



Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology

Azarbaijan University of Shahid Madani

Faculty of Literature and Humanities

Thesis Presented to the Department of English Language and Literature in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts (MA) in
English Language and Literature

**A Study of the Concept of Totalitarianism in Orwell's
*Nineteen Eighty-Four***

Supervisor

Abolfazl Ramazani, Ph.D.

Advisor

Bahram Behin, Ph.D.

By

Hamed Nikpooya

May 2012

Tabriz/Iran

Abstract

George Orwell's aim in writing his last novel was to enlighten the world to have some provisions in order to prevent a much darker future based on Totalitarianism. This thesis focuses on Orwell's last novel, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, in order to attain a clearer understanding of the modern political concept of Totalitarianism. It tries to clarify the nature of Totalitarianism from Orwell's point of view and then analyzes different Totalitarian elements in his novel. The findings of this research are: first, Orwell believed that the origin of Totalitarianism is the political intellectuals' aspiration to possess an unrestricted power. He believed that the lust for power for its own sake in the modern age was the direct consequence of the decline of religion. Second, according to Orwell, Totalitarianism tries to limit the possibility of questioning the ideology of a regime by changing the way the mind processes information. Totalitarianism is changing and distorting language to the level that subversive thinking is a matter of impossibility. Third, modern technologies do not naturally and inevitably tend, as Orwell suggests, toward limiting human's freedom; nor do they naturally and inevitably tend to freedom. Technologies function as we choose. They develop as we design them, and we can design them to be more or less protective of freedom. Fourth, it is necessary to differentiate among various kinds of sexuality and to consider their different effects on political freedom. Actually, the relation of sexual freedom and political freedom is complicated and it is not easy to generalize it in a single rule as Orwell did. Orwell proposes that if, against the demonic Totalitarian mind control, only a single person was able to resist and keep his free will, then he could put the whole of the system into a danger. The total domination can be hugely threatened by means of even a single opposition, by someone who can remember the better conditions of life before Totalitarianism and imagine the bright possibilities of future without Totalitarianism. This study benefits mankind especially the peoples of those countries whose state is or seems to be democratic on the surface but in reality uses some elements of Totalitarianism. Women's oppression in general and in a state under Totalitarianism in specific, is something about which Orwell generally remained silent. The researcher believes that this case can be an original topic for full investigation.

Key Terms: George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Totalitarianism, Socialism, Doublethink, Newspeak

Acknowledgments

My first debt of gratitude is to my supervisor, Dr. Abolfazl Ramazani, for his insights, support, and hard work in revising my lines. He offered invaluable comments for each draft of the chapters of this thesis, and I have attempted to implement those insights into the final edition. His steady interest was a welcome source of encouragement, and his comments led to considerable improvements in clarity and structure.

My particular thanks go to Dr. Bahram Behin who read the final draft of my thesis. I deeply thank him for his encouragement, advice, and gentle criticism. I also express my appreciation for Dr. Ahad Mehrvand's kind and thoughtful advises as well as his excellent teaching of seminar course prior to the writing of this thesis that clearly set me on the right path.

I also thank Dr. Farzad Salahshoor and Dr. Biok Behnam, two other professors at Azarbaijan University of Tarbiat Moallem, who gave me plenty of insightful ideas during my BA years.

My most special thanks go to my mother for her sustaining love and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Totalitarianism, Socialism and George Orwell	26
Chapter 2: Totalitarian Mind Control and Language Manipulation in <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	59
Chapter 3: Totalitarian Technology, Sexual Politics, and Religion in <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i> ...	85
Conclusion	122
Notes	134
Bibliography	140

