



**THE MECHANISMS OF TYRANNY AND DICTATORSHIP AND THEIR
REPRODUCTION IN *1984* By GEORGE ORWELL**

Hadil BALKHI

**Master's Thesis
Department of English Language and Literature
Advisor: Assistant Professor Fulya KİNCAL**

2025

**GEORGE ORWELL'UN 1984 ADLI ROMANINDA TIRANLIK VE DIKTATÖRLÜK
MEKANİZMALARI İLE BUNLARIN YENİDEN ÜRETİMİ**

Hadil BALKHI

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fulya KİNCAL**

2025

T.R.
TEKİRDAG NAMIK KEMAL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
MASTER’S THESIS

**THE MECHANISMS OF TYRANNY AND DICTATORSHIP AND
THEIR REPRODUCTION IN *1984* By GEORGE ORWELL**

Hadil BALKHI

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ADVISOR: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR FULYA KİNCAL

TEKİRDAĞ-2025
All rights reserved.

T.C.
TEKİRDAĞ NAMIK KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**GEORGE ORWELL'UN 1984 ADLI ROMANINDA TİRANLIK VE
DİKTATÖRLÜK MEKANİZMALARI İLE BUNLARIN YENİDEN
ÜRETİMİ**

Hadil BALKHI

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
DANIŞMAN: DR. ÖĞR. ÜYESİ FULYA KİNCAL

TEKİRDAĞ-2025

Her hakkı saklıdır.

SCIENTIFIC ETHICS STATEMENT

I declare that throughout the entire process of preparing this Master Thesis, I have diligently adhered to the established academic guidelines and principles of scientific ethics. I have ensured that every citation, whether direct or indirect, is appropriately referenced, and the works I have drawn upon are exclusively those listed in the references section. In addition, I have consistently followed the prescribed spelling conventions outlined by the institution.

Hadil BALKHI

19/06/2025



BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ

Hazırladığım Yüksek Lisans Tezinin bütün aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara riayet ettiğimi, çalışmada doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak kullandığım her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, yazımda enstitü yazım kılavuzuna uygun davranıldığını taahhüt ederim.

Hadil BALKHI

19/06/2025





ABSTRACT

Institution,Institue : Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University, Institute of Social Sciences,
Department : Department of English Language and Literature
Thesis Title : The Mechanisms of Tyranny and Dictatorship and Their Reproduction In 1984 By George Orwell
Thesis Author : Hadil BALKHI
Thesis Adviser : Asst. Prof. Fulya KİNCAL
Type of Thesis,Year : M.S. Thesis, 2025
Total Number of : 76
Pages

This research seeks to analyze George Orwell's novel, 1984, that also investigates psychological and political mechanisms of tyranny and dictatorship, to insightfully reflect on some of the ways these regimes are depicted and reproduced through the actions of individuals, as well as state apparatuses. In addition to consideration of the social and political milieu during the novel's production, this research will take a comparative approach that juxtaposes the fictional dystopia against real instances of historic dictatorships. The reading of 1984 does not include analyses that explore plot or character developments claimed to be disconnected from the central mechanisms of oppression, it is focused on the ways individuals taking the role of either their rulers or the only citizens being ruled, come to be agents of what governed them. The qualitative descriptive approach will rely on close textual analysis to identify the literary means by which the text expresses themes of surveillance, propaganda, repression and psychological manipulation. The historical-linguistic framework will elucidate some previously unnoticed connections to 20th century totalitarian means and restrictions on society. Although there has been considerable academic interest in totalitarian regimes for decades, there is no final say when it comes to the reproduction of tyranny, particularly with regard to internal obedience and complicity. This study will use theorists such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Hannah Arendt, and more to inform how Orwell's characters are representative of the endurance of authoritarian regimes, and, using individual fear, unconscious desire, and ideological subjection, how dictatorships endure

Keywords: Tyranny, Dictatorship, Character Reproduction, Literary Analysis, Authoritarian Regimes, Psychological Control, Comparative Study

ÖZET

Kurum,Enstiü, : Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi,Sosyal Bilimler
Enstitüsü,
ABD : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Tez Başlığı : George Orwell'un 1984 Adlı Romanında Tiranlık ve
Diktatörlük Mekanizmaları ile Bunların Yeniden Üretimi
Tez Yazarı : Hadil BALKHI
Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi FULYA KİNCAL
Tez Türü,Yılı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2025
Sayfa Sayısı : 76

Bu araştırma, George Orwell'in "1984" adlı romanını analiz etmeyi amaçlamakta; psikolojik ve politik tiranlık ile diktatörlük mekanizmalarını inceleyerek, bu tür rejimlerin bireylerin eylemleri ve devlet aygıtları aracılığıyla nasıl tasvir edildiğini ve yeniden üretildiğini derinlemesine yansıtmaktadır. Romanın yazıldığı dönemdeki toplumsal ve siyasal ortam dikkate alınarak, kurmaca distopya ile tarihsel diktatörlük örnekleri karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alınacaktır.Bu çalışmada, "1984" romanının olay örgüsüne veya merkezi baskı mekanizmalarıyla ilgisi olmayan karakter gelişimlerine odaklanılmayacaktır. Bunun yerine, yöneten ya da yönetilen rollerini üstlenen bireylerin, nasıl kendi baskıcı sistemlerinin ajanlarına dönüştükleri incelenecektir. Nitel betimsel yöntem kullanılarak metne yakın bir çözümleme yapılacaktır; gözetim, propaganda, baskı ve psikolojik manipülasyon temalarının edebi yollarla nasıl sunulduğu ortaya konulacaktır.Tarihsel-dilbilimsel bir çerçeve ile 20. yüzyıl totaliter rejimlerinin topluma uyguladığı yöntemlerle olan bağlantılar aydınlatılacaktır. Totaliter rejimler üzerine onlarca yıldır akademik çalışmalar yapılmış olsa da, tiranlığın nasıl yeniden üretildiği, özellikle içsel itaat ve suç ortaklığı bağlamında, hâlâ tartışmalıdır. Bu çalışma, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Hannah Arendt gibi teorisyenlerden yararlanarak Orwell'in karakterlerinin otoriter rejimlerin sürekliliğini nasıl temsil ettiğini, bireysel korku, bilinçdışı arzu ve ideolojik boyun eğme yoluyla diktatörlüklerin nasıl ayakta kaldığını inceleyecektir

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tiranlık, Diktatörlük, Karakter Üretimi, Edebi Analiz, Otoriter Rejimler, Psikolojik Kontrol, Karşılaştırmalı Çalışma

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt and deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Assistant Professor Fulya Kincal. Her unwavering guidance, continuous support, and invaluable feedback have been essential throughout every stage of this thesis. Her patience, encouragement, and belief in my academic potential made this journey possible, and I will always be sincerely thankful to her.

I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Buğra Zengin for his valuable academic insight and support throughout my studies.

My heartfelt thanks also go to my dear friends Sema Çelik and Candan İl, whose emotional support and constant encouragement have been a source of strength during the most challenging moments of this academic journey.

I am also especially grateful to my dear friend Moumena Abdusselam, who has been like an elder sister to me throughout this journey. Her constant encouragement, warmth, and sincere support played a vital role in helping me stay strong and focused during the most challenging times of this process.

I am especially grateful to my beloved mother, whose endless love, sacrifices, and unwavering belief in me have carried me through the most difficult times. Her prayers and presence have been my greatest source of comfort and motivation.

This thesis would not have been completed without the support of all these incredible people in my life. I remain deeply thankful for each of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCIENTIFIC ETHICS STATEMENT	ii
BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ.....	iii
TEZ ONAY SAYFASI.....	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Aim of the Study	7
Literature Review	9
1. CHAPTER 1.....	15
1.1 Theoretical Framework and Scope of the Study.....	15
1.2 Literary Reflections on Tyranny through the Theories of Arendt, Weber, and Foucault.....	16
1.3 Explanation of Methodological Approaches	19
2. CHAPTER 2.....	22
2.1 The Socio-Political Landscape	22
2.2 Historical Parallels and Internal Reproduction of Authoritarianism.....	23
2.3 The Author's Socio-Political Commentary	25
2.4 Power Structures and Governance in the Novel	27
2.5 Propaganda, Media, and Information Control	29
2.6 The Role of Culture and Ideology.....	31
2.7 The Political Climates of the Real World in 1984's publication.....	33
2.8 Societal Reflections in 1984.....	35
3. CHAPTER 3.....	37
3.1 Analysis of Main Characters within a Tyrannical Context	37
3.2 The Protagonist Journey under Tyranny: Identity, Belief, and the Shift toward Confronting Power	39
3.3 A Comprehensive Examination of Antagonists: Power, Motivations, and Their Impact on the Narrative	41
3.4 Secondary Characters and the Reproduction of Tyranny in Everyday Life.....	43
3.5 Interpersonal Dynamics and Symbolic Roles: Trust, Resistance, and Representation under Tyranny.....	45

3.6	Character Transformation and Narrative Evolution under Dictatorship.....	48
3.7	Tyranny Within: The Silent Erosion of Identity in Orwell's World	49
4.	CHAPTER 4.....	50
4.1	Language and Thought as Instruments of Tyranny: The Linguistic Production of Obedient Subjects in <i>1984</i>	50
4.2	Shame, Betrayal, and the Internalization of Tyranny: The Emotional Reproduction of Obedience.....	51
4.3	Memory and the Erosion of the Self: The Psychological Displacement of Identity 53	
4.4	Infantilization and the Politics of Obedience: How Tyranny Reduces Citizens to Children.....	54
4.5	Bureaucratic Machinery and the Anonymity of Oppression: The Rational Face of Tyranny in <i>1984</i>	55
5.	CHAPTER 5.....	58
5.1	Real-World Echoes: Historical Cases of Internalized Tyranny and Fictional Reflections in <i>1984</i>	58
5.2	Allegory as Political Critique: Symbolic Representations of Historical Dictatorships in <i>1984</i>	60
5.3	From History to Narrative Collapse: How Real Regimes Shaped <i>1984</i> 's Themes of Psychological Control.....	62
6.	CHAPTER 6.....	65
6.1	Themes of Rebellion and Resistance in <i>1984</i>	65
6.2	Forms of Resistance Depicted in the Novel	66
6.3	Psychological and Emotional Dimensions of Resistance	68
6.4	The Role of Individual versus Collective Action.....	69
6.5	The Cost of Rebellion.....	71
	CONCLUSION	73
	REFERENCES	76
	GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET	77

INTRODUCTION

Tyranny and dictatorship have been studied academically throughout the disciplines of political science, history, and literature, among others, for a long time. In contrast to softer systems of authority, tyranny and dictatorship mark the sovereign concentration of power—or control—over both public and private life. Tyranny and dictatorship include many characteristics and attributes of power, the mechanisms through which power operates, sustains itself, and reproduces itself over time. In recent fiction, modern literary figures have delved into fiction to reflect, question, and critique tyrannical political structures. One of the great works is George Orwell's *1984*, which examines the relationship between power, ideology, and the human psyche in a totalitarian world. *1984* engages in fiction, but is more than an imagined dystopia. It explores how control mechanisms, such as surveillance, censorship, propaganda, and psychological manipulation, affect not only institutions but people as well. Orwell depicts a regime's power not only imposed on subjects by physical force or coercion, but one that internalizes power both within and beyond the subject. The fear, guilt, and confusion experienced by the characters demonstrate how the tyranny has become a mental structure—a decidedly un-equal equality that appears in the agency of the victims of that tyranny internalizing terrible forms of oppression. Thus, a regime that asserts control does not just dominate people but gets them to sustain (in James C. Scott's terms, subject of oppression) the tyrannical system of bondage that represses them. This thesis aims to study the work of *1984* in terms of how tyranny is reproduced through individual agency and internalized control, and not simply on how the structure and institution of authoritarianism are coercively configured.

The research shifts focus from observing how the state dominates to observing how individuals in the system react, adapt, or comply, sometimes willingly. The personal notion of power, often ignored in analyses of the state, is what this research brings to the fore. These dimensions of power in *1984* are exemplified through characters such as Winston, Julia, and O'Brien demonstrating how complicated the relationship is between individual resistance and complicity. Even acts of resisting can be subject to the psychological and ideological constructs of the regime. The research adopts a qualitative, descriptive textual analysis method. It examines the literary process of Orwell in articulating themes of power, fear, control, and submission. By means of close reading and analyzing the narratological structure, the symbolic imagery, and development of the characters, the research will analyze how these narrative devices demonstrate the representation of authoritarian rule. First, it will examine the historical and ideological basis for Orwell's fiction—specifically the depiction of totalitarian regimes of

the 20th century, namely the Nazi regime in Germany and the totalitarian system of the Soviet Union, but from this, it is not only about demonstrating parallels but explore how Orwell fictionalizes and ultimately critiques real-world tyranny. The overarching goal of the thesis responds to the question of how *1984* illustrates the psychological and social processes that support the existence of dictatorship, not only the external imposition of power, but ongoing understandings of it from below. This mode of reading assumes that everything in the novel is moving toward demonstrating how the characters are key to understanding the existence of authoritarian regimes. The internal reproduction of tyranny—through fear, conditioned helplessness, and ideological conditioning—not only plays out as a theme but signifies a caution against the realities of autonomy and the fragility of truth. The organization of the study is intended to build upon this argument.

