Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

English Language and Literature

British Cultural Studies

THE CHANGING FACE OF DYSTOPIA REPRESENTED IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND TERRY GILLIAM'S *BRAZIL*: A CULTURAL MATERIALIST STUDY

Burcu ÖKE PRETTYMAN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2019

THE CHANGING FACE OF DYSTOPIA REPRESENTED IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND TERRY GILLIAM'S *BRAZIL*: A CULTURAL MATERIALIST STUDY

Burcu ÖKE PRETTYMAN

Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

English Language and Literature

British Cultural Studies

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2019

KABUL VE ONAY

Burcu ÖKE PRETTYMAN tarafından hazırlanan "The Changing Face of Dystopia Represented in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* And Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*: A Cultural Materialist Study" başlıklı bu çalışma, 17 Haziran 2019 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. F. Burçin EROL (Başkan)

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Alev KARADUMAN (Danışman)

Prof. Dr. Hande SEBER

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Pınar Taşdelen

Doç. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt Fenge

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Enstitü Müdürü

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin/raporumun tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kağıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinlerin yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan *"Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"* kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihinden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. (1)
- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihinden itibaren ... ay ertelenmiştir. (2)
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. (3)

03.07.2019

Burcu ÖKE PRETTYMAN

1 "Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge"

(1) Madde 6 - 1. Lisansüstü tezle ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent alınması süreçlerinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu iki yılı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.

(2) Madde 6. 2. Yeni teknik, materyal ve metotların kullanıldığı, kanıtlayıcı nitelikteki görüntü veya ses gibi unsurlarla çalışmanın ve materyalin paylaşılması durumunda 1. şıkkındaki süre kısaltılarak veya kısaltılmadan tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulunun verecekçeli kararı ile altı ay aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması ertelenebilir.

*(3) Madde 7. 1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, savunma, istihbarat, terörün ve güvenlik, mülki idare birimleri ile ilgili Lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, tezin niteliğine karar sürecinden verilir *. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi ile enstitü veya fakültenin uygun görüşü üzerine üniversite yönetim kurulu tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kurulunun bilgisine Madde 7.2. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kapsamında muhafaza edilir. gizlilik kapsamı kaldırılınca tezlerde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir.*

** Tez danışmanının önerisi ve enstitü anabilim dalının uygun görüşü üzerine enstitü veya fakülte yönetim kurulu tarafından karar verilir.*

ETİK BEYAN

Bu çalışmadaki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, kullandığım verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, yararlandığım kaynakları bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, tezimin kaynak gösterilen durumlar dışında özgün olduğunu, **Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Alev KARADUMAN** danışmanlığında tarafımdan üretildiğini ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Yönergesine göre yazıldığını beyan ederim.

Burcu ÖKE PRETTYMAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most profound gratitude goes to George Orwell and Terry Gilliam, whose unconventional works helped me see the world more critically and gave me the power to endure even through the darkest times.

I would like to express my deepest thanks and gratitude to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman. Even until the last minute, her door was always open whenever I needed help or had a question about my research or writing. I am thankful for her steering me in the right the direction whenever she thought I needed it, for her warm encouragement and continuous support during my research.

I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol whose Utopian Thought and Utopia in English Literature class gave me the background necessary to write this thesis, and whose insightful comments were always a source of inspiration for my thesis research. I also wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Hande Seber, Assist. Prof. Dr. Pınar Taşdelen and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt Fenge for their invaluable feedback, critiques and corrections.

My deepest and lifelong thanks are to my beloved family and my dearest husband, Jeremy Prettyman, who have tirelessly encouraged me, believed in me, and always been there for me. Without their help, encouragement and patience, this thesis wouldn't have come about.

I am very much indebted to my dear friends, Duygu Beste Başer Özcan and Dilara Ataman, who have always encouraged and motivated me throughout the whole writing process.

I finally thank my colleagues Berkan Özkan and Şebnem Öztürk for their support.

I am thankful for having you all in my life.

ABSTRACT

ÖKE PRETTYMAN, Burcu. The Changing Face of Dystopia Represented in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*: A Cultural Materialist Study. Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2019.

One of Raymond Williams' biggest contributions to the field of cultural studies is his development of cultural materialism and his introduction of a new way of thinking historically about culture. Describing culture as "a whole way of living", Raymond Williams enlarges the definition of culture and focuses on the materiality of cultural experience and draws our attention to the matter of culture, its ontology and experiential nature. In Williams' approach, instead of thinking of culture as an "intellectual attitude", culture is understood in its entirety. In other words, culture is dynamic and forms in relation to the economic, political and social components of a society. Literature, deeply intermingled with all of these components, can reveal to us the changing character of a society and the material conditions that affect its members most profoundly. A meaningful attempt to read literary texts can be made by seeing them as material products of a society. Dystopias, though not necessarily accurate representations of reality, are also reflections of cultural materialistic conditions and can be analysed in detail in order to better understand both the conditions in which they come about as well as the works themselves.

This thesis examines George Orwell's dystopian novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) along with Terry Gilliam's 1985 film *Brazil* to study the role of material culture in shaping the dystopian visions in these works. Material culture in these works is analysed using the framework provided by the cultural materialist approach. By looking at the material conditions as well as the historical context of the works in question, it is argued in the thesis that contemporary living conditions have an important and determining role in shaping ideas of dystopia in these works. The thesis demonstrates how the material circumstances of the writers in question changed from the middle twentieth century to late twentieth century, and how this affected their ideas of a dystopian future. Finally, the works are examined with respect to Raymond Williams' framework of dominant, emergent, and residual cultural forms. The study takes an interdisciplinary approach using resources from literary studies, cultural studies and history.

Key Words: George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), Terry Gilliam, *Brazil* (1985), utopia, dystopia, Raymond Williams, cultural materialism, fascism, communism, totalitarianism, capitalism, ideology, post-ideology.

ÖZET

ÖKE PRETTYMAN, Burcu. George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* ve Terry Gilliam'ın *Brazil* Eserlerinde Distopyanın Değişen Yüzü: Kültürel Materyalist Bir Çalışma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2019.

Kültürel Çalışmalar alanına önemli katkılarda bulunan isimlerden biri kültürel materyalizmi ve kültür hakkında tarihsel düşünme yöntemini geliştiren Raymond Williams'dır. Kültürü "bir bütün olarak yaşam tarzı" olarak tanımlayan Williams kültürün tanımını genişletmiş ve dikkatimizi kültür meselesine, onun ontolojisine ve deneyimsel doğasına çekerek kültürel deneyimin maddeselliğine vurgu yapmıştır. Williams'ın yaklaşımında kültür "entelektüel bir tutum" dan çok bir bütün şeklinde algılanır. Diğer bir deyişle, kültür dinamiktir ve toplumun ekonomik, sosyal ve politik parçalarıyla ilişkili olarak ortaya çıkar. Bütün bu parçalarla iç içe geçmiş olan edebiyat, bir toplumun değişen karakterini ve toplumun üyelerini derinden etkileyen materyal koşulları su yüzüne çıkarabilir. Edebi metinleri toplumun materyal ürünleri olarak görerek anlamı okumalar yapılabilir. Distopyalar, her ne kadar gerçeğin tam tamına yansımaları olmasalar da, kültürel materyalist koşulları yansıtırlar ve eserlerin ortaya çıktıkları koşulları ve eserlerin kendisini daha iyi anlamak amacıyla derin analizlere tutulabilirler.

Bu tez, George Orwell'in distopik eseri *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* (1949) ve Terry Gilliam 1985 yapımı filmi *Brazil*'deki distopik bakış açıların kültürel materyal koşullarla nasıl biçimlendiğinin analizini yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu eserlerdeki materyal koşullar kültürel materyalizm yaklaşımı çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Bu çalışmada söz konusu eserlerin materyal koşulları ve tarihsel bağlamları incelenerek eş zamanlı yaşam koşullarının bu eserlerdeki distopya fikrinin şekillenmesinde önemli ve belirleyici bir rol oynadığı ileri sürülmektedir. Bu tez yirminci yüzyılın ortalarından yüzyılın sonlarına kadar geçen zaman dilimde söz konusu yazarların materyal koşulların nasıl değiştiğini ve bunun yazarların distopik gelecek fikirlerini nasıl etkilediğini göstermektedir. Son olarak, eserler Raymond Williams'ın 'egemen', 'yükselişte olan' ve 'kalıntı' şeklindeki kültürel formlar çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Bu araştırmada edebi çalışmalar, kültürel çalışmalar ve tarih alanlarındaki kaynaklardan yararlanılarak disiplinlerarası bir yaklaşım benimsenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: George Orwell, *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* (1949), Terry Gilliam, *Brazil* (1985), ütopya, distopya, Raymond Williams, kültürel materyalizm, faşizm, komünizm, totalitaryanizm, kapitalizm, ideoloji, post-ideoloji.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KABUL VE ONAY…….…..i

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI……..…ii

ETİK BEYAN…….iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ……...……...iv

ABSTRACT…….……....v

ÖZET ……...…….....….vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS.…….……...…vii

INTRODUCTION……...…….....1

CHAPTER I: THE TRUTHS OF EXPERIENCE: ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR*……...18

CHAPTER II: *BRAZIL*: NOT YOUR TROPICAL PARADISE…….46

CONCLUSION……..73

WORKS CITED…….....79

APPENDIX1. *NEWSPEAK* DICTIONARY AND TERMINOLOGY RELATED TO *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* …….…...86

APPENDIX2. ORIGINALITY REPORT…….. 91

APPENDIX3. ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM……...93

INTRODUCTION[1]

One of the most influential political writers of the twentieth century, George Orwell (1903 – 1950) wrote six novels between the years 1933 and 1949, as well as numerous essays on politics, literature and his discontentment with the direction of society. Many of these works are auto-biographical or semi-autobiographical. In his essay "Why I Write" (1946), Orwell expressed his intentions about writing as follows: "What I have most wanted to do throughout the past ten years is to make political writing into an art" (394). To this purpose, Orwell developed a documentary style in his fiction. Bernard Crick calls Orwell's fiction "descriptive works" which are "not always directly political in the subject matter", yet always exhibit "political consciousness" (*A Life* xiv). What makes Orwell's documentary fiction unique and authentic is perhaps his talent in journalism and reporting, as well as his first-hand experiences of studying at Eton College, serving as an imperial policeman in colonial Burma, exploring poorer parts of London and Paris, witnessing the life of the English poor and working class, fighting in the Spanish Civil War, and lastly working for various newspapers and the BBC. Orwell bore witness to many of the tragic events of his time, and it was these experiences that provided inspiration for a number of his fictional works. He used his time as a colonial police officer in Burma to furnish his first novel, *Burmese Days* (1934), with vivid characterisations of colonial functionaries. His embarrassment of the colonial system and guilty conscience for having participated in it clearly manifest themselves in the novel. "Shooting an Elephant" (1936) is another short account where he struggles with the idea of British Imperial power. Upon returning to London from Burma, Orwell gave up his middle-class status and lived among the destitute. Orwell empathised with the poor in the same way when he moved to the slums of Paris, finding employment in a restaurant working long hours and struggling to survive. It was this part of his life that led to the memoir *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). This book is followed by two other works in succession, *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1934), a work of fiction about the British class system, and *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) commenting on the loss of faith in God**.** A documentation of the life and daily struggle of the working class appears in *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937) where he depicts the social conditions in the coal mining regions of England.

[1]Since this thesis includes a comparison of the factual historical events with the fictional works, in this thesis, simple past tense is employed to talk about past events, author's biographies and memoirs, and simple present is used to refer to the fictional works.

Orwell lived in Wigan, Manchester, and Sheffield, went down into coal mines, and saw the suffering and drudgery of coalminers. When the Spanish Civil War broke out, Orwell departed for Spain to fight against fascism. The political turmoil of the war, along with Orwell's disillusion with political infighting amongst communists, is portrayed in his book *Homage to Catalonia* (1938). His next novel *Coming up for Air* (1939) was published shortly before the Second World War. The novel fictionalises Orwell's nostalgia for the past, anxiety about the war, and criticism of commercialism and capitalism. When the Second World War broke out, frustrated at not being eligible to join the army due to his poor health, Orwell started working for the press writing reviews for literary works at the *Tribune* and contributing to various newspapers. In 1941, he began working for the BBC. In 1943 he became the Literary Editor for the *Tribune*. His career working as a journalist and editor provided inspiration for his upcoming novels. Crick states "all the dominant themes of both *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* occur in the reviews of these years" when he worked as a literary critic (*A Life* 303). These works were published in 1945 and 1949 respectively, the first one being an allegorical story and the latter a dystopian work of fiction. These two books are the culmination of Orwell's life experiences, amalgamating his ideas on fascism, communism, repression, and manipulation. Closely observing the Russian Revolution, government propaganda, and power worship, Orwell was inspired to write his final works of political fiction. He finished his last novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) when he was in an advanced state of illness from tuberculosis. In the novel he synthesized the themes of Nazism and Stalinism, focusing on the aspects of propaganda and oppression motivated by a desire for power. The book is a creation of Orwell's sociological imagination and it reflects the social conditions it is produced in.

Ever since it was written, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has been an influential book and provided inspiration for many other dystopian works. Terry Gilliam's (1940 -) film *Brazil* (1985) is one such work where the recurring themes of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are handled with a new outlook from 1980s England. These dystopian works selected for analysis in this thesis provide especially salient examples of how literary works are affected by the material conditions of their production. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, a stunning and original dystopian vision, was deeply coloured by the experience of the Second World War era ideological regimes, by wartime scarcity, and by the uses of rapidly developing technology for social control and propaganda

distribution. Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*, while clearly derivative of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in a number of ways, contrasts with it on several important points. *Brazil*, as a product of the 1980s, reflects the development of consumer capitalism in Britain, the hollow promises of a better life through technology, and the frustrations accompanying the development of a distant and uncaring bureaucratic state. Loss of faith, cynicism and despair are the common striking themes of both works. Material scarcity in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* contrasts with the material abundance and consumerism of *Brazil*. This is the result of the contemporaneous conditions of these works. The 1940s, when Orwell was writing, were marked by the Second World War, scarcities, and a bleak outlook towards the future. Relative to the 1940s, the 1980s were a more prosperous time for England. Despite periodic economic and political crises, the decade was defined by high street consumerism and the triumph of individualism as represented by the Thatcher administration. Both *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Brazil* reflect the conditions in which they were produced in ways that not only provide the occasion for a study of the historical and cultural contents of those conditions, but also shed light on their major themes in novel and interesting ways.

The claim that the material conditions a literary work is produced in can always be observed in that work may at first glance seem trivial. All literary works, dystopias included, reflect the time they are written in. Rather than being futuristic estimations or musings, dystopias are a criticism of the times and conditions of their production. In a sense, they are the materialized forms of the cultural experiences of their authors, and it is possible to consider dystopias as the cultural material products of a society.

Considering all of the above, the aim of this thesis is to analyse George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and Terry Gilliam's film *Brazil* (1985) in relation to the economic, political and cultural circumstances in which they were written in order to shed light on the changing material conditions of the societies they were produced in, how these material conditions are reflected in dystopian fiction, and how the nature, content, and interpretation of dystopias are closely interrelated to the material conditions and the *zeitgeist* of their contemporary times. The framework of the thesis is the cultural materialist approach. Before moving on to the analysis of the above-mentioned

dystopias, it is essential to first understand the meaning of the terms ‘utopia’ and ‘dystopia’.

Challenging the status quo and imagining alternative possibilities are inclinations that philosophers, writers, political philosophers, and a variety of intellectuals from different ages share. Imagining possible alternatives for better (or worse) futures is a distinguishing feature of many literary works, particularly for those that portray utopias and dystopias. Fatima Vieira describes utopia as “a kind of reaction to an undesirable present and an aspiration to overcome all difficulties by the imagination of possible alternatives” (7). Indeed, being born out of a desire to explore alternatives to the current social and political status quo and acting as tools for criticizing the deficiencies and flaws of society, in the most fundamental sense utopias and dystopias both function on the same level and serve similar purposes. Dystopian works play with the idea of utopia, which is a state where human social structure, including political and economic organisation, have reached a seeming perfection.

The etymology of the word utopia, which roughly means “no place,” (“utopia”) implies the impossibility of such a perfect state. It was Thomas More (1478-1535) who coined the word ‘utopia’ in his 1516 work *Utopia*. Utopia comes from the Greek *ou-topos* meaning “no place”, yet it is also almost identical to another Greek word, *eu-topos*, meaning a “good place”. With this pun, More alludes to the fact that the primary characteristic of a utopia as “an ideal place” is its non-existence. Eminent utopian scholar Lyman Tower Sargent emphasizes in his 1994 article “The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited” that when talking about utopias, thinking about perfect places where everyone lives happily would not accurately reflect the reality of utopian literary works (6). It is not the perfection, but the impossibility of perfection that marks utopias. The word “utopia” thus already contains the seed of the idea of a dystopia, a state that is far from perfect, where many or all aspects of life are unpleasant or intolerable. Both utopian and dystopian literature share a desire to imagine better living conditions, the former through an idealised representation of perfection and the latter through a more critical representation of just how bad things could become and how one can avoid it. Both also contain criticism of the periods in which they are written since it is the authors’ conception of what needs to be fixed in their own society that inevitably

colours their idea of utopia or dystopia. Lastly, both utopias and dystopias are - not surprisingly- influenced by the circumstances they are written in, perhaps the latter more so. While the optimism of the Enlightenment era backed with the progress of science and the steady belief in reason provided the background for utopias, the destruction and slaughter of the twentieth century World Wars and totalitarian regimes planted the seeds for dystopias by shattering the belief in humanity and displacing perfection with negativity and criticism.

The term 'dystopia' entered the common language in the twentieth century, but the first documented use of the term ('dys-topia' or 'cacotopia' meaning bad place) dates back to John Stuart Mill (1806 – 1873) in an 1868 parliamentary debate (Claeys 107). Although the concept of dystopian literature did not yet exist, the late eighteenth century saw a few precursors to dystopian or anti-utopian works, the most important of which was *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) by Jonathan Swift (1667 - 1745). The satirical parody of Swift served as a criticism of the optimism of the Enlightenment Era. In a general sense, political, social and cultural events such as the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution maintained a belief in humanity and its potential, and utopias dominated the literary tradition. Satirical authors such as Swift lampooned the 'new man' of the Enlightenment, driven by reason and science, and later in the late eighteenth century Rousseauesque themes of man being corrupted by society and civilization started to be discussed. As for the nineteenth century, it was both chaotic and promising. As Walsh noted, "the nineteenth century believed in Progress, even inevitable progress" (118). Things were happening in this century: Slavery was abolished, women were marching for their rights, scientists were busy in laboratories, industrial productivity was increasing, and literacy was rising (Walsh 119). Yet, all these rapid industrial, scientific, evolutionary, social and medical advancements that emerged especially towards the turn of the century brought about the *fin de siècle* pessimism of civilization and industrialisation leading to decadence and decay. What led to the failure of the utopian ideal and marked the sharp turn from utopias to dystopias, however, was the wake of totalitarianism in the twentieth century. Walsh calls these "the two greatest let-downs" of the century: the fascist movements and Communism set back democracy and individual rights (122). The events such as the First World War, the Second World War, the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the Great Depression (1929), Nazi Germany (1933-1945) with its anti-Semitism and the

Holocaust, the use of atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Mussolini's fascism (1922-1945), the Spanish Civil War, Franco's Dictatorship (1939-1975), the Vietnam War (1955-1975), the 60s and 70s Countercultural Movements, 1968 Events in France, the nuclear plant explosions in Chernobyl, the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989), the dissolution of Soviet Russia (1991), the Cold War (1947-1991), the Gulf War (1990-1991), and the Rwandan Genocide (1994) all led to the production of dystopian works in the twentieth century. In the first half of the century, the themes of eugenics, socialism-gone-wrong, fascism, and the repercussions of the growing social and economic divide all became topics in dystopian works of fiction. Hillegas purports that "dictatorships, welfare states, planned economies, and all manner of bureaucracies" as well as the regimes of "Hitler, Stalin, or Roosevelt" were the stimuli for the literary texts of this era (qtd in Moylan 126). The tumultuous European politics from the 1920s to the late 1940s highly affected authors such as Yevgeny Zamyatin (1884-1927), Aldous Huxley (1894-1963) and George Orwell (1903-1950). The big three dystopias, Zamyatin's *We* (1924), Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), concentrating on the common theme of the totalitarian state's control over individuals by using scientific and technological advances, were portrayed and explored under the influence of the negative social and political developments of the time. Isaiah Berlin (1909- 1997) describes these utopias as such:

> … the protest - and anti- Utopias - of Aldous Huxley, or Orwell, or Zamyatin (in Russia in the early 1920s), who paint a horrifying picture of a frictionless society in which differences between human beings are, as far as possible, eliminated, or at least reduced, and the multi-coloured pattern of the variety of human temperaments, inclinations, ideals - in short, the flow of life - is brutally reduced to uniformity, pressed into a social and political straitjacket which hurts and maims and ends by crushing men in the name of a monistic theory, a dream of a perfect, static order. (47)

The "uniformitarian despotism" (Berlin 47) imposed by Nazism and Communism, both of which demand adherence to a single ideology, do not give any room for different human potentialities and attempts to control them via technology, pseudo-science and psychological manipulation. Liberty of thought, expression of different ideas, and even human vitality are all crushed by the enforced uniformity of these dystopias. "Industrial organization versus human rights, bureaucratic rules versus 'doing one's own thing',

good government versus self-government and security versus freedom" are some of the common themes of the dystopias emerging around this time (Berlin 49).

Other honourable mentions from this first half of the century include the British author Katharine Burdekin's *Swastika Night* (1937) whose speculative fiction also presents a fascist regime and reflects the pessimism of the author who had first-hand experience of both World Wars. In her novel, Burdekin focuses on the manipulative discourses of totalitarianism and the masculine and power-related elements of the Nazi regime. Similar to Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in *Swastika Night* the past is erased and rewritten, language is altered, only a few books exist for propaganda purposes, and there is only one secret book to witness the past. The group holding power does everything to control and distort the truth.

The relationship between power and the manipulation of truth continued to be a major theme in dystopian works of the second half of the century as well. One such example from this period comes from the American author Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* (1953). In this novel, the manipulation of truth by power manifests itself in book burnings (another reference to Nazi Germany, where such burnings were common). In Bradbury's dystopic world, reading books is banned and the individuals who secretly read or hide books are punished by mechanical hounds. Apart from the manipulation of truth, the regime based on fear, and government overreach, Bradbury also touches upon concerns about the growing numbing effects of mass media. Bradbury displays contempt for mass media, considering it a threat to a reading, thinking and questioning society.