Introduction

Today George Orwell is almost unavoidable; this is because he was primarily a political writer and the dark vision that he had in such novels as *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) is universal. In his essay 'Why I Write' (1946), Orwell stated that he wanted 'to make political writing into an art' (Rossi 1). Although he was a master of plain prose and some critics praise his prose style, there is no doubt that his greatness lies in his political thoughts which is always fresh. He can be considered a sole defender of freedom at the time when the threat of oppression was immense. Freedom for Orwell meant telling the truth, the objective truth which people usually do not want to hear. At a time when many of the left intelligentsia was captivated by the Soviet Communism, he relentlessly attacked Totalitarianism, especially the Soviet variety of it. In the process, Orwell turned political writing into an art form. When he completed *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, his life was also nearly spent, but the value of his dark vision and its paradoxically bright message was just beginning to be appreciated. Orwell saw things as they really were, but he also insisted that just one ordinary individual who tells the truth can offer humanity the hope it needs to go on. In spite of many severe criticisms especially

from the left thinkers, time has proved that in almost all cases Orwell's warnings about Totalitarianism were on target.

Orwell was obviously a Socialist, but his definition of Socialism was quite different from that of Communism. In his time he saw the Stalinist Soviet as the real embodiment of the Totalitarianism, and determined to fight it in any way that he could. Today there is no longer Communism or Fascism, but what he described as Totalitarianism and its elements in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be seen in different states. That is why Orwell is still unavoidable. Through his works, Orwell continues to battle hypocrisy, deceit, and lies with the deadly weapon of truth. Orwell remains at the center of modern political life, just when we might have expected him to depart. But Orwell did not lose his power with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the new era of postmodern technology and mass media seems to give some new relevance to his ideas, just when their specific political occasion had apparently vanished.

Orwell in 'Politics and the English Language' (1946) famously asserted that the great enemy of clear language was insincerity. In many of his essays and novels, Orwell was stressing the role of the language in political manipulation. He was particularly keen to recognize the importance of language control for Totalitarianism. In his two great novels, he placed language at the center of the stage. Remarkably, Orwell's description of the relationship between politics and language usage sounds every bit as accurate now as it did when he wrote it almost sixty years ago.

The fact is that Orwell had ideas and some dark visions about a disgusting future. When he was writing, the threat of a dark Totalitarian future was in the horizon. He did his best in order to prevent such a future. The very same threat is actually in the horizon today and is going to remain in the future too. Indeed the threat of Totalitarianism is an ever present threat for all

societies. So what he wrote about Totalitarianism sixty years ago is still pertinent to our present political climate, and that is why the researcher thinks that in spite of a great deal of criticism that exists about the works of Orwell, we still must study his writings for their political natures. Thus the important point is that Orwell and his theory of Totalitarianism still matters.

Eric Arthur Blair, who would later become known as George Orwell, was born on June 25, 1903 in Motihari, Bengal, the son of a minor British official in India. He and his sister were taken back to England by their mother when he was two years old. The family was able to save enough money to send its only son to St. Cyprian's, an expensive private school near Eastbourne in East Sussex. There Orwell won scholarships to Eton¹ in 1917, where he spent four years. Although an excellent student at St. Cyprian's, Orwell was unhappy there and showed little interest in his studies at Eton. He wrote about his unhappy days in St. Cyprian's in his essay 'Such, Such Were the Joys' (1947). Instead of going on to a university program like what most of his classmates did, he became an officer in the Indian Imperial Police in Burma. But Orwell's five years in Burma were dismal; in his first novel, *Burmese Days* (1934), he painted a highly critical portrait of the British community there. He returned to England in 1927, poor and without any hope of success. He lived in London for several years and then in Paris, earning only enough money to feed himself. He chronicled his experiences among the world of day laborers, itinerant hop pickers, and restaurant employees in his first published book, *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933).