Chapter 1 lays the theoretical and analytical foundation of the thesis by introducing the central topic, outlining the significance of the study, and presenting the methodological approach. It focuses on *1984* not merely as a literary depiction of tyranny as an external imposition, but rather as a complex system that is internally reproduced by the very individuals subjected to it. The chapter constructs its theoretical framework through the integration of key philosophical perspectives: Hannah Arendt's insights into the dissolution of boundaries between public and private life and the effects of social isolation; Max Weber's concept of bureaucratic authority and its impersonal mechanisms of control; Michel Foucault's theory of surveillance and disciplinary power; and Jacques Lacan's psychoanalytic model of the Big Other, which explores how subjects internalize dominant ideologies and participate in their own subjugation.

In addition, the chapter underscores the literary techniques Orwell employs—such as symbolism, irony, and narrative distortion—to convey the psychological and political weight of totalitarian control. These tools enable a nuanced reading of how literature can capture the subtleties of authoritarianism in ways that historical or political discourse often cannot. By situating *1984* within the historical context of the rise of fascist and communist regimes in the twentieth century, the study reinforces the relevance of the novel's themes and their applicability to real-world political systems. This context also enhances the scholarly contribution of the research, establishing it as both a literary and political inquiry into how tyranny operates not only through external mechanisms of control, but through the very people who unconsciously uphold it.

Chapter 2 deals with the historical and socio-political context of *1984*, positioning Orwell's narrative amongst real ideologies, political systems and historical events that would have informed his dystopian vision. The authors analyze the relationship between the fictitious world of Oceania and the emergence of twentieth century totalitarian regimes such as fascism, Stalinism and National Socialist Germany. Referencing the work of theorists such as Hannah Arendt, Timothy Snyder and Robert Paxton, the chapter highlights how Orwell produces a world that reflects or emulates historical authoritarian regimes—propaganda, surveillance, disappearance of fact and truth, emotional numbness etc.

Furthermore, this chapter reinforces the notion that *1984* was not a merely fictional speculative novel but was politically situated in real historical demoralizations. Through the integration of theory and historical artifacts, this chapter provides the background for analyzing Orwell's critique of not simply the systems of power but also the psychological and social internal mechanisms to sustain their existence. The chapter provides a contribution to the thesis by showcasing how characteristics of dictatorship in *1984* were reflective of universal characteristics of dictatorship and the complicated process of internalizing and reproducing tyranny.

Chapter 3 This chapter explores the socio-political roots that influenced Orwell's *1984*, positioning the novel within a broader historical and ideological context. It argues that *1984* is not merely a fictional dystopia, but a reflection of real-world authoritarian experiences. Drawing on the historical rise of fascism and communism in the 20th century, the chapter connects Orwell's narrative to the mechanisms of state control, propaganda, and psychological domination.

Key political theorists—such as Arendt, Foucault, Paxton, and Snyder—are invoked to highlight how Orwell's work mirrors and critiques real power systems. Arendt's ideas on isolation and the collapse of public-private boundaries are implicitly present. Foucault's concepts of surveillance and normalization are aligned with the Party's strategies in Oceania. Paxton and Snyder help position Orwell's warnings in relation to historical fascism and modern authoritarianism. The chapter also emphasizes the symbolic function of literature as a form of resistance and meta-critique against ideological oppression, reinforcing the novel's relevance in understanding both past and emerging forms of tyranny.

Chapter 4 analyzes the subtle and complex ways that tyranny in Orwell's *1984* is reproduced from within the individual as opposed to externally imposed. Fundamentally, the

chapter asserts that language, emotions, memories and bureaucratic procedures are not without power; rather, they can become engaged in those power relations. They are weaponized by totalitarian regimes to create obedience and suppress resistance.

Language, as Orwell shows it, is a mechanism of mental domination. Through Newspeak, the regime restricts the terms of the thought itself; the regime makes it impossible for subjects to conceive of rebellion. This is consistent with Michel Foucault's thesis that discourse is not simply a representation of reality, it is a reality creator. Control of language means control of knowledge, and structure of consciousness. From a Lacanian perspective, the Party serves as the "Big Other" by controlling what subjects say as well as what they desire; not that Winston could rebel in the first place. A character's inability to express dissent is not only one of fear, it is a structural consequence of deprivation of symbolic resources necessary for autonomy.

There is also the question of how emotional life is restructured under conditions of tyranny. Feelings of betrayal, anger, shame, etc., are not private and spontaneous, but operate at the level of conditioned responses under orchestrated conditions, reinforcing loyalty to the regimes. Emotional compliance is not an abstract notion; consider the relationship of betrayal between subjects who subsequently proudly identify and proclaim their respective betrayals of each other (as in the case of Winston and Julia). In a configurative sense, this illustrates Foucault's freestanding power of self-regulation and Lacan's conceptualization of identity through the stance of the Other. The disappearance of the love between Winston and Julia subsequent to their respective betrayals was not simply narrative convenience; it served as a realization of total emotional domination.

Next, in addition to the collapse of memory, the chapter emphasizes the methods employed by the Party to destroy memory so as to destabilize the self. The Party sets memory in a time/space where the coherence and continuity of a narrative identity is eliminated simply by rewriting history. Consider both Foucault's analysis of the structure of knowledge-power and Lacan's stress on stable signifiers. The dislocation of collective memory is consistent with existential confusion and the disbandment of the personal truth. The subjects are trapped in a dynamic where they both do not know who they are and do not know how to oppose that situation.

This distortion of forms of selfhood is compounded by the infantilization of the population. The Party takes an active role in reducing citizens to obedient, dependent beings

needing to be provided for. Drawing from Weber's analysis of bureaucracies and Hannah Arendt's notion of the "banality of evil," the chapter explores the manner in which bureaucratic roles produced the condition for tyranny to become impersonal, invisible, and mechanical in operation. Citizens act not out of belief but from the role they have learned to embody, absent of thought.

Chapter 5 examines how George Orwell's *1984* operates as both a literary representation and a symbolic re-mapping of totalitarian actualities. The story of the novel is not just a fictional warning, but is also a political and psychological case study of how people internalize authoritarianism, and re-create that authoritarianism through the mental and social actions of ordinary human beings. Using well-documented historical examples—from the culture of report writing resulted in family and friends becoming informants (the Stasi) in East Germany), the zealous indoctrination of youngsters (the Red Guards) during Mao's Cultural Revolution, the mindless prosecutions of figures like Vyshinsky during the Soviet purges, and the organizational banal cruelty of bureaucratic killers like Rudolf Höss in the Nazi regime—the chapter illustrates how victims can also become perpetrators of authoritarianism. These historical events illustrate how a person can transition from bystander to perpetrator, just like the character Winston Smith (the protagonist of *1984*) moves from quiet dissent (against the Party) to complete ideological obedience.

Chapter 6 of *1984* examines the project of resistance and demonstrates in multiple ways that, even when men rebel internally and externally against totalitarianism, rebellion is not a representation of freedom. Rather, rebellion is a performance, absorbed by totalitarianism. Winston Smith moves from insurrectionary intention to insurrectionary performance, but ultimately fails because he exhibited no resistance. It is important to conceptualize that although these acts of rebellion could be interpreted as rebellious and even 'defiant' strategy on the part of Winston; the only act of rebellion they truly signify more than perhaps a time of resistance or rebellion; would be the spectacle or performance of rebellion/fighting back, however, not real opposition. The Party actually anticipates rebellion, which allows it to regulate rebellion and dissension inside a rule-based structure. The Party knows about our neuro-psycho-spirituality before we do, some act of rebellion was to be expected.

Using Lacan's theory of the symbolic order illustrates how desires are mediated by ideology so much and deep that even love, will become a tool of production. Foucault's notion that power is not only repressive but productive is justified in examining how the Party produced acts that presented themselves as defiant struggle or resistance, only for the Party to

snuff it out. Winston's writing in the wad of paper he calls his diary, his relationship with Julia, and the reading of "The Book", are nothing more than staged performance within the ideological structure.

The emotional moments of resistance are probably even more destructive than the physical as, the shock and awe of Winston's betrayal and fear, provide a new emotional reality as explained in Hannah Arendt's work, which notes that individuals will ultimately become isolated heartbeat by heartbeat rooted in the destruction of solidarity, in totalitarianism. Room 101 is not only a place of torture, but also a metaphor for emotional collapse, which extinguishes inner freedom through fear-based judgment.

Additionally, Orwell also criticizes the structure of collective resistance simultaneously. The Brotherhood, while imagining themselves as free and organized rebels, is quickly presented manufactured as singular delineated presentation, or reduced to the functions of totalitarianism, which Gramsci's notion of cultural hegemony Newspeak limiting rational discourse.

To sum up is to say that *1984* suggests resistance is always repressed under totalitarianism and this does not only mean being made subjugated coerced but more so, reappropriated and internalized and even made impossible to legitimately achieve. If physical death is not the most significant form of subjugation or oppression, erasure of thought, identity and ability to unite and be together as one, would have more value than simply subsiding to nihilism and nihilistic assertions socially and politically.

The allegorical structure of the novel is unpacked through Orwell's symbolic representations, including Big Brother, Room 101, and Newspeak, which are not simply symbols or devices of fiction, but representations of how the totalitarian regime controls thought, language, memory, and identity. How Orwell's vision corresponds closely with a number of important theoretical frameworks, including Foucault's theoretical construct of disciplinary power and surveillance, Lacan's concept of the symbolic order and the fragmented subject, Marcuse's amalgamation located within the language of totalitarianisms, Arendt's conception of social isolation and existential isolation that manifests totalitarian regimes, reveals how representational theorizing can produce meaningful connections to ideological totalitarianism.

Most importantly, *1984* presents an analytic view of tyranny, not as something external or physical, but as a diffusion process that invades the internal world of the subject—emotionally, psychologically, and symbolically. What is it that Orwell demonstrates?

According to Orwell, authoritarian regimes cannot maintain the status quo through violence alone. However, violence undermines critical thinking, shatters language, weakens social cohesion, and ultimately destroys the norms that sustain the regime. The deep structures of totalitarian regimes may insert one representing resistance, i.e., fragmented and contained within the logic of the regime; This process has a deeper meaning, as totalitarianism maintains itself through internal control—when individuals extinguish resistance not through external force, but from within.. In conclusion, *1984* is more than a historical allegory—rather, a tactile meditation on emotional components of complicity, ethical choices of conviction, and the welfare of human sustainability in the era of ideological tyranny.

Aim of the Study

This research focuses on the general objective of a very keen analysis of tyranny and dictatorship within *1984* concerning the techniques that represent the regimes. This will require an approach that compares the methods of enslavement in the novel to other historical periods to highlight the contemporary relevance of Orwell's portrayal. Moreover, the study will assess the applicability of the literary devices employed by the author in portraying the reproduction of tyranny in the character's experiences. Another important aim is to evaluate the nature of character transformation through the depiction of psychological consequences arising from the existence of a dictatorship regime on the citizens. The examination will also unveil how the novel's context enhances the general tone of dominance and repression. In addition, compliance with societal and political factors as the drivers of characters' actions within the story will also be analyzed. The study will also establish the level to which *1984* depicts general ideas of power, control, and revolt. It seeks to find the extent of the use of propaganda as well as censorship as means of perpetrating dictatorship in the story. The form of resistance and subversion used by the characters will also be described and evaluated concerning how effective they are. In preparation for the analysis, the study will conduct a search for secondary sources regarding tyranny and dictatorship to establish a list of desired works. Finally, the study aims to provide a critical literary interpretation of the novel *1984*, shedding light on the mechanisms through which the literature reflects, deconstructs, and reveals the enduring structures of tyranny and ideological oppression.

The present study aims to clearly define its scope in order to enhance a systematic and coherent approach to analyze *1984*, specifically in relation to the tactics of tyranny and dictatorship portrayed in the novel. The geographical method of analysis will also be limited to

the time of writing of the novel; this would assist in the identification of the possible sources applied by the author and general socio-political context that would characterize the time of writing of the novel. This temporal restriction contributes to framing the novel within its historical perspective, which allows for an analysis of the ideological and political forces that influenced its creation. In content terms, it may be said that the scope of this research is mainly concerned with the text of *1984*. In the context of this novel, the analysis of autocratic rule is going to be discovered in the character transformation, narrating of the plot line and subjects such as rebellion, suffering under the oppression; what it means to live under the dictatorship psychologically. The study will examine how Orwell uses literary devices—such as symbolism, irony, and narrative perspective—to emphasize themes of control, surveillance, and ideological hegemony. Some of the background works for the study include historical works that attempt to explore dictators, articles that tackle the psychological aspect of the subject, and analyses of the novel with emphasis on dictators. Additional literary texts that explore similar themes—such as tyranny, resistance, and ideological control—could also be considered to place *1984* within a broader comparative literary framework. However, the study will deal selectively with secondary sources that directly contribute to a deeper understanding of the novel *1984* and its criticism of tyranny.