As the twentieth century progressed, the dystopian novel evolved as well. The concerns about fascism and communism gradually decreased; nevertheless, new themes such as bureaucracy, consumerism, feminism, racism and other technological and scientific concerns appeared and started dominating dystopian works. After the Second World War, dystopian impulses were shaped by the hostilities between America and the Soviet Union and the probability of a nuclear disaster (Booker 91). The cultural crisis of modern capitalism, and the deficiencies of a society based on scientific efficiency, technology, and happiness provided by commercial consumption and behavioural

engineering all led to the creation of "bourgeois dystopias" (Booker 98). In the second half of the century, Anthony Burgess emerged as one of the more prominent writers who focused on topics such as state brainwashing, psychological manipulation, behavioural engineering and free will in his 1962 novel, *A Clockwork Orange*. The same year he published another dystopian novel, *The Wanting Seed*, which deals with issues concerning and expanding population and the ways to deal with it. Other notable mentions from the second half of the century include Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) which tells the story of a totalitarian and theocratic state and deals with issues of religious control, women's subjugation and misogyny in a patriarchal society. It was no coincidence that Atwood wrote the novel in the 1980s, when there was a conservative revival in the West: Ronald Reagan was elected in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain. Around this time, there was also a backlash against the second wave of feminism and the religious right was thinking the 'sexual revolution' of the 1960s and 70s had gone too far. Another hotly debated topic in the US was the legality of abortion, legal since the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* court decision but still controversial today. Atwood's novel touches upon all these topical themes of the time.

The first two decades of the twenty-first century witnessed brand new dystopian themes along with the common themes of state control, technological control, and loss of individualism. With the advance of new technologies and emerging concerns about the environment and global warming, new dystopic themes of human cloning, depleted resources, the survival of humanity and environmental disasters were shaped by some of the pressing issues of this century. *Never Let Me Go* (2005) by Kazuo Ishiguro and Cormac McCarthy's *The Road* (2006) were some of the dystopian examples of the century.

The origin of utopian and dystopian works of fiction and their development to the present time, an insight into the purpose and function of these works as well as the ways in which they respond to contemporary conditions are provided.

Since this thesis analyses the works of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Brazil* from a cultural materialist perspective, it is necessary to survey cultural materialist approach and its

repercussions for literary studies in more detail. In *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (2009), Peter Barry explains cultural materialism by focusing on each word in the term separately. He regards culture as *all* forms of culture, from high cultural forms to other forms of culture such as television, popular music, and fiction as well. As for materialism, he indicates that "materialism signifies the opposite of idealism: an 'idealist' belief would be that high culture represents the free and independent play of the talented individual mind, the contrary 'materialist' belief is that culture cannot transcend the material forces and relations of production" (emphasis in the original) (177). Culture is in fact an amalgamation of the economic and political conditions. Though not fully articulated until modern times, this focus on the interaction between culture and material production has a long and distinguished intellectual pedigree.

The initial turn to materialism in Western thought was provided by the major developments in science and philosophy in the seventeenth century (Milner 12). Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679), a prominent figure of modern English political philosophy, defended materialist and empiricist ideas against Cartesian and Aristotelian idealistic alternatives (Duncan). Hobbes claims: "I can explain all the workings of the mind using only material resources. What need is there to postulate an immaterial mind when this perfectly good, and more minimal, explanation is available?" (Hobbes 2.9). Hobbes suggests there is no need to invoke an immaterial mind when corporeal and material conditions are sufficient to understand how thought works. In the subsequent century, by focusing on the corporeal body and its natural inclination to pursue pleasure and avoid pain, utilitarianism would also deny the existence of transcendent categories of good, bad, right, or wrong. Marxian materialism, though it differs from Hobbesian and utilitarian conceptions on important points, continues in the materialist tradition broadly construed. In his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859) Karl Marx (1818 -1883) wrote:

> In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of

> social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. (92)

By emphasizing the role of the means of production, which are literally the physical facilities and natural resources needed for producing material goods, Marxian materialism suggests that it is the material conditions that fundamentally determine a society's organization and development. Through examining these material conditions, one can understand the underlying changes in human history.

It is Raymond Williams (1921-1988), one of the key figures in the field of cultural studies, who coined the term "cultural materialism". Williams explains in *New Left Review* that cultural materialism:

> is a theory of culture as a (social and material) productive process and of specific practices, of 'arts', as social uses of material means of production (from language as material 'practical consciousness' to the specific technologies of writing and forms of writing, through to mechanical and electronic communications systems). (243)

In his book *Marxism and Literature* (1977), Williams expands his position on cultural materialism and defines it "as a theory of specificities of material cultural and literary production within historical materialism" (5) and states that "we cannot separate literature from other kinds of social practice, in such a way as to make them subject to quite special and distinct laws" (44). In *Reading and Criticism*, Williams comments on the insights one can get from a literary work:

> What is it that literature represents which has reference to our social needs? It is valuable primarily as a record of detailed individual experience which has been coherently stated and valued. This may be the commentary of a fully intelligent mind on the society and culture of its day. Or it may be the articulate statement of a perception of certain individual relationships which set the pattern of a culture. Or it may be the coherent evaluation of close personal relationships, or the exposition of intense and considered personal experience. … Literature is communication in written language. To the language of a people, which is perhaps the fundamental texture of its life, literature is supremely important as the agent of discovery and analysis. (107)

Williams accepts the conventional value of doing a literary analysis, yet he also remarks that literature can function as a form of social commentary on contemporary society and culture. He acknowledges that social, cultural, economic and political practices are all parts of narratives. By introducing material productive processes and the means of production, Williams provides a way of thinking about culture materially and historically. He moves literary studies away from merely aesthetic evaluation and brings together "three dimensions of textual, historical and theoretical analysis" in the framework of cultural materialist analysis (Higgins 173). Describing culture as "a whole way of living," he enlarges the definition of culture and focuses on the materiality of cultural experience (*Culture and Society* 1958). In his *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976), Williams sketches the history of words such as "industry", "democracy", "class" and "art" and observes the changing meanings of them, which leads him to the idea that language and its forms of expression are a reflection of a society's transformation and that this transformation is inevitably embedded in material practices.

Language changes as material conditions change. By focusing on this interactive nature of culture and language, Williams draws attention to the matter of culture, its ontology, and its experiential nature. In his approach, instead of thinking of culture only as an 'intellectual attitude,' culture is understood in its entirety and formed in relation to the economic, political, and social components of a society. Williams invented the term 'structures of feeling' which are related to the "meanings and values as they are lived and felt" (*Marxism and Literature* 132). He defines structures of feeling as "a particular quality of social experience … historically distinct from other particular qualities, which gives the sense of a generation or of a period" (132). The significance of structures of feelings is that they usually reflect antagonistic feelings against hegemonic forces and dominant ideologies by opposing the status quo. According to Williams, literature is where one can readily encounter structures of feeling, since literary works are products of the human social condition and struggle.

Literature, deeply intermingled with all components of society, can reveal the changing character of a society and the material conditions that affect its members most profoundly. Thus, it is possible to read literary texts as material products of a society.

Thinking literature and history together and analysing texts and their contexts can provide a fuller understanding of narratives. Literary critic Jean Howard argues:

> A common way of speaking about literature and history is just that way: literature and history, text and context. In these binary oppositions, if one term is stable and transparent and the other in some way mirrors it, then that term can be stabilized and clarified too. (qtd in Brannigan 3)

The creation of literary narratives can be better understood by analysing the historical context of their creation. Dystopias, though not accurate representations of reality, are texts that reflect cultural materialistic conditions of their time in interesting ways. By looking at where a text "is located historically, both in terms of its means and conditions of production, also in relation to the history of its readings" (Higgins 173), it can be read to investigate social, political and cultural elements of its time of production. Hence, in order to discuss the relationship between the dystopian narratives and the material conditions of their times, it is essential to look more closely at their historical background.

In the first half of the twentieth century, Europe was undergoing significant political and social changes. By 1914, the world had already been divided into two opposing alliances, and the countries involved in these alliances were speedily mobilizing their armies. During the conflict, these two blocs, the Central Powers and the Allied, fought against each other. The new military technologies turned the war into a theatre of unprecedented carnage. In the First World War, sixty-five million men were mobilized, over eight million were killed, and another twenty-one million were injured or economically and psychologically affected by the war (Mazower ix). Unresolved issues of World War I led the world into the deadliest conflict in human history. The Second World War, which lasted from 1939 to 1945, witnessed the conflict of two opposing military alliances: the Allies and the Axis. Politicians of these alliances promised the masses a remake of their societies –their hard-won utopias- and enfranchised and mobilized them. The rivalry of three ideologies -liberal democracy, communism, and fascism- led most of the world into an exhausting and murderous conflict. The Second World War witnessed the horrors of totalitarian and abusive regimes, the use of nuclear weapons for the first time in history, and the death of millions by massacres, starvation and disease. Meanwhile in the Soviet Union, the horrors of the communist regime were

increasingly felt by its own public. The end of the Second World War left two superpowers emerging as rivals and this set the stage for the Cold War that lasted for another 46 years.

The immediate period following the Second World War witnessed the reconstruction of wartime destruction and losses. It was also shaped by mass migrations and retaliation to Nazi exterminations. The conditions emerging after the war were surely affected by the social experiences of wartime. Mazower describes these post-war conditions as follows:

> [W]e cannot hope to understand the subsequent course of European history without attending to this enormous upheaval and trying to ascertain its social and political consequences. The years of Nazi occupation, followed by the chaos of the immediate post-war period had sundered human ties, destroyed homes and communities and in many cases uprooted the very foundations of society. The thousands of ruined buildings, mined roads and devastated economies were the most visible legacy of these years; but alongside the physical destruction were more intangible wounds which lasted well after the work of reconstruction had been completed. Changing moral and mental perspectives changed individual behaviour, and thence society and politics. (222)

It was in this dark atmosphere that Orwell was writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Jeffrey Meyers describes the novel as belonging to "the melancholy mid-century genre of lost illusions and Utopia betrayed" (*George Orwell* 268). The book was published in 1949, during the post-World War Two period when Europe was trying to recover itself and heal the wounds of the war. Post War London had many problems of its own, from housing needs to all kinds of other scarcities. Describing his impressions of Europe in 1947, the editor of the *Foreign Affairs* magazine Hamilton Fish wrote:

> There is too little of everything—too few trains, trams, buses and automobiles to transport people to work on time, let alone to take them on holidays; too little flour to make bread without adulterants, and even so not enough bread to provide energies for hard labor; too little paper for newspapers to report more than a fraction of the world's news; too little seed for planting and too little fertilizer to nourish it; too few houses to live in and not enough glass to supply them with window panes; too little leather for shoes, wool for sweaters, gas for cooking, cotton for diapers, sugar for jam, fats for frying, milk for babies, soap for washing. (qtd in Judt 89)

In such times of scarcity and hardship, austerity measures had to be imposed. Bread rationing was introduced in Britain between July 1946 and July 1948, clothing and furniture rationing stayed in effect until 1952, and the rationing of meat was not curtailed until 1954 (Judt 235). In terms of its economy, the country was not doing well. The cost of the war turned Britain from "a position of the world's largest creditor nation to the world's largest debtor nation" as one wartime Chancellor of the Exchequer Henry R. Morgenthau Jr. put it (qtd in Judt 161). Along with economic problems, there was also the issue of censorship and limitations. Government agencies started imposing constraints on expression of opinion and started applying censorship on theatre, cinema and literature as well as on radio and television during the First and Second World Wars, and the laws on censorship and freedom of expressions were never repealed after the wars (Judt 373).

Combined with the post-war hardships and pessimism were worries about cultural decline. Orwell pointed out in 1947, "[t]he English are not sufficiently interested in intellectual matters to be intolerant about them" (*Orwell's England* 328). Around this time, Orwell was overtly concerned about the indifference of the British people towards political and cultural matters and commercialism on the make, and he had a strong nostalgia for the pre-war times. In *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948), T.S.Eliot (1888-1965) wrote, with a similar kind of post-war disillusionment, "our own period is one of decline; that the standards of culture are lower than they were fifty years ago; and that the evidences of this decline are visible in every department of human activity" (17). Although Orwell and T.S.Eliot were from different backgrounds and political aisles, they both had sensibilities related to the decline of culture in the second half of the twentieth century. It was this post-war condition of scarcity, hardship, austerity measures, along with the laws of censorship and cultural decline that affected Orwell's conception of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Similarly, the period between the time when *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published and the early 1980s, when *Brazil* was filmed, is characterized by momentous social and economic as well as cultural and political change. The decade long overlap between Terry Gilliam's birth and Orwell's death is a fascinating, nearly serendipitous, coincidence. When Orwell died in 1950, the United Kingdom had not yet recovered

from the disasters of the Second World War. The aftermath of the conflict was still palpable in the form of bomb sites left over from the Luftwaffe's blitz. "Thousands of buildings have been burnt and blasted to the cellars," as one observer noted of London in 1951. Large sections of the city still lay in ruins, "Here and there the side of a building ris[ing] gauntly from the rubble, a detached gateway stand[ing] by itself in the undergrowth, the towers of a few churches, or a spire, lift[ing] themselves mournfully, like tombstones in a forgotten cemetery" (Watts). Rationing of food and fuel was a daily reality, with the rationing of petrol coming to an end only in the year of Orwell's death, and of meat and bacon continuing well into the year 1954 ("1954: Housewives"). Europe, particularly Germany and the East, was precariously divided between Americans and the victorious Allies on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other. The Cold War was still in its early stages, and had not yet taken the form of a nuclear arms race, or of proxy wars between the superpowers that would begin in Korea in 1950 and reach their climax in the American invasion of Vietnam in the 1960-70s and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1970s-80s. Thus, the renewal of armed conflict in Europe was still a very real possibility.

Gilliam, though born during the War, came of age in the relative prosperity, isolation, safety, and stability of the American Midwest. He did, however, experience Cold War paranoia and the militaristic atmosphere of the mid twentieth century US. Coming of age in an isolated rural farmstead in Minnesota, he describes his childhood days with bitter sarcasm as follows:

> Marching, carrying flags, these are the kinds of things we did in the fifties. The Cold War was very much in everyone's minds, from the 'duck and cover' exercises we had to do at school to ensure that we would be properly prepared for a possible Soviet nuclear attack, to the hysterical witch hunt of the McCarthy hearings[2]. That's why we were healthy, we were strong and we were good – we weren't quite America's Hitler Youth, but there was definitely a militaristic undertow. Our scout troop was a little army in miniature, and if cold-war push ever came to shove, the communists didn't have a chance: tomorrow belonged to us. (28)

[2] The 1954 Congressional hearings conducted by the US Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (1908-1957) against suspected Communists living in the US. By 'witch-hunt', Gilliam refers to "the practice of publicizing accusations of treason and disloyalty with insufficient evidence" during these hearings ("Army-McCarthy Hearings").

Growing up in this militaristic political atmosphere and later studying political science in Los Angeles, Gilliam eventually moved to New York to work as a cartoonist, where he became a part of the civil rights movement and observed the feminist movement closely. In his memoirs, he mentions New York as a good place to "feel the wind of change in your hair" while all the old systems are being challenged and somewhat ripped apart (64).

When all these changes were happening, American soldiers were still fighting in the Vietnam War and Gilliam was drafted in 1964 to join the war. Yet, refusing to fight in a war he considered meaningless, Gilliam somehow managed to evade active service in the military (77). Shortly thereafter, Gilliam decided to renounce his country, becoming "free of accountability for all the destruction of America" (116) and moved to London -- and later denounced his American citizenship- to become a part of the Monty Python comedy troupe. Comparing his contemporary London to the London he moved to in the late 70s, Gilliam remarks:

> the London I live in now is not the place I was so excited to find myself in as 1967 rubbed itself lasciviously up against 1968. From the late sixties even into the seventies, London still functioned like an ancient city. Things were still being made here, there was a properly mixed economy. But then suddenly – and I suspect Margaret Thatcher had a little something to do with it – nobody needed craftsmen or factory-workers any more. It was all service industries with nothing to actually service. (121)

While leaving his native country and his bitter experiences of it behind him, Gilliam considered himself privileged to be able to reside in London, at once a centre of the counterculture and a place with a sense of history unthinkable in North America. However, with the political, social and economic changes, his London of the 1970s was slowly changing. Gilliam's earlier experiences of Soviet paranoia, the counterculture he witnessed in New York, the Vietnam War, and his later experiences of Thatcher and Reagan's free-market fundamentalism, mindless consumerism and IRA bombings are all reflected in his work *Brazil*. The following parts of this thesis will examine how these cultural materialistic conditions affected both Orwell's and Gilliam's visions of dystopias

In the first chapter, Orwell's conception of dystopia is analyzed in the framework of cultural materialism. George Orwell's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s totalitarian society is considered with respect to various characteristics of life and in relation to Orwell's first-hand experiences and the contemporary conditions of the novel. In the second chapter, Terry Gilliam's film, *Brazil* is analysed as a product of dystopian imagination affected by *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in relation to the contemporary conditions of the writer and director's lifetime. The chapter looks at the common and divergent points between *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Brazil*, and considers the extent to which they reflect the historical and cultural milieu of their respective authors. In the conclusion, the two works will be considered within the framework of Raymond Williams' dominant, residual, and emergent cultural forms.

CHAPTER I[3]

THE TRUTHS OF EXPERIENCE: ORWELL'S *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR*

De te fabula narratur.[4]

Horace

Published in 1949, George Orwell's dystopian novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is set in a totalitarian state and focuses on the story of Winston Smith, a government employee in the Ministry of Truth who is responsible for changing or redacting news items in line with the government's propaganda. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*[5]'s world is composed of three superstates: Eurasia, Oceania, and Eastasia, which are constantly at war. Citizens are constantly monitored by both telescreens and a network of secret informants, while private relations of love and friendship that do not serve the state's goals are discouraged or forbidden. Mass rituals that glorify the state and vilify its enemies are obligatory, and any criticism or individual expression is forbidden. The state alters language itself, creating a government approved "newspeak" that expresses state ideology and curtails criticism. The themes of government propaganda, thought control, brainwashing, of the intrusion of the state into every corner of human life, and the subsequent breakdown of human social relations are some of the dystopian themes of the novel.

George Orwell's book coined and popularized the terms such as "Big Brother", "Thought Police", "Thoughtcrime", and "Doublethink." As far right-wing populism, government intrusion into the lives of people, and advanced surveillance technologies gain ground across the world, these Orwellian neologisms demonstrate their continued relevance and the terms resonate even with those who have never read the novel. The ideas proposed in the novel are debated even today, and the novel still carries with it a sense of urgency and warning. Albeit some of its predictions went unrealized, the work of George Orwell offers powerful criticism of the real horrors of Soviet Communism

---

[3] In this chapter, since a comparison is made between the factual events and the fiction that is affected by them, simple past tense is used for factual occurrences and Orwell's telling of his experiences of the time and simple present tense is made use of for fictional works.

4 It is of you that the story is told.

[5] *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will be referred to as *NEF* in the Chapters I and II.

and Hitler's fascism, and more generally the dangers of an abusive and totalitarian government. Thus, the novel is worthy of repeated analysis from multiple perspectives.

The major aim of this chapter is to analyse Orwell's conception of dystopia in the framework of cultural materialism by looking at different aspects of life in *NEF*'s totalitarian society while discussing how Orwell's first-hand experiences and the contemporary conditions of the novel had an impact on its content. Within this chapter, the analysis is carried out under the following titles: geographical location, government, language, culture and literature, technology and science, architecture, sexuality and individuality.

As mentioned above, *NEF* presents a world divided into three superstates: Oceania, an allusion to the British Isles, the United States and other nations of the Americas; Eurasia, including Russia, northern Europe and some of the Asiatic land mass; and Eastasia comprised of China and Japan[6] *(NEF* 185). Oceania's capital is "London, chief city of Airstrip One", a drab, grey, dusty and gloomy city where Winston Smith lives in a dilapidated block of apartments called Victorian Mansions whose hallways "smelt of boiled cabbage and old rag mats" (*NEF* 1-3). In his apartment, the lifts usually do not work, the soap is coarse, razor blades are spare, and there are no signs of luxuries. Orwell's London in *NEF* is in fact an all too familiar city to anybody who lived in the war-weary London of the 1940s. One of Orwell's friends, Julian Symons compared Winston's London with Orwell's:

> In one of its aspects *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was about a world familiar to anybody who lived in Britain during the war that began in 1939. The reductions in rations, the odious food, the sometimes unobtainable and always dubiously authentic drink, these were with us when the book appeared. (41)

The uneasy circumstances of the war are painstakingly and thoroughly represented in *NEF:* The chocolate rations, artificial tea and coffee, cheap oily-tasting Victory Gin, Victory Cigarettes, ill-fitting blue overalls, unhealthy faces, appalling food in the work-

[6] Orwell said he devised the idea of dividing the world into "spheres of influence" during the Tehran Conference of 1944, where Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill came together to discuss the opening of a second war front against Nazi Germany (qtd. in Kumar 308). He used the idea to "parody the intellectual implications of totalitarianism" (Kumar 308).

canteen described as “a pool of stew, a filthy liquid mess that had the appearance of vomit” (50). While telescreens keep pouring out deceptive statistics about how there is “more food, more clothes, more houses, more furniture, more cooking pots, more fuel, more ships, more helicopters, more books, more babies”, Winston reflects upon these things and forces his memory to remember if things were ever any different before (*NEF* 59):

> He meditated resentfully on the physical texture of life. Had it always been like this? Had food always tasted like this? He looked round the canteen. A low-ceilinged, crowded room, its walls grimy from the contact of innumerable bodies; battered metal tables and chairs, placed so close together that you sat with elbows touching; bent spoons, dented trays, coarse white mugs; all surfaces greasy, grime in every crack; and a sourish, composite smell of bad gin and bad coffee and metallic stew and dirty clothes. … In any time that he could accurately remember, there had never been quite enough to eat, one had never had socks or underclothes that were not full of holes, furniture had always been battered and rickety, rooms underheated, tube trains crowded, houses falling to pieces, bread dark-colored, tea a rarity, coffee filthy-tasting, cigarettes insufficient—nothing cheap and plentiful except synthetic gin. … was it not a sign that this was not the natural order of things, if one's heart sickened at the discomfort and dirt and scarcity, the interminable winters, the stickiness of one's socks, the lifts that never worked, the cold water, the gritty soap, the cigarettes that came to pieces, the food with its strange evil tastes? (59-60)

Winston laments the present and longs for the past, and he has a hunch that things were different in the past and that the life he is provided with now strips him of even the basic necessities of a human being. The food is foul, the places are cold, filthy and cramped, and the coffee and gin taste lousy. He does not have decent clothes, soap and cigarettes. The furniture is ugly and uncomfortable, and elevators never work. It seems like there is not much that Winston can appreciate about living in Oceania.

Orwell has a high level of empathy towards Winston’s demise because he [Orwell], at first hand, experienced the painful conditions of the Spanish Civil War and his depictions of his life in the trenches seem strikingly similar to Winston’s experiences:

> Beside the cold the other discomforts seemed petty. Of course all of us were permanently dirty. Our water, like our food, came on mule-back from Alcubierre, and each man's share worked out at about a quart a day. It was beastly water, hardly more transparent than milk. … The position stank

> abominably, and outside the little enclosure of the barricade there was excrement everywhere. (*Homage to Catalonia* 32)

Orwell's descriptions of life in war-torn Barcelona are reminiscent of his depiction of the setting in *NEF*. The fear of air-raids, neglected streets, derelict buildings and shortages of absolutely every necessity, even including water, mark the life of Spaniards and Orwell around that time. This first-hand experience would clearly provide an inspiration for Orwell's vivid depiction of a squalid future city in *NEF*.

