often the victims rather than the beneficiaries.

As Orwell says, his main intention was to show how false the popular idea that Soviet Russia was a socialist state. Thus, being a socialist, he wanted to save socialism from communism. By writing the novel, Orwell also wanted to remind people and especially leaders of the immediate past its consequences, and the facts.

The song 'Beasts of England' and the 'Seven Commandments' which were quoted in the introduction were the essence of the animals' revolution. However, in the end, we see that the song is banned, and the commandments are turned into an illogical and unjust slogan.

This thesis was a brief study of Orwell's "*Animal Farm*" as a political satire. He gave some information about the author's life and career; mentioned the situation of English society in the beginning of the 20th century, regarding its history, literature, economics, and political status; stated the factors that caused Orwell to write the novel; and finally, after defining allegory, He tried to

examine Orwell's methods of characterization, focusing especially on the allegorical characterization. Nine different sources were used which are indicated in the bibliography.

7. Emelie Brax (2015): A Rhetorical Reading of George Orwell's "Nineteen Eighty-four": The brainwashing of Winston in the light of ethos, logos, and pathos. An Essay. University of Barcelona: Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences

This essay aims to cast a light upon the brainwashing carried out by the totalitarian Party in George Orwell's dystopian novel, "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", and induce a deeper understanding of its persuasive effect on Winston Smith, the main character. Winston passionately hates the Party and its leader Big Brother who govern the country of Oceania in which he lives. However, after having undergone brainwashing that also includes torture, Winston surrenders to the ideology of the Party and at the end of the novel, his hatred towards Big Brother has turned to love. To understand Winston's conversion, I carry out a close reading of the novel and apply the three rhetorical means of persuasion, ethos, logos and pathos, to the novel and demonstrate when and how these appeals are used on Winston. Against this rhetorical background, the analysis shows that the Party's usage of rhetorical appeals can explain why the brainwashing works successfully in its persuasive aim. This result also demonstrates that these three appeals play a prominent role over a course of several years in the Party's indoctrination of Winston. Additionally, the presence of rhetoric proves that there is more than Winston being tortured to his conversion. Thus, Winston is not only tortured into repeating the principles of the party, but he is also persuaded into actually believing in them and loving Big Brother by the Party's strategic appeals to ethos, logos, and pathos.

8. Griet Vantieghem, (2009) Ideology in the works of George Orwell: a Sociocultural Approach in the Wake of Raymond Williams" Cultural Materialism. Master Thesis, University of Ghent: Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Ideology is one of the main pillars of Rowell's works. In this thesis, the writer has tried to show how ideology influences the lives of the characters in Orwell's novels. Raymond Williams has been very useful as a framework to do so. During his lifetime, Orwell wrote more novels than those discussed here of course. His novels can be subdivided into two groups: the factional novels and the fictional ones. "Orwell's writing in the 1930s can be conventionally divided between the „documentary“ and „factual“ work on one hand, and the „fictional“ and „imaginative“ work on the other" (Williams George Orwell 39). *Down and Out in Paris and London* and *Homage to Catalonia* represents his documentary work. The last two novels, "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", are fully fictional and have a very strong political undertone.

The first novel, *Down and Out in Paris and London*, is the least ideological, in the sense that the protagonists are less linked to or determined by ideology. Orwell and his companions are not concerned with ideological premises. That is to say, they have their ideological ideas, but these are not prominent. The novel depicts a heterogeneous set of ideologies, of which none is decisive. From an expedient point of view, the protagonists adapt their ideology to benefit the most from every situation. The main point of the novel is then to show how futile ideology is. Surviving overrules all ideological principles.

Homage to Catalonia is crucial for the personality of Orwell. His decision to go to Spain is purely ideological but it turns out wholly different than he had

expected. In the first months of his stay there, Orwell gets convinced to the core of the social ideas he has been dreaming of all along. However, the sudden betrayal of the Spanish government and his abrupt departure out of Catalonia will utterly disappoint him. Orwell is much more influenced by ideological ideal this time than in *Down and Out*. Ideology is what the Spanish Civil War is all about. Those months in Catalonia are therefore unique in Orwell's life. The original ideological spirit with which he comes to Spain is simultaneously invigorated and crushed down by his experiences in the war.

In *Animal Farm* we get a fuller view on ideological systems than was previously the case. The fictional genre allows for Orwell to explore the largest depths of political totalitarian systems. For the first time, ideology becomes a real tool for domination, a means by which people or animals can be enslaved. The hope that is present in his first novels gradually disappears in the course of this story. "*Animal Farm*" shows a communal experience of ideological abuse and a group of dumb beasts not capable of finding an answer to it. "Even the last sad scene, where the excluded animals look from man to pig and pig to man and cannot tell which is which carries a feeling that is more than disillusion and defeat" (Williams, George Orwell 74-75).

Orwell's last novel is also his most despairing one. Whereas *Animal Farm* starts promisingly, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* immediately assures us that Winston will never have any chance to get away from the system. The situation in Oceania is utterly bleak and Orwell manages to create a waterproof system that cannot be overthrown. The fictional world is permeated with the concept of ideology. Ingsoc is the embodiment of a totalitarian regime that has complete control over its inhabitants due to its ingenious application of thoughts and

ideas. This novel gives us the most pessimistic views on ideology and its abuses. In the world of Oceania, there is no hope.

In the four novels discussed an evolution can be traced. Both Orwell's own life experiences and the types of the novel he writes an account for this. His writings evolve from ideology as a minor facet in *Down and Out in Paris and London*, over a cherished conviction in his recount of the Spanish Civil War, to utter despair in the last works he writes. In the course of his writing, Orwell's interest in social facts becomes an obsession with ideology (Williams George Orwell 77). In order to discern Orwell's literary evolution "One have, rather, to try to understand, in the detail of experience, how the instincts of humanity can break down under pressure into an inhuman paradox; how a great and humane tradition can seem at times, to all of us, to disintegrate into a caustic dust" (Williams Culture and Society 284).

9. Radha Madhab Jha. (2015), The Political & Social Ideas of George Orwell: With Particular Reference to His Novel: "1984". Research Article published in the International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies. Vol.2. Issue4.,2015 (Oct.-Dec.)

Orwell's "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" is a scathing satire on modern totalitarian states. Orwell also fears that there are some political states as well which have their own open and subtle designs to strike at the bastion of liberty and the freedom of thought and expression. Orwell's mind was troubled by three evils- class, oppression, and poverty. Against these three evils, he set the following three values- decency, liberty, and justice. Around these six terms, we would shape the whole story of Orwell's mind and heart, taking his fiction and non-fiction together as a whole. Though the writer's nightmarish

visions of 1948 did not come true in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", his timely warning was good for the political health of the world of our times. Orwell's protest is against the iron-fisted rule of only 2% of people (the politicians and the bureaucrats) over the rest of mankind. In "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", he warns that if something is not immediately, the future of the world is dark, bleak and dreadful. If the emerging patterns of governance in some socialist or socialistic political states are not challenged and nipped in the building state, they would become totalitarian. And these totalitarian states will dehumanize and brutalize mankind. The world is precariously poised on the brink of a precipice. Civilization is in imminent danger of being annihilated. In "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" Orwell made an intellectual exploration into the simulated model of the political state to which totalitarianism would derive human beings. The political activities of "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" are in throwing acids on a human face, in 'foot stamping man's face forever' and in betraying even the most personal relations with the least remorse. The political influence of "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" on the twentieth-century political scenario is comparable to the waves brought about by Hobbes' Leviathan during the muddled political turbulence of the seventeenth century. The title of Orwell's book is political by word. The terms coined by him have entered the political vocabulary, terms like "Newspeak", "mutability of the past", "Big Brother", "Thought Police", "doublethink", and "Hate Week. It is a fantasy of the political future and serves its author as a magnifying device as an examination of the present. "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" is a warning for the future that of what society could become should totalitarianism be allowed to achieve dominance. The objective of this paper is to highlight the political and social ideas of Orwell and also an attempt to show how political systems can suppress individual freedom.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses mainly on the portrayal, the depiction and the manifestation of the political allegory in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” besides the views of George Orwell that have been artistically embedded in both novels “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”.

3.1 Methodology of the Study

The whole study is based on the researcher’s selection of the methodology will be adopted and the secondary resources of the data collected for such a study. The method of this study analytically and comparatively examined the allegorical, characterization, elements and contents of both novels “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” by means of critical and textual analysis.

3.2 Techniques of Data Collection

The technique the researcher resorted to collect the data of the study was the critical analysis. It was used with selected and extracted texts from “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, and previous studies that were in total concord with the objectives of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

**Portrayal of Political Allegory in “Animal Farm”
and “Nineteen Eighty-four”**

Chapter Four

Portrayal of Political Allegory in “Animal Farm” and “Nineteen Eighty-four”

4.0 Introduction

This chapter portrayed the political views of George Orwell that have been artistically and aesthetically allegorized through his two novels “Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four”. The researcher relied greatly on specific texts selected and extracted carefully to serve fulfilling the objectives of the study and to verify the hypothesis set by the researcher to prove the main claim the study was conducted to.

4.1 Panorama of Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four

As Dickstein (2007) affirmed that after working for the BBC from 1941 until 1943, Orwell joined the *Tribune* as a literary editor. His essays brought him acclaim and he could finally choose for whom to write. But his next book, “*Animal Farm*”, propelled him into being one of the greatest novelists of the 20th century. “*Animal Farm*” is a take on the Russian Revolution and its aftermath in the deceptively simple form of a barnyard fable and satirical allegory. The book was Orwell’s confrontation with Stalin’s regime. Similarly, as with *Homage to Catalonia*, he had problems finding a publisher since it was a very inopportune time to criticize a war ally. The book was finally published in 1945 by Secker & Warburg and achieved huge sales both in Britain and the United States, ironically, because the Cold War followed quickly after the Second World War, and the USSR was no

longer seen as an ally. The book was widely misunderstood by some American critics and writers “as a satirical polemic against all forms of socialism, rather than a betrayal of revolutionary egalitarian ideals by Stalin and the Communist Party.

However, Crick (2007), critically claimed that it is ironic how, in place of Orwell's emphasis on straight-talking and plain writing, his two most successful works of art were written as elaborate allegory and have been so widely misread.

After the success of “*Animal Farm*” and the death of his first wife, Orwell moved to Jura, a secluded Scottish island in the Inner Hebrides, where, seriously ill from tuberculosis, he wrote “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”. It was his final, most complex and widely read novel published in 1949 by Secker and Warburg. Orwell himself was not particularly happy with the result.

The book received favorable reviews except for the communists, who saw it as a direct attack. *Nineteen Eighty-four*” offers many interpretations. It is a controversial work that has been widely misunderstood. Even Orwell's publisher misinterpreted its idea and believed it to represent the final breach between Orwell and socialism:

The political system which prevails is Ingsoc = English Socialism. This I take to be a deliberate and sadistic attack on socialism and socialist parties generally. It seems to indicate a final breach between Orwell and Socialism, not the socialism of equality and human brotherhood which Orwell no longer expects from socialist parties, but the socialism of Marxism and the managerial revolution. 1984 is among other things an attack on Burnham's managerial revolution, and it is worth a cool million votes to the Conservative

Party; it is imaginable that it might have a preface by Winston Churchill after whom its hero is named. (Warburg cited in Crick 1992, 567)

Similar interpretations were concocted by the left- and right-wing critics, believing that “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is Orwell’s recantation of socialism. The right used the book as anti-propaganda against communism, socialism, Marxism and the left in general and praised Orwell for it, while the left denounced him as a traitor. As Crick, (2007) wrote that he espousal of Orwell by the American right and free-market liberals made some British socialists immediately brand him as a betrayer of socialism and a cold war warrior.

Crick, (2007) maintained that Orwell’s biographer, also refuted the idea that *Nineteen Eighty-four*” represents Orwell’s divorce with “Socialism” by relying on the evidence that Orwell continued to write for the Tribune and American “Left-wing” journals right up to his final illness, during the time of the composition of *Nineteen Eighty-four*”. Many left-wing critics tried to downplay Orwell’s importance as a political writer and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a serious political work.

Williams, (1960) in his book *Culture and Society 1780-1950* believed Orwell to have put himself in a position of self-exile as a continuously critical outsider. Williams asserts that as an exile, he is incapable of relying on anyone or developing strong social connections since by doing so, his position might be compromised. He further fears his self-imposed standing, as he has no means by which to confirm his unique social identity and individuality. Williams continues to brand *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a deterministic prophecy of doom. Orwell, as an intellectual exile against the

whole system, recognized that he could not win; there was no hope at all. Many left-wing critics share similar perspectives.

Gottlieb (2007) described the book as “a cry from the abyss of despair”. Orwell's pessimistic approach may be due, in part, to the sudden death of his wife and deterioration of his health. But more significantly, West continues, Orwell’s “mood of suicidal despair” seems to result from the exhaustion of hope for solutions to the “monstrous progress” of mankind.

But the literary value of the book must not be regarded as a doomsday prophecy as is suggested by the leftist critics, whose criticism is largely a defense mechanism against Orwell's harsh attacks on his kind. This type of interpretation completely disregards the historical context and his political shrewdness in identifying the pitfalls that await us to protect our liberal values. Orwell, in *Nineteen Eighty-four*”, managed to portray with such accuracy the inner-workings of Stalin’s regime that even some Soviet Union writers, such as Milan Simecka and Czeslav Milos, were obfuscated at how a person who never lived in Russia managed to write such an accurate account. “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” also received validation as a political study in Hannah Arendt’s *Origins of Totalitarianism*, and Carl Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinsky’s *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. As Erica Gottlieb suggested, these books are evidence of scholarly confirmations that Orwell’s original ‘anatomy’ of totalitarianism was an accurate diagnosis of reality and not the fantasmagorical ‘invention’ of an author in the throes of terminal despair. (ibid).

And if “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is not a prophecy of the impending future, what is it? Crick, (2007) suggested that it is a “Swiftian satire” and a

“warning”. Orwell parodies the Soviet Union and totalitarian regimes in general.

The switching of the enemy during Hate Week in the heights of ceremonial anti-propaganda against Eurasia satirizes the German-Soviet non-aggression pact. False confessions by the leading politicians of the Party in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” mock the Moscow Trials and the Great Purge. The falsification of history that was performed by Winston in the Ministry of Truth derisively attacks the falsifications that were made by the USSR, such as Trotsky’s disappearance from official pictures in the begging stages of the revolution. The examples are numerous; Orwell made a dark parody of the world he lived in and tried to warn us of how quickly great ideas fall prey to desire of power. But in the end, disappointed by the misinterpretations of the book, he explained it best himself in an open letter:

It has been suggested by some of the reviewers of Nineteen Eighty-Four that it is the author's view that this, or something like this, is what will happen inside the next forty years in the Western World. This is not correct. I think that allowing for the book being after all a parody, something like Nineteen Eighty-Four could happen. This is the direction in which the world is going at present, and the trend lies deep in the political, social and economic foundations of the contemporary world situation.