To examine the mechanisms of tyranny and dictatorship as depicted in the novel *1984*, this research aims to explore how the novel expresses these themes and the understanding it offers of the nature of authoritarian regimes. The research will focus in particular on how the narrative structure supports the depiction of an oppressive political environment. It will also examine the development of characters as a reflection of the psychological impact of authoritarian regimes. Furthermore, the study will analyze the literary techniques used by the author to embody processes such as indoctrination and propaganda, focusing on their role in shaping public perception and compliance. The novel's setting will also be investigated for its symbolic meaning and how it reflects real historical dictatorships. Finally, the significance of social stratification within the novel will be reviewed, focusing on how hierarchical divisions contribute to supporting oppressive power and are reflected in the characters' interactions. The focus of the work will be the descriptive analysis of the novel and its elements within the framework of the concepts applied.

This study relies on the methodology of careful reading to provide an in-depth literary analysis of the novel *1984*, aiming to uncover its central plot threads, characters, and themes. The analytical approach includes an in-depth exploration of narrative aspects to discover how

they contribute together to the portrayal of tyranny and dictatorship. It focuses in particular on the use of literary devices in the novel. These literary devices—such as irony, symbolism, and representation—are used by Orwell to offer implicit criticisms of totalitarian systems, and to reveal their psychological and structural foundations. Through metaphor, symbolism, and narrative structure, the text reveals multiple layers of meaning related to control, resistance, and indoctrination. The study also provides a comprehensive analysis of the main characters, closely observing their developments and interactions to understand how they respond to and reflect their existence within an authoritarian regime. The transformation of the main characters throughout the novel highlights the personal and societal effects of political oppression. Regarding sources, the novel *1984* constitutes the primary source material for this research. All interpretations and analyses are drawn directly from the book's content, ensuring consistency and authenticity with the original narrative. To further support and contextualize the findings, secondary sources, such as academic articles, critical essays, and historical research on authoritarianism and dictatorship, will be incorporated into the analysis. These materials offer theoretical and comparative perspectives that reinforce the primary textual interpretation. Ultimately, the research also explores the social and political context of the late 1940s, when *1984* was written and published, to understand the ideological concerns that shaped Orwell's vision. This contextual understanding allows for a deeper explanation of how *1984* reflects, criticizes, and warns against realist authoritarian tendencies. This understanding adds depth to the analysis by placing the novel within its broader historical and ideological framework.

Literature Review

One of the pivotal values in exploring the portrayal of tyrants and dictators in literature lies in the deep understanding it provides of the psychological drivers and social and political conditions that lead to the emergence of authoritarian regimes. Therefore, this literature review aims to discuss the various multiple aspects of power and oppression in the portrait of authoritarian regimes presented in the literature, especially in the novel *1984*. This topic has been discussed widely in the academia in different disciplines including political science, psychology, sociology, criticism and literature. Previous academic work has examined how literature reflects or challenges oppressive systems, how individuals deal psychologically with oppression, and how texts and images are embedded in historical reality. This review brings together essential contributions from these fields to build a comprehensive theoretical foundation for the literary analysis of *1984*.

To derive a meaningful analysis of the presentation of dictatorial power, Bhattacharya and Chattopadhyay (2015) note that the form that the novel takes is integrally tied to this theme. They show an insightful analysis of the text and convincing as to how the author uses a rather nonlinear plot structure to reflect the experience of living in a dictatorship and how it causes disorientation. The fragmentation of the timeline is done in a way to disable the audience just as they are disabled by an unpredictable and chaotic governmental regime of the state. This argument aligns closely with Orwell's stylistic choices, in which time, memory, and perception become unstable under totalitarian conditions. They go further by suggesting that this dislocation is the process of the systematic dismantling of the individual which tyrants love to employ once they are in power. By analyzing key moments where characters' perceptions of time and reality are blurred, the study reveals how Orwell's use of postmodernist techniques enhances the novel's portrayal of control and psychological manipulation.

As Hannah Arendt (*Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 1963, p. 290) states, totalitarian bureaucracies depend on their ability to turn individuals into functionaries - "cogs" in the gargantuan machine that does the administrative work - thus destroying their moral conscious. While Arendt's earlier book *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) provides a sociopolitical and philosophical account of the historical forces that made those regimes possible, including the collapse of established class structures, the emergence of mass society, and the spread of ideologically based rationales for total domination, *Eichmann in Jerusalem* introduces a psychological aspect through the ideas surrounding the "banality of evil." Arendt developed the idea of the banality of evil to explain how normal people, like Eichmann, wound themselves into systems of oppression mindlessly, not with malicious intent, but because they were serving their duties.

Orwell captures this impersonality that accompanies bureaucratic responsibility in 1984, where the Party operates as a faceless machine, and characters like O'Brien execute torture and surveillance with no ideological conviction, or hatred, but as a dutiful functionary. The violence imposed by the Party is ordinary — delivered through agents who do not see their work as moral choices, or morality- the act has become banal. Illustrated through Orwell's dystopia lies with Arendt's essay — cruelty is not always based on hate but by the mechanical compliance made by actors within bureaucratic systems engineered to deny and remove individual responsibilities..

Chomsky's *Media Control* (1991) is regarding propaganda and the manipulation of the audience for the preservation of power. Chomsky makes quite a powerful point here when he

says that mass media is a mechanism through which the elites construct consensus while at the same time silencing the opposition and thus aids in the continued maintenance of tyranny and oppression (Chomsky, 1991, pp. 1–2). This idea parallels Orwell's portrayal of the Ministry of Truth in *1984*, where history is rewritten and truth is systematically distorted to maintain ideological control. Both views emphasize how information distortion becomes a cornerstone of authoritarian rule. It derives from Bhattacharya and Chattopadhyay's and Arendt's concepts and elaborates on the modern means by which state power maintains its reign over a population, which is a critique of the media. Chomsky encourages readers to reflect on how the manipulation of information and control of a story are incorporated in *1984*.

Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* Michel Foucault in his book *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1995) gives a detailed insight of how the great institutions of society exercise power through discipline. A very detailed analysis of how the punishment changed from a very brutal method, which included public execution, to a silent authority that dominates prisons through surveillance and normalization processes. His conception of the "panopticon"—a metaphor for constant, invisible surveillance—aligns closely with Orwell's portrayal of the Party's omnipresent gaze in *1984*, particularly through devices such as the telescreen and the figure of Big Brother. This form of surveillance not only enforces obedience but also reshapes internal subjectivity.

As Snyder (2017) and Arendt (1951) note in their analysis of totalitarian regimes, authoritarian powers engage in the use of the external threat and manufactured crises to impose internal control. In Orwell's *1984*, additive war is not only explicable as a form of perpetual war, but it also is a strategic obstinacy of political character. Opponents, allies, enemies, all are concepts rendered useless, as war becomes a perpetual state for no other reason than to maintain internal control for governing power. According to Snyder (2017), totalitarian regimes often rely on the continuous invocation of external or internal enemies to justify calls for unity and suppress dissent. This persistent emphasis on threats fosters a culture of anticipatory obedience, where individuals align with authoritarian expectations even before being forced, thereby accelerating the erosion of critical thinking and democratic resistance (Snyder, 2017, p. 11). This fabrication of external conflict becomes a psychological mechanism of fear and obedience. In other words, the members of the society become slaves to a political enemy and fabricated fear. Similarly, Arendt posits that totalitarian systems operate by instituting fear, and rendering repression justifiable and palatable through manufactured systems of existential fear that threatens society (Arendt, 1951, pp. 474–478). In *1984*, war becomes less about "winning"

or "defeating" a political opponent, and instead becomes a psychological agent of transcending political manipulation of poor political and governing behaviors ideologic manipulation that collapses thought and morality organized in social, economic, or geopolitical manipulations forming decisions in a tissue of internal tyranny.

Stephen Greenblatt (1980) argues that, within the context of *a Renaissance self-consciousness* about identity, it had become a malleable and strategically constructed concept but was also still defined and shaped by the force of dominant social and institutional forms of power—religion, the state, and the patriarchal family (Greenblatt, 1980, pp. 1–9). Greenblatt's study of figures such as Moor and Shakespeare highlights the tensions between court politics, religious instability, and individual identity. A prevalent concept in all of his works, and one that the characters in *1984* feel due to the fictional totalitarian regime, is the concept of "self-fashioning," the art of shaping a lifestyle that defies societal norms or simply its constraints. This concept helps frame Winston Smith's struggle as a form of existential self-definition under surveillance. Greenblatt's theoretical framework thus provides a lens for analyzing how the characters in *1984*, specifically Winston Smith negotiates their identities through small acts of disobedience, memory or desire, even under the watchful eye of the omnipresent Big Brother.

Primo Levi's *The Drowned and the Saved* (1988), is a work of a memoir about surviving Auschwitz while laying down moral questions for which survivors and oppressors shared responsibility for answering. Levi's insights into the human capacity to cause and endure suffering reflect key themes in *1984*, particularly Winston Smith's internal struggle with guilt, complicity, and the burden of survival under totalitarian oppression. Levi's emphasis on survival ethics resonates with Orwell's portrayal of broken human will and adaptation under tyranny. Speaking about himself and sharing his story strengthens the novel's focus on individual's identity within the context of the oppressive regime.

The science fiction novel *1984* by George Orwell is frequently referenced as an example of totalitarianism. Orwell's novel portrays a world under a totalitarian state, individual freedoms are obliterated, realities are distorted, and authoritarian control is established in every area of life (Patil, 2025, p. 207). Thus, the dystopian vision of the society observed in Orwell's works, especially in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* describes an authoritarian government that controls every aspect of life. In *1984*, Orwell illustrates this mechanism through the ever-present Big Brother gaze and telescreens, which create a social structure in which citizens are disciplined not only externally but internally as well.

In his book published in the United States in 2004, *The Anatomy of Fascism*, Robert O. Paxton defines the fascisms by their constituent parts. The insights which can be gleaned from Paxton's view on the processes of gaining people's support, the usage of propaganda, and creation of enemies are crucial to understanding the social factors that allow fascism to rise and consolidate its power (Paxton, 2004, pp. 5–6). Paxton's taxonomy provides a socio-psychological map that aligns with the Party's use of enemies and symbols like Emmanuel Goldstein. The above framework can be examined in relation to the forces present in *1984*, where the party creates enemies like Emanuel Goldstein, manipulates public sentiment through two-minute hate, and employs propaganda to maintain overall control.

As discussed, in *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*, Snyder emphasizes historiographic lessons on how to stand up to authoritarianism. Snyder's brief manual offers recommendations for practice derived from the historical lessons of tyranny, stressing the need for active participation in community life and individual awareness of potential threats. It is a motivational act that springs from the necessity of action—an idea that resonates with the contrasting notions of activity and passive compliance as illustrated in *1984*, particularly through Winston's internal conflict and eventual surrender to the system.

Susan Sontag's 1975 essay entitled *Fascinating Fascism* deals with the tragic abandonment of critical judgment and the attraction or glorification of contemporaneous totalitarianism. This makes cultural criticism relevant to investigating how and what dictatorships are portrayed and imagined, a theme that closely aligns with Orwell's depiction of totalitarianism in *1984*, particularly in how the regime shapes aesthetics, ideology, and public perception. Sontag's critique informs our understanding of how totalitarianism manipulates not just minds but also cultural tastes.

The themes of tyranny and dictatorship are familiar to readers of a great deal of literature; it is possible to say that *1984* stands out within a long tradition of political and dystopian works dealing with authoritarianism. Ongoing research extends previous investigations in an attempt to comment on the mechanisms of dictatorial power and the psychological experience of individuals under authoritarian control in *1984*. This study will examine the implications of these representations in deepening the understanding of Winston Smith's resilience and its complex relationship with rejection and submission under the Greater Brother system. Such analysis reveals how individual subjectivity becomes the ultimate battlefield in totalitarian regimes. That is why the study is to reveal the sorts of psychological

motivisms and sociopolitical circumstances, as the factors behind dictatorial regimes and various aspects of the literature that may help overcome them.

Finally, the Significance of this research lies in providing a different perspective for examining the novel *1984*. It shifts the focus from the mechanisms of state control to the psychological and social mechanisms through which people reproduce and maintain authoritarian rule. By examining how characters internalize fear, ideology, and surveillance, this thesis sheds light on how authoritarianism can persist, or even exist, without institutional support. In a world where authoritarianism appears to be on the rise, I hope this study will contribute to broader discussions about power, complicity, and resistance. It also adds value to both literary studies and political thought by illustrating how the novel can offer insight into, and warn against, the persistent dangers of ideological conformity and psychological control. The findings may also serve as a lens for examining current global dynamics of oppression and control.

1. CHAPTER 1

1.1 Theoretical Framework and Scope of the Study

The study of literature has the tendency of moving from mere narration, to reflect deeper social structures, political systems, and the historical evolution of power dynamics. Thus, the consideration of the topics, which include tyranny or dictatorship in the works of literature, gives deep understanding of the processes in the framework of authoritarianism and the human experience under dictatorial rule (Arendt, 1951). The aim of this study is to explore these themes with reference to a novel of this type, which is *1984* by George Orwell.