> Together with all this there was something of the evil atmosphere of war. The town had a gaunt untidy look, roads and buildings were in poor repair, the streets at night were dimly lit for fear of air-raids, the shops were mostly shabby and half-empty. Meat was scarce and milk practically unobtainable, there was a shortage of coal, sugar, and petrol, and a really serious shortage of bread. Even at this period the bread-queues were often hundreds of yards long. (*Homage to Catalonia* 4)

The lack of resources, the state of filth and the atmosphere of fear that Orwell had to struggle with during the war are all reflected in *NEF* through Winston's experiences. It is as if Oceanian citizens are constantly living in a state of war in a filthy and fearful place always lacking even basic necessities.

Anthony Burgess notes "novels are made out of day-to-day experience" (18). In this case, Orwell's experiences are Winston's experiences. Food rationing cards, black markets, shortages of clothes, *ersatz* sugar, paper and other daily needs are mentioned in Orwell's *Diaries* as having turned into normalcies during the war. Even basic food items such as eggs were difficult to find (*Diaries* 269). Taxes were raised to finance the war and many resources were channelled to meet the war needs. Other aspects of Orwell's daily routine in London included the intermittent rocket bombs, alarms, blowing of whistles, panic about air-raids, sheltering in underground stations, and machine gun nests and distant gun sounds (*Diaries* 269, 273-4). Lack of reliable news,

misinformation and posters with war slogans[7] were all common. Winston has a similar experience in Airstrip One:

> He remembered better the rackety, uneasy circumstances of the time: the periodical panics about air raids and the sheltering in Tube stations, the piles of rubble everywhere, the unintelligible proclamations posted at street corners, the gangs of youths in shirts all the same color, the enormous queues outside the bakeries, the intermittent machine-gun fire in the distance—above all, the fact that there was never enough to eat. (*NEF* 160-161)

All these deprivations and horrors mentioned above were in fact physically real and recognizable for Orwell and his contemporaries living in London as well as living in the Soviet Union. Orwell's grasp of the conditions under Communist rule is equally striking and acute. Polish writer Czeslaw Milosz remarks: "Orwell fascinates [East Europeans] through his insight into details they know well … . [They] are amazed that a writer who never lived in Russia should have so keen a perception into its life" (qtd in Hitchens 69). Orwell had a deep understanding of how wealth and resources were distributed in Soviet Russia. While the Soviet Communist system claimed to provide social homogeneity and elimination of economic and class differences, it turned out to be a system where there was economic inequality and even people's basic needs were not provided for while a small percentage of the ruling Soviet 'elite' thrived. As Figes also points out "Soviet Russia was in fact a highly stratified society. … Families of government workers received provisions which could be very hard to find in Soviet shops (meat, sausage, dairy products, sugar, caviar, cigarettes, soap, etc. … Below the Soviet elite nobody had much" (248). In Soviet Russia, there were also thriving black markets which catered to the demand for Western goods were smuggled as prestige items or as product that contradicted Party ideology (Pick). These expanding black markets are described as the "second economy" (Grossman 25), an economy that is out of the control of the official economy.

A similar pattern of shortages and underground economy appears in *NEF*. In what is called the "free" market, one can obtain things that Party shops do not supply (*NEF* 49).

---

[7] The "Big Brother is Watching You" posters in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are thought to be based on Stalin, but it is also suggested that "the well-known recruiting poster of 1914 picturing Field-Marshal Kitcherner and the caption 'Your Country Needs YOU' " could be an inspiration for it (Meyers *Life and Art* 129).

When Winston secretly meets with Julia, she brings some “Inner Party Stuff”: “Real sugar” instead of “saccharine”, “a loaf of bread proper white bread”, “a tin of milk”, “real tea” instead of “blackberry leaves” and “real coffee” whose smell reminds Winston of his early childhood days (*NEF* 140-141). Winston becomes surprised at seeing all these things and asks Julia how she manages to get them. Julia explains: “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” (*NEF* 140-141). Despite the abundance of resources the Inner Party has, the Outer Party and proles suffers from the lack of even basic needs and just as in Soviet Russia, a system of prestige economy that only provides a certain group of people with luxuries prevails in *NEF*. Orwell had an idea about the economic conditions in Soviet Russia as well as experiencing wartime and post-war scarcities himself in England. It is clear that the environment of scarcity and absence all influenced Orwell’s conception of dystopia. The resemblance and the familiar setting of the novel provide the feeling of the reality and the urgency of the conditions Orwell and the British people found themselves in during the times of war and totalitarian rules.

Totalitarian ideologies -whether they were communist or fascist- dominated the world around the time Orwell was writing *NEF*. It is obvious that Orwell derived the political structure of the novel from his contemporary situation. The late 1940s were tumultuous times. Orwell’s experience of the Spanish Civil War, of life in wartime Britain and, moreover, his criticism of the Soviet Union under Stalin, all influenced his vision in *NEF*. Orwell, having observed Germany and Soviet Russia very closely, witnessed the atrocities and danger of absolute political authority, and illustrated that peril in his novel.

Before joining the Spanish Civil War, Orwell -like many left-wing sympathizers in England- thought that the main totalitarian threat was Fascism (Kumar 302) and was more concerned with how to tackle it and its elitist philosophy. His earlier novels had a common streak that dealt with the middle classes’ drawing towards fascism and its menaces. During this time, Orwell knew about the Moscow Trials[8], terrors, and

[8] The Moscow Trials were trials that were carried out in the Soviet Union due to the provocation and urge of Joseph Stalin from the year 1936 to 1938 against alleged Trotskyists and the members of the Opposition to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. (“Great Purge”)

executions of Bolsheviks. He did not yet grasp that Bolshevism and Fascism had many things in common. It was when Orwell joined POUM (The United Marxist Workers' Party) in Spain in 1937 that he saw 'totalitarianism from inside' and realized the insidious menace of Communism and all totalitarian ideas in this manner. Rossi and Rodden explaining "his [Orwell's] experiences in Spain during the Civil War" added "another dimension to his thought – a pervasive distrust of communism" making him "disgusted by the way the war in Spain was distorted for political reasons and for the first time began to fear that the idea of objective truth was in danger of disappearing" (5).

While Orwell kept his faith in socialism, he was worried about how ideologies can distort people's minds and make them believe in anything: "His faith in socialism remained strong but he was disgusted by its adherents' blind hero worship of Stalin's Soviet Union" (Rossi and Rodden 6). A letter he sent to his friend, Geoffrey Gorer, about his Spanish experience also exhibits his viewpoint clearly: " … the grotesque feature, which very few people outside Spain have yet grasped, is that the Communists stood furthest of all to the Right, and were more anxious even than the liberals to hunt down the revolutionaries and stamp out all revolutionary ideas" (qtd in Crick *A Life* 235). After his ordeals in Spain, the distinction between 'the left' and 'the right' blurred in Orwell's mind. Soviet Communism looked as threatening as Fascism. His later literature demonstrates this viewpoint. Orwell contributed to the task of exposing the 'Soviet Myth' in *Animal Farm* and menaces of any kind of totalitarian regime in *NEF*. In his essay "Literature and Totalitarianism" (1941), Orwell notes:

> [t]his is the age of the totalitarian state. … When one mentions totalitarianism one thinks immediately of Germany, Russia, Italy, but I think one must face the risk that this phenomenon is going to be world-wide. It is obvious that the period of free capitalism is coming to an end and that one country after another is adopting a centralized economy that one can call Socialism or state capitalism according as one prefers. With that the economic liberty of the individual, and to a great extent his liberty to do what he likes, to choose his own work, to move to and fro across the surface of the earth, comes to an end.

By the year 1948, Hitler and Mussolini had lost the war and fascism was no longer a threat. Only Stalin was left in power. Orwell, having seen the exploitation of both

Nazism and Bolshevism, started considering fascism and communism as a variant of a single totalitarian idea. By this time, he had already formed his definite purpose of writing *NEF:* exposing the totalitarian states and their control over their subjects. Newsinger suggests "… towards the end of the 1930s the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany were beginning to converge, they were becoming similar kinds of society, some sort of bureaucratic collectivism. This is, of course, the notion that informs *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" ("Orwell" 116). Orwell's principal purpose in *NEF* is to reveal the true nature of these regimes regardless of whether they are called fascist or communist.

Accordingly, the organization of society in Orwell's work resembles, in many ways, the organization of society in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. While a ruling elite and a closer circle to this elite enjoy some freedoms and privileges, the rest of the society basically struggles at the bare minimum economic survival level. Chapter One of Goldstein's book sets out the structure of the society in Oceania. The society is divided into three main groups: The High, the Middle, and the Low (*NEF* 200). The objectives of these groups are in conflict with each other. The High hopes to maintain their position in society. The Middle tries to change places with the High. The aim of the Low -when they can have time and energy to have an aim – is to create a society where all men are equal (*NEF* 201). Orwell's Oceanian society very much resembles the Soviet Union experience. For Orwell, what happened in the Soviet Russian experience is that the Middle class took power, got rid of the aristocratic class with the help of working class then created a managerial oligarchy where the bureaucrats of the Middle went on to exploit the Low and reduce them to servitude again. Orwell notes that the supporters of the Soviet regime in fact "belong to the 'managerial class' " about which James Burnham writes, and this class is in fact hungry for more power and more prestige ("Second Thoughts on James Burnham"). What Orwell mentions in *NEF* in Goldstein's book about *Oligarchical Collectivism* is somewhat similar to James Burnham's analysis of the Soviet Union. Orwell summarizes Burnham's thesis as follows:

> Capitalism is disappearing, but Socialism is not replacing it. What is now arising is a new kind of planned, centralised society which will be neither capitalist nor, in any accepted sense of the word, democratic. The rulers of

> this new society will be the people who effectively control the means of production: that is, business executives, technicians, bureaucrats and soldiers, lumped together by Burnham, under the name of 'managers'. These people will eliminate the old capitalist class, crush the working class, and so organise society that all power and economic privilege remain in their own hands. Private property rights will be abolished. … Internally, each society will be hierarchical, with an aristocracy of talent at the top and a mass of semi-slaves at the bottom. ("Second Thoughts on James Burnham")

As explained above, his scenario is quite similar to what happens in *NEF* and what was about to happen in Europe if Hitler won the war. Around the beginning of the 1940s, both Russia and Germany seemed to be evolving into states where a ruling elite, a class of bureaucracy, held power in their hands and exploited the rest of the society. It is clear from *NEF* that Orwell got some inspiration from Burnham about the hierarchical structure of the society. In *NEF*, the High control everything and enjoy the privileges, the Middle are semi-slaves working for the High, and the Low just show servitude to both and basically have a slave status. Orwell's organization of the Oceanian society demonstrates how a totalitarian regime -whether it is communist or capitalist- would engineer a society in a way to only benefit the ruling elite.

Around the same time that Orwell was writing *NEF* in the alarming atmosphere of war in Europe, a German-born political theorist, Hannah Arendt (1906-1975), was also creating a three-volume work called *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951), in which she describes and analyses the then-contemporary stage of the world, Nazism and Stalinism, and the major totalitarian political movements of the first half of the twentieth century. She examines the history, politics, psychology, and economics of totalitarianism. There are in fact striking similarities between Orwell's totalitarian state in the novel and Arendt's analysis of contemporary and near-contemporary political realities. In totalitarian regimes, Arendt explains, "all men, without a single exception, are reliably dominated in every aspect of their life" (485). In *NEF*, totalitarian society as depicted by Orwell functions seamlessly with the government monitoring and controlling every aspect of human life. Another criterion Arendt proposes for totalitarian government is that it requires "organized loneliness" as a pre-condition (475). Orwell also creates a world where the protagonist Winston lacks real human connection; he is systemically isolated until he secretly meets Julia. This systemic

isolation, loneliness and lack of mutual trust are perhaps created for the fear of organized rebellion against the forces that enchain them. According to Arendt, totalitarian movements "assume the ultimate victory of lie and fiction over truth and reality" (385). In *NEF* the Party controls, manages and rewrites every source of information and makes its own reality. Individuals are not allowed to keep any records or items of the past. By controlling the present, the Party controls the past, and by controlling the past, they can justify any present action: "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past" are the exact words of O'Brien (*NEF* 248). The last point Arendt makes is that totalitarian rulers "feel more threatened by their own than by foreign people" (119). The result is constant brainwashing, attempts to control the language, mock trials, hate weeks, lying propaganda and so forth. All the qualities Arendt mentions about totalitarianism in her book also appear in *NEF*. As she also suggests, in totalitarian societies, the manipulation of reality is the basis of society. Every day the news is redacted, distorted or suppressed. On this point, Orwell suggests:

> [f]rom the totalitarian point of view history is something to be created rather than learned. A totalitarian state is in effect a theocracy, and its ruling caste, in order to keep its position, has to be thought of as infallible. But since, in practice, no one is infallible, it is frequently necessary to rearrange past events in order to show that this or that mistake was not made, or that this or that imaginary triumph actually happened. … Totalitarianism demands, in fact, the continuous alteration of the past, and in the long run probably demands a disbelief in the very existence of objective truth. ("The Prevention of Literature")

In *NEF*, it is in fact Winston's duty to change the truth in his job in the Records Department[9]. Every day, he rewrites the news, destroys 'subversive' ones through a system called memory holes. He describes this system as follows:

> [T]hey were nicknamed memory holes. When one knew that any document was due for destruction, or even when one saw a scrap of waste paper lying about, it was an automatic action to lift the flap of the nearest memory hole and drop it in. (*NEF* 37)

[9] It is ironic that Orwell's wife Eileen was employed in the Censorship Department in Whitehall (Davison *The Orwell Diaries* 244). Orwell had first-hand experience of media censorship through his wife's job.

In *NEF* memory holes are used to get rid of or modify unwanted information. Through the use of memory holes, the erasing of memories and constant rewriting of history are enabled. As Orwell suggests, an infallible system is run by constantly adjusting reality for any given purpose. Thereby, an unchallengeable system is set up.

Winston resists the destruction of any objective history and memory through his clandestine diary. Bernard Crick demonstrates the significance of "the authenticity of memory, thus the diary: the attempt to write the diary begins the main thread of the plot in which private memory is defended against the official attempts to rewrite history" (152). In this way, Winston resists the Party's attempt to manipulate and cover up truths to achieve their ends. Terry Eagleton explains the true nature of totalitarian regimes as follows: "Gross deception, whitewash, cover-up and lying through one's teeth: these are no longer sporadic, regrettable necessities of our form of life but permanently and structurally essential to it" (379). In Oceania, manipulation of reality becomes commonplace and Winston, working at the Records Department of the Ministry of Truth, witnesses this firsthand.

Manipulation of truth is not only possible through the destruction of objectivity but also through *doublethink*, which is one of the main principles of the ruling party INGSOC in *NEF*. *Doublethink* involves the act of having two opposite ideas and believing in both of them absolutely and simultaneously. Orwell describes this in the book: "To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy" (*NEF* 214). So, *doublethink* is a mental regimen that requires contradicting the basic principles of logic when it is necessary to do so. The slogans of the totalitarian society in *NEF* are salient examples of *doublethink*: "IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH", "WAR IS PEACE" and "FREEDOM IS SLAVERY" (4). The Ministry of Truth, which is related to news, media and education; The Ministry of Peace, which concerns itself with providing peace; the Ministry of Love, which keeps up law and order; and the Ministry of Plenty, which deals with economic affairs and consumption of goods are also the oxymorons of this totalitarian society. Goldstein's

book explains this hypocrisy. The Ministry of Love concerns itself with torture, the Ministry of Plenty with starvation and shortages, the Ministry of Peace with war and the Ministry of Truth with lies (*NEF* 216). According to the principle of *doublethink*, there is nothing wrong about thinking that two opposite ideas can go hand in hand as long as this process serves the purposes of the Party. This kind of thinking in fact defies the limits of logical reasoning and corrupts the language leading to the manipulation of ideas.

Orwell, being so keenly aware of the power of language in manipulating ideas, especially at the time of the Spanish Civil War, used this theme in *NEF* (Calder 138). He observed *doublethink* in the Communist movement in Spain closely. Orwell notes "every communist is in fact liable at any moment to have to alter his most fundamental convictions, or leave the party. The unquestionable dogma of Monday may become the damnable heresy of Tuesday, and so on" ("Inside the Whale"). Similar shifts happened in Soviet Russia as well as in Europe with the change of Russian foreign policy and European policy against Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. During the World Wars, alliances changed due to power politics. According to the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact of 1939, members of the Communist Party were required to downplay Nazi atrocities and be pro-Hitler; later the 1941 Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, however, suddenly required them to reverse course and be anti-Hitler again. This sudden change of political sides is portrayed in *NEF*: "it became known, with extreme suddenness and everywhere at once, that Eastasia and not Eurasia was the enemy… the Hate continued exactly as before, except that the target had been changed" (*NEF* 180). Whatever the Party deems as the 'enemy' becomes the enemy overnight

In *NEF*, the changing of truths is not only carried out by memory holes and *doublethink* but also through the manipulation of language itself. *Newspeak* is the official language of Oceania devised for the purposes of the official ideology of the Party, and all citizens have to adopt it. This way, *doublethink* and *newspeak* go hand in hand since *Newspeak* only allows mechanical production of thoughts and ideas. Syme, who is the official working on the eleventh edition of the *newspeak* dictionary, describes what they do with the language to Winston: "You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words – scores of them, hundreds of them,

every day. We're cutting the language to the bone" (*NEF* 51). By destroying the language and narrowing the range of thought, they strip people of thought. Syme goes on: "In fact there will *be* no thought. Orthodoxy means not thinking- not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness" (*NEF* 53). Through the development of *newspeak* the Party hopes to control people's minds and strip them of any kind of subversive thought. This attempt by the party recalls the western logocentric idea that illustrates words and language as a fundamental expression of an external reality. If the kind of language one uses impacts and determines what one can think as well as express, this attempt can indeed be successful in fostering the obedient public the Party hopes to create. With the idea of *newspeak*, Meyers claims Orwell participated in the literary debate about minimalism and simplicity of language in modern prose, a debate that was started after World War I by authors like Ernest Hemingway and Ezra Pound (*Life and Art* 138). In his essay "Politics and the English Language", Orwell comments on the decay of language. While Orwell explains he is against using "pretentious diction", he is also concerned about simplifying the language to the extent that it loses its capacity of expressing complex thoughts and feelings (160). He tries to find a middle ground where language allows one to express oneself clearly and without meaningless abstractions. Any extreme view towards either oversimplifying the language or making it pompous and fuzzy is criticized by Orwell. He maintains that clear language makes a proletarian literature possible while an oversimplified language creates a perversion of meaning and corruption of language and thus eventually facilitating fascist expression.

With the use of *newspeak*, political manipulation becomes easier since there is a direct relationship between truth, language and politics. If an ideology employs a political jargon to give lies an appearance of truth, and truth an appearance of lies, things can be manipulated, and wrongdoings and encroachments can appear rightful and justified. Mentioning the political "euphemisms" and vague political vocabulary, Orwell notes:

> [p]olitical language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenseless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called *pacification*. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called *transfer of population* or *rectification of frontiers*. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in

> Arctic lumber camps: this is called *elimination of unreliable elements*. (“Politics and the English Language” 166-7)

These fabricated political terms are reminders of the contemporary political atmosphere. Pentagon euphemisms -such as “peace”, “peacekeeper” or “bringing peace” which in fact refer to wars, “enhanced interrogation techniques” which is a sugarcoated word for torture and “collateral damage” which stands for wounded or killed civilians, are merely some examples of words manipulated for political purposes (Astore). The metonymy of ‘concentration camp’ (*konzentrationslager* in German) is probably one of the most significant in history. During the Second World War, the concentration camps[10] whose purpose was supposedly to confine ‘racially undesirable elements’ into one place in fact turned into places of mass murder. The euphemistic names of nuclear bombs and missiles[11] during the Second World War also give a similar feeling of confusion and distraction. The common use of these terms points to the fact that the employment of euphemisms and metonymy in politics is not only relevant for our contemporary situation but also for the time when *NEF* was written. Orwell, being an astute journalist and aware of this language manipulation, used it as one of the themes in *NEF*. Words such as *joycamp*[12], which in fact means forced-labour camp, *Minipax* (short for Ministry of Peace), which refers to the Ministry of War, and *prolefeed*, which is the “rubbishy” entertainment handed out to the masses, are some examples of euphemisms and abbreviations from the book (*NEF* 306-7). Another example of vague political language mentioned in the Appendix on *newspeak* in *NEF* is the tendency to use abbreviations and what Orwell calls “telescoped” words, examples of which include “Nazi, Gestapo, Comintern, Inprecorr, Agitprop” (*NEF* 307). Orwell suggests, through the use of these abbreviations[13], the meaning of the words is narrowed, subtly changed and associations

---

[10] Similar metaphors were used around the same era for camps created in the US as well for the people of Japanese ancestry. During the Second World War, forced relocation and incarceration of these people were carried out after the Pearl Harbour attack. Likewise, in Soviet Russia, the GULAG, “an acronym for Glavnoe Upravlenie Lagerei, or Main Camp Administration” was a bureaucratic institution which basically functioned as a labour camp/prison for political dissidents (“Gulag”).

[11]“Ironically, “Little Boy” is the code name for the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan during the Second World War and “Fat Man” is the name for the plutonium weapon used against Nagasaki (Wellerstein).

12 See Appendix 1 for *newspeak* terminology.

[13]These euphemism and abbreviations also bring to mind the contemporary language on nuclear technology which causes confusion and a lack of familiarity. Starting in the Cold War period until the current times, the language of nuclear weapons followed a tendency to confuse the public. *Nukespeak* is a word coined by Rory O’Connor who has a book on the history of nuclear technology. O’Connor points out to the way the language is manipulated so as to avoid any uncomfortable or threatening thought related to nuclear weapons and nuclear energy (*Nukespeak*).

with the original versions can no longer be made (*NEF* 308). With the manipulation of language, a vague meaning is created and even a learned reader has hard time making sense of shortened words.

In *NEF*, the manipulation of language not only involves these abbreviations and euphemisms but also the translation of literary works into the new language, which creates the kind of literature that serves the aims of totalitarian society. In his essay "Prevention of Literature", Orwell speculates about what literature would be like in a rigidly totalitarian society:

> … [i]t is doubtful even now whether the great mass of people in the industrialized countries feel the need for any kind of literature. They are unwilling, at any rate, to spend anywhere near as much on reading matter as they spend on several other recreations. Probably novels and stories will be completely superseded by film and radio productions. Or perhaps some kind of low grade sensational fiction will survive, produced by a sort of conveyor-belt process that reduces human initiative to the minimum. … Imagination — even consciousness, so far as possible — would be eliminated from the process of writing.

It is this kind of unimaginative, mind-numbing literature the Party hopes to create. There is strict control over culture and cultural products in Oceania. All culture is produced by the Ministry of Truth, which provides Party members with "newspapers, films, textbooks, telescreen programs, plays, novels-with every conceivable kind of information, instruction, or entertainment" (*NEF* 43). Proles are also supplied with "rubbishy newspapers, containing almost nothing except sport, crime, and astrology, sensational fivecent novelettes, films oozing with sex, and sentimental songs which were composed entirely by mechanical means" (*NEF* 43). These novelettes resembling cheap dime store novels with a superficial content and similar cultural products are designed to condition the public for the roles they are supposed to play in society. Booker suggests "Orwell's Ministry of Truth functions as the official organ of an Adornian Culture Industry that seeks to interpellate individual subjects within the ideology of the Party" (79).