Orwell's early ambition was to write realistic novels. He became increasingly involved in political debate, though, and throughout the early 1930s his work was more political than literary. Following two minor novels, *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) and *Keep the Aspidochelone* (1936), he was assigned in 1936 to write a book-length report on the living conditions of

coal miners in northern England; this study was published by the Left Book Club as *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937). In the following year, Orwell went to Spain to cover the Spanish Civil War, but again his politics replaced his literary aspirations: he joined, and became a captain in the military branch of a Syndicalist Party² that was fighting the Falangist (Spanish fascist political party) insurgents. After many months at the front, he was shot through the neck, sustaining a permanent injury to his vocal cords. He returned from his convalescence just in time to find that his factions had been denounced by its Communist partners and was being systematically purged. With his wife of one year, Eileen O' Shaughnessy, he escaped across the border to France and returned to England. In 1938 he published *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), an account of his Spanish adventure. In 1939, Orwell published his fourth novel, *Coming Up for Air* (1939), as he continued to write political commentary and reviews.

Once World War II broke out, he joined the Home Guard (the British citizen army organized in 1940 to defend the UK against invasion) and began to work for the Indian Division of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), producing presentations of political and literary commentary for broadcast to India; these pieces were published in 1985 as *The War Broadcasts and The War Commentaries*. In 1943, after disputes with his superiors over the censorship of war news, he left that position and became a literary editor for the *Tribune*, a left-wing weekly for which for several years he also wrote a column entitled 'As I Please'.

During this time he composed a brief satirical fable about Stalinism³, which after many rejections was published in 1945 as *Animal Farm* and was very well received. In the same year his wife, Eileen, died suddenly. Her death left Orwell, who was now chronically ill, to raise the infant son they had adopted in 1944. Increasingly hampered by pneumonia, Orwell spent his final years on the island of Jura in the Outer Hebrides, working on his last novel, *Nineteen*

Eighty-Four (1949). This embittered and compelling dystopian fantasy seemed to prophesy the Totalitarian future, and it was an immediate worldwide success, but Orwell would not survive to reap its rewards. He entered a London hospital for treatment of his tuberculosis late in 1949, and soon thereafter he married a young editorial assistant, Sonia Brownell, in a bedside ceremony. Three months later he suffered severe hemorrhaging in one lung, and on January 21, 1950, Orwell died. In his short life Orwell managed to leave several works that would inspire and define debate across the political spectrum for decades. He is also regarded as one of the finest essayists in modern English literature; his *Collected Essays Journalism and Letters* appeared in four volumes in 1968.

In a letter, written on 16 June 1949, to Francis A. Henson of the United Automobile Workers, Orwell explains his aim in writing *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Excerpts from the letter were published in the *New York Times Book Review*, 31 July 1949; the following is an important excerpt of his letter:

My recent novel [*Nineteen Eighty-Four*] is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in Communism and Fascism. I do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily will arrive, but I believe (allowing of course for the fact that the book is a satire) that something resembling it could arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences. The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasize that the English-speaking races are not innately better than anyone else and that

Totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere. (qtd. in Bloom, 'Guide', 44)

Hanna Arendt is a German political theorist whose influential book, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951), is a thorough analysis about the postmodern political phenomenon of Totalitarianism. She puts forward Nazi⁴ and Stalinist regimes as some prominent examples of Totalitarianism. She identifies these kinds of regimes with the old tyrannical regimes and considers it as a totally novel form of government which is built completely upon terror and ideology. She argues that terror is not an efficient tool for Totalitarian regimes as it was for the most of historical tyrannical regimes, for subduing any opposition. Terror, in fact, is the essence of Totalitarianism. Her theory about Totalitarianism which also distinguishes her from other theorists saw the appeal of Totalitarian ideology to the masses and considered Europeans' late nineteenth century Imperialism as the main origins of the Totalitarianism. For the masses that were lost the sense of social order after the World War and the Great Depression (longest and most severe economic depression ever experienced by the Western world in 1930s), ideology was something that could reveal to these masses the mysteries of the whole historical process, the secrets of the past, the intricacies of the present, and the uncertainties of the future, and it was very fascinating and comforting for them. Imperialism which was only caring about unlimited expansion and gathering of as much wealth as possible no longer concerned with a stable and limited public world but with conquest. It also brought Europeans in contact with native populations around the world and caused Europeans' sense of racial superiority. These characteristics of Imperialism in Europe's history served as the very important origin for the rise of Totalitarianism which only cared about total domination.