Tyranny and dictatorship are not only terms of reference regarding the bygone days as they are actively used in the 21st century. It is here that the importance of studying these themes becomes apparent: for all the differences between epochs and cultures, these issues remain urgent. Literature is really a way to grasp the infinite graduations of power and the eternal tenacity within the human spirit in regard to tyranny (Greenblatt, 1980). In so doing, this particular research seeks to join the discussion among academics on how literature does reflect, challenge, and shape conceptions of authoritarian stewardship as illustrated in George Orwell's novel, *1984*.

The novel *1984*'s highly symbolic and affluent narrative of a dictatorship provides fertile ground for allegorical depictions of life under a totalitarian regime. In this study, the aim is to uncover hidden meanings within Orwell's novel by examining how literary techniques—such as irony, symbolism, and narrative distortion—are used to convey the complex nature of totalitarian dictatorship. Thus, in the framework of this analysis, the research will reveal how the novel helps to form the understanding of tyranny and its impact on people's psychological condition.

The study will also examine the psychosocial burden of life under dictatorship. While literature, and especially Orwell's treatment in *1984*, greatly illuminates the nuances of how repression influences the human psyche, we can derive the experience of Winston Smith according to his imperfect memory, limited emotional engagement with others or fleeting moments of connection and personal acts of internal resistance to a system that actively and relentlessly tries to deter personal identity—an approach that is better understood using psychoanalytic context than survivor testimony (Lacan, 2006). The social and political backdrop of *1984*, including its dystopian setting and totalitarian structure, creates a critical framework for analyzing how power is embodied in both narrative and structure. The study will

analyze how Orwell constructs both the material and cultural structure of Oceania to create a general atmosphere of control and enforced submission, in close alignment with Foucault's analysis of disciplinary institutions and mechanisms of surveillance (Foucault, 1995). A major advantage of this work will be in highlighting how Orwell's contextual world defines the consequences of tyranny on both the individual psyche—as illustrated by Winston's Collapse—and the societal structure, as illustrated by the passive and manipulative masses.

In this context, this study will begin to examine an overarching inquiry: that Orwell is not simply demonstrating a one-dimensional tyranny imposed from above; rather he dramatizes the manner in which such regimes are created and repeated from within, by the very people who are oppressed. In the case of Winston this is particularly revealing, in which he makes stabs at resistance, providing submission that is aligned with the very ideologies which he had resisted. We will examine this situation as far more than the moral collapse of Winston. What we recognize in this collapse is a more complex process of complicity and conceptual absorption, which will be understood using psychoanalytic and ideological perspectives in the chapters to come. So, while this section outlines the theoretical and narrative framework, subsequent chapters further investigate how the reproduction of dictatorship is carried out by the characters themselves, making this study not simply an exploration of power, but of complicity in the reproduction of dictatorial power.

1.2 Literary Reflections on Tyranny through the Theories of Arendt, Weber, and Foucault

The concepts of tyranny and dictatorship have long been entrenched in political discourse and literary expression. Historically, the term tyranny derives from the Greek word *tyrannos*, meaning a ruler who exercises power without legal or constitutional constraints. Similarly, the Roman concept of *dictatorship* initially referred to a temporary position in times of emergency but gradually evolved into a term associated with absolute and oppressive power.

Throughout literature, these systems of government have served as primary themes through which authors critique or reflect on the dynamics of real-world politics. From the satirical approach of Machiavelli's *The Prince* to Orwell's dystopian vision of *1984*, literary depictions of tyranny are not only artistic expressions but also cautionary commentaries on the fragility of freedom. In *1984*, Orwell emphasizes this tradition of building a society in which tyranny is institutionalized through psychological manipulation, historical distortion, and constant surveillance. The Party's slogan, "Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two

make four. If that is granted, all else follows” illustrates the depth of control over thought and truth. (Orwell, 2003, p.103).

One of the most important thinkers of totalitarianism is Hannah Arendt, and her groundbreaking text *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) is a landmark study highlighting the elements – structural and psychological – that make such regimes possible. Totalitarianism, according to Arendt, is marked by the dissolution of the boundary between the public and private, the use of ideology to blur reality, and the deliberate isolation of citizens from viable forms of civic participation; Arendt says they actively seek these forms of isolationary participation (Arendt, 1951, pp. 322–323). These characteristics are very much in keeping with the dystopian setting of *1984*, where citizens like Winston Smith are subjected to constant surveillance, ideological indoctrination, and a complete erosion of personal identity. Orwell captures this isolation most clearly when he reflects on Winston: “Nothing was your own except the few cubic centimeters inside your skull.” (Orwell, 2003, p.34).

Max Weber's theory of authority provides a valuable lens through which to analyze the processes of domination in totalitarian regimes. His famous classification of authority—traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal—helps explain how regimes build and maintain their legitimacy. In *1984*, however, legitimacy is replaced by a manufactured sense of order and fear, enforced through a rigid bureaucratic system. Although Weber did not discuss *1984* directly, his concept of bureaucratic domination can be applied to the Party's structure, which is impersonal, centralized, and systematized. The Ministry of Truth, for example, operates not through the personal influence of leaders but through the mechanical and systematic application of ideological doctrine.

Michel Foucault's analysis of power and surveillance complements this framework. In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault argues that modern forms of control are internalized through constant surveillance, normalization, and the regulation of behavior. These mechanisms are clearly present in *1984*, where the Party exercises control not only through physical surveillance but also through the psychological internalization of its gaze. Figures like Winston and Julia monitor their actions in anticipation of punishment or exclusion, embodying Foucault's concept of "disciplinary power" (Foucault, 1995). The psychological impact of living under such oppressive regimes has also been explored by writers such as Primo Levi, who documented the traumatic effects of concentration camp life in *Survival at Auschwitz*. His reflections on the existential consequences of totalitarian regimes—fear, moral ambiguity,

and the disintegration of personal identity—also echo Orwell's depiction of a society devoid of authentic individuality (Levi, 1988).

Thus, examining *1984* within this theoretical and historical framework goes beyond mere narrative analysis. It provides a multidimensional understanding of the mechanisms of power, the erosion of individuality, and the silent complicity that allows tyranny to persist. The integration of Arendt's philosophical insights, Weber's structural theory, and Foucault's critique of surveillance deepens the literary study and places it firmly within the realm of political and existential thought. *1984*, as a literary work is a narrative that tells more than planned dictatorship and tyrant rulers; it is a reflection of the socio-political world of authority. The theme of tyranny emerges as a historical vehicle, where power restricts freedom and language itself becomes a tool of deception. These are questions that have been taboo to people since the dawn of history. These are questions that have remained anathemas to people from time immemorial. It is both appropriate and necessary to place *1984* in the series of literature that depicts authoritarian rule, oppression, and the psychology of control.

One can easily recognize that *1984* is a story that deals with many issues of people's existence in conditions of totalitarianism. Representing characters surviving in a centralized system of total control is consistent with the work of political theorists, in particular Hannah Arendt examined the psychological and structural conditions of an oppressive regime (Arendt, 1951). Orwell's presentation of the psychological and sociopolitical dimensions of authoritarianism is not hypothetical as it reflects the realities of a historical period marked by the rise of fascist and communist regimes.

From the concepts that seem to underlie *1984*, It turns out that Orwell drew deeply from historical and ideological contexts shaped by oppression, conformity, and rebellion. The novel's events, and characters, reflect the structural patterns of real totalitarian regimes, especially those prevalent in the twentieth century. These comparisons allow readers to understand the universal features of authoritarian rule and the specific historical and cultural anxieties that appear in Orwell's dystopia.

In addition, *1984* can be seen as a text that participates in the broader tradition of literary resistance to authoritarianism, where metaphor, irony, and narrative complexity become tools of dissent. As Susan Sontag (1975) argued in her critique of fascist aesthetics, cultural forms—especially literature—can either reinforce or challenge dominant power structures. Orwell's use of narrative irony and symbolic subversion places the novel firmly within this tradition of

critical engagement with tyranny. Which invites readers to think deeply about the mechanisms of control and the fragility of truth in authoritarian contexts (Greenblatt, 1980).

In addition to the themes, which in the case of the novel are somewhat explicit, it can be said that *1984* is also valuable in terms of the possibilities it opens for analyzing the contemporary discourses on governance and power. Indeed, following Snyder (2017), there is a role of literature in identifying and combating contemporary neo-totalitarianism. Thus, with references to historical experience and literary tropes, *1984* goes beyond simple narrative and develops into a critical reflection on how societies respond to concentrated power and the urgent need to protect democratic values.

1.3 Explanation of Methodological Approaches

The method for this analysis starts with an interpretive textual analysis of *1984* using an interpretive textual analysis, which examines how Orwell utilizes symbolic elements and character behavior and interaction to represent the processes of authoritarianism, using the fictional representations as a reference, we then connect it to the theoretical aspects derived from Paxton (2004) especially his explanation of fascism as an active mobilization driven by crisis, mass mobilization, and abandonment of the democratic process. These sources will also help to contrast the portrayal of dictatorships in *1984*, with real life. Furthermore, the study integrates theoretical frameworks that include Michel Foucault's theory of disciplinary power, Hannah Arendt's analysis of totalitarianism, and Jacques Lacan's psychoanalytic model of the Big Other (Lacan, 2006), to deepen literary inquiry. Secondary research will be undertaken for the socio-political background of when the novel was written. This historical context, particularly the rise of fascist and communist regimes, is crucial for understanding Orwell's thematic intentions and symbolic structure the time and place of the author can provide one with an understanding of possible influence on the text, and its themes.

The chosen methodology is significant because it helps to make a more elaborate analysis of the novel's potential to enrich the concept of authoritarianism. It is, therefore, the intention of the study to show both the theoretical and the historical perspectives in analyzing *1984* as a literary text and as a source of insight into areas of literature and political science.

In a world that is still a vivid resonant of authoritarianism, books such as *1984* are not only important but are essential. Long after the events and stories of this novel, tyranny and dictatorship remain relevant forms of government and social controlling, hence this work as an effective tool for analysis of today's society. This study does not only provide literary criticism,

but it also interacts with political theory, using perspectives from Arendt on totalitarianism, Foucault on the mechanisms of discipline, and Lacan on the subject's internalization of power through the concept of the "Big Other" (Lacan, 2006). These approaches allow for a deeper understanding of how the characters of *1984* bear power, and even subconsciously reproduce systems of control.

Works of literature are a mirror of the society, which means that they echo the most popular, the most believed, and the most accepted principles of the society during the time the literature was produced (Greenblatt, 1980). However, *1984* is not merely an imaginative critique of social and political dynamics, but a psychological exploration of how individuals represent and replicate the mechanisms of power. In this way, it offers a point of view that allows modern academics to study the continuity of authoritarianism and the effects that it has on people and cultures (Greenblatt, 1980).

1984 can be interpreted not only as a critique of authoritarian regimes, but also as an exposure of how individuals are complicit in upholding these regimes. Through characters like Winston and Parsons, Orwell shows how people institutionalize the values of the ruling party and begin to emulate its mechanisms of control. This aligns with Lacan's concept of the "Big Other"—a symbolic authority whose presence dominates the subject (Lacan, 2006). While Winston contemplates the futility of rebellion, his ideas reveal a deeper subordination to the symbolic order imposed by the party. Thus, the novel not only depicts oppression from above, but also reveals how it is reinforced from within.

While Orwell's *1984* critiques state repression, it also offers insight into how ordinary individuals contribute to the renewal of authoritarian power. Characters like Parsons do not resist the system, but rather embrace it, embodying the unconscious submission to power that Lacan identifies through the "Big Other." This symbolic figure serves as a prospective source of law and order—its presence need not be constantly enforced because it is embedded in the individual's psyche. Thus, even in the absence of physical coercion, individuals in *1984* behave as if they are under surveillance, censorship, and judgment. This internalized surveillance perpetuates the system more effectively than violence alone.

Although fiction is not the equivalent of political discourse, it reflects the political climates in which it is created and provides a space for examining issues of power, control, and governance. Authoritarian regimes and power in literature can illustrate the processes by which these governments seek to control and coordinate people (Foucault, 1995). In *1984*, the

internalization of authoritarian ideology is so widespread that even ordinary citizens mimic the mechanisms of power themselves. For example, Parsons, after being reprimanded by his daughter for committing a thought crime, proudly declares; “I’m proud of her. It shows I brought her up in the right spirit, anyway.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 295). This moment clearly highlights how individuals not only adhere to the values of the system, but also reproduce them, embodying Lacan’s concept of the “Big Other,” where the individual seeks recognition—even from oppressive authority—by aligning with its ideology. Such moments in the novel highlight the terrifying triumph of totalitarian systems: the enslavement of conscience itself. While literature is often a reflection of prevailing power dynamics, it can also be a covert form of resistance against dominant political structures.