Telescreens in Oceania, apart from serving as 'security' mechanisms, bring to mind the Althusserian ideological state apparatus with their cultural propagandist purposes.

(Booker 79). Constant party propaganda carried out through telescreens serves to control the public and create a unilateral and superficial way of thinking. Telescreens also continually provide the public with statistics to prove "that people today had more food, more clothes, better houses, better recreations – that they lived longer, worked shorter hours, were bigger, healthier, stronger, happier, more intelligent, better educated, than the people of fifty years ago" (*NEF* 74). All of these are forged statistics to control and manipulate the public opinion and to prevent them from questioning their current predicament. As a matter of fact, the proles do not question their predicament at all. Instead, they frequent pubs which smell of "urine, sawdust and sour beer" and all they do in these pubs is to play dart and talk about the Lottery, which is "the principal if not the only reason for remaining alive" (*NEF* 84 - 85). The Proles are fooled by mundane consolations and cheap entertainment, and thus controlled easily. Yet, Orwell still has high hopes about their potentiality.

In many of his works, Orwell ruminates over the proletariat, their predicament, their possibility of rebellion and the role of the middle class in this. His personas in Paris, London, Wigan and Spain suffer through war, poverty, exploitation and manipulation as members of lower classes; Gordon Comstock in *Aspidistra* starts as a middle-class bourgeois but refuses this role. George Bowling in *Coming up for Air*, with his two children and a house in the suburbs, is a typical lower-middle class insurance salesman who is disillusioned with his life, job and his prospects. All these characters and personas -regardless of being a member of middle classes or working classes- live in an age of anxiety as victims of modern capitalism and oppressive fears of the artificial contemporary world and they all share a part with Winston Smith himself, a defeated individual in such a world. Although he is not a part of the proletariat, Winston wants to believe in the proles and their potential. He reflects, "if there is hope, it *must* lie in the proles" (*NEF* 69, 202) [italics in original]. If they could somehow become aware of their power and shake off their political ignorance and apathy, they can overthrow the Party, Winston thinks. He considers the proles as an agent of political change. In proles, he sees not only anger and despair, but also an outburst of emotions: screams, quarrels and rebellion. Proles also have no loyalties to the party or any ideology:

> They were not loyal to a party or a country or an idea, they were loyal to one another. For the first time in his life he did not despise the proles or think of

> them merely as an inert force which would one day spring to life and regenerate the world. The proles stayed human. They had not become hardened inside. (*NEF* 165)

While Winston admires the emotional purity and passion of the proles, he also realizes how difficult and far-fetched his hope in them is. He pessimistically ponders about their impasse: "Until they become conscious, they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious" (*NEF* 70). In fact, Winston realizes how easy it is to keep the proles in control because of the way they lead their lives:

> Left to themselves, they had reverted to a style of life that appeared to be natural to them, a sort of ancestral pattern. They were born, they grew up in the gutters, they went to work at twelve, they passed through a brief blossoming period of beauty and sexual desire, they married at twenty, they were middle-aged at thirty, they died, for the most part, at sixty. Heavy physical work, the care of home and children, petty quarrels with neighbors, films, football, beer, and, above all, gambling filled up the horizon of their minds. To keep them in control was not difficult. (*NEF* 71)

Winston is ambivalent about the proles' strength and their role as a political actor. While he thinks one day proles' strength will turn into consciousness and thus rebellion, a sense of hopelessness overcomes him all at once. Resch claims it is Winston's superiority to the proles and his middle-class background that make him question his belief in the proles: "Class prejudices separate Winston from the values of social equality and moral community, and place him, however reluctantly, on the side of elitism" (156). Resch connects Winston's elitism to Orwell's elitism, claiming that unconsciously Orwell does not think highly of working classes' capacity for intelligence and initiative, and Resch adds that Orwell recognizes the strength of working classes only in terms of human solidarity and moral community. Resch asserts that the capacity for thought and action is endowed to the middle class in Orwell's eyes (164). As a matter of fact, Orwell's depiction of the proles in *NEF* is heavily affected by his observations of the English working class in *The Road to Wigan Pier*. When he lived among the working class, he observed at first hand their family ties, loyalties to each other and their decency, he also recognized their incapacity for revolting against their appalling circumstances. Instead of rebellion, they were content enough with "cheap palliatives": "It is quite likely that fish and chips, art-silk stockings, tinned salmon, cut-price chocolate (five two-ounce bars for sixpence), the movies, the radio, strong tea and

the Football Pools have between them averted revolution" (Orwell *The Road* 92). Orwell's disappointment with the proles and the system that pushes them into submissiveness and apathy can be observed both in *NEF* and his sociological account, *The Road to Wigan Pier*.

In *NEF*, apart from manipulation of language and cheap entertainment, containment of the public is provided by certain technological applications which are used for political oppression and maintaining control over citizens. Written around 1948, at the dawn of the age of television, the novel envisions a dictatorship where each and every individual is monitored continuously by means of telescreens and clandestine microphones that record them all the time everywhere. For Oceanian subjects there is no privacy and any deviant behaviour is analysed and corrected. Telescreens are quite delicate technological tools which can even pick up heartbeats and facial expressions. With the help of this technology, party members are kept under surveillance anytime and anywhere, even in the privacy of their houses. Winston describes this non-stop monitoring:

> Even from the coin the eyes pursued you. On coins, on stamps, on the cover of the books, on banners, on posters, and on the wrappings of cigarette packet –everywhere. Always the eyes watching you and the voice enveloping you. Asleep or awake, working or eating, indoor or outdoors, in bath or in bed - no escape. Nothing was your own, except the few cubic centimetres inside your skull. (Orwell *NEF* 27)

Under this constant surveillance, all party members have to adjust their behaviours, even facial expressions accordingly. There is no possible way to express any discontent or deviancy even with facial expressions. The interpellation of individuals occurs through telescreens that literally speak to Oceanian subjects. Telescreens provide constant surveillance, functioning like what Jeremy Bentham (1748- 1832) describes as a Panopticon, which is originally designed as a prison run that could be controlled by a minimum number of guards. In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault (1926-1984) observes the concept from a different angle and describes today's society as a "society of surveillance" (208), where the individual is under constant surveillance. Foucault focuses on the carceral nature of modern society and its disciplinary institutions. In Oceania, too, the subjects are always being observed: 'Big Brother is always watching'.

In *NEF*, the repressive effect of technology can easily be observed. Despite the so-called liberating effects of science and technology, when they are politicized and used to serve ill intentions, they can be used for the oppression of society. Booker remarks "the politicization of science and technology in this society has in fact had a suffocating effect on science itself" (Booker 70). Apart from constant electronic surveillance and research on weaponry, the society in *NEF* is indeed scientifically and technologically backwards. In fact, O'Brien suggests that science itself is open to inquiry since facts and truths are determined by the Party. Science and technology are merely instrumental for the Party, for which nothing exists outside the mind. O'Brien even claims that "we control the matter because we control the mind" (*NEF* 264). He denies the theory of evolution and Copernican heliocentrism, saying they [the inner Party] "make the laws of nature" (265). If the Party finds it appropriate and states "the earth is the center of the universe. The sun and the stars go round it" then it shall be accepted as the truth (265). If the laws of nature do not align with Party politics, they can simply be ignored, changed and made look otherwise. The practice of *doublethink* exists to serve this purpose.

Novel-writing machines are another technological device made use of in *NEF*. Novel writing machines are controlled by the Fiction Department where books are seen as "just commodities that had to be produced, like jam or bootlaces" (*NEF* 124). Control of any heretical literature is provided through novel writing machines. Orwell's novel writing machines bring to mind Jonathan Swift's knowledge producing engines in *Gulliver's Travels* (1726). These machines enable even the most ignorant person to produce knowledge with the least effort:

> Every one knew how laborious the usual method is of attaining to arts and sciences; whereas, by his contrivance, the most ignorant person, at a reasonable charge, and with a little bodily labour, might write books in philosophy, poetry, politics, laws, mathematics, and theology, without the least assistance from genius or study. (Swift 171)

In the same vein, the novel-writing machines of *NEF* allow for fast and cheap production of mechanically produced knowledge that buys off the masses. Novel writing machines are not the only reminiscent aspect of *Gulliver's Travels* in *NEF*. The "Floating Fortress" alludes to the "Floating Island" of Laputa, Goldstein's weird

scientific experiments are derivative of Swift's mocking of the Royal Society and the fact that Houyhnhnmns do not have a language to express themselves; therefore, a diminished range of ideas and thought is similar to the objectives of *Newspeak* in *NEF* (Meyers *Life and Art* 127).

Not only technology but also architectural design is made use of to impose power and fear upon people in Oceania, seen especially in the construction of Ministry buildings and Victory Mansions. The architecture of Orwell's dehumanized world oppresses the individuals who live in them. Winston's own apartment, a pre-revolutionary building, is dark, sparsely furnished, dilapidated and nothing in it properly functions, reminding the reader of inexpensive public housing projects (*NEF* 96). As a contrast, the new buildings of Oceanian bureaucracy are monumental and ominous: The Ministry of Truth "was an enormous pyramidal structure of glittering white concrete, soaring up, terrace after terrace, three hundred meters into the air" (*NEF* 4). The Ministries are protected with "barbed-wire entanglements, steel doors, and hidden machine-gun nests" and "by gorilla-faced guards in black uniforms" (*NEF* 5). Elite party members live in spacious, clean and properly functioning houses where telescreen can be turned off. Unlike the elite party members, Winston works in a narrow cubicle in a stuffed hall of the colossal Ministry of Truth and he describes as being "in the long, windowless hall, with its double row of cubicles and its endless rustle of papers and hum of voices murmuring into speakwrites" (*NEF* 41), an atmosphere which is not very distant from the modern work environments where people work long hours in small cubicles on computers. The proletarian districts of London are full of "vistas of rotting nineteenth-century houses, their sides shored up with balks of timber, their windows patched with cardboard and their roofs with corrugated iron" (*NEF* 3). These "dwellings like chicken houses" are almost like a scene from contemporary *favelas (NEF* 3). The contrast between the concrete giants of Ministries and these slums with their shanty dwarf buildings strikingly points out to the controlling power of the Big Brother, whose face is everywhere inside and outside these buildings. Even if there were not any posters of him gazing around, the buildings would still distract the population with their visibility, making them invisible. The striking contrast between the sizes and the conditions of the buildings of the elite and the proles serves the purpose of making the proles feel small, weak and helpless against the giant control mechanism. As Bernstein suggests Oceania is "a society controlled by architecture" (26). Figes points to the inequalities in terms of

housing in Soviet Russia, where "new blocks of private flats were built up for the elite" while "eighty percent of the urban population lived in communal apartments" where there was very little space, no privacy, and eavesdropping and spying were rather common (249). When Winston visits O'Brien's residence, he finds a room "long-shaped and softly-lit" and furnished with a "dark blue carpet" that "gave one the impression of treading on velvet" (*NEF* 167). Winston comments on the houses of Inner Party members: "The whole atmosphere of huge block of flats, the richness and spaciousness of everything, the unfamiliar smells of good food and good tobacco, the silent and incredibly rapid lifts sliding up and down, the white-jacketed servants hurrying to and fro" (*NEF* 168). This "softly-carpeted" and "exquisitely clean" room "with cream-papered walls" intimidates Winston (*NEF* 168). The fact that he was admitted to these premises by daunting black-uniformed guards adds more to his intimidation. Even before Winston talks to O'Brien, he can feel his power over him through his surroundings and he feels petty and filled with terror and embarrassment.

The architectural setting of Winston's secret room, where he meets Julia, reminds the reader of Orwell's nostalgia for simpler pre-war times. The room has a Victorian armchair, a few pictures, a fireplace, a carpet, an old-fashioned clock, a large bed and, much to Winston's amazement, no telescreen (*NEF* 96). This room gives Winston a feeling of nostalgia and he thinks it is a "… room meant to be lived in" (*NEF* 96). The secret room includes a picture frame that depicts a building, previously a church which is now converted into "a museum used for propaganda displays of various kinds" (*NEF* 99). In Soviet Russia, the churches were also converted into public buildings and reappropriated as depots for artwork, libraries, cinemas, museums, headquarters for the KGB, prisons, factories and even turned into gyms and swimming pools. The similarity here is too close to be merely coincidental, suggesting that Orwell was probably aware of these events.

Compared to Winston's own apartment, the secret room has a character, a humane quality which is what Winston is trying to bring about by reminiscing over pre-revolutionary times. This feeling of nostalgia appears not only in *NEF* but also in the other works by Orwell. George Bowling in *Coming up for Air* has a deep desire to go back to the times before the war, very much like Winston's yearning for finding out

about the past. The fact that nostalgia takes up a lot of attention in Orwell's works is perhaps related to Orwell's "allegedly backward-looking character" (Brooker 1). Fredric Warburg claims "[h]e [Orwell] didn't like progress, he preferred the old ways, the traditional ways" (194). Nostalgia is understandably a very common feeling among people who experienced the World Wars, since in those times the idea of progress and science began to be associated with racist pseudo-scientific applications used by the Nazis, atomic bombs killing millions, and mass manipulation. Longing for a more "peaceful age" is a natural reaction for people considering such circumstances (Orwell "Why I Write?" 393). Yet, claiming that Orwell had a backward-looking character or that he was a conservative is far-fetched. As much as Orwell focuses on nostalgia and longs for times when technology and science did not have that much importance in people's lives, he defends the idea of progress and scientific rationality, and has a positive outlook towards the gains of modernity. Orwell only has concerns over science and technology being manipulated in order to control or harm people. Thus, Orwell's nostalgia is not for the sake of technological conservatism or any kind of conservatism, but a nostalgia for more peaceful and humane times.

Another form of technology that affects society in *NEF* is *artSem,* which is *Newspeak* for artificial insemination. Along with the Junior Anti-sex league whose purpose is to "prevent men and women from forming loyalties", *artSem* encourages complete celibacy and the conception of babies through artificial methods rather than through sexual intercourse (*NEF* 65). Luegenbiehl suggests *artSem* is "a way of doing away with sexual and, therefore individually human, contact between the sexes" (292). This serves the Party's agenda of decreasing human interaction and harnessing of sexual energy for the goals of the Party. It also serves to diminish strong ties and loyalty between people, creating a sense of "organized loneliness", which as Hannah Arendt claims in *The Origins of Totalitarianism,* is a pre-condition for creating a totalitarian regime (475). Sexuality is used as a tool for political manipulation in *NEF*.

In Oceania, there is a direct link "between chastity and political orthodoxy" (*NEF* 133). Sexual impulse is considered dangerous and therefore has to be eradicated: "We shall abolish the orgasm," proclaims O'Brien (*NEF* 267). The reason why Winston loves Julia is that she is courageous enough to carry out the sexual act: "If the sexual act,

successfully performed, is rebellion, then Julia is a rebel *par excellence*" (Newsinger *Orwell's Politics* 132). Winston is provoked by her promiscuity and courage: "His heart leapt. Scores of times she had done it; he wished it had been hundreds – thousands. Anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope.' 'Listen,' he tells her, 'the more men you've had, the more I love you" (*NEF* 125). For Winston, the sexual act is a political act. And through Julia, Orwell makes a point about political liberation.

In *NEF*, the Party again expects a quasi-religious attitude towards sexuality from its members. The constraint and the devotion of their sexual energy to the goals of the Party are dictated. In a sense, the Party appears to be applying the Freudian repressive hypothesis. Freud suggests in *Civilization and Its Discontents* that "civilization is built up upon renunciation of instinct, how much it presupposes precisely the non-satisfaction…of powerful instincts [such as sex and aggression]" (84). In other words, civilization requires one to suppress sexual instincts and conditions him/her to control sexual pleasure and happiness. In *NEF*, however, an extreme form of this repression is in play. The Party represses sexuality on the grounds that "when you make love you're using up energy" (110) that would be useful in the service of the party (Booker 76). The hysteria caused by the repression of sexual energy is sublimated into hatred and party worship. As in many other dystopian novels, in *NEF*, sexual intercourse is acceptable only for the mere purpose of reproduction. With regard to the repression of sexuality, Foucault in *The Use of Pleasure* talks about the prescriptive discourses that "attempted to reflect on and regulate sexual conduct" (*The History of Sexuality* 249). Foucault points out that in Ancient Greece, the choice between bodily pleasures and restrained passion was a moral one. The exercise of restraint and moderation was an ethical struggle (249). The domination over one's passions is a reoccurring topic in *NEF* as well, and this domination is accomplished through state ideology instead of religion or morality.

The Party in *NEF* has a quasi-religious tone not just in the form of supressing sexuality but as a manifestation of divine power. It uses many techniques borrowed from the idea of religion. O'Brien declares: "We are the priests of power. … God is power" (*NEF* 264). Communal rituals in *NEF* are a befitting example to demonstrate the role of

religious remnants in this society. The "Two Minutes Hate" where Party members jump and scream with angry fits and hatred focused on Goldstein, ending with the frantic exhibition of their devotion to Big Brother as their saviour, bears some similarity to religious rituals. This mass hysteria is used for the sole purpose of empowering the Party. Regarding the parallel between Roman Catholicism and power worship in *NEF*, Kumar remarks the following: "the oblique reference to a long-enduring religious collectivity underlines the point that modern dictatorships realize that the greatest power comes from its collective embodiment and exercise. Individuals are merely the temporary representatives and agents of the Party, which is 'all-powerful and immortal' " (338-39). As with the Church, the power over the bodies and minds of individuals is important in *NEF* and the confusion between political power and religion helps the Party to take advantage of the need for a divine power and strengthen its position in the society by monopolizing the loyalty and devotion of the society.

Other control mechanisms used in *NEF* take the psychological manipulation of Party members as their aim. *Crimestop* is the mental discipline that requires Party members to refrain from having any private emotions, or any thought that could be dangerous for the survival of the Party. It is a manipulation technique applied even (in fact especially) to children for the purposes of spying and control:

> *Crimestop* means the faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought. It includes the power of not grasping analogies, of failing to perceive logical errors, of misunderstanding the simplest arguments if they are inimical to Ingsoc, and of being bored or repelled by any train of thought which is capable of leading in a heretical direction. *Crimestop*, in short, means protective stupidity. (*NEF* 212)

Through *crimestop* any subversive thought is repressed and contained. Towards the end of the novel when Winston gets caught, he encounters his neighbour, Parsons, who was denounced by his own daughter. As a part of *crimestop*, the use of children as informants was a usual practice in Oceania. This was also a common practice in Soviet Russia, where children were indoctrinated at a young age to be 'good' Communists. Mentioning the young generations, one Soviet theorist declared "[w]e must rescue these children from the nefarious influence of family life. … We must nationalize them" (Zenzinov 27). Through the school curriculum, the children are politicized, recruited as

‘comrades’ and even “encouraged to police the teachers for ‘anti- Soviet’ views” (Figes 197). In *NEF*, Winston’s neighbours, the Parsons, have their children dressed in “the uniform of Spies” (23) and the children play a game in which they catch traitors with toy guns. They are taken to witness “the hanging”, a public spectacle taking place once a month, where “Eurasian prisoners, guilty of war crimes” are “hanged in the Park” (*NEF* 23). Thus, in *NEF*, children are not only indoctrinated from young ages to be ‘good’ Oceanians, but they also take an active role enforcing the state’s mandate so that they can ‘catch the enemies of the revolution’ in this deceitful way.

The power over individuals’ minds and bodies is provided in *NEF* not only by control over sexuality by *artSem* and control over thoughts by *crimestop,* but by torture as well. If things cannot be controlled by *crimestop,* a further level of control over thought comes onto the stage, the Thought Police. The Thought Police are responsible for revealing and punishing *thoughtcrime*. The punishment usually involves torture and, as a last resort, the execution of individuals committing this crime. In the usual case, counterrevolutionaries and ‘traitors’ are caught by the thought police, cases are fabricated against them, then they are tortured by the Police until they make the ‘necessary’ confessions and eventually, they are executed after these spectacular public show trials, very similar to the ones in Soviet Russia after the Bolshevik revolution (Figes 271). The last survivors of the revolution are forced to ‘confess’ their guilt and make amends (*NEF* 75, 78). Purges and ‘vaporizations’ are considered a mundane part of the government mechanism. The government, if it wishes, can make a person not exist, in other words “*vaporized*” (*NEF* 19). These people are simply called “refs unpersons” (*NEF* 45). One such person who suddenly disappears is Syme, Winston’s colleague who works on *newspeak.* No one dares to question his non-existence, he simply vanishes (*NEF* 147). Winston himself experiences the humiliation and torture executed by O’Brien in the notorious Room 101. By inflicting excruciating pain, O’Brien makes him confess to anything and eventually even profess his love for Big Brother.

As one might expect, there is no room for individuality in *NEF*. Denial of one’s own thoughts, control of the language through *newspeak*, and the stripping away of emotions other than the ones useful to sustain ideology with *artSem* and discarding any deviant

thought with *crimestop* are all ways to eradicate individuality. Similar to many other dystopias, in *NEF*, the Party members wear the same outfits; their life is uniform, controlled and orderly. Individualism is considered eccentricity. When party members are not working, sleeping and eating, they are expected to participate in communal recreations that involve party lectures and "to do anything that suggested a taste for solitude, even to go for a walk by yourself, was always slightly dangerous" (*NEF* 82). Similarly, in Soviet Russia private life was eliminated, and people were forced to live communally. About his visit to Moscow, Walter Benjamin wrote, "Bolshevism had abolished private life. … The bureaucracy, political activity, the press are so powerful that no time remains for interests that do not converge with them. Nor any space" (30). Censorship was also strong: What people read and thought was strictly controlled. In *NEF*, by keeping a journal, Winston dares to break this pattern. He expresses his feelings, gives himself a voice, and thus tries to achieve some kind of individuality. Another way Winston challenges the ban on individuality is pursuing a relationship with Julia, which is a form of rebellion both for him and Julia. Julia's putting on make-up and wearing different clothes other than her uniform can be interpreted as minor forms of rebellion against the ban on individuality as well.

Oceania is a place where all individuals are expected to act, talk and think in a certain uniform way: "[A]ll thinking the same thoughts and shouting the same slogans, perpetually working, fighting, triumphing, persecuting – three hundred million people all with the same face (NEF 74). Any sign of individuality is incompatible with the Party's totalitarian rule. Isaiah Berlin notes "[i]n a society in which the same goals are universally accepted, problems can be only of means, all soluble by technological methods. That is a society in which the inner life of man, the moral and spiritual and aesthetic imagination, no longer speaks at all" (15). This is when individuals are enslaved and 'what it means to be human' is lost. "To force people into the neat uniforms demanded by dogmatically believed-in schemes is almost always the road to inhumanity" (Berlin 19). What Winston ultimately tries in *NEF* is to be human. By having the power to express himself through his diary, by feeling what he feels through his love for Julia and believing in what he thinks to be moral and ultimately fighting to resist despite both physical and psychological torture, he attempts to demonstrate his individuality. The relevant question is not whether he is good or right, but what matters is that he lacks the right to express his individuality, his own values and his own way of

life. In a totalitarian society, this is not even a slight possibility. The history of Nazism and Communism that Orwell took his inspiration from also proves this point with absolute clarity.