Although Arendt puts forward her theory in 1951, a few years after Orwell's novels, her ideas about the nature of the Totalitarianism and also its origins can be traced in Orwell's novels. Orwell, maybe in an indirect way, both in *Animal Farm* (1945) and in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) wanted to stress the ideological aspect of Totalitarian regimes and the importance of the ideology in establishing their power and subduing the masses. A biographical survey in Orwell's life and an investigation in his other writings including his essays such as 'Shooting an Elephant' (1936) can reveal the fact that he was a staunch critic of European Imperialism and he saw it as the main reason for many of oppressions both in Europe and other parts of the world and, just like Arendt, he saw that it was one the origins of the new phenomenon of Totalitarianism.

In a Foreword to *Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Centennial Edition of Orwell's Work*, Thomas Pynchon sketches the historical context of the Novel's original publication date and assesses its relevance to our own historical moment. In sketching the historical context of the novel, Pynchon refers to Orwell's articles and letters in order to place the novel in the context of the author's own political thinking as well as broader political events in post-war England. He states that Orwell's concern is not limited to the Soviet Union and it includes Fascist and even British left. He argues that with the collapse of the Soviet Union the threat of the Totalitarianism does not dissipate. Pynchon refers to many technological improvements especially the mass media to revalidate Orwell's text as still relevant warning of things to come.

As an Afterword to *Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Centennial Edition of Orwell's Work*, Erich Fromm analyzes *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a dystopian fiction. He refers to the changing of the genre of utopia to dystopia in the 20th century because of some technological improvements and believes his peers should feel more of the threat Orwell depicts so that they might try to avoid eventual catastrophe. He contends that Orwell's novel is a powerful warning and it would be most unfortunate if the reader snugly interpreted *Nineteen Eighty Four* as another description of Stalinist barbarism, and if he does not see that it means us. As a psychotherapist, Fromm believes that the central question Orwell and other dystopian writers raise is: can human nature be changed in such a way that man will forget his longing for freedom, for dignity, for integrity, and for love, that is to say, can man forget that he is human? So Fromm urges readers to heed Orwell's warnings before it is too late.

In his essay 'The New Barbarians: Totalitarianism, Terror and the Left Intelligentsia in Orwell's 1984' (1985), John David Frodsham writes that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 'reconsiders and questions ourselves, our society, our world; our past, our present and -- above all -- our future' (139). For, whatever the date, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will always remain as a threatening possibility, being not so much a year as a state of mind, a nightmare which we fear because we know it to be essentially true; because something in us responds to Orwell's warning cry. Frodsham observes that Orwell although lacked religious faith, was a deeply moral man with profound commitment to absolute values, especially truth, freedom, and justice, and unflinching courage and resolution. He concludes his essay with referring to Orwell's warning that what can be waiting for us if everyone continues defining himself in materialistic and economic terms and forgets his real identity. He states that 'But as Orwell has chillingly demonstrated, once we lose

our souls in this devil's bargain, we lose the whole world as well. This is the lesson we must all soon learn -- or perish' (154).

In her essay 'The Demonic World of Oceania: The Mystical Adulation of the Sacred Leader' (1992), Erica Gottlieb praises the supposed imagistic power of demonic Oceania. She analyzes the relationship between political and religious discourses and their role in obliging the citizens of Oceania to obey and worship Big Brother. Gottlieb uses mystical terms such as learning, understanding and acceptance to the process that every individual like Winston undergoes in order to learn and practice Doublethink and accept Big Brother as the god of power in the Totalitarian state.