By crafting stories that deviate from official ideological frameworks, writers can disrupt the narratives used to legitimize authoritarian regimes. Literary texts often embed ideological critiques into characters and plots, influencing political consciousness. In *1984*, for example, Winston’s rebellion—beginning with the thought “Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four”—ends in psychological surrender: “But it was all right, everything was all right... He loved Big Brother” (Orwell, 2003, p. 376). While Susan Sontag (1975) primarily critiques the aestheticization of fascism, her warning about the seductive power of cultural forms underscores the need to remain vigilant against representations that normalize domination. This aligns with Lacan’s notion that the subject’s desire is structured by the “Big Other”—a symbolic authority whose recognition defines one’s identity. In Orwell’s dystopia, even the desire for freedom is ultimately redirected toward the oppressive gaze of the Party, resulting in a psychological reproduction of tyranny (Lacan, 2006).

This psychological mechanism illustrates how observation of internalized control and desire for approval by authorities function as self-reinforcing dominance systems. Lacan’s theory will be utilized here as a key interpretive framework, one that will allow a deeper psychological reading of the actions of the characters—not as mere products of the system; but as agents who unconsciously assist in the maintenance and reproduction of it. The characters are not merely products of ideology, but rather they were made into tools of it, which lies at the heart of this research’s objective to reveal the functioning of tyranny, reproduced from within.

2. CHAPTER2

2.1 The Socio-Political Landscape

Rather than being merely a backdrop, the social and political landscape in *1984* actively shapes the characters' behaviors and inner worlds. The totalitarian environment constructs a reality in which individual desires are denied, and obedience becomes a psychological necessity. As Arendt (1951) argues, totalitarianism flourishes when private and public life collapse into a single ideological space. In this framework, Orwell highlights how individuals not only suffer under power but also internalize it. The novel's depiction of Winston's eventual capitulation—"He loved Big Brother"—exemplifies Lacan's notion of the "Big Other," suggesting that the subject subconsciously seeks acceptance even from an oppressive authority (Lacan, 2006). This illustrates a deeper mechanism: authoritarianism is not only internalized from above, but is also reproduced from within.

Censorship in *1984* was not limited to institutional repression; vision of self-censorship became clear. For example, Winston works at the Ministry of Truth, where he actively alters historical records to conform to Party ideology. This creates a society where truth itself is unstable. "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell, 2003, p.44). This manipulation is reciprocated by characters who lose faith in their memories. This demonstrates Lacan's view that the ego, in its quest for validation from the 'Big Other', will conform to dominant narratives even when they differ from its own experience (Lacan, 2006).

In *1984*, physical coercion and psychological pressure combine to discipline not only bodies but also minds. Torture in the Ministry of Love is the most direct form of domination, but Orwell shows that true control is achieved when individuals begin to monitor and evaluate themselves. This duality of visible and invisible violence echoes Foucault's theory of Discipline and Punish (1995), where the individual subjects himself to surveillance and becomes both the prisoner and guardian of his own mind. The Party's use of ideology in *1984*—from the doctrine of English socialism to the ritual of the "Two Minutes Hate"—contributes to the replacement of personal judgments with state-imposed beliefs. As Arendt (1951) explains, totalitarian regimes thrive when ideology replaces reality and reshapes the human conscience. Through constant indoctrination, the regime not only enforces obedience but also compels citizens to desire it. Characters like Parsons not only accept the party's ideology but celebrate it, demonstrating how indoctrination drives citizens to subconsciously conform to the regime. For example, when his daughter is arrested for thought crime, Parsons says, "I'm proud of her. It

shows that I raised her with the right spirit" (Orwell, 2003, p. 295). This illustrates Lacan's (2006) concept of the "Big Other": a symbolic authority so deeply ingrained that subservience becomes a form of identity. Individuals no longer need direct commands to conform—they police and discipline themselves out of an unconscious need for recognition from the system. Thus, Orwell's novel not only depicts top-down oppression but also reveals a deeper mechanism of tyranny: one that is not merely imposed from above but is reproduced from within, by the very individuals it subjugates.

2.2 Historical Parallels and Internal Reproduction of Authoritarianism

The world of *1984*, like many real-world dictatorships, represents tyranny not only from above, but from within. The imaginary society of Oceania contains traces of Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, and implies many of the traits of totalitarian regimes, which reflect how totalitarian regime's structure and manipulate human behavior (Arendt, 1951). Thinking about the Party, as a generalized structural elite, is propaganda as possibly the most powerful item at each person and perceptions level. Big Brother's face appears in the streets, shops, books and everywhere else. The public rituals (e.g., "Two Minutes Hate") foster unity in shared outrage for the system." It was impossible to avoid joining in" (Orwell, 2003, p.19), shows how even personal emotions can be distorted by the regime.

The control of history is yet another deep-seated item / tool used. At the Ministry of Truth, Winston's duty is to edit old records and documents into accounts to match the Party's version of truth. The Party slogan: " Who controls the past... controls the future: who controls the present controls the past " (Orwell, 2003, p 44), demonstrates the overt system. People have petty memories that are tweaked in their interpretations, only to trust the Party's lies, becoming normality.

The idea of self-monitoring/monitoring just all amid the central surveillant gaze is also key. The telescreens remind everyone they are being watched. This constant awareness reinforces their fear, which stimulates self-control. As the narrator explains: " You had to live—did live, from habit that became instinct—in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard..." (Orwell, 2003, p.5). This reflects the general principle of Foucault's panoptism; in essence, it is the threat of the gaze that will invoke the behaviors.

O'Brien as a character shows that the system becomes reproduced through individuals. Winston becomes overwhelmed with initially the thought that O'Brien will be a dissident, but he is actually the same person who destroys Winston's mind. " We convert him, we capture his

inner mind, we reshape him " (Orwell, 2003, p 321). O'Brien was not just implementing rule, as he believed in the same ruling, this is much more dangerous. This aligns with Arendt that totalitarian regimes do not seek to control actions, but all thoughts (Arendt, 1951).

The way that people accept dictatorships when they need stability, as after war and turmoil, an apathetic populace duty and thus accepted the Party to not be chaotic. This relates to Paxton's (2004) assertion of fascists who, within a context, will rise to order and unity. This ability to comply also relates to Lacan's theory of the "Big Other" (Lacan, 2006) where subjects desire symbolic recognition, even in oppressive structures, so that they might be stabilized. In other words, citizens develop a psychological investment in the authority that must govern them, even when that authority dehumanizes or punitive in nature.

How does this resistance project, it is ceaseless. In essence, Orwell illustrates what rebellion can look like when personal behaviors can be replicated and evolve in exigent behaviors of obedience. Julia, once proud to oppose the system, eventually describes herself as being in a dissociated emotional state following her experience of torture: " And after that, you don't feel the same towards the other person any longer " (Orwell, 2003, p.369). This agrees with Lacan's argument in *The Subversion of the Subject and The Dialectic of Desire* (2006), where Lacan specifies that subjectivity and desire are not stable, but continuously reshaped through symbolic disruptions, notably appraising the type of disruption power causes and the type of disruption the experience of trauma creates, power can alter the individual's orientation to, for example, the experience of trauma can reorganize the individual's relationship with themselves and their relationship with authority. Lacan's model of psychoanalysis provides insight into how the structure of trauma can alter not only singular subjectivity but collective submission. The subject internalizes the gaze of power and in its quest for approval turns itself into another vehicle for the same oppressive regime they once opposed (Lacan, 2006, pp.292–324).

1984 is not only about dictatorship from above, it is about how fear, desire, and identity can be mobilized to maintain a system, that takes control of life in good faith. Each person becomes part of the machine, influencing and maintaining an unconsciously constructed system. The means of control depicted in Orwell's dystopia in *1984* are not purely fictional and reflect behavior typically exhibited by totalitarian regimes like Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia.

In Nazi Germany, propaganda was everywhere; Hitler's face was ubiquitous, and Joseph Goebbels, as the propaganda minister, ran mass media campaigns to present the regime in a positive light and demonize opponents of the regime. The public rituals demonstrated such as the Nuremberg rallies are similar to Orwell's Two Minutes Hate as they encouraged persons to focus their emotionally intense feelings of hatred towards a state-initiated object of hatred, rather than an individual. For a totalitarian regime, rewriting history is permissible as long as birth to death records are kept and punishments were especially severe if anyone were to veer from the official record. In fact, citizens lived in such a state of fear that often their own family members - in George Orwell's case, their children - would report the adults to authorities - just as Parsons demonstrates in 1984.

In Stalinist Russia, realities were switched. In a manner described in 1984, opponents of Stalin were completely erased by disappearing from photos or whatever official records existed. Stalin controlled education, language, and history to support his supreme authority. Citizens in Stalinist Russia also practiced self-censorship or what they anticipated from others, thanks to the ever-present NKVD expressed in the mantra, "Arrested for what?". Standards of loyalty to the regime were pervasive and absolute - and even demanded showmanship: an outward and public loyalty or shows of psychological submission as described in 1984. These examples could help us understand and clarify how Orwell's fictional world is directly referenced from historical examples of authoritarianism forcing internalization and self-ideological conditioning through fear and propaganda.

2.3 The Author's Socio-Political Commentary

Orwell's 1984 functions as an effective socio-political commentary on totalitarian regimes through the depiction of indoctrination, censorship, and surveillance. An effective example of education as indoctrination occurs during "Hate Week", a public event meant to inspire extreme loyalty to the Party while igniting hatred toward the Party's enemies. Through forced chants, posters, and slogans, citizens become active participants in furthering the Party's rhetoric. It demonstrates the way that authoritarian regimes create consent for their actions. As Orwell states, "The horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was not that one was obliged to act a part, but, on the contrary, that it was impossible to avoid joining in" (Orwell, 2003, p.18,19). Hate is not just tolerated but embraced.

Education is also portrayed as a mechanism for ideological control through the regime. In 1984 children are raised to become loyal spies for the regime. The Junior Spies program

turns them into tools of repression, even against their own family. As Orwell explains, "It was almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children" (Orwell, 2003, p. 31). This reflects Foucault's understanding of the way that power works through institutions, and especially works to normalize surveillance and obedience from the time they are children (Foucault, 1995).

The portrayal of literature and art is adapted through the character of *Emmanuel Goldstein* and the *Forbidden Book* that he purportedly wrote. Similar to samizdat literature in the Soviet experience, it contains truths that the regime fears. Although we can never be entirely certain whether the Book is real or merely a trap, we do know that it signifies the same thing in that narrative: that regimes suppress thought and representation. When Winston reads, "Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows" (Orwell, 2003, p. 103), it reinforces that even the act of articulating language and reasoning can itself embody acts of resistance. This moment captures how even the smallest acts of rational thought—like asserting that two plus two equals four—can threaten the foundations of totalitarian control. In Orwell's narrative, language itself becomes a battleground where resistance takes shape.

The theme of surveillance culminates through the omniscient gaze of the Party. Through the telescreen, the Thought Police, and through daily citizens (as an extension of the Party), there is a sense that the Party exists at all times and in all places. Winston reflects on the level of monitoring by sharing, "There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. How often, or on what system, the Thought Police plugged in on any individual wire was guesswork. It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time." (Orwell, 2003, p. 5). This omniscience does not merely provoke physical oppression and constraint, but it invades the psyche, stifling all opposition. This directly supports Foucault's concept of panoptic power, where individuals internalize surveillance and thus become agents of their own regulation (Foucault, 1995). On these terms, another way to conceptualize this suppression is through Foucault's notion of the internalization of power, wherein we self-police ourselves even when we think we are alone.

Therefore, the socio-political critique of *1984* is located in how structures of power adopt allegiance from the very people the regime seeks to control. Orwell is not merely warning against dictatorship "out there," he is demonstrating how it moves inside every subject. O'Brien, for instance, does not merely memorize Party ideology, he believes in it. He doesn't engage in mere acts for the Party when he engages in the manipulation of Winston, he does it

symbolically. He states clearly, " Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else. Not in the individual mind, which can make mistakes, and in any case soon perishes: only in the mind of the Party, which is collective and immortal" (Orwell, 2003, p. 314), which collapses the truth down to whatever the party trumps. This corresponds to Lacan's "Big Other" (Lacan, 2006), in which the subject internalizes an abstract authority that directs their thoughts and desires. The clearest representation of symbolic systems of power being produced within the psyche of subjects that renders resistance difficult is O'Brien's entire identification with Party ideology.

This bears great affinity to Hannah Arendt's thought where totalitarianism seeks to obliterate the distinction between reality and fiction (Arendt, 1951). Ultimately, Orwell's text strands together a generalized notion of dystopianism and respective political critique, as he situates propagandizing, the rewriting of history, policing thought, and consolidating emotionality towards the citizen. He weaves each construct into their lives and demonstrates how structures of oppression can survive and remain in existence, not merely through violence, but through particular participation and allegiance.

2.4 Power Structures and Governance in the Novel

In *1984*, the Party's power structure is not only oppressive in a vertical manner, but also diffused horizontally through all social life. Big Brother, the supposed leader, is never seen, but is always present; his image is everywhere and with the slogan: "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU" (Orwell, 2003, p. 3). This constant presence creates a cult of personality, comparable to some historical leaders, like Stalin or Mao. According to Arendt (1951), totalitarian structures require constructing infallible leaders whose very image promises the moral and political perfection of the regime.