As can be observed in the preceding paragraphs, all that Orwell wrote is permeated by the places he visits, experiences he has, and observations he makes of society and civilization. As Lodge also acknowledges, *"Nineteen Eighty-Four* derives most of its power and authenticity from Orwell's imaginative exploitation of facts, emotions, and iconography, specifically associated with Stalinist Russia, Nazi Germany and World-War-II-devastated Europe" (Lodge 68). Drawn on from his experiences, Orwell's works demonstrate his resistance towards the driving forces of his age. He wanted a "decent and humane world to be created" (Kumar 293). His concerns about truth, the autonomy of the individual, integrity and freedom reveal themselves even in the minute details of his novels. Kumar suggests that by creating a familiar background of his own times in *NEF*, Orwell makes it possible for the reader to feel "a sense of familiarity" and "a point of contact" so that they shockingly come face to face with the vicious political system that can actually turn out to be their own reality if they do not care and take action. Orwell's world is not exotic, populated by science-fiction fantasies, or set in the far distant future. It is rather realistic, close to his time and informed by the day-to-day experiences of people living through the World Wars. Orwell's purpose is clearly deliberate. Orwell wants to reveal to the reader: These are our times and this is your story that it is being told here, and it could be your own reality unless you show some concern: "*De te fabula narratur"* (qtd in Kumar 297).

NEF is a reminder of where indifference, negligence and apathy can take societies. The book not only describes the horrors of the 1940s but also warns against any possible totalitarian regime regardless of when or where they may come into existence. As in many other twentieth century dystopias, *NEF* focuses on the theme of "the quasi-omnipotence of a monolithic, totalitarian state demanding and normally exacting complete obedience from its citizens, challenged occasionally but usually ineffectually by vestigial individualism or systemic flaws, and relying upon scientific and technological advances to ensure social control" (Claeys 109). Recent history shows

that the development of such states is not confined to any specific geographic region or historical period. *NEF* is as relevant and relatable in 2019 as it was in 1949.

CHAPTER II[14]

BRAZIL: NOT YOUR TROPICAL PARADISE

We're all in it together, kid![15]

Harry Tuttle

Certain literary works occupy a vivid place in the popular imagination, shaping how the world is perceived, affecting later visions and evoking ideas in future generations. George Orwell's *NEF* is one such work that influenced later visions of dystopia. By responding to the political anxiety and dread of totalitarian rule, the book becomes a part of our vocabulary and continues to inspire works of dystopian fiction in the twenty first century. One of the later visions of dystopia affected by *NEF* is Terry Gilliam's 1985 film *Brazil*, which draws from its own contemporary cultural context as well as the ideas in *NEF*. Despite the differing contexts of these two works - the former a novel written in the aftermath of the Second World War, the latter a film released in the late twentieth century - there are some definite similarities between them.

Brazil is set in a post-industrial capitalist society where bureaucracy runs out of control and consumerism goes overboard. The film depicts a world of material abundance and technological progress in which nothing quite works properly, i.e. the promise of improved quality of life through consumption and 'advanced' technology is empty. Much like *NEF*, the world *Brazil* depicts is also a terrorizing and totalitarian one. Unspecified terrorists send bombs in the form of Christmas gifts, the government's Central Services control every detail in peoples' lives, the Ministry of Information keeps comprehensive records of every person, dreary technology makes people's lives difficult, and people are reduced to cogs in the totalitarian machinery. Peter Wollen remarks that *Brazil* depicts "horror of standardization, regimentation, instrumental reason, and … the feeling of being lost in nightmarish chaos in which you are excluded

[14] In this chapter, the present simple tense is used for the parts related to the fictional work *Brazil* while the simple past tense is used for the depiction of historical events, Terry Gilliam's memoirs and biography.

[15] This refers to a slogan that viewers notice throughout the movie as a piece of State propaganda, here appropriated by the renegade plumber, Harry Tuttle, as parting words after he fixes Sam's air conditioning without the filing the necessary paperwork. Interestingly enough, the use of this slogan as state propaganda was remarkably foresighted since it is also used by the 2010-15 coalition government in the UK (Hatherly).

from all power, pleasure and enjoyment" (61). As a product of the 1980s, *Brazil* depicts a cold bureaucratic dystopian metropolis. With its endless gray skies full of skyscrapers and government agencies with cumbersome technology, it is a world obsessed with the idea of convenient technology but unable to actually produce it. It is a world that runs automatically yet always improperly almost at the level of absurdity.

Despite the fact that *Brazil* contains fantastical elements compared to *NEF*, the director of the film, Terry Gilliam considers it "all too realistic" and comments "I don't think it's as much a prediction as an observation. … I think it's like a very elaborate documentary, done in a Lewis Carroll way - seen through the looking glass. It's all recognizable things you see around you, but it's been transformed. I wanted to do a cautionary tale about where we are and where we're going" (qtd. in Bennetts). In a similar vein, Gilliam remarks that "all that stuff was already out there for those with eyes to see it in the mid-1980s. In those terms, I'd say *Brazil* was as much a documentary as it was a dystopia" (202). Gilliam's film is indeed not a prophecy but is about the world he was living in. Describing his film, Gilliam says "it's a post-Orwellian view of a pre-Orwellian world" (Bennetts). In terms of fashion choices and (retro) futuristic technological gadgets, the film gets inspiration from the 1920s, 30s and 40s, yet the political, social and economic atmosphere of the film reflects the 1980s. In this sense, the film is a cultural product of the 80s in terms of the ideas and values it contains. Yet, it is also strikingly similar to *NEF*. Not coincidentally, the film *Brazil* was scheduled to be released in the year 1984, but disputes[16] about its content caused a delay in the release until 1985. In the following part, a plot summary of the film is provided to be able to make further comparisons between two works.

In the film *Brazil*, the protagonist, Sam Lowry, is a man who works in a mind-numbing low-level government job and lives in a small apartment. Out of loneliness or boredom, Sam constantly daydreams of strange and exotic lands where he, dressed as a knight and soaring through the sky with a pair of angelic wings, falls in love with a girl and

[16] The film *Brazil* was released in Europe with no problems, yet Universal Studios, which was responsible for the US distribution of the film, found *Brazil*'s ending too dark and demanded a re-edit for a Hollywood-style happy ending, to which, the studio claimed, the audience would respond more positively and that the film would be more successful commercially. Gilliam refused to change his film's ending. It was after a long struggle between the director, Terry Gilliam and the Universal Studios that the film was released in the US. The book, *The Battle of Brazil* first published in 1987, captures this struggle between a Hollywood conglomerate and a film director. (Mathews, *The Battle of Brazil*)

heroically fights to save her, his damsel in distress. Sam comes across the girl of his recurring dreams (or at least someone with the same facial features) in reality while informing the family of a man named Buttle that he has been apprehended mistakenly by the State because of a computer error (Tuttle becomes Buttle) and accidentally tortured to death. Sam becomes infatuated with this woman, Jill Layton, despite the fact that she is a complete stranger. Jill, who is actually the upstairs neighbour of the Buttle family, witnesses Buttle's horrifying arrest and tries to help the family find his whereabouts.

As the film progresses, Jill becomes implicated in a terrorist plot by a kind of guilt by association: her attempt to help the bereaved Buttle family somehow implies sympathy for the government's real target, the so-called 'terrorist' Harry Tuttle. Sam, meanwhile, takes a promotion at Information Retrieval in the Ministry of Information for the sole purpose of getting access to more information about Jill. He also encounters Tuttle, a former repairman specializing in ventilation systems, who helps him fix his air conditioner without filing the necessary paperwork.

Because of his suspicious connections to Jill and Tuttle, Sam is also labelled a terrorist by the totalitarian state. He runs away with Jill, even though she insistently tries to literally kick him out of her truck and abandon him since she sees him as a part of the totalitarian bureaucracy that she has to deal with while trying to help the Buttle family. In an attempt to protect Jill, Sam uses his facility with the state computer system to fake Jill's death, which contributes to win Jill's affection. In the end, however, they are caught by the state. Jill is immediately killed, and Sam is arrested and taken to custody to be questioned for his crimes. As Jack Lint, Sam's old friend, is about to torture him, the renegade Tuttle and a group of 'terrorists' come to Sam's aid and help him escape. He meets Jill and they leave the city together to start living in a beautiful green valley, an agrarian utopia. Yet later, it is understood that the whole escape sequence and the 'happy-ending' are only Sam's torture-induced delusions. In reality, Sam is strapped to the torture chair and contained by the dystopian system, and Jill is dead. Sam remains in the chair with a happy smile on his face humming the song "Brazil", which the film takes its name from.

In this chapter, in the framework of cultural materialism, *Brazil* is analysed as a product of dystopian imagination affected by *NEF* by looking at different aspects of life in *Brazil*'s totalitarian society while discussing how the contemporary conditions of the writer and director's lifetime, encompassing roughly the period from the publication of *NEF* until the 1980s, had an impact on the content of the film. The major aim of this chapter is to discuss both the common and divergent points between *NEF* and *Brazil* in the conception of dystopia affected by their times of production and cultural context. Hence, the analysis of the work, *Brazil*, is carried out in relation to *NEF*. By using the basic premise of cultural materialism, asserting that the physical, material, and economic conditions a society is built upon affects its social institutions, relations, values, beliefs, and most importantly their literary and artistic productions, this chapter examines how the changing conditions from the time of Orwell to the time of Gilliam affected the conceptions of dystopia in *Brazil.*

What is attempted here is not a film analysis in terms of cinematography and technicalities. Rather, *Brazil* is read as a literary text on screen. For the sake of textual analysis, technical aspects of the film are deliberately ignored. Within this chapter, the comparative analysis is carried out within the following order: Synoptic comparison, comparisons in terms of geographical and temporal location, bureaucracy and propaganda, terrorism, consumerism, technology, individuality, female characters and lastly dreams.

Before moving on to the in-depth comparisons in terms of the points mentioned above, it is worth making a synoptic comparison between *NEF* and *Brazil.* Both works have male protagonists, Winston and Sam, who work in the ministry of information of their own state. Thus, they are parts of the governmental system and neither of them are satisfied with being a part of the system they are in. They are both cogs in a totalitarian system, and try to escape from it or resist it in their own ways. Both characters dream about different places and have love interests, Julia and Jill respectively, with whom they associate political rebellion and sexual independence.

Winston and Sam both live in un-futuristic worlds where lifts are out of order, plumbing systems are faulty, technology (expect for surveillance and war technologies) is archaic,

and clothes are either monotonous or literally uniform. In both worlds, they use pneumatic delivery systems to get rid of unwanted information. Propagandistic government slogans are everywhere both in *NEF* and *Brazil*. A totalitarian government based upon surveillance, spying, arrests and torture exists in them. Most importantly, both works involve some kind of resistance towards these totalitarian systems. On top of these common themes, however, *Brazil* raises more points into discussion since the 1980s, the years the work was in production, brought new phenomena such as the invasion of advanced technology into everyday life (i.e. the dawn of the information age), Thatcherism, IRA bombings, privatization, the expansion of markets and, thus consumerism. Peter Marks astutely summarizes the themes of the film as such "the pathology of bureaucracy, the emptiness of consumerism, the absurdities of technology, narcissism … the manipulation of language, the violence, … the institutional crushing of imagination, the compensations and dangers of escapism" (84), some of which are also portrayed in *NEF*. In the following paragraphs, a more detailed analysis to explore these themes is made between two works in the above-mentioned headings.

There are parallels as well as divergences between *NEF* and *Brazil* in terms of temporal and geographical location. Timewise, both works are set in the twentieth century. While Orwell sets his novel in the future in the specific year 1984, the details of life he provides in the novel for this future date are not that different from what in fact happened and what he himself experienced in 1948, the year when he was writing the novel. Orwell inverts the numbers, yet time seems to have stopped in 1948 in *NEF*. As was previously analysed in the first chapter, in the novel the technology of the year 1984 - except for the surveillance and military technology- is quite old-fashioned and not as advanced as one might expect and there is no substantial improvement in terms of improving the economic and social conditions. Thus, readers' high expectations of a futuristic utopia or dystopia are not in fact met. This is intentionally carried out by Orwell since he wants to convince the reader that a totalitarian regime would not strive to improve people's standards of living through technological, economic, or social improvement but would only use any kind of innovative and futuristic invention to pursue power and domination for their own sake. A very similar thing occurs in *Brazil*: The country of *Brazil* also features an abundance of 'advanced' technology, none of which actually serves to help its citizens. Unlike Orwell, Gilliam, seemingly intentionally, locates his film in an indeterminate time. *Brazil* takes place "sometime in

the 20th century" (*Brazil* 00:00:44). *Brazil* has an ambiguity in terms of temporal reference. While it looks futuristic in many senses, it has a touch of the past as well since the film combines 1930s' and 40s' film noir fashion choice, retro-looking technology and art deco architecture with 1980s' computer technology and consumerism. As mentioned above by Gilliam himself, *Brazil* is "a pre-Orwellian world with post-Orwellian views" (Bennetts).

As for locational reference, Orwell's *NEF* is set in the London of the future, which is in fact quite similar to the London of his time. Gilliam, once again, does not specify any exact place for his film. He comments that the place in *Brazil* could be a representation of anywhere "on the Los Angeles/Belfast border" in the twentieth century (Christie and Gilliam 129). In one of his interviews with the British Film Institute Gilliam states he was "trying to make it in no place at all, neither future nor past, a mixture" ("Terry Gilliam on *Brazil*" 02:05). Gilliam's setting seems to have less of a historical or a locational referent.

The location of *Brazil* has a more fictional and ideological reference. Salman Rushdie notes that it is not the country of Brazil but a popular song referring to a dreamy land that is the fictional reference of *Brazil*'s location (119). The lyrics of the song "Brazil" by Xavier Cugat goes as follows:

Brazil, where hearts were entertaining June
We stood beneath an amber moon
And softly murmured "someday soon"
We kissed and clung together
Then, tomorrow was another day
The morning found me miles away
With still a million things to say
Now, when twilight dims the sky above
Recalling thrills of our love
There's one thing I'm certain of
Return I will to old Brazil
Then, tomorrow was another day
The morning found me miles away
With still a million things to say
Now, when twilight dims the sky above
Recalling thrills of our love
There's one thing that I'm certain of
Return I will to old Brazil ("Lyrics").

In the song "that old Brazil" does not refer to the actual country of Brazil but to an idea: A nostalgic and dreamy place, where worries are remote and "thrills of love" are felt. Yet, this romantic place is distant; it is an unattainable utopian land. Despite the upbeat rhythms of the song, the land of *Brazil* is nothing like the place described in the song. Much like the film itself, the location of the film has an element of irony in the way that the actual *Brazil* provokes a state of terror with its "towering skyscrapers" (Erickson

28), gorilla-faced guards and monolithic buildings, yet the song that keeps playing several times in the film refers to this dreamy utopian place, a place that offers an escape from reality, as Sam, the protagonist of the movie, does frequently. In an interview, Gilliam stated that he came up with the name for *Brazil* while he was looking for shooting locations in Wales. He recalls:

> We were in this steel town on the coast, Port Talbot, a really awful place. The beach was completely covered with iron ore, black and awful, and I was there at sunset, seeing these strange industrial shapes all over the place … All I could see was this guy at sunset, sitting on the beach, fiddling with his radio. He's tuning in the radio and getting this wonderful Latin escapist romantic music that has nothing to do with the world he's in. As it turned out, that's not in the film, but it's still what the film is about. (Bennetts)

The name *Brazil* refers to this idea of escapism, and perhaps to the possibility of dreaming about an alternate world. Gilliam also said he thought of the name "1984½" as a possible name for *Brazil*, which makes a reference to the novel *NEF* and, is an homage to Federico Fellini's 1963 film 8½ (McGabe 112). Much like Fellini's 8½ and *NEF*, critiques of contemporary culture, *Brazil* discusses the themes of dehumanization, alienation and fear caused by modern states, and the desire to escape from all of these.

One way the dehumanizing and alienating effects of the state is felt in *Brazil* is through bureaucracy. While the power of the government is felt and has a visible face incorporated through Big Brother and O' Brien in *NEF*, *Brazil* depicts a faceless bureaucracy. As Erickson comments, "Gilliam's film decenters the State. In contrast to Orwell's dystopia, it is a State without control" (33). It is, nonetheless, no less scary than the State in *NEF* because in Brazil, the oppression of people is carried out through bureaucracy. Explaining how bureaucracy can in fact fuel totalitarianism and tyranny, in her 1970 book *On Violence* Hannah Arendt describes the burden of it as follows:

> The greater the bureaucratization of public life, the greater will be the attraction of violence. In a fully developed bureaucracy there is nobody left with whom one could argue, to whom one could present grievances, on whom the pressures of power could be exerted. Bureaucracy is the form of government in which everybody is deprived of political freedom, of the power to act; for the rule by Nobody is not no-rule, and where all are equally powerless we have a tyranny without a tyrant. (18)

"A tyranny without a tyrant" is what the film in fact describes. In *Brazil* people suffer on a daily basis because of a mindless, faceless bureaucracy. Government officials usually try to relegate their responsibilities, creating errors that in fact affect the lives of ordinary people extensively. The direness of the bureaucracy shows itself when Jill, the female protagonist of the film, tries to help the wife of Buttle, an innocent man who is mistaken for a terrorist and killed, again due to a bureaucratic error. Jill desperately goes to different government offices in order to find the missing Buttle, whose fate has not yet been revealed in the film, only to find apathy. She is constantly transferred to other government offices and eventually ends up with no substantial outcome but only wasting her time.

Another example of how bureaucracy tortures people is exemplified through Harry Tuttle, who was formerly a technician working for Central Services. Tuttle decides to work freelance in order to avoid the endless paperwork and bureaucracy. Describing how restrictive bureaucracy can be, Tuttle remarks, "They've got the whole country sectioned off- you can't make a move without a form" (*Brazil* 00:28:28). The State does not allow anything to happen without its control and knowledge. Being outside of the system and doing freelance engineering work like Tuttle are described as terrorist acts. Because of his evasion, Tuttle is branded a terrorist by the State and has to live as a fugitive, fearful of being caught even though what he is doing is not a threat to anybody other than the ideology of the state. Similar to Tuttle, Sam, in fact, also wants a simpler life free from all the complications of bureaucratic rules. One reason for his earlier refusal to accept his promotion (arranged by Sam's mother[17]) to a high-level position in his job is that he does not have ambitions to be a part of this defective bureaucratic system. Instead, he daydreams of himself as a knight in shining silver armour flying among the clouds and fighting conglomerates and technological monsters to save his maiden, Jill, and to have a happy-ever-after life with her in an idyllic green valley where he is far removed from all the intrusions of the totalitarian bureaucratic rules.

Part of the faceless bureaucracy and the power mechanism in *Brazil* are slogans seen everywhere in the film. The slogans of the government and propaganda allude to *NEF* in many ways. In the office of Kurtzmann, a high-ranking Ministry of Information

[17] The fact that job promotions can be secured through nepotism is another sign of a malfunctioning bureaucratic system in *Brazil*.

official, a sign says, “Suspicion Breeds Confidence” and on another poster in Jack’s, who turns out to be the official torturer of the State, office one notices another slogan: “Who can you trust?”. Other slogans observed throughout the film include the following: “Don’t suspect a friend, report him”, “Trust in haste, regret at leisure” and “Be safe, be suspicious” Similar to *NEF*, an atmosphere of paranoia and lack of trust is felt strongly, and snitching on others is highly encouraged. Despite the fact that *Brazil* does not depict a strong central government that scares people overtly, it does have a system that is based on individualism, selfishness, paranoia. Solidarity between people is effectively prevented through the lack of trust created between them through *Brazil*’s Kafkaesque bureaucracy.

The faceless bureaucracy and control mechanism created by encouraging people to inform on one another bears a striking resemblance to Michel Foucault's Panopticon argument. Foucault borrows this term from Bentham’s Panopticon, which is an architectural prison design and a system that allows the control of inmates by a single watchman without the prisoners being able to understand whether they are being watched or not. A single guard tower stands in the prison courtyard such that all of the prisoners’ activities could be observed by a watchman inside. The prisoners, however, are unable to see whether the watchman is present or absent in the guard tower at any given moment. Since they are not able to understand whether they are under surveillance or not, they are forced to behave themselves and any disobedient behaviour is effectively prevented as such. In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault uses the Panopticon to explain how power and authority function. He explains that “a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power” (201) is created with the help of the Panopticon. The inmates constantly feel like they are being watched without seeing the real person that is watching them. Meanwhile the inmates can also watch each other in the peripheric ring. All this creates the effect of constant surveillance. Since the inmates cannot really see the person who watches them, whoever actually controls the prison becomes unimportant. This way the Panopticon “automatizes and disindividualizes power” (202). Foucault claims that “the Panopticon is a marvellous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power” (202). It is a power apparatus that works automatically and allows the powerholder to stay in control without being exposed. In *Brazil* a similar system automatically functions since everyone is controlled by a computer mechanism

that gives all of them numbers and constrains their actions with all kinds of paperwork. This creates what Foucault calls "permanent visibility" (*Discipline and Punish* 201). A higher figure of power seems missing, yet the system of control runs perfectly. Just like the inmates in Panopticon, in *Brazil* citizens are encouraged not to rely on each other and even to denounce each other. An atmosphere of distrust is thus created, and the functioning of power and authority is guaranteed through a faceless bureaucracy and technological surveillance.

Apart from propagandistic slogans, language itself is also manipulated in *Brazil* in a similar way as in *NEF*. Bureaucratic euphemisms are made as fuzzy as possible to avoid clear expression or simply not to leave a bad taste in the bureaucrats' mouth. As an example, the words used for the death of Buttle, who is killed and tortured due to a technical mistake, are "dormanted, deleted, inoperative, completed"[18] (*Brazil* 00:34:52), none of which have even a passing resemblance to murder or killing. When a killing is state-sanctioned, the words used for it never allude to anything remotely negative. Even the name Information Retrieval, similar to Ministry of Love in *NEF*, is misleading as it is a torture site that has only a very limited means of actually retrieving information. In the wire system of the sympathetic-looking secretary Sam is talking to in Information Retrieval, the viewers can hear a torture victim's screams and cries for help (*Brazil* 01:11:32). The use of misleading language is a tool for hiding 'bad business' in *Brazil*. The fact that Jack the torturer is presented as a family man is also a part this misrepresentation.

Apart from slogans encouraging people to distrust each other, another control/propaganda theme in *Brazil* is the role of children in the system. In contrast to *NEF*, children play both good and bad roles in *Brazil*. They are naturally affected both by the political propaganda and the slogans they see everywhere: In one scene in the film, a game played by the children on the street involves military toys and is about interrogating a make-believe suspect. The existence of a police state in fact is a part of their daily lives, even their games. Similarly, in *NEF* the children play games involving policing each other or catching the 'traitors'. Yet, in *Brazil* children are portrayed in a positive fashion as well. It is Mrs Buttle's daughter who helps Sam follow Jill. It is also

[18] See Appendix 1: vaporized, unperson

Mrs. Buttle's son who attacks the policemen in return for their wrongful arrest of his father. Thus, in *Brazil* childhood innocence is characterized by good intentions, but at the same time as a naivete that can also easily be manipulated by political propaganda. In *NEF*, however, there is more of a cynical approach towards children. Since children are indoctrinated by the political system in Oceania, they act as spies and snitches, even against their own parents. Orwell, by making a reference to Soviet Russia's educational system, where a blind obedience to the state is taught, depicts children as brainwashed tools of the propagandic state. Starting from the Soviet revolution, the Soviet educational system and organizations such as Komosol and Young Pioneers[19] were geared towards educating the youth in line with Party rules ("Komosol").