Specifically, the danger lies in the structure imposed on Socialist and Liberal capitalist communities by the necessity to prepare for total war with the USSR and the new weapons, of which of course the atomic bomb is the most powerful and the most publicized. But danger lies also in the acceptance of a totalitarian outlook by intellectuals of all colors. (Orwell 1992, p. 565-566)

Crick, (2007) confirmed that “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is a long premeditated, rational warning against totalitarian tendencies in societies like our own rather than a sick and sudden prophecy about a Soviet or neo-Nazi takeover, still less a scream of despair and recantation of his democratic Socialism.

George Orwell died on the 21st of January 1950 of pulmonary tuberculosis but his literary legacy survived. “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” entered social consciousness and helped us prevent the totalitarian horror world of Oceania. But to what extent? Is his warning still relevant? The following lines explore whether the techniques of control used in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” are still in use today and to what extent they affect modern society.

4.2 Allegorical views in “Animal Farm” and “Nineteen Eighty-four”

According to the framework of this thesis, the objective of the previous chapter has been to conceptualize some literary and political issues that underlie the discussion carried on concerning the decaying interest, on the part of literary criticism, on the work of George Orwell.

The researcher tried deeply to present the reading of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, demonstrating how it is possible to empty these allegorical views from their critical interpretations and their connection with the reality of our contemporary world. As a result, “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” will be approached so that some points of this transition from symbolism into allegory becomes more evident. Some possible points of connection between the works will also be discussed. Along with this effort, the researcher hopes to stress the artistic dimension of the works analyzed, which belong to the realm of political Literature –

and is precisely their artistic value that makes them survive and allow the possibility of new readings. That would not be the goal if it was dealing with strictly political documents.

Kubal, (1972) claimed that the transition from an allegorical to a symbolical analysis matches the transition from the animal condition of the characters of "*Animal Farm*", who simply accepted what was imposed on them, to a rational human condition, like the main character of "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" who was at least able to see further when all the sights of reality were limited by oppression. This awakening and evolution of a political consciousness that happens when reading the novels as a sequence, from the irrational to the rational state of perception, to a certain extent, keep up with the need of critical novelty that contemporary readers may provide to artistic works of Literature.

The transitional points that may be identified between "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" are many, and such connections open the possibility to read the two novels as a continuum on the same theme, forming a story that starts with the dream of Old Major in the fable of the animals of Manor Farm and finishes with the symbolic death of Winston Smith in the futuristic pessimistic view of Oceania, establishing the view of a unique totalitarian society in progress.

In addition to the way in which the two works are presented, *Animal Farm* in a form of a fable, culminating in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", in a form of science fiction collaborates to enlighten the utopian past of revolutions, which may become dystopian futures if they are left to follow their ways with a centralizing government, since the popular motto "total power

corrupts totally" seems to find its place in the works. These links may not only serve as a means to explore the way totalitarian societies have developed since totalitarianism got historically linked to Nazi and Communist policies, but mainly to totalitarian attitudes, that seem to be subtly spread in a fluid way in many world affairs nowadays, in some cases, exactly through the same apparatus of propaganda and manipulation of reality, not to mention the use of violence and torture. And this may be considered the first element where allegory opens space to symbol: Totalitarian actions did not cease with the fall of Nazism or Communism, but so, they are still relatively common practices in our globalized contemporary world. (ibid).

Kubal, (1972) stressed that in "*Animal Farm*", everything starts with the dream of Old Major, the boar, who triggers the animals into believing in the creation of a farm where the animals would not need to serve the exploiting humans as possible:

"Now, comrades, what is the nature of this life of ours? Let us face it: our lives are miserable, laborious, and short. We are born, we are given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and those of us who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of our strength, and the very instant that our usefulness has come to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. No animal in England knows the meaning of happiness or leisure after he is a year old. No animal in England is free. The life of an animal is misery and slavery: that is the plain truth... There, comrades are the answer to all our problems. It is summed up in a single word—Man. Man is the only real enemy we have. Remove Man from the scene, and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished forever".
(Kubal, 1945, p. 14-15)

Following this assumption, the animals rebel and make the revolution in the name of better conditions of life. One of the most inspiring things is the change of name from *Manor Farm* to “*Animal Farm*”, and a change of name may bring within itself many ideological questions. This revolution was implemented in terms of equality among the animals, where, the utopia of reaching a society where all animals were equal and would have their individualities respected is led by the pigs, who, in a first moment, become the great leaders and strategists of the revolution. With this, the first division that can be realized in that society begins: there is a gap dividing the pigs, more precisely Snowball and Napoleon, from the other animals, who are meant to follow the pigs’ orders. However, the taste for power that the swine ruling class samples has such a force that opens the possibility of corruption and, with this, gradually, the revolutionary utopian ideals fade away, giving place to a system where the rulers, the pigs, change their attitudes so much that they get to the point of being confused with the former enemies, the humans. At this point, it is impossible to know who is a friend and who is an enemy:

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which. (Ibid. 1972, p. 14-15)

The animals become subordinate to a workforce and a centralized ideology dominated by a privileged class, in the name of the good of the farm. Although some of the animals start to doubt whether their lives are better under the rule of the pigs that when they were under the whip of Mr. Jones.

They are unable to get to a conclusion, mainly since they had never lived in such a situation to compare these two moments.

In an attempt to make things clear, Kubal, (1972) justified that the animals cannot evaluate the situation properly not because the new situation springs from revolution, but the previous utopia starts to become a dystopia. Napoleon becomes not only the total leader of the farm but also the total owner of reality. Along with his silent changes in the laws and control of what way news might be spread, once more, the allegory to Communism finds equivalency in the allegory of some present world affairs, such as the attempts of some governments to stay longer in office than the constitutions of their countries predict, dissolving rival parties and also exerting control on the means of communication. In “*Animal Farm*”, these things are represented in the increasing number of pigs in the farm, that prevents the sharing of power with other races impossible, since this new class, or this new kind, the pigs, have been from early life educated by Napoleon, who was also the biological father of this kind:

In the autumn the four sows had all littered about simultaneously, producing thirty-one young pigs between them. The young pigs were piebald and as Napoleon was the only boar on the farm, it was possible to guess at their parentage. It was announced that later when bricks and timber had been purchased, a schoolroom would be built in the farmhouse garden. For the time being, the young pigs were given their instruction by Napoleon himself in the farmhouse kitchen. They took their exercise in the garden and were discouraged from playing with the other young animals. About this time, too, it was laid down as a rule that when a pig and any other animal met on the path, the other animal must stand aside: and also that all pigs, of whatever degree, were to have the privilege of wearing green ribbons on their tails on Sundays. (ibid. 1972, p. 14-15)

This new kind may participate in the government, of course, but at different levels. Thus, there is the establishment of the "Inner Party" of the pigs, with Napoleon and his assistants. At the same time, there is the creation of a kind of "Outer Party", formed by pigs that received education from Napoleon and helped spread their ideology, and the outsiders, the "proles", formed by the rest of the population of animals in the farm.

Similarly, in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", the equivalent to Napoleon is Big Brother, the one who symbolizes all which must be believed and consequently decides in what things the society must believe. Snowball develops into Goldenstein, the new symbol of betrayal and hatred. As already mentioned, the privileged class of the pigs becomes the inner party, some of them the outer party, who, although belonging to the ruling party, do not enjoy the same individual benefits, and the rest of the animals compose the proles. Squealer, the one who was responsible for the spread of news, always flowered with lies, becomes the Ministry of Truth. Boxer, the symbol of hard-working, abnegation and trust in the government becomes Mr Parsons, a member of the Outer Party loyal to Big Brother. Both die in the hands of the ruling system.

Furthermore, If the raven Moses in "*Animal Farm*" symbolizes religion, teaching the animals to work and not complain, in order to reach the "Sugar Mountain", this evolves in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" to the more abstract connection between religion and power, clearly expressed in the words of O'Brien When described himself as the priests of power- "God is power". And, still, in the 21st century world, religion and politics are entwined. In the case of "*Animal Farm*", the individuals who compose that society has the mark of innocence of the animals, not presenting any sign of a past culture to

be kept to face the new order of the pigs, they do not have roots with the past, and therefore, they do not openly rebel against the new totalitarian ruling system. (ibid)

As a result, this may be understood as a symbolic representation of the human political consciousness, that evolves in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, since there is one individual that wishes that the truth be revealed, that the reality expressed by the inner party is a fake, and that the proles, with their past culture, are the last possibility of salvation. This character, which reminds us of the pigs who received instruction from Napoleon in “*Animal Farm*” becomes Winston Smith, the protagonist in Orwell’s last novel. This might be understood as a metaphor for the evolution of the political consciousness, when somebody becomes able to raise questions about the status quo, passing from an animalistic (irrational) understanding of the situation to a human (rational) understanding. Winston looks for individual rights in a place where absolutely no individuality is permitted, a trace from the time when symbolically Oceania was still called Animal Farm.

With this, as much as the “traitors” like Snowball – Goldstein must be hated to death, Winston Smith must also die for this treason. In other words, Smith wants to show that the utopia preached by Big Brother is false, something that the animal condition of the characters of “*Animal Farm*” prevented them from doing. Smith, as a rational being, has the desire to dismantle the dystopia that the society of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is, but, alone, he does not have the strength to overcome the power of that totalitarian state, that can break Smith under torture. If the animals were naive enough to the point of accepting Napoleon as a total leader, the evolution of the plot seen as a continuum finished up in a plain inertia to what concerns the rational but

marginalized proles of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, because they were also, to a certain extent, kept like animals, with no education nor decent conditions of life.

Following the prerogatives of Friedrich, the totalitarian traces of the society of “*Animal Farm*” evolve significantly into Oceania, starting from the establishment of an elaborate ideology, in which everyone who lived in those societies was obliged to adhere, at least passively. In “*Animal Farm*”, this ideology preaches that the pigs must always get the best portions of food and stay with the “brainwork”, being all the other animals, servants of the pigs, and not exactly of the farm itself. This ideology evolves to “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” in the same form, where not the pigs anymore, but then the Inner Party is responsible for the maintenance of the *status quo* and for the strict division of the society, where no one can ascend, and where the Big Brother is the greatest symbol of the power of this ideology. With this, the existence of a single mass party led by the dictator, also took place in “*Animal Farm*”, although not being a political party in the molds that we can picture nowadays, obviously due to the still precarious political capability of the organization of the animals. This beginning party consisted of a small percentage of the population of the farm, however, the unquestioning participation of pigs and even of some other animals, like the sheep, worked to promote a sense of general acceptance.

What is more, in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” evolves to the Inner party, which holds the least number of inhabitants in Oceania, but that is the one that controls the whole land and also promotes that similar sense of general acceptance. In both cases, such a sense is supported by the manipulation of reality and by a strong system of repression. If allegorically these systems of

repression remind us of Communism, Nazism, and Fascism, it is important to realize that such systems are still realities in many parts of the world. This emphasizes the allegory that the works in question bring into the discussion.

The use of secret polices to support and supervise the party for its leaders ends up originating a system of terror that, in *“Animal Farm”*, starts with the orders to kill animals contrary to the pigs and culminates in the so-called “vaporizations” of *“Nineteen Eighty-four”*, summary executions of considered dangerous citizens. Being this terror physical or psychic, Napoleon, by taking the puppies from their mothers to rear them, and using them to spread terror on the ones who dared question his decisions and authority, commits murders in front of the other animals not only to eliminate potentially dangerous enemies of his ideology, but also to show these murders as examples to the animals who might come to develop any kind of criticism on the ruling class, as happened with Winston Smith. In *“Nineteen Eighty-four”*, Big Brother does no more than continue this practice, maybe, the strongest characteristic of the totalitarian society, by providing public demonstrations of executions of war prisoners. However, there is a subtle evolution from the physical terror to an enhancement of the psychic terror, in such a way that one never knew if their actions might be considered offensive or not to the eyes of Big Brother, and the constant fact of people who were seen every day and suddenly disappeared helped to increase this terror and the necessity to abolish any thought that could be considered a threat to the Party, because the dogs of Napoleon became the Thought Police of Big Brother. In both cases, any sign of treason, or anything that the rulers could consider treason was punished with torture and execution. These are many historical pieces of evidence that Communist and Nazi regimes adopted such

practices toward the considered “enemies of the State” but the symbols found in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” are much more comprehensive. It suffices to mention the military dictatorships that spread around South America in the '60s and '70s when thousands of people reported having been tortured, and the same rate of people who were blacklisted by these governments have been, up to nowadays, considered disappeared.

Education which was another reality that was common to totalitarian states held the monopoly of technology, consequently, in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”. In the first, Napoleon creates a school that is supposed to be attended exclusively by the little pigs, and furthermore, it was a school where he was the teacher, in a clear attempt to impose the ideology of the ruling class on the animals since very early.

Although some animals developed a rudimentary capability of reading and were even triggered to learn more in the first days after the establishment of the revolution, it seems that the hardening of Napoleon’s policies brought together the need to keep the animals the least educated as possible. On the other hand, the pigs could read very well and Napoleon was preparing a new generation of pigs to rule over the farm. Besides, they had the monopoly of the available technology of the farm by having access to some magazines left by Jones, on carpentry, electricity and other useful affairs. So much as the pigs were the only animals who were able to shoot with guns during the fable. These monopolies evolve in Oceania and become more perceptible in their high technology, used to the advantage of the party, mainly by the monitoring of all citizens through the telescreens, and nothing is mentioned in this science fiction about the education of the proles, the greatest percentage of Oceania, (85%) besides that every time they were focused on

the plot, they look ignorant and marginalized, what fitted well to the goals of the party: the more ignorant, the easier to manipulate, and the proles did not seem to be able to perceive this, expressing even a kind of primitive patriotism that kept them indifferent to the situation. This monopoly on technology and education is enhanced by the central control of the economy, that simply passes from the hands (paws?) of Napoleon, who by himself decided what to do with all the wealth of the farm to the (fictitious?) hands of Big Brother, who more and more invested in the maintenance of their own ideology by spying on people's lives and making constant wars.

Another monopoly was of all means of effective mass communication, which is another totalitarian characteristic that Napoleon resorted to keeping himself in power. The news about the battles, strange changes of the seven commandments of Animalism and working orders were spread mainly through the pig Squealer, who was able to make that news seems to be convincing and favorable to Napoleon, since the moment Snowball became a renegade up to the moment when the horse Boxer, the most hard-working of the animals, was sold to a glue factory, a fact that was reported as if he had been mercifully sent to an animal clinic. However, Squealer announced the death of Boxer in this way:

"It was the most affecting sight I have ever seen!" said Squealer, lifting his trotter and wiping away a tear. "I was at his bedside at the very last. And at the end, almost too weak to speak, he whispered in my ear that his sole sorrow was to have passed on before the windmill was finished. 'Forward, comrades!' he whispered. 'Forward in the name of the Rebellion. Long live Animal Farm! Long live Comrade Napoleon! Napoleon is always right.' Those were his very last words, comrades." (Squealer p. 59).