The bureaucratic machinery is a vital tool for maintaining the illusion of order. Party member Parsons is represented as a blindly obedient functionary. Parsons is described as " one of those completely unquestioning, devoted drudges on whom, more even than on the Thought Police, the stability of the Party depended " (Orwell, 2003, p. 28). This is reflective of the "banality of evil," in which ordinary people enact systems of violence by undertaking tasks, without considering consequences.

Governance in *1984*, included state-sponsored terror. The Thought Police is representative of this subversive apparatus of control, creating fear and distrust even amongst family members. Winston states, "It was almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children" (Orwell, 2003, p. 31). This exertion of power is reflective of Foucault's

theory of disciplinary power: governance that is enacted, not just through institution, but through interpersonal relations as sustained or mediated through surveillance (Foucault, 1995).

The state's judicial system, rather than serving justice, serves obedience. Winston's experience of interrogation, or 're-education', is a collective public spectacle which reflects Foucault's perspective, that punishment is no longer simply about punishment, it is about transforming the soul. O'Brien speaks during Winston's torture: "We do not simply destroy our enemies; we change them" (Orwell, 2003, p. 319). This illustrates how totalitarian power is not only about repressing resistance, it is about changing solidarity with it. This scene also exemplifies Lacan's theory of the "Big Other" (Lacan, 2006), where individuals internalize the symbolic authority to such an extent that their identity is reconstructed according to that authority. O'Brien does not only physically torture Winston, but he also reconstructs his subjectivity and thus reinforces the reality that ideologies of tyranny are re-produced from within the subject.

The Party's governance also rests upon managing people's understanding of language. The invention of Newspeak is a deliberate attempt to limit thought through language. Syme states enthusiastically, "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 2003, p. 67). By erasing terms (such as 'freedom'), the State is narrowing not just thoughts of rebellion, but the very possibility of rebellion itself; which supports Foucault's assertion that power is embedded in discourse itself.

The regime also manages history. Winston's job as a new record creator at the Ministry of Truth, as he simply has to revise the past; "Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell, 2003, p. 44). This process of revision removes incongruities against the present, creating a reality that is entirely aligned with whatever the Party needs in the present moment. This again bolsters Lacan's (2006, Lacan) idea that human beings construct coherence through the symbolic order—even if that coherence is fictive and imposed by a higher authority. Now, it employs emotional allegiance along with the articulations of political truth.

In 1984, we see that authoritarian governance is sustained not only by force and violence but by belief. Through Parsons, and Syme as representations, we see how individuals, and even those acting with agency, are required to reproduce the system unconsciously. Totalitarianism is not sustained by a few tyrants, but from a multitude of willing participants, as Orwell asserts (Orwell, 2003, p. 261). These participants are not just complying—they are internalizing the

logic of the Party and acting as self-surveillance and ideological reproduction agents. This only affirms the thesis of this dissertation: tyranny is not just imposed, it is lived in and passed along by average people.

2.5 Propaganda, Media, and Information Control

In *1984*, propaganda is more than merely an external expression—it's an experience of life. It is the Party's design for creating a psychological context where citizens, even subconscious, personally own the Party's ideology. The face of Big Brother is ever-present in the likeness of a father figure, with posters on every wall, banners, and/or screen (Orwell, 2003, pp. 3–4; Patil, 2025, p. 208). Even as there is both fear and reverence regarding Big Brother's omnipresence, and posters, "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU" (Orwell, 2003, p. 3), warnings serve as lovely and affectionate forms of politeness—he's protector, ruler, and punisher all in one. This supports Hannah Arendt's claim that totalitarianism takes a symbolic personage and raises them to an infallible being, thus creating a new political reality (Arendt, 1951). This symbolic figure not only orients behavior externally but also takes root within the subject's unconscious structure in line with Lacan's concept of the Big Other (Lacan, 2006), where you are not merely obliged but you are compelled to obey.

The Party's manipulation of the news media within *1984* depicts the tragic sense of how truth can simply bend beneath the aggressive ownership and totalitarian authoritarianism. The Ministry of Truth is here, ironically understood as the Ministry of Ignorance or the Ministry of Fraud, to be in charge of removing memory, altering historical documents, and simply creating new truths under false circumstances for the sole purpose of the Party. Sharing with himself, Winston reflects, "Day by day and almost minute by minute the past was being brought up to date" (Orwell, 2003, p. 51). The Party's propaganda included "news reports" about economic production and/or fabricated victories in war or creating new truths about false claims, we easily experience the danger of people or citizens allowing for these alterations—not only grasping them outright as alterations but believing them outright as truth. In essence, all aspects of memory, language, and perception have been wholly congested with all pathways to the isolation of parallel truths have been eliminated in every fashion. This, also, concurs with the demographic concept proposed by Michel Foucault that regimes survive by monopolizing discourse, literally removing any alternative form of dissent (Foucault, 1995). The citizens, in their acceptance of such untruths without opposition, contribute to the production of false reality, and therefore their role and identity shifts from victim to producer of tyranny.

Propaganda operates not only through media, but performs as a dimension of quotidian behavior. Events such as "Two Minutes Hate" emphasize the collective enactment of mass manipulation. Subject citizens are expected to experience and release emotional responses of rage against Party enemies, in an organized manner. Winston describes this experience, "A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness... seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current" (Orwell, 2003, p. 19). This suggestion of spontaneity is a well-erased illusion, as the performance is a spontaneous, compulsory response and the "emotion" becomes real through rehearsed repetition. As Lacan has suggested, (Lacan, 2006), this form of compulsive repetition can be interpreted as the subject's unconscious compliance with the symbolic order-- the Party demands not just behavior but desire itself. One could argue that the symbolic order of the regime, as Lacan might insist, produces the individual desire: the hatred of the enemy becomes part of the subject.

Accessing "forbidden" material is also controlled through threat of punishment, and the pre-emptive punishment that accompanies it. As Winston clandestinely reads *The Book*, he literally shakes—not just due to fear of punishment, but also an inner conflict between his learned loyalty and newfound doubt. He writes in his diary, "Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows" (Orwell, 2003, p. 103). This act of thought has revolutionary potential. The control is so psychologically powerful that it affects self-censorship mentally in the private mind of the individual, which is described by Foucault as panoptic self-discipline (Foucault, 1995)—evidencing that real surveillance can be internalized, and the citizen is implicated in their punishment. At this point, internal resistance is relegated to psychic acquiescence; Winston's desire for truth is haunted by guilt, indicating that propaganda does not only capture discourse, it destroys identity itself.

Language is also a weapon. Newspeak aims to eradicate the expression of language by eliminating the conceptualization of subverting language altogether. Syme, a linguist, is excited about his work on the Newspeak Dictionary—"Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 2003, p. 67). The regime does not just regenerate deviant speech; they evaporate any possibility of personality against speech. This intimately embodies the Lacanian pursuit as said; to exert control over language is also to exert control over subjectivity; without the language of freedom, there cannot be the object of desire for it. From a Lacanian perspective, if desire has a language-like structure then, to remove options from language means to remove options from identity-- leaving obedience as the only option for selfhood.

In *1984*, propaganda and media are not a layer of exterior power to everyday life. By producing indoctrination, repetition, emotional responses, and instilling a constrained way of seeing and being through speech, the individual reproduces the system. Orwell's message is painfully clear: truth is no longer an objective reality in the process; it is the political will you apply to your imitation of reality; it is no longer a naive exchange, when this is how you situate permission, permission to report and to authenticate a true truth for example. This auto-reproducing nature becomes truly horrifying. This capacity for auto-reproduction becomes very strange, since it breaks down the boundaries of victim and oppressor. This recursive process shows that the individual under tyranny is not simply surviving, they are unwittingly but unwaveringly embodying and reproducing it.

2.6 The Role of Culture and Ideology

The culture portrayed in *1984* does not reflect anything remotely like a place of diversity or creativity, let alone value culture as a contrived component of party ideology. These cultural ideologies take the form of centrally controlled plays, songs, and literature that are designed to exalt party power and blame their enemies. These performative technologies, by design, mirror the fascist history of cultural concepts such as in Mussolini's Italy, where culture is fashioned to represent a totalizing, state-sponsored viewpoint (Sontag, 1975, pp. 86–87). Such actions are not coincidental—it is, as Foucault named it, a mode of cultural discipline that disguises coercion with participation (Foucault, 1995).

Additionally, education is highly politicized as well in Orwell's story, the schools are trained to be an agent of ideological training and educate children about anything but critical thinking. Children are raised to love Big Brother; children are taught - even conditioned - to betray their own parents if they did or said anything counter to the regime. Winston observes this unsettling fact, “nearly all children nowadays were horrible. What was worst of all was that, by means of such organizations as the Spies, they were systematically turned into ungovernable little savages...and would denounce their parents to the Thought Police” (Orwell, 2003, p. 31). The leadership of Oceania guarantees the Party's future by socializing young people to absorb fear and primary loyalty. As Lacan might suggest, this early conditioning fractures the child's symbolic connection with the parent, and places an abstract fealty to the regime's authority as the 'Big Other' (Lacan, 2006).

Orwell points out an array of ways that the indoctrination of the regime was achieved through the emotional ritual of 'repeat performance.' Weekly momentary rituals, the “Two

Minutes Hate" function as much more than propaganda but as a vehicle to coordinate an emotional state with the Party, an obsessive and addictive collective that captured their subject's thoughts. In 1984, ritual practices functioned in a similar way to mass political rituals in Maoist China that encouraged historians and sociologists to attempt to make the ruling ideology part of the entire social life (Arendt, 1951). Such habitual behaviors are a reiteration of Foucault's observation that discipline is not only spatial in its reach, it also temporally enacts itself, embedding itself through routine (Foucault, 1995).

Since religion offers an alternative source of belief and authority, in 1984, it is completely eradicated. In Oceania, God is replaced by political dedication. Big Brother has a god-like quality, receiving the reverence given to belongingness and truth. There are no churches and no gods, only the Party. This is akin to the anti-religious campaigns in the Soviet Union that killed millions of religious people, destroyed places of worship, and occupied or repurposed other institutions to eliminate ideological competition (Arendt, 1951). In Lacanian terms, the sacred is first emptied of its conventional significance, then filled by the regime, such that faith also becomes subsumed in the symbolic order of the Party (Lacan, 2006, pp. 292–324).

Language plays a crucial role in cultural subjugation. The complete invention of Newspeak -which is a simplified language designed to eliminate dissent- illustrates the Party's attempt to seize control not only of what people say but of what people are able to think. As we see from Syme, a Newspeak specialist, "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 2003, p. 67). This quote reveals that by limiting linguistic expression, the regime alters human consciousness itself. By removing language, the regime removes the ideas associated with the language. This means language ceases to be a tool and becomes an arena of ideological combat—control of language becomes control of reality.

History is also rewritten for ideological purposes. Winston's job at the Ministry of Truth is to rewrite articles in newspapers and official documents to fit the Party's current political position. While the original idea underlying this manipulation was sometimes made transparent in texts, it is no longer important as process to change collective memory and remove historical coherence altogether. When history is rewritten, the Party can then manufacture a reality, located in the public domain, that citizens will be unable to refute since it is now their only truth. The process of altering history serves the same total ideological purpose that forbids dissent or even context in action or of reality, or any comparison to an alternative reality. This action places Winston as a participant in the regime's own survival. His complicity epitomizes

how subjects reproduce the system from being inside it, and therefore perpetuating the logic of control, imperceptibly.

Through these vehicles of culture -education, ritual, language, and history- *1984* shows how totalitarianism seeks not to dominate the world, but also the inner world of its citizens. Orwell demonstrates that ideology can be most effective when it is internalized in people's research and lives until resistance is unimaginable instead of simply banned. The novel uses a framework to critique how culture can be used against people to sustain oppression, and ideological control requires the domination of imagination, history, and thought (Greenblatt, 1980). Ultimately, culture is an instrument of control, and the very infrastructure of tyranny's reproduction.

2.7 The Political Climates of the Real World in *1984*'s publication

When *1984* was published in 1949, the world's political map was still stained by the totalitarian regimes engaged in World War II. The violence and brutality of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia were openly displayed for the world to see. The political climate was rife with the ideologies of totalitarianism and would serve as clear inspiration for Orwell's depiction of the world in Oceania. As Hannah Arendt (1951) points out, it was not just violence that defined totalitarian regimes; they operated under a priority of erasing one's identity while renaming and altering the truth. This parallels the Party's mechanisms in *1984*. Characters such as Winston become internally colonized through the logic of domination, making any external authority unnecessary. This subsequently fulfills Arendt's assertion that ultimately the aim of the regime is the destruction of the self in order to force ideological conformity. Political sublimation became an international issue by the mid-20th century, as many countries addressed how to combat authoritarianism while embarking on the very fragile road toward democratization. Orwell also emphasizes that once indoctrinated, the individual, too, is a vehicle of tyranny—hinting that the danger is not just in systems of government, but rather in predisposed psychological and cultural willingness to comply and comply themselves.

In Latin America and Eastern Europe uprisings against oppressive governments and resistance to their regimes, was indicative of the change in mindset amongst often apathetic, compliant people. Orwell's writing mirrored this unrest and the changing tensions, as he laid bare how people may be victimized and also act as agents of oppression. For example, Winston's ambivalence to the Party's lies, culminating in his ultimate betrayal after torture, illustrates how systems of control annihilate the will, the hope, to stand against it. This transition

from potential resistance to internalized submission reflects what Arendt (1951) characterizes as the collapse of the boundary between public truth and personal integrity, when the subject ceases to resist not out of fear but out of reconstruction of belief.