Another power mechanism that comes into action in the film to make sure all the bureaucratic rules are applied is the police force. The overwhelming visibility of police and the brutal police force is another 1980s' reality reflected in *Brazil.* As a result of economic recession, unemployment, Thatcher's conservative policies and racist tensions, there was an increase in the number of riots across Britain. In the years 1984-5, the most notable strike of British history, namely the Miners' Strikes occurred (Milne). To stop these riots, the police were given additional powers and handled the issues heavy-handedly. In many of the cases, the police acted like a partisan power since Thatcher saw the rioters as "the enemies within" and considered them as 'threats' to her government instead of empathizing with the implications of their real social and economic frustrations (Milne). Rioters were politically marginalized and violent clashes happened between the police and the rioters to protect the Thatcherite state. Price comments *Brazil* also glorifies "the state terror in the name of freedom" (168) and thus privacy and civil rights are denied while a wide range of rights are given to police. In the 1980s, this enhanced power was given to the police and the military to fight with terrorism and riots.

For many, this kind of enhanced power was associated with Thatcher government's confrontational style. McAuley remarks these security concerns and enhanced militarized power were British government's response to the bombings and assassinations in Ireland and Britain: "a series of measures that included juryless

[19] See Appendix 1: Youth League

Diplock courts[20], mass arrests and interrogation techniques used by the British Army against IRA" which were "later ruled inhuman and degrading by the European Court of Human Rights" were taken starting from 1969 (85). Gilliam notes about *Brazil* and the times: "… [T]he arrests were very commonplace in most countries in the other countries in the world. There was very little invented. … This film is really a documentary. These are only things that I have observed" ("Director's Commentary" 05:20). Apart from the IRA bombings and IRA arrests, Gilliam also probably alludes to the Red Brigades in Italy and Baader–Meinhof Group in Germany, which were both far-left organizations active in the 1970s and 80s.

To make sure rules and regulations are properly applied and that there is no opposition, the police force sometimes takes things one step further. In *Brazil* both physical and psychological torture are carried out to eradicate unwanted elements, to make an exemplary case and to diffuse fear. In fact, one of Gilliam's earlier titles for *Brazil*'s original script was "The Ministry of Torture, or *Brazil*, or How I learned to live with the system- so far, By T. Gilliam" (McGabe 112). In the film, both physical and psychological torture, and police violence are just seen as mundane things. When Buttle is arrested accidentally in the beginning of the film, while they are celebrating Christmas, the arresting officers come into the house from the ceiling (like Santa Claus), pack him in a bag so that he cannot see anything around him, and then he is bound by chains. Once they are arrested, there is no humane treatment of citizens. While the family is shocked and devastated by what just happened, the arresting officers simply extend a receipt to Mrs. Buttle: "This is your receipt for your husband … and this is my receipt for your receipt" (*Brazil* 00:06:11). The fate of Mrs Buttle's husband simply becomes a piece of paper among millions of bureaucratic papers. Later, after Mr. Buttle is tortured to death due to a 'bureaucratic error' and Sam has to give Mrs. Buttle a refund check for her husband's accidental death, the following dialogue takes place between them:

> Mrs Buttle: [crying and devasted] "What have you done with his body?"
> Sam: [looking confused and helpless] "I assure you, Mrs. Buttle, the Ministry is very scrupulous about following up and eradicating any error. If

[20] Introduced during the height of The Troubles, Diplock courts were used to sentence members of paramilitary and terrorist organizations without a trial by jury (Bowcott).

> you have any complaints which you'd like to make, I'd be more than happy to send you the appropriate forms. (*Brazil* 00:42:13)

While in this dialogue Sam seems unsympathetic to Mrs Buttle's pain, it is this human moment that triggers Sam's awakening about the corruption of the system. In the eyes of Sam, pain and suffering become concrete through Mrs Buttle. Throughout the film, Sam was somewhat aware of what was going on since there were hints of torture previously in the movie such as the blood stains in Jack's office. Yet, he simply remained indifferent to the reality that surrounds him and to which his job contributes. At the end of the film, because of his involvement with Jill and his 'subversive' actions, Sam finds himself in the torture chair -tortured by his old friend, Jack- as he also became one of the 'terrorists'.

The blurry terms 'terrorism' and 'terrorists' are other prominent themes in the film *Brazil*. These terms do not appear anywhere in *NEF* since the issues of terrorism and terrorist attacks were not a priority in the wake of the Second World War, in which warfare between nations took such a central role. In *NEF*, the State engages in constant war with other states, while in *Brazil*, the State is at war with internal 'terrorists'. Terrorism became part of daily reality in Europe and the UK only in the subsequent decades and especially in the 1980s. In the UK, the Brighton hotel bombing by the IRA (Irish Republican Army), which targeted British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and her cabinet, took place in 1984. During the 1980s, several IRA bombings happened in different places of the UK ("London: past terror attacks"). Similar to the reality of the 1980s, terrorism is a part of life in *Brazil* as well. The film opens with a terrorist bombing scene and throughout the film, many other similar scenes recur. These scenes have an almost absurd aspect to them, since during the explosions people barely react at all, neither panicking nor caring nor helping each other. They act totally unaffected and go on with their lives, focusing on whatever they were doing, and talking about the unimportant details of life. Gilliam, in fact, depicts how usual and casual terrorism becomes in people's lives and how insensitive they become after a while towards these acts of violence. Gilliam mentions in an interview about the IRA bombings and adds ironically:

> I loved the idea that, no matter what goes on, no matter how bad the bombings, no matter how much human carnage there is, people get on with their lives, this was really as a result to IRA bombing in London which we got used to very easily. Life would go on. A bombing would occur, and the next day the restaurants would open and life would go on. People would accuse me of being insensitive, but in that kind of world, the only way you can survive is to cut out great chunks of the awfulness. ("Director's Commentary" 22:10)

As mentioned above, *Brazil* opens with terrorist bombing news and a state official "Mr Helpmann[21]" naming terrorists "a ruthless minority of people" who do not "play the game" right (*Brazil* 00:02:04). He also calls terrorism "bad sportsmanship" as if this was just a football game and the lives involved did not matter. (*Brazil* 00:02:00). The use of sports metaphors demonstrates how careless the State itself is towards death. It is also ironic that through the film, viewers come across advertisements for "Mellowfields" which are "top security holiday camps" that offer "luxury without fear" and "fun without suspicion" and relaxing "in a panic-free environment" (*Brazil* 00:39:04). The fact that consumerism as usual goes on even in these times of terror is emphasized in the film. It is as if *Brazil* alludes to the Second World War slogan: 'Keep Calm and Carry On'[22], yet the slogan better suited for the land of *Brazil* is 'Keep Calm and Go on Shopping'. Price notes "consumerism helps citizens avoid coping with the contradictions posed by the terror war" (177). In the film, consumerism either distracts the attention of the citizens from serious issues or the fear of terror is used aggressively to market new products.

In *Brazil*, terrorism is a highly nebulous concept. It is never exactly stated who the terrorists are or what their purpose is, however, there is 'the idea of terrorists out there threatening the state'. Explaining the idea of terrorism, Gilliam remarks in an interview about the bombing scenes in the film:

> The Ministry didn't know if they were really terrorist out there because over the years, they had so many counter-agents, counter-counter-agents out there, and agent-provocateurs who maybe set up explosions to lure people

[21] Contrary to the meaning of his name, Mr "Helpmann" appears incapable of helping anyone, not even himself as he requires assistance from Sam to use the lavatory.

[22] "Keep Calm and Carry On" is one of the many motivational posters manufactured by the British government shortly before the start of the Second World War in order to boost the morale of the people in Britain, whose lives were threatened by the widely predicted Nazi air-raids ("Keep Calm and Carry on" Imperial War Museums).

> in. The people lost track of whether there were really terrorists or not. The important thing is the belief in terrorists had to be maintained to allow the Ministry to continue to survive. ("Director's Commentary" 01:40:10)

This belief is maintained by constant government provocation and warnings in *Brazil*. The official buildings are filled with slogans such as "Watch that parcel/ Eagle eyes can save a life" making reference to bombing and being fearful. Melton and Sterling note "both terrorism and governmental control work to keep citizens fearful and isolated as seemingly solitary victims of circumstances beyond their comprehension. The director suggests that governments control citizens through bureaucratic numbness and fear" (70). Even if there is no actual terrorist in the film, the idea of terrorism is always there scaring the citizens and making everyone suspect each other. The following dialogue between Sam and Jill is a telling example of how the existence of terrorists itself is a point of controversy:

> Jill: Does not it bother you the sort of things you do at Information Retrieval?
> Sam: What? Would you rather have terrorists?
> Jill: How many terrorists have you met? Actual terrorists?
> Sam: Actual terrorists? Well… it's only my first day. (*Brazil* 01:28:16)

The fact that Sam also gets suspicious of Jill's package, which does not actually contain anything explosive, indicates that the propaganda of terrorism functions rather successfully, destroying the trust between people by putting everyone in a suspect position.

An important theme of the film which limits and controls citizens of *Brazil* in a more subtle but significant way than the faceless bureaucracy and state propaganda is consumerism. The film makes strong criticisms about consumerism. There are many instances where consumerism is humorously ridiculed and criticized. The events in the film take place around Christmas time. Although everyone seems to exchange gifts, the right spirit of caring for each other seems missing in the film. Melton and Sterling notes: "one gets the impression that Christmas is a year-round to opiate to allow the performance of human interaction via exchanging gifts, while everyone remains distant and isolated" (69). Thus, the ceremony of exchanging gifts does not serve its real purpose but turns into a consumerist madness. Rather than being an activity that

connects people, gift-exchange becomes a mandatory activity. One also notices "Consumers for Christ" banners in the public areas, which encourage mindless spending under the name of religious or festival spirit. Price states that "*Brazil*'s world merges religion, state, and consumerism towards a common compose" (178). In another scene when a child in a shopping mall is asked what she wants for Christmas, her response is: "I want 'my own credit card' " (*Brazil* 00:55:50). Having the power to consume is a part of even a child's mundane wishes. Interestingly enough, Buttle family seems to be spending Christmas quite differently. Just before Mr Buttle was violently arrested, the viewers see a peaceful atmosphere where Mrs Buttle is reading *A Christmas Carol* by Charles Dickens to her children. No one in the house is watching TV. They look very happy in their little microcosm, not affected by the mandatory consumerist spirit of Christmas. It is also a noteworthy coincidence that the time of *Brazil'*s original release date was Christmas of 1984 (McCabe 113), which proves Gilliam's intention for criticising the consumerist culture of the 1980s.

In the film, the demand for consumerism reveals itself in the demand for looking young and beautiful as well. Throughout the film, Sam's mother is going through several cosmetic surgery operations to get younger and younger. One of his mother's friends, Mrs Terrain, is also going through these operations for the same purpose, yet her operations turn out to have disastrous results, which their doctor calls "complications of the complications" (*Brazil* 00:55:44). These operations represent the ridiculous demand for perpetually looking good and young, which is a demand created by advertising and marketing.

Capitalist consumer culture uses advertising and marketing to create desires and demands. The desire for being young or dressing in a certain way to prove your status is a fabricated desire for Sam's mother and her friends. A child wanting to have her own credit card or one's wish to keep a high credit score are about the standards the society and the consumer culture stipulate for people. These desires manufactured by consumer culture lead to false needs. In *One Dimensional Man*, while discussing consumerism, Marcuse divides human needs into two: "true needs" and "false needs" and he claims "most of the prevailing needs to relax, to have fun, to behave and consume in

accordance with the advertisements, to love and hate what others love and hate" are products of a society and determined by consumer culture (Marcuse 5).

"Pretensions of high-end restaurants" (McAuley 43), extreme and ostentatious fashion choices and make up of Sam's mother and her friends also represent the absurdity of consumerism and capitalist culture. Where this absurdity is taken to extreme is the scene when Sam is being tortured: The torturer says "Confess, son. Quickly! You hold out too long, you'll jeopardize your credit rating!" (*Brazil* 01:54:49). In *Brazil*, having a high credit rating seems to prove to be a higher status citizen. In this regard Buttle family again seems as an outsider since Mrs Buttle does not have a bank account, which her refund check for the accidental death of her husband in the hands of the government can be sent to through pneumonic tubes. Mandatory and spiritless gift exchanges, the demand for perpetually looking young and beautiful, and having a high credit rating are just some of the coercions of the consumerist culture. In this respect, the film perfectly catches the zeitgeist of the 1980s Britain.

The 1980s in Britain was when the consumer culture was taken to its extremes. Expanding markets, privatization, and the free market politics of Margaret Thatcher changed the spending habits of British people, raising the spending power of the richer class while making working class people poorer. According to statistics, "the richest families – the top 10% – did far better, with their incomes increasing from the equivalent of £472.98 in 1979 to £694.83 in 1990" (Ball). This new class that had by far the highest spending power compared to their predecessors developed a new lifestyle and new spending habits. A new spending class appeared: The cult of yuppies who are overly ambitious young urban professionals working in sectors such as banking and finance, and living affluently and spending extravagantly. To answers their demands, new consumer products were put into markets. New fads with electronic gadgets and fitness caught on. While this class was expanding, the working class of Britain had problems.

In fact, the policies of the Thatcher era changed the definition of the working class. Coal-mining and manufacturing jobs disappeared. This created a rise in the unemployment rates, especially in northern England and Wales. While the

unemployment rate was 5.3% in 1979, in 1984 it rose to 11.9% (Ball). As Glynn and Booth note, "… the 1980s have witnessed changes which have led some doubt whether a working class still exists" (179). With the loss of employment in industrial sectors and the rise of administrative and service jobs, the demand for more skilled workers increased in the 80s. "The severe decline of male, full time employment accelerated, particularly in the highly unionized sectors of industry" (Glynn and Booth 179). This caused what is called as "managerial revolution": "an enormous expansion of the service class (males employed in administrative, professional and managerial occupations" (Glynn and Booth 177). With the loss of working class, and the rise of a managerial class, the social and economic dynamic changed in the society of the 1980s.

Along with these economic changes, another reality of the 1980s was the invasion of technology in people's lives, and its effects on human relationships. The relationship between humans and technology also plays a major role in both *Brazil* and *NEF*. As mentioned in the previous chapter, in *NEF* technology is not very advanced except for the technologies of surveillance and warfare. In contrast, technology is abundant in *Brazil*: The film starts with a television screen, and one encounters many TV screens in the following scenes. Similarly, Sam's apartment is full of whimsical automated devices and gadgets. These are, however, quaint-looking and usually malfunctioning devices. *Brazil* is "a place where over-engineered phones and computers are difficult to use and often don't work properly, where machines for living introduce unexpected inconveniences, and intrusive ducts deliver shoddy services and goods" (McAuley 27). The computers in the Ministry of Information make deadly errors leading to tragic consequences. Throughout the film, similar to *NEF*, elevators often malfunction. Erickson remarks "the helplessness of humans confronted by machines is epitomized in the scene where Sam, in the glass-encased elevator, sees, below him in the lobby, Jill Layton [the girl he falls in love with], whom he has sought vainly" (28). Erickson also claims malfunctioning elevators and the unpredictability of technology in general are signs of instability in the totalizing system in *Brazil*. That the technology malfunctions most of the time shows that the system does not actually provide what it had initially promised. The promise of advanced technology that is supposed to ease people's lives is in fact a farce. The helplessness of humans against the incompetence of these technological devices becomes most obvious when the air-conditioning unit in Sam's apartment breaks down. This breakdown causes him many problems, and the solution

becomes even more difficult because of the bureaucracy and paperwork involved to get it fixed. The underground hero, Tuttle, who is moonlighting as a freelance technical worker, turns out to be the only person who manages to fix the problem with aptitude.

Another effect of the invasion of technology is the effect it has on people's relationships. Along with the bureaucracy, technology not only makes people's lives miserable by breaking down or creating deadly errors, it also distances people from each other cutting the human connection. Similar to the machines around them, people turn into automatons themselves. Melton and Sterling remark "the dehumanising effect of this reliance upon machines is most evident in the absence of altruism or even basic caring for others" (69). Since people depend on technology for everything, do everything with technology, turn everything to numbers and forms on a computer, they start lacking face-to-face human connection and compassion. Regarding this, Gilliam notes this is the "price to pay for all of these Central Services, for the world we have … By taking part in that process, the price you pay is a more complicated society, and one you're dependent on" (Gleiberman 32). Technology becomes indispensable to run things in the meantime destroying human connection and self-identity.

Individualism is a common theme handled both in *Brazil* and *NEF*. Similar to NEF, the bureaucratic system in *Brazil* controls the actions of everybody, making people feel insignificant in various ways. In *Brazil*, unlike *NEF*, people do not have uniforms, yet everyone who works in the Ministry of Information dresses similarly (all in grey suits). Everyone receives a number: Sam is the Information Retrieval Officer DZ-105. All workers in the Information Retrieval where Sam also works have to fit in small cubicles, similar to prison cells, which separate him from other workers. Sam also has to share his table in the cubicle with his adjacent office and constantly gets into petty arguments just to get more space on the desk, shared through an absurd cut-out in the wall separating the offices. An atmosphere of competition between individuals is thus created. Through this system of separation, numbering, and sequestering, people become nameless and insignificant. Bureaucracy does not see humans as individuals but as clusters of information in official forms and in these forms, officials sometimes make deadly errors causing the accidental death of an innocent man. Torture is carried out when considered to be necessary. Even the visual image of the torture chamber, the

huge dome shaped structure where Sam is taken to, emphasizes how small and insignificant an individual is against the system. The only way individualism is understood in *Brazil* is as self-advancement and personal wellbeing, which creates a system where people merely care about personal gains, and only the people who are at the higher levels of the system take advantage.

In parallel to consumerism and the invasion of technology in private lives, the themes of lack of trust between individuals and seeking only self-advancement fit perfectly well into the zeitgeist of the 1980s, when individualism, self-advancement, and personal gains and well-being, rather than a feeling of community and solidarity, are encouraged. The existence of a state that has obligations towards its people is rejected while privatization and the rise of free market economic policies decrease the role of the state even in pivotal sectors such as healthcare and education. The famous quotation from Margaret Thatcher perhaps best sums up the spirit of the times reflected also in *Brazil*: "And, you know, there's no such thing as society. There are individual men and women and there are families" ("Margaret Thatcher: a life in quotes"). Thatcher herself focused on the individual spirit and the desire of the individual to do better for herself/himself. Yet, the implications of such kind of a policy diminishes collective culture and unity between individuals. While Thatcher's individualistic policies were meant to raise individual responsibility, they also encourage competition between individuals and undermine solidarity between people. Gilliam makes a criticism of this kind of attitude in *Brazil.*

As opposed to the individualism observed throughout the film in the behaviour of government officials, one can witness solidarity and human compassion in the actions of Tuttle and Jill. Throughout the film, it is Tuttle and Jill who care for others rather than only being interested in their own self-advancement and well-being. Jill tirelessly tries to find the missing husband of Mrs Buttle. Regarding Jill's behaviour Fred Glass remarks that "Jill sees through the machinations of the state bureaucracy and the myriad ideological systems it utilizes because she cares about human beings and her empathy puts her into direct conflict with the worldview and practices of nearly everyone around her" (27). Jill does not understand individualism as something that contradicts with caring for others. Rather, as a compassionate human being, she is an individual that

actively makes a choice to go beyond a system that imposes the idea of individualism as not caring for others. This, in fact, makes her a true individual who can make her own choices independent of the system. Melton and Sterling note "Layton's altruism and willingness to challenge the bureaucratic hegemony renders her dangerously human, for it manifests her desire to make her own decisions; her choices give her a true individual identity, which makes her a subversive force. The moral point, though, is that her individuality exists in context with others" (72). Jill's making a consciously moral choice about caring for others puts her in a dangerous position in the eye of the state. She is labelled as an outsider and a 'terrorist' due to her complaining about the bureaucracy and exhibiting altruism.

Another character that shows anti-establishment behaviour and altruism is Tuttle. Tuttle is among the "people who make things work" (Gleiberman 32). He refuses to sit idly or go through a myriad of paperwork to be able to repair a broken pipe. While describing his motive for working, Tuttle says "I come into this game for the action" (*Brazil* 00:30:21). All Tuttle wants is to be able to do quality work without the intervention of tireless bureaucratic procedures. By simply doing quality work, Tuttle helps others and does not expect any form of compensation in return. Tuttle helps Sam fix the air-conditioning unit in his apartment. When Sam responds to him thankfully in return, Tuttle says "Son, we're all in this together" emphasizing that the system crushes all of them in the same way and that they need to show comradeship and solidarity to fight against it (*Brazil* 00:32:29). These acts of solidarity are, however, seen as deviant and subversive behaviour since the usual norm in society in *Brazil* is to not care about others. Gilliam here makes a commentary about the society in the 80s. As elsewhere, Britain in the 1980s was marked by individualism. The idea of the freedom of the individual and their material well-being went hand in hand. The feeling of community, compassion for the poor and the needy, and equality were not among the principal values the Conservative Party went after. The moral shift was towards 'greed is good'. This was not all because of the conscious policies of Margaret Thatcher, but also a result of economic and political change in the world. With the collapse of Soviet ideology, free market economy, privatization, and consumer empowerment were on the rise. All these ideas went along with individualism.

Jill and Julia, the central love interests and representatives of female characters in their respective texts, bear some striking points of comparison and contrast that help illuminate the changing social conditions in which the texts were produced. As mentioned earlier, both protagonists have love interests, with whom they associate political rebellion and sexual independence. Both characters fall in love and ultimately, this leads to their redemption/downfall, depending on how one interprets the ending of the works. This being the common point between the novel and the film, the love interest of Winston and Sam in fact have quite different characteristic features. While Julia is a rebel in terms of sexuality and lacks the intellectual depth Winston has, Jill is a more empowered woman. In real life, she is actually very different from the woman in Sam's dreams, who is a beautiful but helpless woman kept in captivity waiting for her saviour. Yet, the real Jill is nothing like that. She is not fragile at all. She drives a lorry and she is a self-sufficient and empowered character. One powerful aspect of Jill, as mentioned in detail above, is her compassionate nature.