In his essay 'The Ghostly Bells of London' (1994), Robert Plank surveys the novel from the psychological point. He tries to make a parallel between Orwell's real life and what he really experienced and what is happening to Winston Smith in the novel. In the processes he analyzes the importance of remembering memories from the past and also analyzes Orwell's religious belief and their bearings on the psychological matters of the novel. Robert Plank ponders over Orwell's musings upon the social effect of a general loss of belief in immortality.

In his essay 'The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*' (1997), Malcolm Pittock analyzes the novel from political and psychological point of view. He argues that Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty Four* depicts a world that truly represents the real and modern hell without any counterpart as heaven. He furthers that in this modern hell, O'Brien is in the role of the real Satan. By bringing examples from different parts of the novel, Pittock tries to prove the way the Totalitarian regime of Oceania gains the total power and control over its citizens and misuses them in order to create

a real hell. Pittock argues that the hell which is depicted in *Nineteen Eighty Four* is more pervasive than even what Orwell intended it to be.

Mario Varricchio in his essay 'Power of Images/Images of Power in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*' (1999) reviews two important dystopia novels of 20th century, *Brave New World* (1932) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949). He argues that both of these novels make use of cinema and television to draw an extremely pessimistic picture of humanity's future, emphasizing their role as essential means for distorting reality and also for providing artificial pleasures which dim the mind. The screen performs a crucial political function by preventing and repressing protest and, more generally, by conditioning and inhibiting oppositional forces in a fashion that ominously foreshadows the present. In the standardized societies depicted in both novels the media uphold conformity, denying individuals their own privacy and personal feelings. Simultaneously, they strengthen powers capable of controlling every single facet of their subjects' lives by depriving them of all critical attitudes. Varricchio studies in detail the ideological roles of the different images in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, concluding,

...in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the visual elements have both an overt and a metaphorical character. Besides, in this work the frequent use of visual metaphors strengthens the sensation of the ubiquity of power and shows that the pervasive presence of the Party's eye in the story has also been translated into narrative technique. (98)

In his book, *Orwell and Marxism, The Political and Cultural Thinking of George Orwell* (2000), Philip Bounds argues that although as a writer Orwell is being widely read, as a cultural thinker he has been to a great extent neglected. He thinks the reason for this neglect is that

Orwell as a socialist was very suspicious of his own side's susceptibility to Totalitarianism. The perception of Orwell as an intellectual outsider has a lot to do with his legendary political independence. Bounds declares the aim of his book by saying that the suspicion of Orwell is misplaced and that his cultural writings have been neglected for too long. He sets out to gain this aim in two ways. On the one hand, he provides a lengthy introduction to Orwell's cultural thinking, showing that his ideas about literature, class, popular culture, and a range of other subjects were simultaneously realistic and informed by a solidly political purpose. On the other hand, he seeks to prove that while Orwell was indeed a lifelong outsider and a persistent critic of his own side, it is simply not true that his writings about culture bore no resemblance to those of his socialist contemporaries. Bounds even argues that Orwell owed a special intellectual debt to the very people on the left to whom he was most opposed politically. Actually he argues that even 'there are some striking parallels between Orwell's cultural writings and those of the young literary intellectuals who were either members of, or closely associated with, the Communist Party of Great Britain in the 1930s and 1940s' (2).

In *George Orwell, Doubtless, and the Value of Decency* (2003), Anthony Stewart argues for the important place of language in the thinking and writing of Orwell. He refers to Orwell's essay 'Politics and the English Language' and considers Orwell's ideas about English language and the fact that Orwell maintained that English language is in the bad situation because of the political abuse of the language. Stewart then argues for the relevance of Orwell's ideas about the language to our own era by referring to some political happenings of our time. In this survey of Orwell's relatedness to present life he came to the conclusion that 'there is an optimism that emerges from Orwell when read as I read him here. As he says, the process is reversible. We cannot control what others do, but we can change—and improve—our own habits' (xiv).