In “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, the profession of the protagonist is very meaningful. Winston Smith works for the Ministry of Truth, a place responsible for the production of news that should become always favorable to the Party, even if, for this, the elimination of entire issues of books and magazines was necessary, not to mention the montages in pictures, to show that certain people were never seen together. Winston had the option, and his awakening political consciousness shows that it is possible to develop such a consciousness when you know more clearly how reality can be approached from diverse angles by the means of communication. And this capability of interpreting what media broadcasts is what may be the difference from allegorical interpretations of reality as if everything were already ready to be accepted, and symbolic interpretations of this same reality, when there is the concern to evaluate what a piece of certain news means, at a given place and time.

With this, the researcher offers another common feature that could be identified in a totalitarian society, one that seems to be more subtle than the ones described above: the manipulation of a dystopian reality through media. This feature considered as an absolute totalitarian because it is the intromission of the state in things that, ethically, the state should not have access to. Reality may not be another thing than what happens, and the media must bring this information in the most neutral form. In “*Animal Farm*”, reality seems to be no more than a mental state which can be manipulated by the superiors. Whereas in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, this goes on, where the facts remain in the shadow of the perceived reality. Much of this manipulation of reality through the control of thoughts is performed by the pigs through songs, like Beasts of England, which was the anthem of the revolution, and through the seven commandments of Animalism, that were

constantly repeated by the sheep. These commandments finish up being oversimplified to only one, the famous motto "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others". This oversimplification justifies the constant secret changes of laws on the farm because the animals did not seem to be able to assimilate what was happening. In "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", however, there are no oversimplifications of laws, since that could be more easily perceived in a human society, but there is the constant simplification of language –Newspeak-, since it is through language that thoughts are formed, and the simpler the language was, the simpler the thoughts of the people would be.

In terms of transition from one book to the other, this is also meaningful, because if in "*Animal Farm*" the pigs had to openly change their maxims to keep their ideology, in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*", the initial principles that ignorance is strength, war is freedom and freedom is slavery does not change, but what changes is the capability of people to interpret this maxim. At this point, dealing with "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" as allegories of Communism seems to be rather simplistic, once the action of interpretation of what political rulers say and demand is not on the kind of regime, but so, on political rhetoric, which is much more comprehensive. For this reason, the researcher considers the constant changes of laws of "*Animal Farm*" and the changes in language Newspeak in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" a symbol of political rhetoric that served for obscure ends, causing misunderstandings among the ones who had to submit to these rules and laws.

At this level, as mentioned before, Kubal, (1972) stressed that totalitarianism, which got historically linked mainly to Nazi and Communist policies, seems to have gone beyond and spread its tentacles, taking place in any political

regime through attitudes that appeal to totalitarian practices, including Democracies, exactly through the same apparatus of propaganda of certain ideologies. The maintenance of the pig's ideology in "*Animal Farm*" was possible not only because of repression, but also because of propaganda on the actions of Napoleon, that could be great failures, but was always optimized and approached as marvelous initiatives, to an extent that made the animals sure that they were being well treated. As Boxer always repeated, "Napoleon is always right". This evolves to "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" in a magnified way, with the publications of endless numbers of production of material and constant reduction and increasing of food, confusing the population, who got to the point of not even knowing against which country Oceania was in the war. These practices, far from being exclusively allegorical references to past historical moments, are symbols of many present political attitudes.

The revolution of "*Animal Farm*" starts with a dream of Old Major, the utopia of a farm without human beings to exploit the animals. With the rebellion and the victory in the battle of Cowshed, a first sight at the former Manor Farm would give the impression that the utopian state could be reached. Under the seven commandments of Animalism, the animals felt that they had the same rights and that human comforts ought to be avoided. However, since the beginning, it is possible to see that "the pigs did not work, but directed and supervised the others. With this, there is, in "*Animal Farm*", the first moment when there seems to be something wrong with the attitude of the pigs: it is in the milk episode, when the cows ask to be milked and Napoleon presents himself to milk them, while the other animals should work

in the harvest, “and when they came back in the evening it was noticed that the milk had disappeared.

Whether Napoleon had the intention of getting things on his self-interest, or if the view of so much milk at his disposal corrupted him is what Friedrich calls a “bad man” theory. It is not that Napoleon was bad in his essence, or that he intended to take advantage of his position before the establishment of the revolution. The fact is that the sequence of events corrupts Napoleon, making him guilty for not respecting the equalitarian fundamentals of the revolution, as the taking of the puppies, who return in the future as fierce watchdogs brain-washed by the pigs’ ideology and the sudden attack on his former partner Snowball. However, even at this point, it is not a safe assurance to say that this society is under a totalitarian regime - the primordial propaganda that is overspread among the animals with the song Beasts of England and Squealer's always favorable to Napoleon news, and the monopoly of technology that the pigs have by getting Jones’s magazines about some practical works, “*Animal Farm*”, can still be seen as an autocracy. It becomes clearly a totalitarian society when the state, represented by Napoleon, makes the first drop of blood fall from another animal, in a sequence of executions that include four pigs, not by chance “the same four pigs as had protested when Napoleon abolished the Sunday Meetings, three hens, a goose, and three sheep. In the dystopian future of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*,” we are going to see that the public executions performed to "teach" the society are going to become commonplace, with public hangings and the two-minute hate sessions. Approaching these attitudes as totalitarian ones, as they are, the allegorical reference to the past may serve as a dangerous blindfold for political attitudes of nowadays. Once more, it is in the present

time's allegory that the force of those executions and the general spread of hatred may be more clearly felt by 21st-century readers.

From then on, the utopia of the new farm starts to ruin. Although the animals used to “work like slaves, they used to keep the faith. But when the confusion of laws that seemed to be changed according to the necessity (including the one about one animal killing another animal) grows, faith starts to fade in the same proportion. The two farms that were beside Animal Farm, Foxwood and Pinchfield were sometimes allies, sometimes enemies, but never both at the same time. Who was who depended on the news (true or not) of where the traitor Snowball was. The relations with these two neighbors were very similar to what happens to Eurasia and Eastasia, the two nations which Airstrip One is constantly fighting one or the other, according to the convenience. This is something that brings the strong allegory of what happens in present world affairs. What defines alliances or rivalries among countries lies, nowadays, much more in the field of the economy than in the field of ideology. However, sometimes the identification of enemies or friends is no more than a matter of the moment. The change of the slogan from "Death to Frederick" to “death to Pilkington is very clarifying in this sense since it is the same that is going to happen with Eurasia and Eastasia. This constant state of a possible attack, be it from Jones or the other farms kept the animals in an even warring alert, something that is going to become common in the atmosphere of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”:

At this moment, for example, in “Nineteen Eighty-four” (if it was 1984), Oceania was at war with Eurasia and in alliance with Eastasia. In no public or private utterance was it ever admitted that the three powers had at any time been grouped along different lines. As Winston well knew, it was only four years since Oceania had been at war with Eastasia and in

alliance with Eurasia. But that was merely a piece of furtive knowledge which he happened to possess because his memory was not satisfactorily under control. Officially the change of partners had never happened. Oceania was at war with Eurasia: therefore Oceania had always been at war with Eurasia. The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil, and it followed that any past or future agreement with him was impossible. (Orwell. p. 762)

Even so, the animals wanted to believe that all the setbacks were the responsibility of the renegade pig Snowball. Not even the great mistake that Napoleon made, by selling timber from “*Animal Farm*” to Frederick and accepting forged bank-notes seemed to be a good reason to hate Napoleon. The risk of being involved in capitalist affairs was a hard lesson that the animals had to learn, and that would be one of the most hated things in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, at least according to the Party's propaganda. However, Napoleon dealt well with that public scandal of wasting the funds of the farm, making the situation favorable to him, because, shortly after that, the attack suffered from Foxwood, and the consequent destruction of the windmill was transformed into a victory in the rhetoric of Squealer. The spokesman for the government promised that they would build six windmills “if they felt like. With the attack, “the unfortunate affair of the bank-notes was forgotten”, in a strategy of news substitution that made the animal society forget the government mistakes and admire Napoleon even more, by giving credibility to the thesis that the battle had been a victory for the Farm, and not a tragedy that cost the lives of animals and ruined two years of hard work, with the destruction of the windmill.

However, even to this point, the years passed, the routine took control and the animals did not complain, although they had a feeling that something seemed

to be wrong. They could not remember if life was better or worse before the revolution. This is very relevant: the lack of a political past, the lack of involvement with the power and the absent sense of individuality was determinant to the fate of the animals. Nevertheless, the doctrine of the pig's ideology "four legs good, two legs bad" was deeply rooted in their hearts and minds, but seeing a pig walking on his hind legs, and the new doctrine that claimed "four legs good, two legs better" may have been the final hit on the dream of Old Major. This is so true that all the symbols of the revolution are abolished, as the green flag and the song, in an attempt to avoid the birth of any kind of culture, that could serve as a basis for the awakening of political consciousness. The animals witness the moment when, although distortedly, the pig is not a pig anymore: it is a being getting into a metamorphosis from an animal condition to a human condition, becoming a rational and political being, that may still take advantage of the power on his self-interest.

The new and unique commandment of "All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others", creates the law that proclaims the race of pigs the superior race. The birth of thirty-one sows motivated the construction of a schoolroom, where Napoleon would teach. Symbolically, it is from this privileged class, from the pigs, that Winston Smith derives. He was somebody who was taught to follow all the prerogatives of the ruling party (symbolically, his past of irrational political being), but who was also able to reflect upon the results of those prerogatives on the life of people (developing a rational political awareness). This is something that Orwell had already called the attention in previous books: the basis of a rational political and stable society should join the instinct of survival of the low-classes with the high education and good manners of the middle-class. This means that the

need for liberty to which the human being aspires is connected to his capacity to think about his present reality.

As mentioned before, it is possible to understand that the race of pigs of “*Animal Farm*” becomes the Inner Party of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. On the very first pages of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, right after the sentence “Big Brother is watching you”, the voice that comes from the telescreens is mentioning figures about the production of *pig-iron*. Of course that it means no more than raw iron, but, instead of using the expression “raw iron”, it was preferred to use the one that mentions the name of the ruling class of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, and more, relating it to the propaganda of the party. Besides, “swine” is the word that the character Julia uses to refer to the Inner Party, first on page 813, saying that “there’s always the chance of one of those *swine* recognize your voice” and on page 817, when Winston asks Julia if she had had secret affairs with members of the party. “Not with those *swine*, no”. was the answer. On the page, 841, once more the word “swine” is referred to when Winston is telling Julia about the way that he caused harm to his mother and sister by not leaving any chocolate to them. Julia said that she expected Winston was a beastly *swine* in those days’ she said indistinctively. All children are *swine*”. This last statement can be understood mainly in two ways, the first, as if the children are usually just worried about their feelings and needs, instinctively, like animals. The second, it can be a reference to the already mentioned “pigs” of the party, once that saying that all children are swine matches the part where children are leaving school as if they were marching, being described as the most effective agents of the party (p. 822). However, the connection of Winston to a “swine” when he was a child matches the times of “*Animal Farm*”, when Winston was still metaphorically another pig that acted according to the rules of Napoleon.

This also has a connection with a passage from the book *Coming Up for Air*, when schoolchildren march on the street in an array wearing t-shirts that claim for the readiness of the war. Still, about the relationship between mothers and children, a clear transition from “*Animal Farm*” to “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is the "sacrifice of mothers". On the farm, the animals could freely procreate and chickens were encouraged to lay eggs, however, it is necessary to remember what happened with the puppies that were taken from their mothers: they became the police of Napoleon. In the case of the eggs, they were sold, and this fact causes the unique rebellion against Napoleon: the chicken decided to break their eggs instead of seeing their "children" being sold. In a desperate attempt to save themselves, they flew to the highest woods of the barn, and could not go down because the dogs would kill them for disobedience, so they starved to death. This maternal instinct evolves in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” in the character of the mother of Winston, who practically abandons herself and the little baby-daughter to help Winston survive, because, although she had tried hard to keep both children alive, the food was so little that she knew that only one could survive. She chose the son, who, at his childhood, was symbolically already under the ideology of the pigs. The revolution of “*Animal Farm*” establishes a kind of society that, in a first moment avoids any cost the involvement of the animals with human affairs, and it includes the use of money. However, as already mentioned, Napoleon gets involved with the sale of timber, and despite being cheated on his adventures in the capitalist world, he goes on, although secretly, buying loads of whiskey for him and the privileged class of the pigs. Thus, capitalism is a form of social organization that the animals of the farm are taught to avoid, but that the rulers take self-advantage.

In “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, it seems that the Inner Party abominates any kind of connection with capitalism as well, but a closer look is going to show that, in the same way of the pigs, the members of the Inner Party may also have secret affairs with merchandise that the Outer Party and the proles are forbidden to have. A good example is on page 826, in one of the secret meetings of Julia and Winston:

She was carrying a tool-bag of coarse brown canvas, such as he had sometimes seen her carrying to and fro at the Ministry. He started forward to take her in his arms, but she disengaged herself rather hurriedly, partly because she was still holding the tool-bag. 'Half a second,' she said. 'Just let me show you what I've brought. Did you bring some of that filthy Victory Coffee?

I thought you would. You can chuck it away again because we shan't be needing it. Look here.' She fell on her knees, threw open the bag, and tumbled out some spanners and a screwdriver that filled the top part of it. Underneath were some neat paper packets. The first packet that she passed to Winston had a strange and yet vaguely familiar feeling. It was filled with some kind of heavy, sand-like stuff which yielded wherever you touched it. 'It isn't sugar?' he said.

'Real sugar. Not saccharine, sugar. And here's a loaf of bread proper white bread, not our bloody stuff - and a little pot of jam. And here's a tin of milk - but look! This is the one I'm proud of. I had to wrap a bit of sacking round it, because-'But she did not need to tell him why she had wrapped it up. The smell was already filling the room, a rich hot smell which seemed like an emanation from his early childhood, but which one did occasionally meet with even now, blowing down a passage-way before a door slammed, or diffusing itself mysteriously in a crowded street, sniffed for an instant and then lost again. 'It's coffee,' he murmured, 'real coffee.'