The range of ambiguities presented by society, from hopefulness for change to general despair following the collapse of dictatorship is presented in *1984*, where rebellion is something that invites danger and futility. Levi (1988) argues that post-totalitarian societies, in particular, often fail to negotiate the memory and trauma of disruption. In *1984*, Orwell had anticipated the lack of negotiation, through Winston's silent, doomed resistance and the Party's totalized control over narratives, history, and language. Winston's metamorphosis from dissenter to believer illustrates the astonishing success of the internalization of ideology. Resistance becomes a mere symbol rather than a reflective attitude when the regime is allowed to dictate not just the facts, but the frameworks of understanding.

Moreover, following the Cold War and beyond *1984* has maintained its relevance; especially with concerns regarding media manipulation, civil obedience, and state systems of surveillance and monitoring. Sociology and Linguistic analyst, Noam Chomsky (1991) would later recognize how democratic societies are spoiling their own democracy, through the exercise of soft propaganda and engineering dissent. Chomsky's argument directly correlates to Orwell's concerns: when the populations learn to accept contradictions, surveillance, and the systematic alteration of language as conventional practices, they are complicit in their own oppression (Chomsky, 1991, pp. 16–18). Orwell's "Newspeak" becomes a potential model for how democracies can decline from within, rather than some Orwellian nightmare. Orwell presaged the beginning of this tragedy: the Party's absolute goal to control information, to censor, and invent an entirely new language through Newspeak, communicates the logical ending of reconstructing "truth" to manifest power. Thus, the collapse of "objective reality" is not just a fictional horror, it is political maneuver and potential for authoritarianism to regenerate even in ostensibly free societies.

In that sense, *1984* is still engaging contemporary readers as it serves as a warning not just to guard against authoritarianism, but also for their exploration of how internalized memory and trauma from protest can be subsumed and neutralized, where the protest itself becomes an allegiance to the regime. This last paradox—the gesture of revolt ending up back at the system—shows that with modern tyranny, dissent is not extinguished; dissent is folded back in as evidence of the system's categorical superiority.

2.8 Societal Reflections in *1984*

Economic stratification in the system laid out in *1984* is extreme and deliberate. This is evident in the distinction between the Inner Party, the Outer Party and the Proles indicating a society where wealth and privilege are concentrated in the hands of the few. The Proles, consisting of the vast majority, live in poverty but remain ignored by the Party because they are perceived to have no power. Winston elaborates, saying, “If there is hope... it lies in the Proles” (Orwell, 2003, p. 89), but the Party ensured they were uneducated and easily distracted. This expresses Michel Foucault’s point of view that power does not necessarily need to exhibit direct violence, rather it can render a population docile by deploying them to perceive reality in particular ways, and efficiently distributing ignorance (Foucault, 1995, pp. 222–223). This is similar in real-world cases of authoritarian regimes and how deprivation is linked to social pacification.

Additionally, the novel raises questions of moral choice and complicity. Winston wrestles internally, struggling with conforming to survive or resisting and risking destruction. His capitulation of Julia under torture is an illustration of how a totalitarian regime renders a regime for moral agency. Levi (1988) significantly noted in his engagement with trauma in relation to fascist regimes, that survival is often participating within evil and thus, producing victims that are also somehow perpetrators (Levi, 1988, pp. 36–69). Lacan (2006) would describe this submission as a rupture of the symbolic system of desire, in which the subject is not an active agent who is unconsciously re-oriented, but who is in fact forced to love what imprisons him/her (Lacan, 2006, pp. 292–300). Orwell alluded to this devastatingly, stating: “He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother” (Orwell, 2003, p. 376).

1984 also exposes the psychological violence of regimes. The constant surveillance, torture through outwardly forced conformity, and regimentation of language through Newspeak systematically dismantle personal identity, and thus, human intimacy. The isolating of private emotion—as displayed by Winston and Julia's doomed relationship—is indicative of how authoritarianism obliterates the notion of self. Arendt (1951) described this as a destruction of spontaneity, a key aspect of individuality. This rupture of personal relationships illustrates not only outside oppression, but an oppression that has been internalized—characters reproduce the power of the regime by restricting even their emotional truth. The Party does not only seek obedience, it wants to fashion thinking, rewrite desire and establish reality.

Through these multi-faceted examples, *1984* is not only a political dystopia, but a compelling reflection on what it means to be human. The novel poses a question about the price

of survival and what it means to resist and how. Arguably, it offers a disturbing yet timeless commentary on how regimes take advantage of economic inequity, they manipulate morality, and above all, they violate human dignity to maintain power. Most troublingly, *1984* suggests that when sufficiently coerced, the human subject is not just an object of oppression, but is willing to be an instrument of the regime illustrating that ideology is reproduced as not just a matter of structure, but also a matter of interpellation.



3. CHAPTER 3

3.1 Analysis of Main Characters within a Tyrannical Context

Rather than just filling the narrative, the characters of *1984* act as live examples of life under totalitarianism. They exemplify both resistance and complicity in the manner in which dictatorship not only infests political institutions but also the psyche of human beings. Orwell writes characters from a psychological stance, conflict, and relational utility to show the effects of tyranny as it dismantles individuality and tortures the soul. This dual dynamic - resisting yet internalizing the order - illustrates Louis Althusser's idea of ideological interpellation: the subject is 'hailed' into ideology and accepts it as natural (Althusser, 1971, pp. 174–176). Characters in *1984* do not merely live under ideology; they also enact it, and their actions in the novel reveal that the most intimate thoughts can feel the influence of the invisible hand of power.

Winston Smith, the protagonist, is not a dissident but rather a splintered subject whose impulse is determined by repression. He engages in secret human acts to regain his autonomy; writing the truth, even though he knows it is not good, and his sense of forbidden love. Even so, based on Lacanian theory, subjectivity is organized in relation to the Big Other, the symbolic authority which determines desire and form's identity. Winston's uprising is bound not only by the violence of external agency but by his own desire for significance within the structure of the system. The psychological grip the party exerts is chillingly summed up in O'Brien's comments, that, "You will be hollow. We shall squeeze you empty, and then we shall fill you with ourselves" (Orwell, 2003, p.323). This moment signifies the killing of Winston's subjectivity—his shift from a man of thought to an expression of party ideology—what Lacan would see as the emergence of the Symbolic over the Real. This transformation captures Levi's insight that, unlike simply a victim, under fascism, survival often involves one's moral agency as a surrender and so forming victims who also could be willing agents of harm (Levi, 1988, pp. 36–38).

In contrast, Julia engages with a more corporeal form of resistance. Her defiance is of the body, of sexuality, and of acting on pleasure that resists outright a regime of repression. She embodies resistance as instinct — a refusal to be governed through the regulation of desire. That said, she is still illustrated within a totalizing arc of a system. During her interrogation, O'Brien's interrogator states, "You want it done to the other person. You don't give a damn what they suffer. The only person you are interested in is you." (Orwell 2003, p. 369). This admission

of stripped emotion, stands as an example of Foucault's premise about how power not only disciplines bodies, but makes meaning of emotion, intimacy, and survival. This erotic rebellion is coded even in the Lacanian view completely within the Symbolic Order because it is something the regime already expects and absorbs. Julia's pleasure is allowed in this instance because it ultimately fits the logic of containment of the Party.

O'Brien is one of Orwell's most enigmatic characters, embodying a disturbing duality as both a trusted guide and a ruthless oppressor. As Jani (2023) notes, he is portrayed as a government official "responsible for the terroristic torture of the protagonist," highlighting how totalitarian power operates through both ideological seduction and brutal coercion (Jani, 2023, p. 2). Initially held in a perceived realm of hope, O'Brien presents a figure of ideological conformity. O'Brien's nature as interrogator and teacher affirms the ambitions of totalitarian power - not to punish discontent, but to obliterate other's ability to think otherwise; as he states, "We convert him, we capture his inner mind, we recast him." (Orwell 2003, p. 321). O'Brien's sentiments echo Arendt's (1951) analysis of totalitarianism, which argues that such regimes aim not only to control external behavior but also to colonize the inner world—where the boundaries between the state, the police, and the self become indistinguishable. As Paxton describes (2004), the bureaucrat of fascism is not always the savage, he is the thinker the technician of submission that O'Brien was; a calculated actor (Paxton, 2004, p. 220). The genital sadism of O'Brien is rationality.

Orwell produces a sense of horror through these characters centrally situated in the story, where the fear of oppression and tyrannical government doesn't solely rest in being controlled, but in the extent to which one has accepted value and ideological systems of domination into one's sense of self or reality. The brilliance of this regime is its capacity for co-opting desire, identity, and belief—operating as a self-imprisonment, turned conformity. Winston's resistance is co-opted by the Party, showcasing totalitarian power reposition and recalibrating oppositional dissent and willful neglect into liberated oppression (Jani, 2023, p. 5). Slavoj Žižek (2008) refers to this as ideological enjoyment, where people derive meaning from one's own domination. Arendt states that the true horror of totalitarianism is not its violence, but it's determination to occupy your soul (Žižek, 2008, pp. 124–125).

Viewing this through a Lacanian lens, subjects are determined by the symbolic order, where even the most resistant act is a product of how the system wants and gazes at us. Foucault reflects an added layer to this idea, showing how disciplining power isn't just a matter of governing behaviour, but rather shaping bodies, instincts, even life and death in some regards. Arendt deepens these perspectives, demonstrating how totalitarianism strips individuals of their

individuality by taking aspects of personal identity and subjecting it to an organization-wide ideology that insists on emotional and moral surrender to collective malice sanctioned by political obedience. These perspectives all suggest that power doesn't just operate externally but invades and colonizes the subject, scripting their sense of self, while constructing their reality (Allen, 2016, pp. 164–165).

As a work, *1984* is not simply about how dictatorship works; it shows how power connects and reconfigures the self. Orwell is not just warning against political control, he is demonstrating how totalitarianism attempts to become us. As O'Brien states: "We shall squeeze you empty and then we shall fill you with ourselves" (Orwell, 2003, p. 323). This underscores the most profound prophetic nature. Not a fear of technology as extending surveillance, but the ontological danger—power perfected has no stake in your body and your mind—power aims to take your being. As Allen observes, this form of domination scripts subjectivity that makes the self part of authoritarian structures of control (pp. 164–165).

3.2 The Protagonist Journey under Tyranny: Identity, Belief, and the Shift toward Confronting Power

The character arc of Winston Smith in *1984* is a psychological and existential journey that is developed under the complete conditions of totalitarianism. Orwell does not portray him as an aware rebel from the beginning; on the contrary, Winston is a fractured subject — an ordinary worker who has quietly begun to doubt the truth of his surroundings. Over time, he becomes aware of the machinery of oppression that surrounds him. This journey from malaise to brief rebellion and running headlong towards submission reflects how identity and conviction are suppressed, interrogated, and ultimately disarmed under tyrannical bodies. Winston's metamorphosis shows that the inalienable zone of a person's internal belief does not escape from a colonization when submitted to total control as O'Brien chillingly declares: "We do not merely destroy our enemies; we change them." (Orwell, 2003, p. 319).

Ideology, as Althusser (1971) says, works by hailing individuals as subjects — Winston doesn't just live in ideology, he is an ideological product. His story shows us this ideologization in action, demonstrating that political power is both external and psychological.

From the perspective of Lacan, it can be argued that Winston is never truly individuated. His subjectivity is regulated by the Symbolic order — the Party as the Big Other — which affords meaning and recognition. His small acts of rebellion, such as the fateful line: "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER," are an assertion of resistance and cries for subjectivation outside of

the ideological positioning he finds himself. However, Winston's belief that the Proles could organize a rebellion is prefigured by the impossibility of escape. Looking inwardly at the Proles, as Winston begins to realize, the fate of the working classes is systematic depoliticization: "Until they become conscious, they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled, they cannot become conscious " (Orwell, 2003, p. 90). This paradox reveals the vicious cycle of ideological domination: the masses are kept in ignorance so they cannot rebel, but rebellion is the only way to awareness. Foucault's concept of biopolitics explains this well, as control is not only by way of violent enforcement but also by creating the conditions of possibility—who is thought about and can think, who can take and make actions, who can speak (Foucault, 1995, pp. 26–27).

Winston's psychological movement represents what Hannah Arendt describes as the condition of totalitarian man—alone, devoid of spontaneity, and meaningfully inert (Arendt, 1951, pp. 474–478) . He finally connects with another human being, in a lover, for some of the peak of his disillusioned identity, to have that identity taken away as well. Foucault's conception of power as not only net-present but productive, as opposed to simply repressive illustrates the pervasiveness of totalitarian regimes because even Winston's rebellious acts are foreseen and absorbed. At Mr. Charrington's, the hidden telescreen signifies that surveillance extends into places of imagined resistance. From Lacan's perspective, this is an instance of the Real being masked by the Symbolic. The lived experience of love and desire becomes associated with and therefore subject to control, leaving no room for authentic subjective thought. What is real becomes irrelevant; only in recognition of the regime does it matter.