Homi K. Bhabha's essay entitled 'Doublespeak and the Minority of One' (2005) seeks to refute the idea commonly held, with particular relevance to the case of Orwell, that virtuous people should not be virtuosos. He argues that in fact Orwell is not the plain-spoken figure frequently described in the vast literature that exist about him, but is in his own way a virtuoso, particularly when he 'narrates the vicious'. Orwell's language, Bhabha argues, directed against Totalitarianism, is itself 'suffused with the imagination of Totalitarian violence' (29). Orwell turns into a paranoiac in the service of a good cause precisely when he is 'at his most inventive and insightful' (30). In order for Orwell to defend Winston Smith's commitment to being, at the end of the day, 'a minority of one' in defense of the truth, there has to be another party that denies the truth. Winston's desired relationship with O'Brien is an essential aspect of his struggle for the representation of reality, which can be achieved only by dialogic discourse.

Richard A. Epstein in his essay 'Does Literature Work as Social Science? The Case of George Orwell' (2005) is doubtful of the relevance of Orwell's literary work for social theory. Epstein maintains that the normative messages in Orwell's fiction were based too heavily on Orwell's idiosyncratic and thus unrepresentative experiences. For this reason, Epstein contends Orwell's fiction failed to teach us much about the social institutions he criticized. He thinks a literary work may well teach someone to be sensitive to the pains of poverty but it will not indicate whether poverty is in decline or on the increase. Epstein believes that such tasks are best served by the tools of economics and related disciplines. He acknowledges that the literary imagination has a certain working advantage over a quantitative social science in explaining deviant behavior, and he deems Orwell to be at his best in identifying and exposing twisted personalities and Totalitarian excess. But he insists that Orwell specifically, and writers of fiction

in general, are ill-suited to explain complex social systems or to make recommendations for their reform.

In his essay, 'Puritanism and Power Politics during the Cold War: George Orwell and Historical Objectivity' (2005), Abbott Gleason focuses on Orwell's passionate defense of historical objectivity in the approximate decade between the Spanish Civil War⁵ (1936-1939) and the first years of the Cold War (1948-1949), a period when Orwell was concerned above all with the issue of Totalitarianism. He argues that Orwell's defense of historical objectivity was less an epistemological position than a defense of a variety of other commitments that played a role in his struggle against Totalitarianism. He sees an autobiographical element in Orwell's anguished depiction of O'Brien's total victory over Winston Smith at the end of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which suggests Orwell's pessimism about the ability of his most deeply held values to endure in what he regarded as the Age of Totalitarianism.

Philip G. Zimbardo, a psychology professor, in his essay 'Mind Control in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Fictional Concepts Become Operational Realities in Jim Jones's Jungle Experiment' (2005), focuses on the ways that torture can succeed in shaping thought and mind. After reviewing Orwell's conception of human nature and of the techniques of torture, Zimbardo explains the dimensions along which human minds are subject to control and manipulation. He then illustrates how Orwell's mind control techniques have been utilized, expanded, and made more improved by modern actors, including the CIA. Zimbardo concludes with a fascinating account of how Jim Jones-orchestrated mass suicide and murders of 912 U.S. citizens in Guyana in 1978 were modeled directly on the strategies and tactics of mind control outlined in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

In his new study about Orwell, *The Social and Political Thought of George Orwell: a Reassessment* (2006), Stephen Ingle captures a wide range of social experiences and political visions of Orwell. His new point is that although Orwell is often being read as a socialist, he is best understood as a moralist and imaginative writer. These new readings and new ideas about Orwell's political life involve exploration of issues such as the threat of Totalitarianism, patriotism and imperialism, the nature of revolution and power and the Intellectuals.