'It's Inner Party coffee. There's a whole kilo here, she said. 'How did you manage to get hold of all these things?' 'It's all Inner Party stuff. There's nothing those swine don't have, nothing. But of course, waiters and servants and people pinch things, and - look, I got a little packet of tea as well.' Winston had squatted down beside her. He tore open a corner of the packet. 'It's real tea. Not blackberry leaves.' (Julia and Winston. pp. 826 – 827)

The sensations that Winston felt by smelling trivial things such as coffee and jam, common tastes which were linked to his childhood, maybe the call of nature to what the human being is in his inside, a return to the mixture of instinct and rationality peculiar to human nature. In other words, Winston would remember his childhood as a young pig, with no bonds with party ideologies nor social concepts. In addition to that, the development of his sexual instinct is another mark of this recalling of the past. The avoidance of sex was described in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” as a form of transferring the energy spent on sexual pulsing to the hatred, and the secret meetings with Julia collaborate both to make him rediscover his symbolic animal past (the pig) and the rational awakening present (the human being), because then, Winston had something that could make his life worth living: Julia (the satisfaction of instinct) and the hope in the Brotherhood (the complement of his rational human nature). For this, Winston and Julia first met in the woods (nature), but soon, decided to rent a room in the city, in an attempt to demonstrate that their humanity was evolving: to have meetings in a room, as average human beings would normally have.

About this room, the sentence “The room was a world”, a pocket of the past where extinct animals could walk may show that the secret room that Winston had rented served also as a metaphor for the mind, impenetrable,

where both his instincts of extinct animal could be satisfied (making sex with Julia) and also by being the place where they started reading the book supposedly written by Goldstein, is the room a world apart where his increasing political intellectuality of extinct human being could be exerted. Winston affirmed more than once that the mind was the only thing that belonged to you. For this reason, the room was a world for "extinct animals", from which human beings evolved. With the paperweight with a coral inside, once more there is the expression of the wish to a past condition of nature, a search for a form of getting back to a world that was covered with a hard surface, but that deep inside still existed.

Thus, the hope is on the proles. The proles had a culture that they kept, they were still human beings that the Party maintained under control by making them consume culture that prevented them from fully developing their intellectuality and, consequently, not to reflect upon the actions of the party. The proles, which constituted 85% of the whole population of Oceania, were a natural evolution of the excluded animals of "*Animal Farm*", with the difference that the proles had already developed their own culture, but could not remember their lives before the revolution. In "*Animal Farm*", the donkey Benjamin is a symbol of this memory, he even mentions that for being the oldest of the animals, he has already seen many things that the other animals have not, but, even so, Benjamin does not state that life was better or worse before the revolution, preferring to keep his cynical attitude toward the revolution. About this character, Kubal wrote:

Benjamin, the donkey, appears unsettled, for it is he who remembers what conditions were like before and at the beginning of the revolution. The other animals accept the new rule as a matter of course because they do

not know what equality is in the first place and cannot recall another time vividly enough to evaluate their present position. (Kubal.1972. p. 39)

Benjamin evolves, in “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, to a character who Winston meets in a pub, an old man that does not have even a name in the novel, to whom the protagonist asks questions about life before the revolution, to what Winston does not get any intelligible answer, once the old man is able to remember no more than isolated facts, but not the way life was without the presence of the party. He was a kind of old Benjamin who was not free from the actions and influence of the Inner Party, who had already suffered a loss of memory caused by the transformation of the reality of the Party. Even so, the proles continued to survive with an inherent sense of morality, with a vague and fragmented memory of the past. Thinking in allegorical terms, a 21st. century reader may feel relieved because if this fragmented memory strictly refers to the past, that does not make much difference. It is by thinking symbolically that we, present readers, revisiting “*Animal Farm*” and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* update the symbols that the works present and ratify them as works of art worth being read with contemporary eyes, discovering that those novels have much to help us analyze the reality of today’s world.

4.3 Chief Political Allegory in “Animal Farm” and “Nineteen Eighty-four”

4.3.1 The Seventh Commandments

Orwell, (2000) assured that before he died shortly Old Major set up the constitution by which he thought that all animals would be able to regulate their lives accordingly:

"Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings is a friend. And remember also that in fighting against Man, we must not come to resemble him. Even when you have conquered him, do not adopt his vices. No animal must ever live in a house or sleep in a bed or wear clothes or drink alcohol or smoke tobacco or touch money or engage in trade. All the habits of man are evil. And, above all, no animal must ever tyrannize over his kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, we are all brothers. No animal must ever kill any other animal. All animals are equal."(Old Major, p.42)

These are the words of Old Major, a system of thought that is adopted by the animals and is coined "Animalism". In this system of thought, the animals are to be different from men, whom they consider their oppressor.

This anti-human rhetoric is thus condensed into seven commandments that the animals have to adhere to after they successfully chase away Mr. Jones from the farm. Accompanying the seven commandments is the song the Beasts of England, which acts as a national anthem for the animals in their newly acquired freedom.

Everything goes as planned initially. However, the pigs take advantage of their leadership role and bend all the rules to suit their extravagant living. The first rule to be broken is that "*All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others*". It becomes apparent that the two pigs, Snowball and Napoleon (together with other pigs and dogs) enjoy special treatment at the expense of others.

When other animals are toiling hard from morning till evening in the farms, the pigs assume supervisory roles dishing out orders for them to work harder. Strong animals like Boxer do most of the work, sometimes waking

up earlier than usual to ensure work is completed on time. The weak ones like ducks and hens also do as much as their feeble bodies could allow them to do.

As the other animals allow the pigs to call the shots and do the thinking, as they waste away on hard labor, a social class develops with the pigs becoming the ruling elite and the other animals becoming their slaves or subjects. With this unwarranted power, the pigs can do whatever they wish.

They set aside the harness room for their convenience, where they learn important trades, such as blacksmithing and carpentry, as the other animals are taught only basic reading and writing. It is also discovered that milk, which is always disappearing mysteriously is mixed with the pigs' mash, while all the apples are forcefully taken away from the animals for the pigs' consumption.

The second commandment to be broken is “No animal shall kill any other animal”. There is a battle for supremacy between Snowball and Napoleon evidenced by the constant arguments, disagreements and debates between them. The animosity between the two stems from ideological differences.

While Snowball is an innovative and visionary leader always looking for ways to better the lives of all animals, Napoleon is pro-status quo. He supports the old order and is afraid of change. Napoleon feels that the idea of a windmill, though very noble, will make Snowball a more popular leader and decides to attack him using nine dogs that he has been secretly breeding.

With his canines, Napoleon can consolidate all the power to himself. He uses fear to intimidate everyone into submission, without question. He uses the same instrument that Mr. Jones used to create fear among the animals –

a pack of dogs that are only subservient to him alone. When the hens oppose Napoleon's order to sell their eggs to Whymper, they are met with such cruelty from Napoleon's dogs that result in nine dead hens.

Napoleon further warns that any animal found helping the hens' revolt will be sentenced to death. There is also a series of deaths to all animals believed to be working with Snowball from outside, which results in a pile of corpses in the animal farm – a phenomenon that had never happened even during Mr. Jones's time. The sixth commandment was the first to be amended to “No animal shall kill any other animal without cause”.

Although not part of the seven commandments, the Old Major's edict that all animals should not engage in commerce is also broken by Napoleon. When it becomes apparent that the animals will lack the necessary materials for the construction of the windmill- an idea he initially opposed, Napoleon orders there be a trade to exchange wheat crop, hay, and eggs for the scarce materials. This is a complete violation of all their rules that forbade any human interactions with animals.

He also engages in business dealings with Frederick, despite his reputation for being too cruel towards animals in his Pinchfield farm. Subsequently, the pigs move into the farmhouse and break the fourth commandment, which forbids them from sleeping in beds. To put the matter to rest, the pigs make some slight adjustment to the rule to meet their obligation. It finally states that “No animal shall sleep in a bed with sheets.”

In the farmhouse, the pigs stumble upon a case of whiskey in the cellars and they are unable to resist the temptation of getting drunk, including Napoleon and his propagandist Squealer. After their night of drinking and singing,

Napoleon asks Whymper to procure for him booklets on brewing and distilling liquor. He further takes away the paddock area that was used as grazing ground for animals to plant barley. The sixth commandment, which states that “No animal shall drink alcohol” had another addition to it in the end – No animal shall drink alcohol ‘to excess’.

However, the biggest shock to the animals comes when the pigs begin walking on two legs like humans. The bleating of the sheep that “Four legs good, two legs better” makes it clear that Napoleon and his allies have fully adopted human ways. The first rule – “Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy” is now a distant memory to the animals.

Napoleon soon begins inviting humans from neighboring farms to take a tour of his farm, as other animals toil away in the farms shocked at the treacherous pigs. Napoleon and his comrades also begin wearing clothes that belonged to Mr. and Mrs. Jones, just to ensure that all the commandments are broken. Eventually, all the commandments are thrown aside and in their place stands one permanent rule on the wall of the big barn:

All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others.

“*Animal Farm*” is a critique of the communist system adopted by the Soviet Union, under the stewardship of Joseph Stalin. Two revolutionaries Leon Trotsky and Joseph Stalin overthrew the Russian Czars and converted the Soviet Union into a communist state. Just like in the book, Stalin (the dominant political figure – Napoleon) expels Trotsky (Snowball) from the state and establishes a dictatorship form of government. He abandons all the principles of the revolution and adopts all the traits of their former rulers. Under his tyrannical regime, scores of deaths are reported.

Communism is a system that opposes capitalism in every sense and may be considered an ideal system by many. However, as is evident in “*Animal Farm*”, most of these ideas are only used to serve a purpose and once that purpose is realized, most of the rulers revert to the systems that they initially fought against. In this case, animals/humans fight against class stratification that they associate with capitalism. Once they expel Mr. Jones/ Czars, they adopt animalism/communism, which they believe is a system that will cater to all the needs of everyone in society.

Ironically, the leaders who have bestowed the duty of safeguarding the unifying principles that led them to victory against a common oppressor, are the ones abusing their power. They twist rules against the backdrop of peoples' naivety to have a strong grip on power. What initially starts as mere propaganda to manipulate the masses, is replaced by the sheer use of force to propagate fear and total submission. The ones who suffer the heaviest are the working class. All the burden of the economy lies on their shoulders, but they have nothing to show for their efforts. The ruling elite enjoys most of the resources with only a few scraps left for the majority of people.

This new system turns out to be worse than the previous one. While they are made to believe that they are free, the reality is that they are in bondage. Their situation is now worse because they have been brainwashed to believe that they are far better off this way than in the old system, where they were slaves.

Eventually, the social classes of the previous regime slip back to society and there is no difference between the old regime and the new one. What remains is a theorized form of the new system, but a practice of the old

system. The new hybrid system is, therefore, the old system disguised as the new system.

4.3.2 Song of Beasts of England

Old Major hears this song in his childhood, was taught it by his parents and he taught it to the rest of the animals during the fateful meeting in the barn. Like the communist anthem “Internationale,” on which it is based, “Beasts of England” stirs the emotions of the animals and fires their revolutionary idealism. As it spreads rapidly across the region, the song gives the beasts both courage and solace on many occasions. The lofty optimism of the words “golden future time,” which appear in the last verse as well, serves to keep the animals focused on the Rebellion’s goals so that they will ignore the suffering along the way. Old Major taught this song to the animal in Manor Farm as Orwell declared:

Beasts of England, Beasts of Ireland,

Beasts of every land and clime,

Hearken to my joyful tidings

Of the Golden future time.

Soon or late the day is coming,

Tyrant Man shall be overthrown,

And the fruitful fields of England

Shall be trodden by beasts alone.

Rings shall vanish from our noses,

And the harness from our back,

*Bit and spur shall rust forever,
Cruel whips no more shall crack.
Riches more than the mind can picture,
Wheat and barley, oats and hay,
Clover, beans, and mangel-wurzels
Shall be ours upon that day.
Bright will shine the fields of England,
Purer shall its waters be,
Sweeter yet shall blow its breezes
On the day that sets us free.
For that day we all must labor,
Though we die before it breaks;
Cows and horses, geese and turkeys,
All must toil for freedom's sake. (Old Major, 1945. P.36)*

Later, however, once Napoleon has cemented his control over the farm, the song's revolutionary nature becomes a liability. Squealer chastises the animals for singing it, noting that the song was the song of the Rebellion. Now that the Rebellion is over and a new regime has gained power, Squealer fears the power of such idealistic, future-directed lyrics. Wanting to discourage the animals' capacities for hope and vision, he orders Minimus to write a replacement for "Beasts of England" that praises Napoleon and emphasizes loyalty to the state over the purity of Animalist ideology.

4.3.3 Room 101

Orwell (2000) symbolized the room “101” as the basement torture chamber in the Ministry of Love, in which the Party attempts to subject prisoners to their own worst nightmare, fear or phobia, with the object of breaking down their resistance.

For a moment he was alone, then the door opened and O'Brien came in:

"You asked me once, what was in Room 101. I told you that you knew the answer already. Everyone knows it. The thing that is in Room 101 is the worst in the world" (O'Brien, p.256).

“Room 101,” said the officer. The man's face, already very pale, turned a color Winston would not have believed possible. It was, unmistakably, a shade of green:

"Do anything to me!" he yelled. "You've been starving me for weeks. Finish it off and let me die. Shoot me. Hang me. Sentence me to twenty-five years. Is there somebody else you want me to give away? Just say who it is and I'll tell you anything you want. I don't care who it is or what you do to them. I've got a wife and three children. The biggest of them isn't six years old. You can take the whole lot of them and cut their throats in front of my eyes, and I'll stand by and watch it. But not room 101!" (The prisoner, p. 248)

“Room 101,” said the officer.

The type of torture the party employs is so intense that the people subject to it are ready to betray anything and anyone to avoid it. No private loyalty can be said to exist after the threat of this pain.

Such is the purported omniscience of the state in the society of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” that even a citizen's nightmares are known to the party. The nightmare, and therefore the threatened punishment, of the protagonist Winston Smith, is to be attacked by rats. This is manifested in Room 101 by confronting Smith with a wire cage that contains two large rats. The front of the cage is shaped so that it can fit over a person's face. A trap-door is then opened, allowing the rats to devour the victim's face. This cage is fitted over Smith's face, but he saves himself by begging the authorities to let his lover, Julia, suffer this torture instead of him. The threatened torture, and what Winston does to escape it, breaks his last promise to himself and Julia: never to betray her. The book suggests that Julia is likewise subjected to her own worst fear (although it is not revealed what that fear is), and when she and Winston later meet in a park, he notices a scar on her forehead. The intent of threatening Winston with the rats was to force him into betraying the only person he loved and therefore to break his spirit.

4.3.4 Big Brother

Orwell, (2002) symbolized Big Brother as the face of the Party. Throughout London, Winston sees posters showing a man gazing down over the words “Big Brother Is Watching You” everywhere he goes. The citizens are told that he is the leader of the nation and the head of the Party, but Winston can never determine whether or not he exists. In any case, the face of Big Brother symbolizes the Party in its public manifestation; he is a reassurance to most people (the warmth of his name suggests his ability to protect), but he is also an open threat (one cannot escape his gaze). Big Brother also symbolizes the vagueness with which the higher ranks of the Party present themselves—it is impossible to know who rules Oceania, what life is like

for the rulers, or why they act as they do. Winston thinks he remembers that Big Brother emerged around 1960, but the Party's official records date Big Brother's existence back to 1930 before Winston was even born.