Apart from compassion, though, one can observe her anti-establishment nature even in the beginning of the film. Just before the scene when Mr Buttle is brutally arrested, viewers notice Jill watching the film *the Cocoanuts*[23] (1929) by the Marx Brothers. She appreciates anarchic humour and it is a coincidence that she was watching the Marx Brothers just before the arrest of Buttle by the fully equipped government soldiers. The films of the Marx Brothers are associated with carnivalesque humour and satire on social practices and institutions and hierarchies (Gardner 112). The fact that Jill is watching their film demonstrates her resistance towards bureaucracy and power structures. Not surprisingly, Jill is a loner. Because of her anti-authoritarian nature, she has to be one since she cannot associate herself with the values that the society she lives in provides for her. Despite being a loner, Jill does not isolate herself from real human connection. When necessary, she is not a passive bystander or a dreamer like Sam. She acts against injustice. She tries to save the Buttle family since she cannot tolerate the idea of an innocent man being indicted, or simply because she cares for her neighbours. Similarly, after the terrorist attacks while everyone around simply watches what is happening, she helps the people who are affected and even urges Sam to help others: "Make yourself useful" (*Brazil* 01:33:23). Jill also does not immediately fall in love

[23] "*The Cocoanuts* is a satirical comment on the avarice and chicanery of fraudulent real estate transactions." (Gardner 52)

with Sam. In the beginning, since she associates him with the government and the bureaucratic system that she hates, she actually finds him repulsive, and only stops trying to kick him out of her van when she worries she may have seriously injured him. Sam's pathetic perseverance, along with his gradually maturing attitude, eventually wins Jill over. When Sam stops being passive, complacent and selfish and starts acting against the status quo, Jill starts to like him. McAuley remarks, rather than representing passionate love, Jill represents the good in the system: What Sam looks for in his dreams is not his dream girl but "something good in the world, something good in himself" (58).

At first glance, it may seem that Jill is a more resistant, more rebellious and stronger character than Julia from *NEF*, who appears to be a rebel in disguise. This different depiction of characters cannot entirely be attributed to the authors' differing perceptions of female characters but also to the characters' circumstances. Jill is, after all, not a ministry worker: She is perhaps a member of what Orwell would call the proles of *Brazil* and as such is left relatively untouched by the state surveillance apparatus until she is designated a terrorist. Julia's activities, on the other hand, are closely circumscribed by the state, and even her seemingly insignificant acts of rebellion put her at great personal risk and necessitate her exaggerated participation in state-mandated functions, such as the Two Minutes Hate or Anti-Sex League, to avoid suspicion. Julia's passivity and preoccupation with pleasure is, then, largely a matter of survival.

One of the most important themes in the film *Brazil* is the blurring of reality into fantasy: "Indeed, *Brazil*'s protagonist is a Winston Smith with Kafkaesque[24] day and night dreams," remarks Gray (147). Unlike Winston Smith, though, the male protagonist of *Brazil*, Sam, does not initially dream of the overthrow of the State but his own escape through his juvenile dreams and fantasies. In contrast, even from the beginning, Winston's dreams have more of a political character. Winston dreams of O'Brien, or someone with whose voice he associates O'Brien, and this voice provides him with an escape: "We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness" (*NEF* 13).

[24] Sam's dreams are Kafkaesque since, similar to Josef K. in *The Trial*, he fights against some obscure bureaucratic monsters. Another Kafkaesque point in *Brazil* is the bureucratic error made regarding Tuttle/Buttle and thus, Mr Buttle's wrongful arrest. The randomness and preposterousness of this error echoes Josef K.'s wrongful trial.

In a sense, Winston dreams of some kind of a saviour embodied by O'Brien, to whom he shows respect for his intelligence and thinks that he is "on his side" (*NEF* 46). Winston also dreams about a utopian place, which he calls "the Golden Country"[25], where "the slanting rays of the sun gilds the ground" and "elm trees are swaying very faintly in the breeze" (*NEF* 17). This dream is probably related to Winston's current landscape, which offers him no colour but dust, smoke and concrete. Another dream Winston has seems to have more of a sexual tinge, yet it is also political. He dreams of a dark-haired woman tearing off her clothes, throwing them aside and running naked in the Golden Country. Admiring this gesture, Winston thinks "the grace and carelessness" of this act seem "to annihilate a whole culture, a whole system of thought, as though Big Brother and the Party and the Thought Police could all be swept into nothingness by a single splendid movement of the arm" (*NEF* 17). What excites Winston is not the sexuality of the girl but her defiance.

It can be claimed that Sam does not share the same conscious awareness of the world he inhabits with Winston, and his rebellion is more of an escapist kind. One might also claim that Sam appears too weak or too selfish to be as noble as Winston. Describing his character, Gilliam acknowledges:

> [h]e's[Sam] the guilty party. He is the system. He is what goes on. He's been living in this little sheltered world. … He's got all the privileges through his father and other's connections. He's bright so he should be taking responsibility. He lives in his little fantasy world. (McGabe 126)

Contrary to his moral responsibility and privileged social status, Sam does not fight against the system. Sam is the modern man who feels himself to be very small against the giant machinery he finds himself in. He is the "cog in the machine that just keeps the machine going" (McGabe 126). Yet, it is exactly his "sheltered world" that causes Winston to have immature and fairytale-like dreams in the beginning. It is unfair to claim that Sam only thinks of his own advantage, and that is the reason why he escapes into the realm of dreams. Once Sam begins to see Jill's world and opens his eyes to the pains of Mrs Buttle, his dreams also evolve into a more rebellious and political kind. In one of his final fantasies, he blows the Ministry of Information up. Comparing Winston

[25] See Appendix 1: The Golden Country

and Sam, Gray states "though the noblest human of his time, Winston loses his ultimate freedom – his ability to dream" (148). While Winston ultimately accepts the power of Big Brother, Sam again escapes to his dreamland and bears the torture at the end of the film by transcending into his dreams of an alternate world. The following dialogue between Jack, the torturer, and Mr Helpmann is striking:

> Mr Helpmann: He's gotten away from us, Jack.
> Jack: I am afraid you're right, Mr Helpmann. He's gone. (*Brazil* 02:07:40)

About the ending of *Brazil*, Gilliam remarks, "'To me that's an optimistic ending. Lowry's imagination is still free and alive; they haven't got that. They may have his body, but they don't have his mind" (Bennetts). Sam indeed is not both physically and psychologically contained as Winston, and the ending makes a point about the power of dreaming about other possibilities for a more humane life.

According to Melton and Sterling, Sam's dreams can be regarded as "self-defeating in that they appease his pysche's need for escape while doing nothing to challenge the complacency of his waking self" (68). In a sense, romantic dreams keep Sam passive by opiating and keeping him under control. One of the slogans of the state viewed throughout the film is "they work so we may dream". The state wants its citizens to dream as long as their subversive dreams are not put into practice. Sam's "state-sanctioned dreaming" (Melton and Sterling 69) does not get him anywhere, yet when his dreams and his real life start mixing, he begins to take a more active role in the world that he inhabits. His dreams ultimately lead him to his 'salvation'. When he finds out that the woman in his fantasies does really exist, he starts feeling more human and thus more vulnerable. It is exactly when he starts loving Jill and getting into her world that he realizes that the system is defective, and he begins to have self-awareness, feel guilt and responsibility, and thus matures in character. In an interview with Salman Rushdie, the director notes, "To me, the heart of *Brazil* is responsibility, is involvement—you can't just let the world go on doing what it's doing without getting involved" (Rushdie "An Interview"). After Sam falls in love with the real Julia, not only his character matures but also his dreams begin to change. In one of his later dreams, in a fighting scene where Sam is struggling with technological monsters dressed in full metal, he accidentally reveals the monster's face, and it turns out that the monster is

none other than Sam himself. (*Brazil* 01:36:27). This dream can be interpreted as Sam's realization that he is a part of the system that he started to despise. Sam's realization is another sign of his maturity.

Yet, it is his final utopian dream that reflects his maturity the most. It is no longer a fairy tale type of dream. Sam no longer tries to save his damsel in distress. He realises that Jill is not the passive, powerless woman from his previous dreams. She is actually "active, capable and thoughtful" (Glass 24). Her humanity and subversion are reflected upon Sam. His last dream is not just about aspiring to be with the person he loves, but the dream offers the possibility of an alternative world: a negation of his dystopian reality. Melton and Sterling comment that "his [Sam Lowry's] dream vision implies the removal of oppression for all. … Lowry's final dream concludes with a pastoral vision of shared experience and is in no way a continuation of heroic flights of fancy definitive of his early dreams" (75). It is indeed a utopian ideal: A quiet, peaceful life in an agrarian green valley[26], where people do not need to cope with the totalitarian bureaucracy, incumbent and invasive technology, consumer madness and anything that comes along with modern industrial society. The dream is "a flash of awareness that an alternate world can be imagined" (Melton and Sterling 76). Sam's last dream challenges the viewer: 'Dare to dream of an alternate world'

What the viewers witness in *Brazil* is not exactly a power-hungry ideology, as in Orwell's *NEF*, but an uncontrolled capitalist consumer system running amok. In that sense, *Brazil* is more relevant to our contemporary situation in the twenty-first century that is overrun by technology, consumerism and capitalism rather than merely blatant totalitarian ideologies. As a work of dystopian imagination, *Brazil* gives an ironic commentary about the times it was produced in, while, at the same time, warning the viewers to take up responsibility to change things and, most importantly, it urges the viewers to dream of an alternative world. Thus, the work is a mix of pessimism and optimism. Gilliam states:

[26]Raymond Williams notes "the idea of rural community … is in some respects alternative or oppositional to urban industrial capitalism, though for the most part it is incorporated, as idealization or fantasy, or as an exotic leisure function of the dominant order itself" (*Marxism and Literature* 122). Thus, Sam's last fantasy can be recognized as the rejection of his life in the capitalist bureucratic society of *Brazil*.

> The terrible fact is that I'm terribly optimistic about things. I have a theory about *Brazil* in that it was a very difficult film for a pessimist to watch but it was okay for an optimist to watch it. For a pessimist it just confirms his worst fears; an optimist could somehow find a grain of hope in the ending. Cynicism bothers me because cynicism is in a way an admission of defeat, whereas skepticism is fairly healthy, and also it implies that there is the possibility of change. (Morgan)

It can be claimed *Brazil* ends on a more optimistic note compared to *NEF*. This is again the circumstances of the producers on the works. Writing in the aftermath of the World Wars, when totalitarian nightmares were all too real, Orwell understandably had a more pessimistic outlook for the future of Britain and the world in general. Gilliam, however, is from a different age which is marked by consumerism, bureaucracy and the invasion of technology. Yet, both works have similar outcomes: they illustrate dire circumstances and warn us to take action.

CONCLUSION

When explaining the complexity of culture, Raymond Williams uses the terms "dominant", residual[27] and emergent" (*Marxism and Literature* 121). These terms explain the dynamic relationship between different elements of culture. While the "dominant" is the powerful shaping force of a society, "emergent" refers to "new relationships and kinds of relationship" that "are continually being created" (Williams 123). For Williams, the quality of the "emergent" is not just about the novelty of these relationships but about their "substantially alternative or oppositional" character (123). Looking at the emergent elements of a culture enables the possibility of understanding things happening "outside or against the dominant mode" (Williams 125) and seeing the full range of human practice. In an authentic cultural materialist analysis of a literary text, as also suggested by Williams himself, all these elements of culture should be taken into consideration in order to fully explore and grasp the text in question.

Dystopias, by their nature, display the dominant elements of a culture, if in an exaggerated or distorted manner. Their criticism of these dominant forms also implies the possibility of alternatives or opposition. In this sense, the attempts made by dystopias can be considered a part of what Williams called "emergent" elements of a culture. What is "emergent" in dystopias arises from the desires of their writers' of critically contemplating upon the world they inhabit and urging the readers to think about the available alternatives or simply providing some warning about the direction their society is moving in. By providing the reader with familiar details, yet intentionally setting their works in unspecified times or locations in the future, the authors of utopian/dystopian works gain some safe space in which they can criticize and satirize the "dominant" circumstances they find themselves in. It is indeed primarily their current state which they meditate on, and which inspires them to create their utopian/dystopian worlds. As this thesis also aims to point out, both Orwell and Gilliam's works carry many familiar settings and details for their respective contemporaries. Both Orwell and Gilliam's objectives are to criticise the deficiencies

[27] "Residual" refers to the elements of a culture belonging to its past yet "their place in the contemporary cultural process is profoundly variable" (Williams *Marxism and Literature* 122). Along with dominant and emergent elements, residual elements can still be effective in shaping culture. In this study residual elements are not given prominence, since the works in question are set in the future and do not include many elements of the past.

and flaws of their contemporary societies, while subtly implying that other human social structures are possible, even if they are not necessarily perfect ones.

It is the failed aspiration to utopia exemplified by the Nazi State and the Soviet Union, and their totalitarian uniformist ideologies that drove them along, which were the main source of material for Orwell while writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell points out in his novel that the utopias that these ideologies offered to humankind were in fact dystopias for many others. The lack of individualism and individual expression, manipulation of science and technology for political propaganda, and ultimate destruction of what it means to be human mark the twentieth century and thus Orwell's vision in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. It is also Orwell's first-hand experiences of witnessing the war and post-war conditions in England, observing the life of the English poor and working class, and fighting in the Spanish Civil War that helped shape his novel.

Adapting the totalitarian fascism of continental Europe and Soviet Communism onto an English setting in the not-too-distant future was intended by Orwell not as a premonition, but as a warning. He stresses that it reflects "the direction in which the world is going at the present time" and that it envisions problems that are "deep in the political, social, and economic foundations of the contemporary world situation" ("Orwell's Statement on *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" 134). Though a supporter of British Labour and of socialism more broadly, Orwell also approached them critically as they represented the dominant social and economic form of his time. Be it the fully planned economy of the Soviet Union, the brutality of the National Socialist war machine, or American style capitalism, a planned industrial economy of some form was the clear mode of production for the foreseeable future at the time of the novel's publication. Orwell's narrative, which stresses the importance of the interior life of the individual in such systems, is thus an attempt to create an emergent, oppositional cultural form.

What Orwell failed to anticipate was the degree to which not only planned economies, but indeed leftist politics of any kind, would themselves become oppositional in the latter half of the twentieth century. The death of Stalin, the seemingly miraculous post-war economic growth of Western Europe and the United States (each becoming increasingly *laissez faire* as their wealth grew), the stagnation of the Soviet economy,

the triumph of neo-conservative democracies, the era of *Glasnost* and the fall of the Soviet Union itself all rendered the possibility of the recurrence of a *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* style totalitarian government extremely unlikely. That the novel continues to resonate so powerfully is at least partly a sign of its incorporation by the dominant cultural form. According to Williams, the distinction between the aforementioned dominant, residual, and emergent forms is not a static one, but rather is "constantly repeated, an always renewable move beyond a phase of practical incorporation" (*Marxism and Literature* 124). The dominant cultural form may incorporate emergent or alternative forms, the recognition of which is "usually made much more difficult by the fact that much incorporation looks like recognition, acknowledgement, and thus a form of *acceptance*" (Williams *Marxism and Literature* 125).

In the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell's opposition to a 'totalitarian outlook' is interpreted as condemnation of any kind of state control or intervention. Read in the context of the late twentieth century, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is interpreted as an ode to the individual, and a demonstration of just how slippery the slope from socialism to a nightmare society of total government control can be. Despite his protests and insistence that his "recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which [he is] a supporter) but as a show up of the perversions of which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realized in Communism and Fascism", the novel quickly received a warm welcome from anti-communist conservatives (Orwell qtd in Beadle 4). In spite of the attempts of the "dominant" cultural form to incorporate *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to serve its discourse, the novel goes beyond this simplistic interpretation. It can be interpreted in relation to modern-day manipulation of political language, reduced welfare, control of masses through rubbishy entertainment, and military aggression and spending.

For Gilliam, some of these issues that Orwell dealt with in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were also prevalent since the world had not still yet fully recovered from the conflicts brought on by the Second World War – still going on in the form of the Cold War, the Korean War, the Vietnam War– and the issue of the individual's place in a world full of surveillance technology and state control was still relevant. Yet Gilliam's vision is also coloured by the current issues of his time and his slightly optimistic vision for the

possibility of change. Coming of age in the 1960s counterculture, Gilliam was exposed to both the brutality and repression of which Democratic state was capable, as well as a new flourishing of utopian thought, influenced by the publication of Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* and including not only the hippie and environmentalist movements but also popular utopian novels such as Ursula K. Leguin's *The Dispossessed* (1974) (Jameson 160).

Yet, Gilliam also lived to see the dissolution of these movements and the complacency of the consumer culture of the 1980s. It is in this context that he attempts to adapt the framework of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to his own emergent cultural forms. Gilliam's State and its bureaucracy is less frightening than Orwell's. It has no Big Brother but perhaps many little big brothers in a sense. With the end of grand ideological narratives, a different though perhaps more sinister picture is at hand in Gilliam's work.

It is not a coincidence that *Brazil* was produced when communism was on the decline and the ideological struggle between communism and capitalism was on its last legs, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union within six years' time from the date of *Brazil*'s production. In 1989, shortly before the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Francis Fukuyama claimed in his essay "End of History?"

> What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of postwar history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government. (1)

Fukuyama's hope in this essay was that the age of the end of the grand-narratives, the end of humanity, the end of society and ultimately "the end of history" would bring the rule of free-market based liberal democracy as "the final form of human government" ("End of History?" 1). Fukuyama's claim fits perfectly to the zeitgeist of the 80s, when liberal democracy, globalisation and the capitalist economy appeared to be unquestionable norms. In a similar vein, Slavoj Zizek notes that "today's power no longer needs a consistent ideological edifice to legitimize its rule, it can afford to state directly the obvious truth – search for profits, brutal imposition of economic interests" (Preface iv). Going after only one's own benefits and the 'greed is good' mentality of

the post-ideological world is at the heart of *Brazil*. Selfishness, cynicism and lack of trust are the natural symptoms of the 'Brazilians'.

Gilliam, who produced *Brazil* around the same time as these essays were written, is clearly sceptical of a capitalist, market-driven society being the end of ideology. It was not exactly his prophetic vision but his documentary-style dystopia that makes his film relevant to the times. Gilliam looks at issues not from the side of the "dominant" narratives but rather from the "emergent" narratives of his time. All these issues that Gilliam takes up in *Brazil* derive from his experiences of the world in which he lived. Thus, the work is scarcely produced in a vacuum. The broken promises of 'advanced' technology, consumerism-gone-mad, and the terrorism surrounding people were all realities for those who had eyes to see them. Although the constant surveillance of citizens and a crushing bureaucracy remain in *Brazil*, Gilliam demonstrates that the system is faulty, makes mistakes and has its own flaws. It is not solely this system that keeps citizens in line, but their own failure to even consider the possibility of an alternative to it. Thus, while there is at least the possibility of opposition and rebellion, there is also mass indifference and a tendency to take refuge in dreams and fantasies.

An issue still more notable than the faceless bureaucracy that *Brazil* deals with is capitalism and what it entails: mindless consumerism, lack of real human relationships, and cynicism. It might appear as though in the post-ideological world of *Brazil*, citizens are materially better-off compared to the Oceania of Orwell, yet the 'advanced' technology that surrounds them to supposedly help them do not function properly, the aesthetic surgeries they have to get ever younger and more good-looking have "complications", the food they eat is not real food, the clothes they shop for are absurd and ostentatious. All the material benefits Brazil offer are simply pretensions, and it is in pursuing these meaningless materialistic goals that *Brazilians* are able to close their eyes to the reality of brutal and uncaring State, and continue shopping and consuming without regard to it.

In the broader sense, what replaces totalitarian ideology of *NEF* in *Brazil* is capitalism and consumerism as a mechanism of both control and deception. In this respect, the system in *Brazil* is more sinister and more difficult to penetrate, since the problem of the

citizens of *Brazil* are in fact related to market-based and consumerism-based reality. Rather than a politically produced discourse, their system is monopolized by a discourse based on economic mechanisms. Thus, citizens of *Brazil* do not encounter a clear ideology against which they can struggle. They rather encounter a system that allows them unlimited freedom within a clearly limited scope. Those who transgress the boundaries are labelled 'terrorists' and pursued ruthlessly by the state; those who play by the rules are free to work their way up the career ladder, spend their money on leisure pursuits and plastic surgery, and are more or less left in peace.

This thesis is concerned with these above-mentioned works as cultural products of their times and analyses them first by looking at the different visions of their writers in their own contexts, and later by making comparisons between the works. The two authors understandably have their own dystopian visions affected by their own political, social and economic circumstances. The evolution of their dystopian visions is presented in this academic study for understanding the historical changes and their reflection in these works. This thesis proves the necessity of closely analysing and comparing both works, since they prove instrumental in the understanding of the political, social, and cultural circumstances of their respective periods. This study also aims to pave the way for future studies of twenty-first-century dystopias whose visions are coloured with environmental disasters, depleted resources, the invasion of technology into people's lives, post-human ontologies, and ultimately the survival of humanity on the planet. A cultural materialist comparison of recent dystopian works with *Brazil* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can help readers understand the political, historical and cultural subtexts of such works.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Brazil. Dir. Terry Gilliam. Perf. Jonathan Pryce, Kim Greist, Robert De Niro. Embassy International Pictures. 1985. DVD.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Signet Classics, 1949. Print.

SECONDARY SOURCES

"1954: Housewives celebrate end of rationing." *BBC.* BBC. Web. 12 Apr 2019.

"Army-McCarthy Hearings." *History.com,* 12 Sept. 2018. History.com. Web. 18 May 2019.

"Director's Commentary." *Brazil.* Dir. Terry Gilliam. Perf. Jonathan Pryce, Kim Greist, Robert De Niro. Embassy International Pictures. 1985. DVD.

"Great Purge." *History.com,* 21 Aug. 2018. History.com. Web. 23 Apr. 2019.

"Gulag." *History.com,* 21 Aug. 2018. History.com. Web. 23 Apr. 2019.

"Keep Calm and Carry On: The Truth Behind the Poster". Imperial War Museums. 3 Nov 2017. *Youtube.* Web. 29 Apr 2019.

"Komsomol: Soviet Youth Organization." *Encyclopædia Britannica.* 14 Feb 2016. Encyclopædia Britannica. Web. 30 May 2019.

"London: past terror attacks." *The Guardian*. 7 Jul 2005. The Guardian. Web. 11 March 2019.

"Margaret Thatcher: a life in quotes." *The Guardian.* 8 Apr 2013. The Guardian. Web. 4 May 2019.

"Terry Gilliam on *Brazil*." British Film Institute. 24 Nov 2014. *Youtube.* Web. 5 April 2019.

"The Battle for *Brazil*." Monty Python the Flying Circus. 30 July 2015. *Youtube.* Web. 6 April 2019.

"The Miners' Strike Revisited." *BBC.* 2 Feb 2004. BBC. Web. 30 March 2019.

"Utopia." *Oxford English Dictionary*. OED.com. Web. 13 Sept 2017.

Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970. Print.

---, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966. Print.

Astore, William J. “All the Euphemisms We Use for 'War'.” *The Nation*, 15 Apr. 2016. TheNation.com. 2 Jan 2019. Web.

Ball, James. “The Thatcher effect: what changed and what stayed the same.” *The Guardian*. 12 Apr. 2013. The Guardian. Web. 4 May 2019.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester UP, 2017. Print.

Beadle, Gordon. “George Orwell and the American Conservatives.” *Syracuse Scholar* (1979-1991): 6: 1, Article 8. 1-10. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 June 2019.

Benjamin, Walter. “Moscow.” *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings,* 2:2 :1931- 1934. Belknap, 2005. Print.

Bennetts, Leslie. “How Terry Gilliam Found A Happy Ending For ‘*Brazil*’.” *The New York Times*. 19 Jan. 1986. The New York Times. Web. 21 May 2019.

Berlin, Isaiah, and Henry Hardy. “The Decline of the Utopian Ideas in the West,” *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2013. Print.

Bernstein, Gerald S. “The Architecture of Repression: The Built Environment of George Orwell’s *1984*.” *Journal of Architectural Education (1984)* 1985: 26. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Oct 2018.