In an introduction to a collection of essays entitled *George Orwell, Bloom's Modern Critical View* (2007), Harold Bloom observes that Orwell aesthetically considered, is a far better essayist than a novelist. He refers to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a dystopian fiction and thinks that it lacks a psychological dimension that is much needed in these kinds of novels. He writes, 'The book remains momentous; perhaps it always will be so. But there is nothing intrinsic to the book that will determine its future importance' (1). Bloom considers Orwell's successes as only partially so because he thinks Orwell is crude in creating characters in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* when he compares it to the other works of dystopia and even thinks that *Animal Farm* is better than *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in creating plausible characters. Bloom states that he does not criticize Orwell unreasonably but thinks his aesthetic failing is difficult not to be discerned. He concludes his introduction with a mixed praise of Orwell, claiming that

Orwell lived and died an independent Socialist, hardly Marxist but really a Spanish Anarchist, or an English dissenter and rebel of the line of Cromwell and of Cromwell's celebrators, Milton and Carlyle. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has the singular power, not aesthetic but social, of being the product of an age, and not just of the man who set it down (7).

In their essay entitled ‘A Political Writer’ (2007), John Rossi and John Rodden give a complete account of Orwell’s life and his work. In fact, their account can be considered as a literary biography of Orwell. They evaluate Orwell’s work in the context of his life and conclude with an account of the way he came to write such excellent political novels as *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. They conclude their essay by presenting the reasons for Orwell’s posthumous reputation:

George Orwell died, but ‘Orwell’, the brilliant Cold Warrior and the man within the writings with the ever-living voice and compelling literary personality, did not die. Indeed, more than six decades after his death, he has still not died.

To the contrary, ‘Orwell’ is in some respects more alive today – as an intellectual and moral presence in Anglo-American culture – than he was during his own lifetime.

Certainly the catchwords of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* – ‘Some animals are more equal than others’, ‘Big Brother’, ‘Newspeak’, ‘doublethink’, ‘thoughtcrime’, and so on – are in far wider circulation today than they were at the time of his death. Orwell’s afterlife brings to mind a famous line of Horace in his Odes: ‘non omnis moriar’ ‘Not all of me will die’. (10)

Ian Williams in his essay ‘Orwell and the British Left’ (2007) analyzes Orwell’s political ideas and states that, even according to Orwell’s own words just before his death, he was a supporter of Socialism and of the British Labour Party. Williams declares that Orwell in most of his writings from *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937) onwards was an avowed advocate of socialism, although his conceptions of what that meant certainly changed over the years. Williams believes that Orwell’s posthumous popularity led many people to misrepresent his views since his death,

and to appropriate his prestige for their own political projects. In order to clarify Orwell's brand of Socialism, Williams tries to trace Orwell's political development in the context of the British socialist politics of his era and to show how, at an early stage, he defined himself specifically as a 'democratic socialist', thus intending to distance himself, and indeed socialism itself, from the various totalitarian tendencies that claimed, spuriously in his view, to be socialist.

Darius Rejali, a political scientist and expert on torture's relation to modernity, in his essay 'Whom Do You Trust? What Do You Count On?' (2007), focuses on two torture-related themes in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: the relationship between torture and betrayal, and the various modes of resisting torture. Rejali distinguishes between great betrayals (betrayals of great causes and important persons) and 'ordinary betrayals' (betrayals at an atomic level in ordinary life). Most accounts of torture focus on great betrayals, and most accounts of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* focus on Winston's great betrayals, especially his betrayal of Julia. Rejali maintains that Orwell was also sensitive to how torture leads to and is shaped by ordinary betrayals. In the course of comparing Orwell's account of betrayal to that of Jean Amery⁶, who was tortured in Auschwitz⁷, Rejali argues that ordinary betrayals are what make surviving torture so difficult and complicated. In the second part of his essay, Rejali classifies various modes of resisting torture and concludes his essay with an optimistic note that in contrast to what *Nineteen Eighty-Four* suggests, present and future torture technologies will never render resistance futile and will never be able to reprogram human beings.

In 'Orwell versus Huxley: Economics, Technology, Privacy, and Satire' (2007), Richard A. Posner compares Orwell's treatment of the relationship between privacy and technology in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with that of Aldous Huxley's in *Brave New World* (1932). He acknowledges that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* successfully recognizes that the human desire for