4.3.5 Slogans of The Party

From where Winston stood it was just possible to read, picked out on its white face in elegant lettering, the three slogans of the party.

"War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, and Ignorance is Strength" (Winston, p. 6).

This quote has been used by Orwell, (2002) and retold by Winston in the first chapter of the novel. *"Nineteen Eighty-four"*. This phrase is one of the slogans of the Party. These slogans are, "War is peace, freedom is slavery and ignorance is a strength." The party believed that they could endlessly engage in a war to keep peace in the country. This slogan describes the reality of accepting two mutually opposing beliefs simultaneously as correct. This was also a major program of the party to promote "double thinking." Hence, it is a good example of double thinking, though contradictory, the people of Oceania accepted both ideas as correct.

This slogan simply means that, though Oceania (Oceania is a huge country ruled by the party which includes North America, South Africa, Australia) is perpetually going through a war situation, and people are behaving like peace is everywhere, they could easily change from one state of emotion to another state according to the demands of the party. Simply, it implies that the party created these slogans to ensure the continuation of control and power over people because during wars nations unite and people focus on their common enemy, and less on how unhappy they are with their own

lives. Hence, this makes less trouble for the ruling party or the government. Through weakening strength and independence of public minds, and forcing them to live in a continuous state of propaganda-induced terror, the party forced the people to accept anything, no matter if that was entirely illogical.

The party forced the people to believe that constant war is a good way to maintain peace. War brings forth devotion and patriotism to the country and promotes sacrifice for the community. Constant war shows that people are sacrificing, pledging, and giving devotion to the country and consequently to the government. As a result, this keeps people under control and in check. That was how the party used this slogan.

4.3.6 The Glass Paperweight and St. Clement's Church

By deliberately weakening people's memories and flooding their minds with propaganda, the Party can replace individuals' memories with its version of the truth. It becomes nearly impossible for people to question the Party's power in the present when they accept what the Party tells them about the past that the Party arose to protect them from bloated, oppressive capitalists, and that the world was far uglier and harsher before the Party came to power. Winston vaguely understands this principle. He struggles to recover his memories and formulate a larger picture of what has happened to the world. Winston buys a paperweight in an antique store in the prole district that comes to symbolize his attempt to reconnect with the past. Symbolically, when the Thought Police arrest Winston at last, the paperweight shatters on the floor.

The old picture of St. Clement's Church in the room that Winston rents above Mr. Charrington's shop are another representation of the lost past.

Winston associates a song with the picture that ends with the words “Here comes the chopper to chop off your head!” This is an important foreshadow, as it is the telescreen hidden behind the picture that ultimately leads the Thought Police to Winston, symbolizing the Party’s corrupt control of the past.

4.3.7 The Place Where There Is No Darkness

Throughout the novel, Winston imagines meeting O'Brien in "the place where there is no darkness." The words first come to him in a dream, and he ponders them for the rest of the novel. Eventually, Winston does meet O'Brien in the place where there is no darkness; instead of being the paradise Winston imagined, it is merely a prison cell in which the light is never turned off. The idea of "the place where there is no darkness" symbolizes Winston's approach to the future: possibly because of his intense fatalism (he believes that he is doomed no matter what he does), he unwisely allows himself to trust O'Brien, even though inwardly he senses that O'Brien might be a Party operative.

4.3.8 The Telescreens

The omnipresent telescreens are the book’s most visible symbol of the Party’s constant monitoring of its subjects. In their dual capability to blare constant propaganda and observe citizens, the telescreens also symbolize how totalitarian government abuses technology for its ends instead of exploiting its knowledge to improve civilization.

4.3.9 The Red-Armed Prole Woman

The red-armed prole woman whom Winston hears singing through the window represents Winston's one legitimate hope for the long-term future: the possibility that the proles will eventually come to recognize their plight and rebel against the Party. Winston sees the prole woman as a prime example of reproductive virility; he often imagines her giving birth to the future generations that will finally challenge the Party's authority.

4.4 Methods of the Party

There are some methods The Party uses to control its citizens. One of them is Surveillance, where each citizen is observed, and their freedom of thought is prevented. It has been a duty. It is such an effective method that even children report to the Party if their parents do or say something the Party does not accept.

Another method is torture, which is like an instrument used for political enemies. In the Ministry of Love, they are tortured with their fears in "Room 101", where they cannot find any food, and there are not even windows.

One of the other methods is Newspeak, which is a kind of new language. This language reduces the vocabulary to a minimum level. This can be considered the destruction of language. The Party thinks that Newspeak, with its unreal sentences, is a more effective language than the old one.

"Newspeak" was the official language of Oceania and had been devised to meet the ideological needs of Ingsoc, or English Socialism...the purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the worldwide and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make

all other modes of thought impossible. As seen in this saying, the Party is in complete control of all the notions that determine social consciousness. It reflects a major influence on culture and language.

Doublethink is also a method which produces two contradictory states of mind and makes the individual accept both. For example, The Ministry of Love is about torturing, the Ministry of Truth is about telling lies, The Ministry of Plenty leads people to be in starvation, and the Ministry of Peace causes war. (ibid)

4.5 Lack of Privacy

Each person is living under observation even by their own family and friends. Additionally, Big Brother is always watching and it becomes impossible for any kind of individual to have a private life. In the novel, O'Brien says:

"We, the Party, control all records, and we control all memories. Then we control the past, do we not?"(O'Brien, p. 204-205).

With O'Brien's saying, the notion of lack of privacy comes out. It emphasizes how there is a dominant and powerful look over the individual's attempts. Every aspect of the society presented in 1984 is controlled. Individuals feel under oppression, which shows the collapse of the border between private and public life. Mistrust is a serious issue so that even fathers and mothers don't trust their offspring. This issue is also written in the novel saying No one dares trust a wife or child or a friend any longer. It is all caused by a system created through media in the society which makes the individual suspicious and distrustful. It is such a powerful government that controls the media and the mind is influenced by this controlled media.

4.6 Power of Words

Another strong issue is the role of rhetoric in the novel “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”. Reality is based on this issue mentioned in Orwell’s novel. Rhetoric is used to control and manipulate the population. Its historical context is based on the threat of totalitarianism, fascism, domination. One of the most important slogans in the novel is that "War is Peace", "Freedom is Slavery", “Ignorance is Strength”.

"War is Peace", means that the individual finds peace in the time of war. It is the time of being together peacefully when there is the reality of war.

“Freedom is slavery” : The individual who is independent is subjected to the fail according to the Party.

"Ignorance is Strength": Social ignorance is seen as a tool used by the government. This is organized consciously by the authority that they try to show their power over the individuals by using ignorance as power. This also means an inner struggle against people. If one is aware of the reality of the real face of the system, he will also fall into a trap in the same system.

CHAPTER FIVE

**Political Characterization of "Animal Farm" and
"Nineteen Eighty-Four"**

Chapter Five

Political Characterization of "Animal Farm" and "Nineteen Eighty-Four"

5.0 Introduction

This chapter is basically written to uncover the veil of George Orwell's creativity in placing unexpired and timeless symbolic images adhered to the characters of "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" that coincided with political scenarios whose occurrence dated back to approximately not more than fifty or sixty decades ago but in such a way were repapered, reproduced, and interconnected with similar situations to political incidents and scenarios in both 20th and 21st century.

The chapter will also present a critical analysis of the characters' acts underlining the political allegory, characterization and its insinuations that the writer displayed not only for criticizing political systems, regimes and societies at a time but also for foreseeing his readers' future which will witness the repetition of the same scenarios. This chapter will reflect how the characters' images that appeared in Orwell's novels will remain a mirror of renewable characters' behavior and incidents as long as the dirty games in politics will never be over or purified.

5.1 Animal Farm's Characterization

Chen, (2008) pointed out that "Animal Farm" was the first of Orwell's greatest works that cries despair, his satirical beast fable, often heralded as his lightest, pleasurable work. It depicts the Russian Revolution and the rise

of Stalin and each animal character in the book is a symbol for a key character in the Russian revolution. Animalism, Communism, and Fascism are all illusions which are used by the pigs as a means of satisfying their greed and lust for power. In 1920 and 1930, some sociologists and politicians studied important western Revolutions, as Britain Revolution in 1640, the American Revolution in 1776, France Revolution in 1789 and the Russian Revolution in 1917. They found some common paradigms in all these revolutions which based on them Orwell has written his book, "*Animal Farm*".

Chen, (2008) asserted that animals, the events as well as the plots have symbolic meanings, which facilitates the novel with specific aesthetic effects. Motivated and propelled by his strong desire to arouse people's awareness of the greed and deception of Stalinism, George Orwell desperately created the animal characters based on the stereotypes of some leaders as well as the common people in the Soviet Union. And knowing this background, every reader tends to match the important animal characters in the novel with the main leaders in the revolution of the Soviet Union. We will just take the following three as examples to illustrate the point. First, Old Major shares many aspects with Karl Marx, the former creates "animalism" in the song *Beasts of England*, sees the suffering of the animals and wants to lead them out of the miserable condition but dies before the revolution because of its old age, while the latter invents "communism", wants to unite the working class to overthrow the government, but dies before the Russian revolution. The second match is between Napoleon and Joseph Stalin, for both of them are aggressive and cruel to kill all those on their way. Finally, Snowball is easy to be taken by readers as the symbol of Leon Trotsky, a pure communist

leader, who is influenced a lot by the teachings of Karl Marx, and wants to improve the life for the people in Russia, but is driven away by Stalin's secret police. (ibid).

Zhang & Wang, (2014) confirmed that it mocks and satires the totalitarianism and the cruelty of human nature from three aspects, non-linear space, language fallacies, and rhetoric methods.

The plot of the novel “*Animal Farm*” forms a circle in some sense. It narrates a story of how a utopia becomes a dystopia. The story starts when Old Major gives a speech on the revolution at Manor Farm. Three days later after the speech, Old Major dies, so Snowball and Napoleon emerge as the leaders of the newly named “*Animal Farm*”. The ‘revolution’ begins when Mr. Jones becomes too drunk to feed the animal. Finally, he loses the farm though he tries to retake it. However, divergence and conflicts begin to appear between the two leaders. After a dispute over building a windmill, Napoleon has his dogs chase away Snowball from the farm. At the end of the story, all the old animals die off, and Squealer soon takes over the farm from Napoleon and walks on two legs. The name of the farm is changed back to Manor Farm. In the final scene, the pigs invite the human beings for dinner, during which the animals are watching through a window outside and they are horrified to realize that they can no longer tell the human's faces from that of the animals. Everything returns to its starting point. The whole story is concerned with revolution, and the goal of that revolution is to seek equality. To reinforce this point, Orwell cites the passage from the American Declaration of Independence containing the phrase “All men are created equal”. The ironic slogan, “All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others”, has become part of the language.

5.2 Animals' Characterization

Orwell (2000) claimed that animal image is what a picturesque impression the animal leaves in a person's mind, including both the animal's appearance and its special characteristics. Why did George Orwell choose pigs instead of any other animal as the representatives of the main members of human society? It is of course not the result of a random selection. The pigs were chosen here not because of the appearance but because of their "greedy, stupid, dirty and noisy" characteristics which are quite similar to the evil natures of human beings. These aspects are respectively highlighted in the story and various vivid characters are created. Napoleon became the final leader on the farm, the substitute of Mr. Jones, is just because he is the utmost greedy one.

Humans are complicated and varied, so are the pigs in this story. To distinguish between those pigs, the author gave them different depictions for their roles on the farm. For example, Old Major was described as stout, majestic-looking, wise and benevolent. Napoleon was large, rather fierce-looking, not talkative, but aggressive. Snowball was full of life and spirits, quick in speech and inventive, but not deep in character. Squealer, a brilliant talker, was small and fat, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice.

If pigs resemble people in the leading position most, the ordinary people have their matches in other animals. This was based on the animal images in our minds. The horse to us is usually "a large strong four-legged animal with hard feet (hooves), which people ride on and use for pulling heavy things". The Cart horses, Boxer and Clover are the good illustrations of this hard-

working image. Clover was a stout motherly mare approaching her middle life, and Boxer was an enormous beast, nearly eighteen hands high, and as strong as any two ordinary horses put together. However, not all horses follow the typical image. The white mare Mollie in this story was described as pretty but foolish. Immediately after she took a place near the front, she began flirting her white mane, hoping to draw attention to the red ribbon it was plaited with.

What about the image of a cat? It is a small four-legged animal with soft fur and sharp claws. People sometimes say that a cat has nine lives, meaning that it always seems to stay alive and unhurt even in dangerous situations. This specific characteristic can be seen from the cat of this story: The Cat looked round, as usual, for the warmest place, and finally squeezed herself in between Boxer and Clover; there she purred contentedly throughout Major's speech without listening to a word of what he was saying. The other minor animals on the farm, like the dogs, the hens, the pigeons, the sheep, and the cows, are not given adequate distinct individual descriptions. The readers can use their common images to understand their positions in this story. (ibid)

5.2.1 Humans Are Animals

The whole story is based on the basic conceptual allegory "humans are animals" in the sense that the ironic animal story represents the politics of Russia. Every reader knows that Orwell's sarcasm is towards Stalin and his government but he never blames Stalin outright, otherwise certain readers will be alienated because Stalin proved to be an ally against Adolf Hitler's Nazi forces. By choosing this kind of style, a fable, he expands his potential audience for a political story. For example, the long-lasting "war" between

Napoleon and Snowball just represents the “fighting” between Stalin and Trotsky.

Additionally, “The song *Beast of England*”, the animal version of Bryon’s work “*Men of England*” which saluted to revolution and freedom, reveals the ordinary people's voice for getting out of suffering. Even the flag printed the hoof and horn is the copy of the flag of the Soviet Union, only sarcastically and ironically. There are still some other matches in the story, which make the novel, not just a simple animal story, but a meaningful reflection of history. Reading this novel can be easy if we just read the surface, but it can be really hard if we think deep.

5.2.2 Leaders are Pigs

Among all the animals, in “*Animal Farm*”, pigs dominate the animal world. This forms another conceptual “*allegory*” in the readers' mind, that is, "leaders are pigs." The pigs in this story symbolize the authorities of society. They are smart to some extent because they become the pioneer to teach other animals to read and acquire knowledge. However, their total goal is to educate them on reading the Seven Commandments. Education is just their method to enhance their power and rule, which actually may happen in the human world.