Booker, Keith M. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport: Greenwood, 1994. Print.

Bowcott, Owen. “Northern Ireland's Diplock courts to be abolished soon.” *The Guardian*. 12 Aug 2006. The Guardian. Web. 17 May 2019.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. New York: Martins Press, 1998. Print.

Brooker, Joseph. “Forbidden to Dream Again: Orwell and Nostalgia.” *English* 55.213 (2006): 281-297. PDF.

Burgess, Anthony. *1985*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1978. Print.

Calder, Jenni. “Orwell's post-war prophecy.” *George Orwell: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Williams, Raymond. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1974. 133-155. Print.

Christie, Ian and Terry Gilliam. *Gilliam on Gilliam.* London:Faber. 2000. Print.

Claeys, Gregory. “The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell.” *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Claeys, Gregory. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. 107 - 135. Print.

Crick, Bernard. “Nineteen Eighty-Four: Context and Controversy.” *Cambridge Companion to George Orwell.* Ed. Rodden, John. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. 146-159. Print.

---, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Life*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980. Print.

Duncan, Stewart. “Thomas Hobbes.”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Summer 2017, Ed. Edward N. Zalta. U of Stanford. Web. 26 June 2018.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

Eliot, T.S. *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948. Print.

Erickson, John. “The Ghost in the Machine: Gilliam’s Postmodern response in *Brazil* to the Orwellian Dystopia of *Nineteen Eighty-Four.” Utopian Studies*, 4:2, 1993, pp. 26-34. *JSTOR.* Web. 24 Dec 2017.

Figes, Orlando. *Revolutionary Russia, 1891-1991*. London: Penguin Books, 2014. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. Print.

---, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. London: Leonard & Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press, 1939. Print.

Fukuyama, Francis. “The End of History?.” *The National Interest.* Summer 1989. pp.1-18. embl.de. PDF.

Gardner, Martin A. *The Marx Brothers as Social Critics: Satire and Comic Nihilism in Their Films*. McFarland & Co., 2009. Print.

Gilliam, Terry. *Gilliamesque:A Pre-Posthumous Memoir.* Canongate Books Ltd, 2016. eBook.

Glass, Fred “*Brazil*”, *Film Quarterly*, 39: 4. 1986. pp. 22–8. JSTOR. Web. 25 April 2019.

Gleiberman, Owen. “The Life of Terry”, *Terry Gilliam: Interviews.* Eds. David Sterritt and Lucille Rhodes. Jackson: U of Mississippi Press, 2004. 30–5. Print.

Glynn, Sean and Booth, Alan. *Modern Britain: An Economic and Social History*. Routledge: London and New York. 1996. Print.

Gray, W. Russel. “Taking Nineteen Eighty Four Back to the Future, or There's an Awful Lot of Orwell in Brazil (Not To Mention Python).” *Utopian Studies*, 2:1/2, 1991, pp. 147–156. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Dec 2017.

Grossmann, Gregory. “The Second Economy in the USSR.” *Problems of Communism* 5 September/October 1977: 25-40. Print.

Hatherly, Owen. “Keep Calm and Carry On – the sinister message behind the slogan that seduced the nation.” *The Guardian*. 8 Jan 2016. The Guardian. Web. 5 May 2019.

Higgins, John. *Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism*. Taylor and Francis, 2004. Print.

Hitchens, Christopher. *Why Orwell Matters*. NY: Basic Books, 2002. Print.

Hobbes, Thomas. *De Corpore*. Trans. A. P. Martinich. New York: Abaris Books, 1981. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991. Print.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945.* New York: Penguin Press, 2005. Print.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991. Print.

Lodge, David. "Utopia and Criticism: The Radical longing for Paradise." *Encounter* April 1969: 65–74.

Luegenbiehl, Heinz C. "1984 and the Power of Technology." *Social Theory and Practice*, 10: 3, 1984, pp. 289–300. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Dec 2017.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991. Print.

Marx Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.* Ed. Sitton J.F. *Marx Today*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. 2010. Print.

Mathews, Jack, et al. *The Battle of Brazil*. Applause Books, 1998. PDF.

Mazower, Mark. *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century.* New York: A.A. Knopf, 1999. Print.

McAuley, Paul J. *Brazil*. Palgrave Macmillan on Behalf of the British Film Institute, 2014. eBook.

McCabe, Bob. *Dark Knights & Holy Fools: The Arts and Films of Terry Gilliam.* London: The Orion Publishing Group, 1999. Print.

Melton, Jeffrey and Sterling, Eric. "The Subversion of Happy Endings in Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*." *The Cinema of Terry Gilliam: It's a Mad World*. Eds Jeff Birkenstein, Anna Froula, and Karen Randell. New York: Columbia UP, 2013. 66-78. Print.

Meyers, Jeffrey, Ed. *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1997. Print.

---, Jeffrey. *Orwell: Life and Art.* U of Illinois Press, 2010. *JSTOR.* Web. 27 Nov 2018.

Milne, Seumas. "During the miners' strike, Thatcher's secret state was the real enemy within." *The Guardian.* 3 Oct 2014. The Guardian. Web. 14 Apr 2019.

Milner, Andrew. *Re-Imagining Cultural Studies: The Promise of Cultural Materialism*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 2002. Print.

Morgan, David. "Saga of *Brazil*." *Wide Angle/ Close Up.* 1986. Web. 25 Apr 2019.

Moylan, Tom. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 2000. eBook.

Newsinger, John. "Orwell, anti-Semitism and the Holocaust." *Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. Rodden, John. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. 112-125. Print.

---, John. *Orwell's Politics*. UK: Palgrave, 2007. Print.

O'Connor, Rory, Stephen Hilgartner, Richard Bell. *Nukespeak: Nuclear Language, Visions, and Mindset*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1982. eBook.

Orwell, George, and Peter Davison. *Orwell's England: The Road to Wigan Pier in the Context of Essays, Reviews, Letters and Poems Selected from the Complete Works of George Orwell*. London: Penguin, 2001. Print.

---, George. "Inside the Whale." *Inside the Whale and Other Essays*. GB, London. 11 March 1940. *Orwell.ru.* 24 Sept. 2015. Web. 13 Feb 2019.

---, George. "Literature and Totalitarianism." *Listener* 19 June 1941. *Orwell.ru.* 24 Sept. 2015. Web. 13 Feb 2019.

---, George. "Orwell's Statement on *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *The Complete Works of George Orwell*. Ed. Peter Hobley Davison. London: Sacker & Warburg, 1998. 134-6. Print.

---, George. "Politics and the English Language." *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Harcourt, Inc, 1981. 156-170. Print.

---, George. "Second Thoughts on James Burnham." *Polemic*. GB, London. Summer 1946. *Orwell.ru.* 24 Sept. 2015. Web. 13 Feb 2019.

---, George. "The Prevention of Literature." *Polemic* January 1946: 4-13. *Orwell.ru.* 24 Sept. 2015. Web. 13 Feb 2019.

---, George. "Why I Write." *The Orwell Reader*. London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1984. 390-95. Print.

---, George. *The Orwell Diaries*. Ed. Peter Davison. London: Penguin Books, 2010. Print.

---, George. *Orwell's Politics*. NY: Palgrave, 1999. Print.

---, George. *The Road to Wigan Pier*. London: Penguin Classics, 2001. Print.

---, George. *Homage to Catalonia*. London: Penguin Classics, 2013. Print.

Pick, Hella. "Kremlin bows to capitalist craze for jeans." *The Guardian.* 11 Jul 2009. The Guardian. Web. 4 May 2019.

Price, David H. “Governing Fear in the Iron Cage of Rationalism: Terry Gilliam’s Brazil through the 9/11 Looking Glass.” *Reframing 9/11: Film, Popular Culture and the “War on Terror”.* Eds. Birkenstein, Jeff, Anna Froula, and Karen Randell, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010. 167–182. PDF.

Resch, Robert Paul. “Utopia, Dystopia and the Middle Class in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four.” *boundary 2* Spring 1997: 137-176. *JSTOR.* Web. 23 July 2018.

Rossi, John and John Rodden. “A political writer.” Rodden, John. *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012. 1-11. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. “An Interview with Terry Gilliam.” *The Believer*. 1 Mar 2003. TheBelieverMag.com. Web. 23 Apr 2019.

---, Salman. “The Location of *Brazil.*” *Imaginary Homelands- Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London, Granta Books, 1991. Print.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. “The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited.” *Utopian Studies* 5.1 (1994): 1-37. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Symons, Julian. “Orwell, a Reminiscence.” *London Magazine.* September 1963: 35-49.

Vieira, Fatima. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare.* London: Geoffrey Bles, 1962. Print.

Warburg, Fredric. “His Second, Lasting Publisher.” *Orwell Remembered*. Ed. Crick, Bernard and Audrey Coppard. 1984. pp.193-199. Print.

Watts, Peter. “Blitzed, rebuilt and built again: what became of London's bomb sites?.” *The Guardian*. 2 Sept. 2015. Guardian. Web. 11 March 2019.

Wellerstein, Alex. “Nagasaki: The Last Bomb.” 7 Aug 2015. *The New Yorker.* Web. 5 June 2019.

Williams, Raymond. “Notes on British Marxism since 1945.” *New Left Review* Nov/Dec 1976 NLR I/100.

---, Raymond. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. New York: Anchor Books, 1958. Print.

---, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford UP, 1976. Print.

---, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature.* New York: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

---, Raymond. *Reading and Criticism*. London: Frederick Muller. 1950. Print.

Wollen, Peter. “Terry Gilliam.” *Spellbound.* British Film Institute. London: Hayward Gallery, 1996. Print.

Xavier Cugat. “Lyrics to *Brazil*.” *Genius*, 2019, Genius.com. Web. 05 Jan 2019.

Zenzinov, Vladimir. *Deserted: The Story of the Children Abandoned in Soviet Russia*. London: H. Joseph, 1931. eBook.

Žižek Slavoj. *Enjoy Your Symptom!: Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out.* Routledge, 2001. Print.

APPENDIX 1

NEWSPEAK DICTIONARY AND TERMINOLOGY RELATED TO *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR*

Airstrip One – Formerly called *England*. Airstrip One is a part of Oceania, which is composed of "the Americas, the Atlantic islands including the British Isles, Australasia and the southern portion of Africa" (*NEF* 185). This term demonstrates that Orwell was speculating that England would a part of a bigger structure and play a smaller role in global politics in the future.

Anti-Sex League – an Oceanic organization that "advocates complete celibacy for both sexes" (NEF 65). The association of chastity and party loyalty is the essential indoctrination of this organization.

artsem – artificial insemination. This is the Party's method of controlling the family and childbirth.

Big Brother – Fictional worshippped leader of Oceania, similar to Soviet Russia's Stalin or America's "Uncle Sam". The concept refers to the blind adherence to a leader.

crimestop – "The faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought. It includes the power of not grasping analogies, of failing to perceive logical errors, of misunderstanding the simplest arguments if they are inimical to Ingsoc, and of being bored or repelled by any train of thought which is capable of leading in a heretical direction. *Crimestop*, in short, means protective stupidity" (NEF 212).

doublethink – A mechanism of reality control.
"To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself" (*NEF* 214).

duckspeak – In Syme's words, duckspeak refers "to quack[ing] like a duck. It is one of those interesting words that has two contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent, it is abuse; applied to someone you agree with, it is praise" (*NEF* 55). This refers to the idea of blind bias. If someone is on your side, whatever he/she is saying is good and you agree with them even though what they are saying is totally nonsensical.

Eastasia – Smallest one of the three superstates. Composed of "China and the countries to the south of it, the Japanese islands and a large but fluctuating portion of Manchuria,

Mongolia, and Tibet" (*NEF* 185). Once Oceania's ally, then becomes the enemy at the end of the book.

Eurasia – One of the three superstates. Composed of "the whole northern part of the European and Asiatic land-mass, from Portugal to the Bering Strait" (*NEF* 185). It was the enemy of Oceania in the beginning of the book, later becomes an ally.

facecrime – "It was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in any public place or within range of a telescreen. The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself -- anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example) was itself a punishable offence. There was even a word for it in Newspeak: *facecrime*, it was called" (*NEF* 62). Apart from the language itself, even one's body language and expressions can be a reason for someone's indictment if caught by the telescreens or the thoughtpolice.

Floating Fortress – military bases on the sea composed of enormous battleships. This term alludes to *flying fortress* in Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*.

The Golden Country- A green utopian landscape Winston dreams about. A place beyond the reach of the Party. Winston/Orwell's description: "It was an old, rabbit-bitten pasture, with a foot-track wandering across it and a molehill here and there. In the ragged hedge on the opposite side of the field the boughs of the elm trees were swaying very faintly in the breeze, their leaves just stirring in dense masses like women's hair. Somewhere near at hand, though out of sight, there was a clear, slow-moving stream where dace were swimming in the pools under the willow trees" (*NEF* 30). Davison compares "the Golden Country" to Hebrides, where Orwell was dreaming about living, and he realised this dream when he rented Barnhill, on Jura (*The Orwell Diaries* 258).

Goldstein, Emmanuel – The ultimate enemy of the state in Oceania. Orwell describes Goldstein as having "a lean Jewish face, with a great fuzzy aureole of white hair and a small goatee beard" reminding the reader of the Soviet leader who later became the opponent of Stalin regime: Trotsky. Uncannily similar to Trotsky, Goldstein also had a high position in the Party before, and later betrayed it and denounced it as a dictatorship: "He [Goldstein] was advocating freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, he was crying hysterically that the Revolution had been betrayed" (*NEF* 12). Goldstein is also the leader of the "brotherhood" or the "resistance".

Goldstein's Book - Goldstein's Book is depicted as "the book" of the resistance and anyone who reads it is considered a heretic and committing thoughtcrime. The book contains truths about the organization of Oceanic society, the Big Brother and the Party.

goodthinker – "to think in an orthodox manner" (*NEF* 304), which basically refers to sticking to all the principles of the Party.

hate week – A propaganda week where rallies and parades are organized to demonstrate hatred of the enemy and devotion to the Party. It reminds the reader of the Nazi Rallies and the leader worship of the totalitarian regimes.

Ingsoc – English Socialism.

Inner Party – The upper-class members of the Party. "Its numbers limited to six millions, or something less than the two percent of the population of Oceania" (*NEF* 208). Described as "the brains of the State" (*NEF* 208). They enjoy the privileges of being at the top of the organization.

joycamp – Forced-labor camp where political dissidents are kept, reminding both Gulags and Nazi Camps.

memory hole – A system of pipes which is used to get rid of unwanted documents.

Miniluv – Short for the Ministry of Love, which actually refers to the Ministry of Law and Order. "The Ministry of Love was the really frightening one. There were no windows in it at all. Winston had never been inside the Ministry of Love, nor within half a kilometer of it. It was a place impossible to enter except on official business, and then only by penetrating through a maze of barbed-wire entanglements, steel doors, and hidden machine-gun nests. Even the streets leading up to its outer barriers were roamed by gorilla-faced guards in black uniforms, armed with jointed truncheons" (*NEF* 4).

Minipax – Short for the Ministry of Peace, which actually refers to the Ministry of War).

Miniplenty – Ministry of Plenty which is concerned with economic affairs. In *NEF*, its main job is rationing.

Minitrue – Ministry of Truth serves for the propaganda mission by keeping all the recordings, re-writing the facts, and providing entertainment material for the proles.

Newspeak – The official language of Oceania. It is the "politically correct" form of speaking approved by the Party. It is designed to destroy all the "unorthodox" ideas by simplifying the expression, narrowing the range of words and making them fuzzier.

Oceania – One of the three superstates. Composed of "the Americas, the Atlantic islands including the British Isles, Australasia and the southern portion of Africa" (*NEF* 185). Its official language is Newspeak and its political ideology is Ingsoc.

Oldspeak – Standard English. The type of speech the Party tries to destroy by replacing it with *Newspeak*.

oldthink – Embracing old ways of thinking, which is a threat to the Ingsoc ideology.

Outer Party – the middle-class members of the Party, who are usually government employees and bureaucrats. They form about thirteen percent of the Oceanian population. Orwell likens the Outer Party to "hands" in the body while Inner Party is the "brain" (*NEF* 208). The standard of living between the Inner and Outer Parties is strikingly different. While substantial resources are allocated to the use of the Inner Party, Outer Party members have to deal with rationing and limited resources. All the Outer Party members are also constantly monitored through telescreens.

ownlife – having an individual life thus eccentricity in the eyes of the Party. It is considered a thoughtcrime not to join communal activities and do something – even as basic as taking a walk- for personal benefit.

prole – proletarians "numbering perhaps eighty-five percent of the population" and seen as "dumb masses" by the members of the party (*NEF* 208). They are not as strictly controlled as the members of the Outer party, yet they are provided with cheap entertainment to get them distracted and keep in place.

prolefeed – term for the trashy, cheap entertainment provided to the masses. It includes sensational novels produced by versificators, movies, sports, propagandic and sentimental music and other materials (*NEF* 43).

Recdep – Records Department. A division of the Ministry of Truth, where Winston works as the corrector of "mistakes" in newspaper articles of the past.

resistance – (or the "brotherhood") A revolutionary group which is supposedly guided by Emmanuel Goldstein as the chief traitor. Whether or not this group exists or is fabricated is not certain in the novel.

Room 101 – Torture room where people who commit thoughtcrimes are taken to. It is a part of the Ministry of Love. The source of "Room 101" is thought to be the "committee room where Orwell suffered meetings of the Eastern Services Committee", where he had to go through "the deadly boredom of meetings" (*The Orwell Diaries* 320).

speakwrite – Machines for voice recognition.

Telescreen – Two-way televisions which exist in all the rooms of the Party members. They are a part of the nonstop surveillance system in NEF, while they are also employed for constant propaganda. They cannot be turned off -except that the Inner Party members can do it- nor are there different channels on them.

ThoughtPolice – Brutal and sinister police for responsible fo0r eliminating thoughtcrimes. They work with/as spies and through the help of telesreens.

Two minutes hate – a daily exercise during which Party members are expected to show their hatred focused on Goldstein releasing negative emotions by angry fits, shouting and cursing.

unperson – A person who is deemed non-existent by the State.

vaporized – the process of becoming an *unperson. Abolished and annihilated* are the other words used for *vaporized* (NEF 19). In more simpler words, it means that all the records of a person's existence as well as his/her physical existence are erased by the State.

versificator – Used by "the Music Department", versificator is an instrument composing music "without any human intervention" for the entertainment of the proles (*NEF* 138).

Youth League – Part of the indoctrination program mandatory for children. It involves "lectures, parades, songs, slogans and martial music" to educate children to be 'good' Party members (*NEF* 68). Youth League is a reminder of organizations such as "Hitler Youth" or similar kinds of Soviet educational programs where children are politicised and recruited as 'good comrades'.

APPENDIX2. ORIGINALITY REPORT

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

Tarih: 03/07/2019

Tez Başlığı : George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* ve Terry Gilliam'ın *Brazil* Eserlerinde Distopyanın Değişen Yüzü: Kültürel Materyalist Bir Çalışma

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 96 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 27/06/2019 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda işaretlenmiş filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı %5'tir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1- ✓ Kaynaklar/Onay ve Bildirim sayfaları hariç
2- ✓ Kıyaslama hariç
3- ✓ Alıntılar hariç
4- Alıntılar dâhil
5- ✓ 5 kelimeden daha az cümleyi içeren metin kısımları hariç

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı incelediğimi ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmasının herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edilmesi muhtemal durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

03/07/2019

Tarih ve İmza

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Adı Soyadı:	Ebeno ÜNE PRETTEMAN
Öğrenci No:	13224367
Anabilim Dalı:	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Programı:	İngiliz Kültür Araştırmaları
Statüsü:	■ Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐ Bütünleşik Doktora

DANIŞMAN ONAYI

UYGUNDUR.

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Alev ACARADUMAN

(Unvan, Ad Soyad, İmza)

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
M.A. THESIS ORIGINALITY REPORT

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Date: 03/07/2019

Thesis Title : The Changing Face of Dystopia Represented in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Terry Gilliam's *Brazil*: A Cultural Materialist Study

According to the originality report obtained by myself/my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options checked below on 27/06/2019 for the total of 96 pages including the a) Introduction, c) Main Chapters d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 5%.

Filtering options applied:

1. ✓ Approval and Declaration sections excluded
2. ✓ Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
3. ✓ Quotes excluded
4. Quotes included
5. ✓ Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

03/07/2019

I respectfully submit this for Approval.

Date and Signature

Name Surname:	Burcu ÖKESRETTİMAN
Student No:	22224367
Department:	English Language and Literature
Program:	British Cultural Studies
Status:	■ MA ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Combined MA / Ph.D.

ADVISOR APPROVAL

APPROVED

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Osman ARSLANAN
(Title, Name Surname, Signature)

APPENDIX3. ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ETİK KOMİSYON MUAFİYETİ FORMU

HACETTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞINA

Tarih: 3.07.2019

Tez Başlığı: George Orwell'in On Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört ve Terry Gilliam'ın Brazil Eserlerinde Dönüşümün Değişen Yüzü: Kültürel Materyalist Bir Çalışma

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamda:

1. İnsan ve hayvan üzerinde deney ve testler yapılmamaktadır.
2. Biyolojik materyal (kan, doku vb. biyolojik sıvılar ve numuneler) kullanılmamaktadır veya gerektirmemektedir.
3. Beden bütünlüğüne müdahale içermemektedir.
4. Gözlemsel ve betimsel araştırma (anket, mülakat, ölçek/skala çalışmaları, dosya taramaları, veri kayıtları taraması, sistem-model geliştirme çalışmaları) niteliğinde değildir.

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Etik Kurallar ve Komisyonlarının Yönergelerini incelediğim ve bunlara göre tez çalışmamın yürütülebilmesi için herhangi bir Etik Kurul/Komisyon'dan izin almamıza gerek olmadığını; ileri durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğa katlanmayı ve yukarıda verdiğim bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

03/07/2019

Tarih ve İmza

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Adı Soyadı:	Emre ÜKE PRETTYMAN
Öğrenci No:	13324367
Anabilim Dalı:	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Programı:	İngiliz Kültür Araştırmaları
Statüsü:	■ Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐ Bütünleşik Doktora

DANIŞMAN GÖRÜŞÜ VE ONAYI

Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Aler KARAKUMAN
(Unvanı, Ad Soyadı, İmza)

Dosyalı Bilgi: http://www.sosyalbilimler.hacettepe.edu.tr
Telefon: 0-312-2776860 Faks: 0-312-2992147 E-posta: sosyalb@hacettepe.edu.tr

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ETHICS COMMISSION FORM FOR THESIS

HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Date 3/07/2019

Thesis Title: The Changing Face of Dystopia Represented in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four and Terry Gilliam's Brazil: A Cultural Materialist Study

My thesis work related to the title above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, interview, measures/scales, data screening, system-model development).

I declare I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board/Commission for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

03/07/2019

I respectfully submit this for approval.

Date and Signature

Name Surname:	Burcu ÜNÜ MUTTIMAN
Student No:	19224367
Department:	English Language and Literature
Program:	British Cultural Studies
Status:	☒ MA ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Combined MA/ Ph.D.

ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL

Assistant Prof. Dr. Alev KARAMOMAN
(Title, Name Surname, Signature)