What's more, Napoleon the pig symbolizes the government, who uses many merciless measures to strengthen his status. He uses violence to punish the populace and he creates an imaginary enemy—Snowball—to emphasize his absolute justice, by sending the rumors that Snowball tries hard to ruin their products. This is a "smart" way because it leads people to believe in him and trust his domination. Violent leadership forces the populace to obey because

it threatens their lives. In such situations, most people would like to put up with reality because their only concerns are their own lives. Only a few can stand out to challenge, however, those brave men will eventually become the victims of such a kind of controlling government.

5.2.3 Names are Identities

The names of the animals give them respective labels, so a third conceptual allegory can be perceived. It is "names are identities". For instance, the names of the two leaders of the farm, "Snowball" and "Napoleon", totally reflect their characteristics. Napoleon is named after Napoleon I, one of the greatest military leaders in history and emperor of France, who conquered much of Europe. Napoleon, the well-known aggressive and inspirational leader in history, fought in the French Revolution but then consolidated the power for himself, and left the French empire in a state that, in many ways, looked like the monarchy that they have just overthrown. In this sense, Napoleon the pig resembles Napoleon the man. Snowball the pig is not the name of a historical figure. The symbolic meaning of this word suggests a process that starts from an initial state of small significance and builds upon itself, becoming larger and larger. However, it brings us a feeling of softness and fragility. Snowball the pig, becoming larger and stronger gradually, is still easy to be destroyed. So he is beaten by Napoleon's power in the end.

The raven Moses is named after Moses the man, a religious leader who delivers the people from a terrible situation and leads a great big horde of people out of oppression and into freedom. The ironic effect is Moses the raven does not do anything like Moses the man. There is no necessity to mention the implied meaning of the name Boxer, which refers to a person

who appears to be strong in body but hollow in mind. So the name suggests a strong but simple-minded person. This fits Boxer, the strong but illiterate pig, in the story. As is indicated in squealer the word, Squealer the pig is a big-mouthed talker. He is always eloquent and plausible that all the animals are talked to peace by him, so he becomes Napoleon's mouthpiece. It may represent the propaganda department that works to support Stalin's image.

All in all, it can be seen that the smart uses of the names made the characters more impressive and typical, so the audience can easily grasp the features of the characters Orwell wanted to show.

5.3 Nineteen Eighty Four's Characterization

Luigy and et al (2016) confirmed that in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" Orwell draws a picture of a totalitarian future. It is a dystopia (or kakotopia which denotes a state in which the worst possible conditions exist in government, society, law, etc.) which is a fictional society, usually portrayed as existing in the future.

Although the action takes place in the future, there are a couple of elements and symbols taken from the present and past. So, for example, Emmanuel Goldstein, the main enemy of Oceania, is, as one can see from the name, a Jew. Orwell draws a link to other totalitarian systems of our century, like the Nazis and the Communists, who had anti-Semitic ideas, and who used Jews as so-called scapegoats, who were responsible for all bad and evil things in the country. This fact also shows that totalitarian systems want to arbitrate their perfection. Emmanuel Goldstein somehow also stands for Trotsky, a leader of the Revolution, who was later declared an enemy.

Another symbol that can be found in "*Nineteen Eighty-four*" is the fact that Orwell divides the fictional superstates in the book according to the division that can be found during the Cold War. So Oceania stands for the United States of America, Eurasia for Russia and Eastasia for China. The fact that the two socialist countries Eastasia and Eurasia (in our case Russia and China) are at war with each other, corresponds to our history. (ibid).

Other, non-historical symbols can be found. One of these symbols is the paperweight that Winston buys in the old junk-shop. It stands for the fragile little world that Winston and Julia have made for each other. They are the coral inside of it. As Orwell wrote: It is a little chunk of history, that they have forgotten to alter.

The "Golden Country" is another symbol. It stands for the old European pastoral landscape. The place where Winston and Julia meet for the first time to make love to each other is exactly like the "Golden Country" of Winston's dreams.

While reading the book readers can notice that the characters are dipped into something surreal, and this is clear: a dystopian story is necessarily surreal because it shows an incongruous, incoherent reality. This reality is incongruous with values that should ensure the life of all individuals and parity among them.

But it isn't so important in this discourse, because a dictatorship is not based on these pillars. Anyway, we feel something surreal, and it is quite clear in the characters, perhaps. They have something that makes us think to a fable: the small numbers of main protagonists, and the moral message of the book, that shows us the ideological failure of dictatorships, only based on power,

yen for power and the subordination of human rights, desires, and passions to this want of an oligarchy of persons. They are violent in submitting people's physical freedom, but the biggest violence that they commit is the abatement of freedom of thinking, speech, expression and, above all, knowledge, therefore also information: there isn't freedom without knowledge: freedom is knowledge.

Another “fable-like” element is the place where Winston and Julia have their first meeting. This forest seems their heaven, their dream, in which they can enjoy the taste of freedom and love, that are ordinarily denied to them, since you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred.

When Winston goes out of the city with Julia, he immediately calls the forest that they reach "Golden Country", like a landscape he has sometimes seen in a dream: They were standing in the shade of hazel bushes. The sunlight, filtering through innumerable leaves, was still hot on their faces. Winston looked out into the field beyond and underwent a curious, slow shock of recognition. He knew it by sight. An old, close-bitten pasture, with a footpath wandering across it and a molehill here and there. In the ragged hedge on the opposite side, the boughs of the elm trees swayed just perceptibly in the breeze, and their leaves stirred faintly in dense masses like women's hair. Surely somewhere nearby, but out of sight, there must be a stream with green pools where dace were swimming. (ibid).

5.3.1 Big Brother

Luigy and et al (2016) confirmed that though he does not necessarily exist, he can certainly be called a character in this novel. Omnipresent, on posters

everywhere and stamped on the coins in your pocket, "Big Brother is Watching You." Big Brother, theoretically one of the founders of the Party and the Revolution, has never been seen by anyone, and his birth date is unknown. He is a creation of the Party, the human face it chooses to put on its achievements to more easily appeal to people's devotion. Infallible, glorious, immortal, Big Brother is a symbol whose words are created, ironically, by persons such as Winston working in the Ministry of Truth and "rewriting" Big Brother's speeches. Yet he is worshipped by the very people who create him, called a "savior" and prayed to. Big Brother, the mysterious all-seeing, all-knowing leader of the totalitarian society is a god-like icon to the citizens he rules. He is never seen in person, just staring out of posters and telescreens, looking stern as the caption beneath his image warns "Big Brother Is Watching You." Big Brother demands obedience and devotion of Oceania's citizens; in fact, he insists that they love him more than they love anyone else, even their own families. At the same time, he inspires fear and paranoia. His loyal followers are quick to betray anyone who seems to be against his will.

It's worth noting here that "Big Brother" is not a real person, nobody sees Big Brother in person. Orwell had several things in mind when he created Big Brother. He was certainly thinking of Russian leader Joseph Stalin; the pictures of Big Brother even look like him. He was also thinking of Nazi leader Adolph Hitler and Spanish dictator Francisco Franco. Big Brother stands for dictators everywhere. Orwell may have been thinking about figures in certain religious faiths when he drew Big Brother. To Inner Party members, Big Brother is a leader, a bogeyman they can use to scare the people, and their authorization for doing whatever they want. If anybody

asks, they can say they are under orders from Big Brother. For the unthinking proles, Big Brother is a distant authority figure. For Winston, Big Brother is an inspiration. Big Brother excites and energizes Winston, who hates him. He is also fascinated by Big Brother and drawn to him in some of the same ways that he is drawn to O'Brien, developing a love-hate response to both of them that leads to his downfall.

Throughout London, Winston sees posters showing a man gazing down over the words “Big Brother is Watching You” everywhere he goes. Big Brother is the face of the Party. The citizens are told that he is the leader of the nation and the head of the Party, but Winston can never determine whether or not he exists. In any case, the face of Big Brother symbolizes the Party in its public manifestation; he is a reassurance to most people (the warmth of his name suggests his ability to protect), but he is also an open threat (one cannot escape his gaze). Big Brother also symbolizes the vagueness with which the higher ranks of the Party present themselves—it is impossible to know who rules Oceania, what life is like for the rulers, or why they act as they do. Winston thinks he remembers that Big Brother emerged around 1960, but the Party’s official records date Big Brother’s existence back to 1930 before Winston was even born. (ibid).

5.3.2 Child Hero

Child hero was the phrase generally used — had overheard some compromising remark and denounced its parents to the Thought Police. This virtual character is a symbol of a child who does good things that make him a hero in his parents’ eyes. The signifier represents a threat because this name is used for a child who turns his parents into criminals for committing a

thought crime. Once he notices that his parents start to think, he tells the thought police about them; therefore, they represent a threat to their parents. Also, this symbol indicates irony since the name indicates something and in the novel indicates something else.

5.3.3 Proles

The proles make up about 81% of the population of Oceania. The Party itself is only interested in their labor because the proles are mainly employed in industry and on farms. Without their labor, Oceania would break down. Despite this fact, the Party completely ignores this social caste. The curious thing about this behavior is that the Party calls itself socialist, and generally socialism (at least in the beginning and middle of this century) is a movement of the proletariat. So one could say that the Party abuses the word "Ingsoc". Orwell again had pointed at another regime, the Nazis, who had put "socialism" into their name. One of the main phrases of the Party is "Proles and animals are free". In Oceania, the proles live in very desolate and poor quarters. Compared with the districts where the members of the Party live, there are far fewer telescreens, and policemen. And as long as the proles don't commit crimes (crimes in our sense, not in the sense of the party – Thoughtcrime) they don't have any contact with the state. Therefore in the districts of the proletarians, one can find things that are abolished and forbidden to Party members. For example, old books, old furniture, prostitution and alcohol (mainly beer) Except "Victory Gin" all of these things are not available to Party members. The proletarians don't participate in technological development. They live like they used to do many years ago.

Considering Winston's belief that if there is hope, it lies in the proles, a theme which runs through the novel and which we are to understand as coming from Orwell himself, the proles play very little part in the novel. In some cases, like that of the woman singing as she hangs out her washing, they are merely in the background to point contrast with the lives and behavior of the members of the Party. When Winston makes an extended visit to the prole quarter and attempts to ask the old man in the pub about his memories of his youth, the response is confused and uninformative. Orwell describes Winston's hopes for the proles as "a mystical truth and a palpable absurdity", and from the evidence in the novel, the latter part of the phrase is the more accurate description. Yet Winston needs to feel that there is some hope somewhere, and certainly, there is none in the harsh world of fear and drabness in which Party members live. So the proles become for him not just a romantic hope for the future, but the only hope of all. The novel shows no hope, and certainly not for Winston. He betrays Julia and his feelings for her, and thus betrays an innermost part of himself which, once lost, can never be recovered: his emotions and his integrity, which, for Orwell, should be out of the reach of any powers of the State. Winston is no more heroic under the pressure of Miniluv than he was earlier. In the end, he is seen in the Chestnut Tree Cafe, where he had watched other men who had been broken by the State. Here he finally admits to himself that all rebellion is over and the struggle is finished. Orwell's warning is clear: Winston, with all the force of the State against him, comes not merely to accept that he is powerless against it, but actively to welcome his defeat: he loves Big Brother. (ibid).

To the researcher, the Party ignores the Proles because they pose no danger to their rule. The working class is too uneducated and too unorganized to pose

any real threat. So there is not a need to change the political attitudes of this class.

5.3.4 Winston Smith

Luigy and et al (2016) stressed that Winston is the main character of the story and Orwell showed us “*Nineteen Eighty-four’s*” world through his eyes. The eyes of a rational and innermost man, that knows his ideals: he hates the Party, but he's also a frightened and doubtful person, almost unhopeful to Party's authority. This precarious status concerns also the look of Winston: he's a thin and frail man, and he has a varicose vein on his leg. He’s a minor member of the Party and works at the Ministry of Truth faking information of newspapers, according to the demands of Big Brother. Winston is the "human man", that thinks with his head and loves freedom. Trying to look into the past (that the Party is clearing from collective historical memory), he develops a sense of mission towards posterity. So he starts writing a diary, with his thoughts and memories. But, by doing that, he is committing a crime: Whether he wrote Down With Big Brother, or whether he refrained from writing it, made no difference. Whether he went on with the diary, or whether he did not go on with it, made no difference. The Thought Police would get him just the same. He had committed—would still have committed, even if he had never set pen to paper—the essential crime that contained all others in itself. Thoughtcrime, they called it. The thought crime was not a thing that could be concealed forever. You might dodge successfully for a while, even for years, but sooner or later they were bound to get you.

He seems defeated by the present, but when he meets Julia his fatalism starts to fall and he finds the only reason to live, to trust in the defeat of the Party, and to hazard his life for a free life with Julia and without the Party.

Winston is established from the beginning as an unheroic figure; he is thin and frail, on the way to middle age, and has a leg ulcer (we later discover that he has false teeth and is subject to coughing fits). He may, by the author's irony, have been named after Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister during World War II when he was born, but in many ways, it is clear that he is to stand for Everyman. He is presented as a man from an earlier age, old enough to have a vague memory of the distant world when he was a boy and to respond to objects from an earlier era (the "smooth creamy pages" of the diary, the nib-pen which he feels the diary deserves, and the "soft rain watery glass" of the coral paperweight). His only memory of unselfish and devoted love from one human being to another comes from his childhood, and the culture on which the world of his childhood was based is so far removed from the one in which he now lives that when he dreams of Julia tearing off her clothes in an act of sexual (and therefore political) defiance, he wakes up with the word "Shakespeare" on his lips. Because Orwell wants to show him as a representative as well as an individual, it is important that, for example, Winston is shown genuinely to respond to the Two-Minutes Hate and not as essentially different in this respect from other Party members, as would happen if he were shown from the beginning of the novel as very strong-minded or with his own clearly formed political ideas. In the beginning, Winston's rebellion consists mainly of a dislike of the physical dullness of the world in which he lives and a vague feeling that things are not as they should be, and his diary enables him to express his unease without having to

formulate the principles which he feels Ingsoc has violated. His acts of rebellion against the society in which he lives (buying and writing in the diary, having an affair with Julia, visiting the prole area of the city, renting the room from Charrington, and - the most openly political - making contact with O'Brien) are, in the last analysis, less important than the rebellion of mind and feeling from which they all spring, and it is for this that he is punished. As he reflects in the first chapter that only the Thought Police mattered. His contact with Julia leads him to put into words ideas critical of the society in which they live, which before had been little more than vague feelings of unease - the mute protest in your own bones, as he describes it even if she hardly listens to him when he explains these ideas to her and does not understand their significance, as when he tells her he has proof of official falsification of the news about Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford. Knowing Julia makes him feel that he is no longer, in the words of the original working title, "The Last Man in Europe ", but also makes him realize clearly that he was doomed from the moment he started writing in the diary. So an act of madness such as renting the room above Charrington's shop and continuing to meet in it (in direct contradiction of Julia's dictum that no meeting-place is safe more than twice) can be seen as an attempt to make the most of the moment before the inevitable blow falls, rather than a seriously-held hope that he can escape punishment for such a flagrant offense. His last words to Julia at the moment before the Thought Police arrest them are: " We are the dead. (ibid)

His earlier impression of O'Brien as a man of intelligence who has the same doubts about Ingsoc as himself, and the conspiratorial feeling that this creates, are so strong that he trusts O'Brien without question. Both before his

arrest and when imprisoned, this trust mirrors something of the emotional dependence which a loyal member of Ingsoc should feel for Big Brother so that in a sense O'Brien's purpose in their interviews in Miniluv is to turn Winston's love for himself into love for Big Brother. One of Orwell's most important points is that mere obedience is not enough: Winston must achieve a moment of genuine love for Big Brother, just as earlier he achieved a moment of genuine hate for Big Brother's enemy. To feel this love Winston has to reject, and to admit to himself that he has rejected, all feelings of love and loyalty to anyone else. In the early stages of his time in Miniluv, although he suffers degradation, torture, and humiliation, there is still some integrity inside him. But finally, threatened with what is for him the worst thing in the world, he betrays Julia by begging for her to suffer in his place, and by betraying her he betrays himself. After this, as he reflects, something is killed in his own heart burnt out, cauterized out. He has lost something vital to himself and is a shell of a man, no longer any possible threat to the State or anyone else. (ibid).

5.3.5 Julia

Luigy and et al, (2017) described Julia has got dark eyes and hair, she's very sensual and athletic. Like Winston, Julia is against the Party, but she has a different personality from his: she's very pragmatic. She lives here and now, and tries to live a good present. She does not worry about their biggest problems and tries to get pleasure in the present shacking up the Party, that means cheating it by small crimes.

She is an active member and works as a mechanic in the Fiction Department of the Ministry of Truth. She also attends a prude league against sexuality.

The Party considers it only related to reproduction. But Julia does not agree, and unlike Winston, she had grasped the inner meaning of the Party's sexual puritanism. It was not merely that the sex instinct created a world of its own which was outside the Party's control and which therefore had to be destroyed if possible. What was more important was that sexual privation induced hysteria, which was desirable because it could be transformed into war-fever and leader-worship. The way she put it was: 'When you make love you're using up energy; afterward you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and the Three-Year Plans and the Two Minutes Hate and all the rest of their bloody rot?' That was very true, he thought. There was a direct intimate connection between chastity and political orthodoxy. For how could the fear, the hatred, and the lunatic credulity which the Party needed in its members be kept at the right pitch, except by bottling down some powerful instinct and using it as a driving force? The sex impulse was dangerous to the Party, and the Party had turned it to account.

The young, strong body, now helpless in sleep, awoke in him a pitying, protecting feeling. But the mindless tenderness that he had felt under the hazel tree, while the thrush was singing, had not quite come back. He pulled the overalls aside and studied her smooth white flank. In the old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl's body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear

and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act.

Julia is younger than Winston and does not have his memories of the world before Ingsoc changed it. Her rebellion is more instinctive and immediate than his, and she can live within the State's system because she has stronger feelings of self-preservation and much greater self-confidence. She is not at all interested in the theoretical basis of rebellion; she starts to listen dutifully to Winston reading "the book" but soon goes to sleep. She is, however, much better than Winston not only at practical arrangements (for making contact, hiding signs of their meetings, etc) but also at understanding instinctively the underlying reasons for some of the Party's policies, particularly those connected with sexual matters. She understands that the reason for the Party's sexual Puritanism is that by making the sexual act either a political duty between husband and wife (as it was for Katherine) or - for a man - a furtive and joyless encounter with a prole prostitute, the Party can use sexual frustration and the resulting hysteria for its purposes. Therefore any enjoyable act of lovemaking freely entered into by two Party members (as in the first sexual contact between Winston and Julia before there is any emotional contact between them at all) is in itself a political act. Winston begins as a rebel with his mind and feelings and progresses to physical acts of rebellion via Julia's influence. She has been a rebel with her body all her adult life and has learned to survive in ways Winston does not have the capacity for, but both of them believe that "they [the State, in the form of the Thought Police] can't get inside you", and both are proved wrong. (ibid).

5.3.6 O'Brien

During the "Two minutes of hate" Winston notes a man, and immediately believes that he is a member of Brotherhood, an organization against B.B. The man is named O'Brien. But Winston is wrong: he is a member of the Inner Party. A very mysterious person. He's powerful and his intelligence is superhuman: in fact, he often guesses words and sentences before that Winston spells them. He got in touch with him because Charrington, the owner of the secondhand store in the proles' district where Winston bought his diary, is a member of the Thought police: he arrested them and sent to jail, where O'Brien directed tortures against Winston for converting him to the crazy dogmas of the Party through Newspeak. (ibid).

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc but to make all other modes of thought impossible.

Here are some sentences that O'Brien told Winston while he is torturing him:

"There will be no curiosity, no enjoyment of the process of life. All competing pleasures will be destroyed. But always —do not forget this, Winston —always there will be the intoxication of power, constantly increasing and constantly growing subtler. Always, at every moment, there will be the thrill of victory, the sensation of trampling on a helpless enemy. If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face —forever." (O'Brien, 1950, p. 3)

"Always we shall have the heretic here at our mercy, screaming with pain, broken up, contemptible —and at the end utterly penitent, saved from himself, crawling to our feet of his own accord. That is the world that we are preparing, Winston." (ibid, p. 3)

"We shall abolish the orgasm. Our neurologists are at work upon it now. There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother. There will be no laughter, except the laugh of triumph over a defeated enemy. There will be no art, no literature, no science." (ibid, 1950, p. 3)

"If you are a man, Winston, you are the last man. Your kind is extinct; we are the inheritors. Do you understand that you are alone? You are outside history, you are non-existent." (ibid, p. 3)

"'You asked me once,' said O'Brien, 'what was in Room 101. I told you that you knew the answer already. Everyone knows it. The thing that is in Room 101 is the worst in the world'." (ibid, p. 5)

"Somehow you will fail. Something will defeat you. Life will defeat you." (ibid, p. 3)

O'Brien seems also to be crazy, for his behavior and for some particular points he says. The researcher thought that he could be considered the symbol of dictatorship's madness, and his thought, his work can be considered the extreme trial to have a sort of individual liberation, a redemption in such a society.

All dictatorships are based on the individual liberation of the elite forming the ruling oligarchy, a "redemption" that can be obtained only employing the annihilation of other innocent men. Ingsoc does this, but the worst feature of this dystopian world is that people do not have anymore the possibility to fight the dictatorship because they can't know, they can't think. Ingsoc makes them blind and paradoxically makes them happy. Happy to love the Big Brother, that is what Winston, defeated, will think at the end of the book:

"But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother." (ibid, p. 6)

The secondary characters in the novel are sketched in more lightly. Perhaps the most interesting, and potentially the most complex, is O'Brien. On his first appearance Orwell, through Winston, points up two contrasting strands in his character: coarse brutality, emphasized by his physical appearance, and the delicacy of gesture which Orwell compares to that of an eighteenth-century nobleman. It is the combination of these qualities which is so dangerous for Winston; O'Brien has the sensitivity to be aware of Winston's secret disloyalty to the State, and the force and ability to inflict pain by which he makes Winston suffer for it. He works on Winston in Miniluv with intelligent and fanatical devotion until Winston can be released back into society, cured forever of the infection in his mind (as O'Brien sees it) which prevents him from loving Big Brother. O'Brien is an example of the type of intellectual from whom Orwell feared the worst: he would use his energy and intelligence to preserve and support a dictatorship whose sole aim was to keep power. (ibid).

5.3.7 Tom Parsons

Winston's neighbor and co-worker at the Ministry of Truth is a heavy, sweaty fellow whom Winston despises for his unthinking acceptance of everything the Party tells him. Parsons is active in his community groups, and appears to truly believe Party claims and doctrine; in that respect, Winston assumes Parsons will never be vaporized. But towards the end of the novel, Parsons appears in the Ministry of Love, much to Winston's surprise; he has been denounced by his children.

It is more of a surprise when Parsons also appears as a prisoner in Miniluv. Winston had assumed that his limited intelligence combined with his devoted orthodoxy of political views would keep him safe as a valued worker for the Party, but he is doubly betrayed - by his unconscious mind and by the daughter whose skill at discovering traitors he was so proud of- and he suffers the same fate as the others. The image has been built up of a world where no one is to be trusted. People who seem innocent of all deceit, like the old prole junk-shopkeeper, turn out to be members of the Thought Police and are most dangerous because they were never suspected. Winston's visits to the prole quarter, which he thought (once the patrols were avoided) to be a place of safety, prove fatal to him and Julia.

5.3.8 Mrs. Parsons

The wife of Tom Parsons lives in a neighboring flat to Winston's. She is a tired, dusty woman and mother of two hellions who are bound to denounce her someday. At the beginning of the novel, she knocks on Winston's door to ask him to help her unclog the kitchen sink.

5.3.9 Tillotson

He is a fellow-worker in the Records Department with Winston. He has no special importance, though he seems hostile and Winston assumes that they are given some of the same assignments to work on.

5.3.10 Ampleforth

He is a poet who works in the Records Department rewriting politically or ideologically objectionable Old speak poems. By the end of the novel, he

ends up in prison, encountering Winston there shortly before being sent to Room 101.

5.3.11 Syme

He is a philologist working on the Eleventh Edition of the Newspeak Dictionary, and the closest to a friend that Winston has, because (although he dislikes Winston) they can have interesting conversations. Penetrating, intelligent, incisive, Syme is vaporized despite his fanatical devotion to the Party.

Syme's intellectual powers have also been corrupted by the State, although his interests are more academic and he does not possess O'Brien's force. Yet he still sees too clearly and speaks too plainly for his safety, and, as Winston realizes at an early stage, is marked down for vaporization.

5.3.12 Katharine

Winston's wife never appears directly in the book as she and Winston have separated after a childless marriage. She is notable in her marked aversion to sex, which soured the marriage although it was the proper Party attitude. Her persistence despite her aversion in trying to carry out "their duty to the Party" makes it unbearable for Winston, who at one point confesses to Julia that he was once tempted to murder Katharine.

5.3.13 Mr. Charrington

He is the owner of the antique shop where Winston first buys his diary, then a glass paperweight, and later returns to rent the upstairs room for his meetings with Julia. Mr. Charrington introduces Winston to the rhyme of the

church bells, which becomes a symbol throughout the book. In the end, however, Charrington turns out to be an agent of the Thought Police; his appearance at Winston's arrest is much changed, so much so that it would seem impossible (his entire physique is different).

5.3.14 Martin

He is O'Brien's servant, who leads Winston and Julia into O'Brien and then comes in to sit in on their meeting with him. When he is dismissed, he is told to take a good look at their faces, as he might be seeing them again but O'Brien might not. (As it turns out, the exact opposite is true, in Winston's case at least.)

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

Chapter Six

Conclusion

6.0 Introduction

This chapter is made up of the conclusions reached after the discussion of Orwell's perceptions and attitudes in the third chapter and the fourth one through the use of the political allegory and characterization portrayed into "*Animal Farm*" and "*Nineteen Eighty-four*". Furthermore, the chapter includes a summary for the whole thesis, the political allegory and characterization highlighted by Orwell in both novels, besides the main findings that the study came out with. And finally, the chapter concludes with the recommendations and suggestions set by the researcher for extra future studies.

6.1 Summary

The whole thesis involved five chapters arranged logically so that the discussion of thoughts flows according to the thesis's framework set by the supervisor. The first chapter brought a brief outline of the life and works of Eric Blair, the person, focusing on some decisive moments of his biography that contributed to the birth and development of George Orwell, the author. Furthermore, the chapter presented a synopsis of the allegory beside a framework of the study as a whole.

In the second chapter, the thesis presents a detailed account of the theoretical framework of the study. It included a review of the literature concerning political novels, twentieth-century literature. It also reviewed some critics about Orwell's works and finally, concluded with reviewing the previous studies.

In the third chapter, the thesis deeply investigated the political allegory, and some manifestations of political views of George Orwell that have been symbolized allegorically in both novels “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”.

In the fourth chapter, the thesis reflected an analysis of the characters’ acts underlining the political characterization and its insinuations that the writer displayed not only for criticizing the political systems, regimes and societies at that time but also for foreseeing his readers’ future which will witness the repetition of the same scenarios. This chapter reflected how the characters’ images that appeared in Orwell’s novels will remain a mirror of renewable characters’ behavior and incidents as long as the dirty games in politics will never be over or purified.

The thesis finally concluded with chapter five in which the researcher presented all the results and facts about the necessity and the philosophy of George Orwell beyond the portrayal of political allegory and characterization in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”. The chapters ended with presenting the main findings of the study, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

6.2 The Main Findings

This thesis revealed a dynamic change in the perspective of the analysis of political allegory and characterization in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”. The critic dichotomy and analysis of the political allegory and characterization of the novels is necessary enough to provide an amusing reading that appeals to the 21st-century readers from different walks of life. The emphasis from the allegorical into the symbolical meant to unbalance the

idea of political evil or politically good, and to concentrate the attention on what is common to both works - totalitarianism and totalitarian attitudes, that may come from any political regime, in any time. In this thesis, “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” have been approached through their possible points of connection, demonstrating that these novels can be read as continuation of a single story, which starts in a totalitarian environment where the characters do not have any political participation and finishes in the unique possible outcome of that kind of society.

The most obvious qualities of Orwell’s novels is that they can be of timeless characters for the past and future readers as they unveil all sorts of corruption and tyranny masked by different political regimes ruled their people with an iron fist. Furthermore, Orwell’s novels disclosed the truth of revolutions on how they begin with the slogan of reforms and how they finally go astray of achieving the goals that the revolutionists sacrificed for.

In support of the above claims highlighted by the researcher, there are other real-life events and concurrent political scenarios that can be typical of those allegorized and characterized by Orwell in “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”:

1. The political allegory and characterization that were portrayed to the future readers of Orwell writing to be aware of their leaders when hold the position of decision-makers. Below are salient and vivid examples of the political allegory and characterization that the study has revealed and they can be outlined as follows:

a. Among all the animals, in “*Animal Farm*”, pigs dominate the animal world. This forms another conceptual allegory, that is, "leaders are pigs." The

pigs in this story allegorized the authorities that regulate the affairs of the society. They are smart to some extent because they become the pioneer to teach other animals to read and acquire knowledge. However, their total goal is to educate them on reading the Seven Commandments which is allegorized as the constitution by which the government imposed the restricted laws of freedom upon the masses. This is done through Education which is just the governments' method to enhance their power and rule, that is actually happening in most human world.

What's more, Napoleon the pig allegorized any government dictator rulers, who used many merciless measures to strengthen his status. He used violence to punish the populace and he created an imaginary enemy—Snowball—to emphasized his absolute justice, by sending the rumors that Snowball tries hard to ruin their products. This is a "smart" way because it leads people to believe in him and trust his domination. Violent leadership forced the populace to obey because it threatens their lives. In such situations, most people would like to put up with reality because their only concerns are their own lives. Only a few can stand out to challenge, however, those brave men will eventually become the victims of such a kind of controlling government. This is identically experienced in reality where tyrant regimes launch war to gain their people sympathy and unify them around one man's heart which is the country, not the party the other way round.

b. “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” through the analysis conducted in chapter four and five, have shown a high aesthetic and artistic value and are not just political pamphlets. Through the analysis of some elements that exert the same function in their plots and the connections found in both works, there is the sense that we are dealing with a unique story.

Beginning with the utopia of “*Animal Farm*” and finishing with the dystopia of “*Nineteen Eighty-four*”, there is the complete outline for the desired update. What is seen is not a plain horror view of the future, but so, the unfolding of how the lack of political understanding may cause the coming up of not a declared totalitarian regime. Thus, Orwell gives the reader the chance to reflect upon the dangers of some totalitarian attitudes on the population, the worst of them being the loss of liberty.

c. Orwell's main intention of adopting political allegory and characterization was to show how false the slogans raised by revolutions supporters which are very quickly amended to show the dark side of such revolutions. By so doing, Orwell wanted to remind people and readers’ status quo of the immediate past and future about these revolutions consequences, and their invisible facts.

d. George Orwell incorporated allegory and characterization in “*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*” to warn his readers about the fact that most revolutions begin with slogans of reforms then finally turning into dictatorship and betrayal. Though the novels seem like an attack on totalitarian authorities and regimes, in fact, it dealt with any kind of revolution; its consequences, and criticizes totalitarianism of any kind. Orwell also pointed out that the failure of such revolutions often lay within the revolutionary process since its leaders ignore those whom the revolutions were meant to serve. In the end, those for whom the revolution was intended are often the victims rather than the beneficiaries.

e. The song 'Beasts of England' and the 'Seven Commandments' as political allegories were the essence of the animals' revolution. However, in the end, it has been seen that the song is banned, and the commandments are turned into an illogical and unjust slogan.

f. One of the important factors causing Orwell to resort to allegory and characterization was his greatest fear that people easily forget what had happened in the immediate past. Thus, in a way, he rewrote the history and moral principles disguised in 'a fairy story', and reminded people, and especially leaders of democracy, of the facts.

g. Another reason why Orwell used “*Allegory and Characterization*” is that he wanted to point out that the failure often lay within the revolutionary process since its leaders ignore those whom the revolution was meant to serve. Orwell also shared the 20th-century hope of a socialist revolution that would transform and reconstruct the society. With his novels, he emphasized the fact that those for whom such revolutions were intended, were often the victims rather than the beneficiaries.

h. In Orwell’s “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia did not exist and Big Brother did not succeed in damaging individual thought. However, in a large part of our world, the Big Brother did succeed, by running the news and monitoring the written and spoken words, in severely worsening man's ability to think freely. Even in the free world, many maintain, inroads have been made: commercial interests try to doctor the news and sometimes succeed, elected officials are tempted to misrepresent the truth, Government agencies attempt to and sometimes do invade the privacy of the individuals, and military leaders feel compelled to hide some of their activities.

i. The similarities between George Orwell’s “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” and modern society also stretch to the endless, global war. The novel described a global war that has been going on since forever and shows no signs of slowing down. Furthermore, the main hero, Winston Smith, realized that the enemy keeps changing. In reality, things are not much different war-wise.

The United States is in a war for decades just with different nations and we can also add to that a long list of names such as Russia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, France, and many others. The so-called war on terror has no end in sight and its only “accomplishment” is spreading fear among the general public.

j. The most valuable facts of Orwell’s “*Animal Farm*” and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” have relevance to real scenarios and events repeated in the real life of different societies in the world besides the timeless validity and the universal appeal for readers of different generations and different cultures. These facts can be illustrated as follows:

1. There is a correspondence between “*Animal Farm*” and real political scenarios when Orwell portrayed a farm that overthrew its human master and replaced him with a collective leadership of pigs. These clever pigs promised to reorganize society along egalitarian (populist) lines with the animal workers being rewarded for their labor on a just and fair farm. Mirroring Russia, where Stalin replaced Trotsky and Lenin’s vision with the Gulag camps and a system of brutal repression and corruption, the ruling pigs of “*Animal Farm*” gradually became human-like and their promises of change forgotten.

2. The Cowshed Battle as described by Russo, (2017) was told and retold with fake news added as the pigs began to squabble. As the animals liberated the farm from the humans, new spins on the facts were constantly required. Thus, a true hero of the Battle of the Cowshed, Snowball, was later reported to have sided with the humans. Even Trump’s deleted tweet about how it was an “honor to host [Palestinian] President “Mahmoud Abbas” at the White House was foreseen in “*Animal Farm*”, as writing on the barn wall was

changed and erased as politically necessary. The animals could not recall the original writings or how they were altered.

3. A salient intersection between reality and “*Nineteen Eighty-four*” is that almost all private and public places feature large TV screens that only broadcast government propaganda, news, and of course, the approved entertainment. At the same time, these large screens are two-way monitors which spy on people’s private lives. Nowadays, we have easy access to media which, also, aims to display government propaganda, news, and entertainment. Although we try to convince ourselves thinking entertainment today is largely “free”, that is not the case. Social media websites such as Facebook track our likes, dislikes, even messages and the surveillance spreads to other websites we use on a daily basis at the same time. We may not have a two-way screen that tracks our every move, but there are multiple ways to get spied on and it is impossible to escape.

4. Finally, the study revealed that George Orwell’s motives and philosophy of covering his political ideologies through allegory and characterization are a philosophy for cautioning his readers not only against totalitarian thoughts and regimes, but also informing them that whatever the laws and liberty were restricted, and all forms of rights were entirely assimilated by totalitarianism, dictatorship and tyranny, people have other ways whereby can gain their freedom of expression, call for rights, stand against the darkness of inequality, and injustice.

6.3 Recommendations

It has become very evident that with Orwell, literature finds a way to become a powerful tool to generate political, social, and cultural values for numerous past, present and future readers. As a result, the study posited the following recommends:

1. The works of Orwell author should be accredited, not only the fictional works but also the essays and journalist articles need to be read more and more and have their criticism updated too.
2. The study also recommends that more studies must be conducted to explore the secrets of Orwell's other works. George Orwell wrote different literary works contained morals, messages need to be discovered by extra studies to the readers.
3. The study optimistically recommends to explore subject matter of Orwell's other Novels as "*Burmese Days, Down and Out in Paris and London, Homage to Catalonia, and The Road to Wigan Pier*" that have not yet been artistically investigated.
4. In addition to the political ideologies incorporated in most Orwell's writings, further studies must be conducted to explore the artistic values of Orwell's novels such as the themes of colonization and racial discrimination, empathy with animals, the figurative language, the rhetorical images, and the esthetic contents
5. And the study finally recommends that there are urgent needs for new studies to be carried to prove why George Orwell's novels still have appeal to various readers throughout the world?

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

Owing to the timeless appeal of George Orwell's writings to the present readers of the 21st century, and the most fantastic artistic value these writings still kept inside. The researcher postulates the following promising studies that can be studied for further investigation:

1. George Orwell's "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*" as predictive phenomena in a futuristic world.

2. Investigating Aspects of Political Pessimistic Moments Insinuated By George Orwell in "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*".
3. The Exploration of how George Orwell considered to be The writer Who lived his Writings?
4. A comparative analysis of the Utopian and Dystopian Presence Displayed in Orwell's "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*".
5. George Orwell's "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*" Are criticism of dictatorships.
6. Portrayal of the Political Satire and Allegory in Orwell's "*Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*".

References

Alter, R. (1984) *Motives for Fiction*, Harvard University Press, ISBN 978-0-674-58762-5.

Alegre, M. S. (2017) Post-War English Literature. [Online]. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>. [Accessed 01/03/2018].

Anon. (2018) *English literature: The 20th century*. [Online]. Available at: www.britannica.com/art/English-literature. [Accessed 20 December 2016].

Bossche, E. V. D. (2018) *The Message For Today in Orwell's '1984'*. [Online]. Available at: www.nytimes.com. [Accessed 02/03/17].

Boyers, R. (1985) *Atrocity and Amnesia: The Political Novel since 1945*. Oxford University Press.

Chen, S. B. (2008). The Symbolic Meaning in *Animal Farm*. *Journal of Chengdu University*, 22(6): 112-114.

Cherrat, N. (2012). *The Function of Symbolism in Chinua Achebe's Novel Things Fall Apart*. pp. 15, 60-61. Retrieved from <http://dspace.univ-biskra.dz:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4495/1/dissertation>. PDF.

Crick, B. (2004). *Blair, Eric Arthur [George Orwell] (1903–1950)*. Oxford University Press. Web. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/public/dnb/31915.html>. [Accessed 25/05 2016].

Cuddon, J. A., (1998), *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theories*. Great Britain.

Coughran, E., (1907), *Theories of Style in Literature*. USA: Cornell University Literary.

Crick, Bernard. (2007), “*Nineteen Eighty-Four: Context and Controversy.*” Ed. John Rodden. 146-159. Print.

- Dickstein, M. (2007), “*Animal Farm: History as Fable.*” Ed. John Rodden.. 133-145. Print.
- Didem, B. (1996), *Orwell’s Animal Farm As A Political Satire*. Published Thesis (PhD), Near East University.
- Dinesh, K. (2014), *Vision of Society in George Orwell’s Animal Farm*, (Online) International Journal of Research: 2348-6848. Vol-1, Issue-7, August 2014
- Drabble, M. and Stringer, J. (2007) *Concise Companion to English Literature*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Edmund, M. (1924), *The political novel: its development in England and in America*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Emelie, B. (2015), *A Rhetorical Reading of George Orwell’s “Nineteen Eighty-four”*: *The brainwashing of Winston in the light of ethos, logos, and pathos*. Published Essay: University of Barcelona.
- Fouzia, D. (2014). *Interpretation of the Symbol Black Cat in Edgar Allan Poe’s Short Story*. p. 5. Retrieved June, 2016, from <https://bu.univ-ouargla.dz/master/pdf/Djaafour-Fouzia.pdf?idmemoire=4315>.
- Gottlieb, E. (2007). “*George Orwell: A Bibliographic Essay.*” Ed. John Rodden.. 190-200. Print.
- Griet, V. (2009) *Ideology in the works of George Orwell: a Sociocultural Approach in the Wake of Raymond Williams* “ *Cultural Materialism*. Published Thesis (MA), University of Ghent.
- Hammond, J. R. (1982) *A George Orwell Companion*. London: Macmillan.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Hassan, R., (1976) *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.
- Hitchens, C. (2002) *Why Orwell Matters*. New York, Basic Books.

- Harry, S. (2002), *George Orwell's Animal Farm: A metonym for a dictatorship*. *Literator: Journal of Literary Criticism and Linguistics*, (Online) 0258-2279
- Howe, I. (1957). *Politics and the Novel*. HORIZON PRESS NEW YORK.
- Ink, J., (2010) *Modernism and Modernist Literature: Historical Background*. Retrieved on 12 February at 15:15.
- Jing, N. (2006). *Allan Poe's Literary Theory and its Application in The Black Cat*. *Journal of Sichuan Institute of Technology*, 21, 91-94.
- Khalida, M. (2013), *The Use of Personification in George Orwell's novel Animal Farm*. Published Dissertation (MA), Kasdi Merbah University
- Kubal, D. L. (1972) *Outside the Whale: George Orwell's Art and Politics*. London: University of Notre Dame.
- Luigy, Danwen, S. and Chao, B. (2017) *The World In A book: Characters of Nineteen Eighty- Four*. [Online]. Available at: www.itiscannizario.net. [Accessed 09/11/2017].
- Martin, K. (1945) *Column of New Statesman and Nation* of September 8th, 1945.
- Nicolson, H. (1949) *George Orwell – The Critical Heritage* *Column of Observer* of June 12th, p. 7. In: MEYERS, Jeffrey. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Nouarsi, H. (2015) *Theme of Corruption in George Orwell's novel Animal Farm*. Dissertation Academic Master. Kasdi Merbah University.
- Orwell, G. (1975) *The Critical Heritage*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Orwell, G. (2000). *Animal Farm*. In: *The Complete Novels*. London: Penguin Books.

Orwell, G. (2000). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In: *The Complete Novels*. London: Penguin Books.

Orwell, G. (2002) *Animal Farm*. Research and Education Association: eNotes.

Orwell, G. (2002) *Nineteen Ninety-Four*. Lebanon: New York Press

Orwell: *A Life*. (1992) London: Penguin Books. Print.

Orwell, G. (2007) *1984*. USA: New York, NY 10011. [online]. Available at: www.sparknotes.com. [Accessed: 19/06/2017].

Prescott, O. (1952). *In My Opinion: An Inquiry into the Contemporary Novel*. Indianapolis.

Quinn, E. (2009). *Critical Companion to George Orwell*. Facts On File, Inc. An imprint of Infobase Publishing: New York NY 10001.

Radha, M. J. (2015), *The Political & Social Ideas of George Orwell: With Particular Reference to His Novel: "1984"*. International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies. (Printed), Vol.2. Issue4, 2015 (Oct.-Dec.)

Rashid, H. (2014): *George Orwell's Animal Farm*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention: (Online): 2319 – 7722, (Print): 2319 – 7714.

Richard, J. et al (1985) *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Rodden, J. (2007) *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Russo, J. (2017) *Animal Farm' Perfectly Describes Life in the Era of Donald Trump*. [Online]. Available at: <http://observer.com>. [Accessed 10/06/18].

- Sana, N. & et al (2015): *Allegory & Satire on Animal Farm By George Orwell*. International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection: 2309-0405. Vol. 3, No. 5, 2015
- Savage, R.L., Combs, J. & Nimmo, D. (eds.) (1989). *The Orwellian Moment: Hindsight and Foresight in the Post-1984 World*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.
- Trilling, D. (1949). *George Orwell-The Critical Heritage* Column of Nation of June 25th, pp. 716-717. In: MEYERS, Jeffrey.
- Anon. (2018) *Compare George Orwell's 1984 to Society Today*. [Online]. Available at www.au.edusson.com/bundles/asterfreelance.pdf. [Accessed 09/05/19].
- Warburg, F. (1973). *All Authors are Equal*. London: Hutchinson. pp. 103-104.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. New York: Anchor Books Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960. Print.
- Zhang, Q. (2009). *Symbolism and Its Application in Allan Poe's Gothic Novels*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Zhang, J. S. & Wang W. D. (2014). *On the Narrative Arts in Animal Farm*. Journal of Xi'an International Studies University, 22 (4): 78-81.