The moment of transformation for Winston happens in torture in the Ministry of Love. O'Brien does not simply punish, but remakes. To paraphrase "Sometimes they are five. Sometimes they are three. Sometimes they are all of them at once. You must try harder. It is not easy to become sane" (Orwell, 2003, p. 316), once a totalitarian regime takes over an individual's beliefs, the entirety of their perception is also questioned as state-sanctioned. It is not simply a decisive physical defeat, but an epistemological defeat. Lacan's Real—the unmediated experience of pain and/or disintegration—is overwritten by the Party's Symbolic until Winston ultimately exclaims "He loved Big Brother." This comprehensive suspension of reality is arguably the defining trait of totalitarianism. As Chomsky (1991) later states, when information is shaped and produced by power, the citizen is wholly defenseless—not just politically, but cognitively and morally as well.

This paradox reveals the vicious cycle of ideological domination: the masses are deliberately kept in ignorance to prevent rebellion, yet only through rebellion can awareness be achieved. Michel Foucault's notion of biopolitics offers a compelling framework to understand this mechanism, as control is not merely imposed through violent enforcement, but also through the construction of conditions of possibility—that is, determining who is allowed to think, speak, and act. Power, in this sense, is not possessed but exercised; it is diffused across bodies, institutions, and discourses, shaping individuals not just externally but internally, scripting their very sense of being (Foucault, 1995, pp. 26–27). Winston's journey is not one of liberation, but of tragic recursivity, his pursuit of meaning is consumed by the very structure he seeks to escape. By Arendt's metric, this is not a loss of political agency—but a lack of existential foundation; he is subsumed into an illusion of collective false harmony that manufactures his very self-hood. According to Žižek (2008) Winston's final acceptance should not be seen as purely brainwashing, but rather as ideological enjoyment, a state reached when a subject becomes emotionally attached to their own oppression because it provides false resolution or stability.

What Orwell is presenting through Winston, is not simply a warning, but a psychological genealogy of how totalitarian regimes manufacture subjects — a process exemplified when O'Brien asserts: "We do not merely destroy our enemies; we change them." (Orwell, 2003, p. 319). The failure of Winston is not a failure of the individual, but the design of the system. *1984* doesn't so much ask how people resist tyranny, but how they become its vessels. In this sense Winston becomes, in a tragic way, the prototype of modern subjectivity in an absolute system: not a hero, not a villain, simply a reflection of how power restructures the self.

3.3 A Comprehensive Examination of Antagonists: Power, Motivations, and Their Impact on the Narrative

The antagonists in *1984* are not just barriers to the protagonist; they are structural components of the psychological structure of the regime. They are human agents of the mechanical regime—agents of deprivation, privation, and despotism, who normalize oppression. These subjects manifest the psychological, ideological, and institutional knowledge that produces and reproduces power. Antagonists are not influences enforcing control; they also serve to reconstitute realities, knowledge and belief into something that can be accepted by all, including themselves. Antagonists are not outside the system—they are the voice and mask of

the system. O'Brien, as the primary villain, displays charm, intelligence, and at times moral ambiguity - yet is ultimately loyal, if not utterly fanatical to the Party and its cause. Thus, he is a problematic character; while he represents a totality of the regime, he does not pose an external threat. O'Brien was responsible for turning Winston from a dissenter to unquestioned subject, not only through mutilation of the body but through the production of a perception of reality as well; an extension of truth. The party holds total control over objectivity; as O'Brien says as he tortures Winston, "Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else... whatever the Party holds to be truth, is truth" (Orwell, 2003, p.314). This horrifying claim is quite similar to Chomsky's assertion that the truth becomes almost indistinguishable from propaganda when all of the information is controlled by state power (Chomsky, 1991, pp. 16–18). As O'Brien displays, Orwell also ratifies Arendt's notion that totalitarianism affects not only behavior, but the dominant reality of the day (Arendt, 1951, pp. 474–478).

In Lacanian terms, O'Brien's position is a Big Other; the ultimate structuring authority of Winston's subjectivity. It is not simply that Winston is punished by O'Brien; it is that Winston is deriving value from being recognized by O'Brien. The torturer becomes a perverse form of the recognition. The Party, with O'Brien, does not simply eliminate opposition - it creates desire. Lacan would state that the subject (Winston) ultimately becomes what the Other (O'Brien) wants him to be - an empty vessel of recognition and obedience. In addition, Louis Althusser's notion of ideological interpellation is relevant here: O'Brien does not use brute force alone to get Winston to obey, but rather he uses a strategy of changing the very identity of Winston such that he wants to obey (Althusser, 1971, p. 182) .

Foucault's theory on discipline fits nicely at this point. O'Brien represents a system where surveillance, confession and punishment are intricately intertwined. Orwell writes at the Ministry of Love, torture is not only physical it is also ideological and linguistic: O'Brien tells Winston, "We are not content with negative obedience... we make him one of ourselves before we kill him" (Orwell, 2003 p. 321). This serves to fulfill Foucault's assertion of productive nature of power: it not only represses but produces the subject who internalizes power (Foucault, 1995, p. 194) .This is a direct representation of Foucault's concept of how modern power does not only repress but creates the subject that internalizes and reproduces the logic of control.

The antagonistic force extends further than O'Brien, to the faceless system he serves. Big Brother, never seen, is everywhere and nowhere at the same time. He is not a character but rather an emblem or totalitarian god whose gaze cannot be escaped. The Party's slogan, "Big

Brother is Watching You" (Orwell, 2003 p. 3). This concept introduces constant surveillance into the consciousness of citizens, creating self-surveillance and psychological subordination. Žižek (2009, pp. 127-128) argues that Big Brother is not merely an instrument of terror, but rather an instrument of ideological pleasure, whereby the individual gains a perverted sense of efficacy through conformity. Viewed from the perspective of Arendt's concept of totalizing domination, the individual is torn apart by the illusory authenticity of the collective.

The institutions themselves are at odds. The Ministry of Truth, where Winston works, is itself a vehicle for historical and linguistic revision. The minor character of Syme, as Orwell presents him, provides a clear and profound example of how Newspeak's goal is to "narrow the scope of thought" (Orwell, 2003, p. 67). Control of language, both Orwell and Foucault argue, is control of consciousness: an influence on vocabulary is an influence on reality. The adversary is not just the man with the whip, but the system he serves—a system that makes it possible to say that two plus two equals five.

In *1984*, the antagonists show us how power is not only maintained through violence, but by restructuring thought, desire, and identity. Antagonists are not just villains; they are ideological and depict the inner life of subjects with a purpose; to maintain tyranny. Their purpose is important in illustrating how individuals become complicit in their own oppression; not because they are weak but because the system in which they function creates no alternative. This recalls Arendt's cautionary tale: under tyranny, complicity is not merely an accident, but an artificial one.

Through O'Brien and the broader structures represented, Orwell sows the petrifying logic of a regime that utilizes betrayal, not knowledge, as truth — a system in which epistemological control becomes a form of political submission. As O'Brien states: "Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else... Whatever the Party holds to be the truth, is truth" (Orwell, 2003, p. 314). By the end of the novel, Winston's final submission of "He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother" (Orwell, 2003 p. 376) is not just the death of a man, but the victory of a system that has produced itself as part of the very consciousness of its subject.

3.4 Secondary Characters and the Reproduction of Tyranny in Everyday Life

In addition to the main characters who either enact violent resistance or have assimilated into the regime, Orwell's *1984* introduces secondary characters whose passive participation illuminates the hidden complexity of authoritarian control. Authors who introduce

secondary characters do not do so lightly; astute readers will understand the representational aspects of these characters and how these actions normalize and subsequently maintain tyrannical forms of social control as large numbers of ordinary people function in this capacity. These characters represent micro-level dynamics through which power penetrates daily life and social networks.

They demonstrate how power is not just established from a top-down position, but is recreated ontologically from a bottom-up position by actors who adopt and perform the logic of power.

The character Parsons serves as an illustration of how people internalize oppression, and therefore, he can be proud when he finds out that his daughter had informed on him. "I'm proud of her; it shows I brought her up in the right spirit" (Orwell, 2003, p.295). Parsons exhibits Foucault's notion of a disciplinary society, where even the outside means of supervision are not necessary because it is done by the subjects representing one another and within their families. Parsons has nothing left to resist because he no longer can perceive anything worth resisting. Therefore, his loyalty is not coerced; it is constructed.

Syme illustrates another manifestation of this systematic cultural control. Syme is a committed member of the Newspeak project and wholeheartedly embraces the Party's use of language to control thought; as Winston concludes, Syme is, "too intelligent" and therefore "doomed". His fate is a poignant reminder of Arendt's claim that totalitarian regimes not only want obedience but predictability for the sake of stability, and intellectual curiosity is a threat to the regime not because it is disloyal, but because it is never fully controllable. Syme symbolizes the deaths of not just dissent but excess understanding and knowledge.

These characters serve as symbolic instruments that extend the logic of the Party through normalized behavior and internalized ideology. They represent a wide bandwidth of those who are willing to participate in blindness. They also send a message: authoritarianism is a matter of socialization based on fear, adaptation, and self-censorship, producing comportment far beyond an act of violence. Lacan argues that the subject under power will play along with the "Big Other" and measure its new resolutions against the other, even at the cost of its own truth, and these secondary figures illustrate the premise.

In their presentation of secondary characters, the novel critiques how a dictatorship infiltrates the social sphere, but these characters are not outside the system, they are the system. They normalize the abnormal, which highlights how ideology is lived and not just enforced.

Their stories set us up for the next layer of analysis. While examining how a society interacts with and the psychological social consequences of such domestic dominance becomes the next area for analysis.

3.5 Interpersonal Dynamics and Symbolic Roles: Trust, Resistance, and Representation under Tyranny

In 1984, more than private relationships, the interpersonal sequence is a battlefield on which the totalitarian state imposes its most internal forms of control. The state manipulates and weaponizes identities and intimacies; in effect, even love becomes the site of political contestation. "The sexual act, successfully performed, was rebellion. Desire was thoughtcrime." (Orwell, 2003, p. 83). Foucault (1990, pp. 92-95) argues that power not only represses, it produces and organizes desire, embedding the political control into the most intimate zones of subjectivity.

The example of Winston and Julia demonstrates this dynamic well; their rebellion, their secret love, becomes undone due to the dire potential of surveillance and the imminent fear of betrayal. Lacan's concepts about the subject's formation in the Other's gaze is illustrative here. Initially, Julia to Winston is a mirror and as a result, a reinforcement of his subjectivity as an anti-subject to the Party's symbolic order. Upon arrest, that tenuous space is fractured altogether. The moment Julia betrayed Winston under torture is not one of simple emotional weakness but rather of the disciplinary power and force described by Foucault: "You want it to happen to the other person. You don't give a damn what they suffer" (Orwell, 2003, p. 369). Their love, which once symbolized inner freedom, is ultimately reduced to a mere instinct for survival, highlighting the regime's capacity to dismantle solidarity through the destruction of intimate bonds. As Winston and Julia admit to each other, "I betrayed you... I betrayed you" (Orwell, 2003, p. 369).

From Arendt's perspective, this isolation is one of the hallmarks of a totalitarian society. The totalitarian system does not simply silence opposition, it further isolates individuals from authentic human contact. When trust becomes perilous, and everyone is a potential subject, there can be no collective opposition. Winston thinks to himself, "The terrible thing that the Party had done was to persuade you that mere impulses, mere feelings, were of no account, while at the same time robbing you of all power over the material world" (Orwell, 2003, p. 208). They have removed emotion politically, including love, from a more-than-symbolic world.

O'Brien once again appears to be the most direct representation of violated recognition. He reaches out to Winston not only to control, but to offer an appearance of understanding. Positionally, he becomes the Big Other in Lacanian terms—the one person's recognition Winston needs, despite the ultimate possibility of literal annihilation. O'Brien's purpose is not to simply torture Winston into a position of obedience, but to reinterpret the symbolic framework that encompasses all possibilities is to actually strip it of its individual meaning. As he states: "You do not exist" (Orwell, 2003, p. 327). The act of claiming existence abolishes subjectivity altogether—a final act of violence that will allow the person to be replaced with the reality of the Party.

Even the symbolic roles that manifested in these relationships emphasize the warped logic of the regime. Julia is the embodiment of sensuality and rebellion that has morphed into defeat—most clearly seen in her and Winston's meeting in the moments after their torture, with overwhelming numbness and alteration in their essential selves. She characterized this when she told him, "You don't give a damn what they suffer. All you care about is yourself" (Orwell, 2003, p. 369), evidence of how the regime perverts the relationships among individuals, and their ability to experience empathy and intimacy. When she and Winston somehow discombobulated together post her torture, to the ambient emotion of nothingness: "Sometimes," she says, "they threaten you with something—you can't stand up to it, you can't even think about it. And then you say, 'Don't do it to me, do it to somebody else, do it to so-and-so.' And perhaps you might pretend afterwards, that it was only a trick and that you just said it to make them stop... but that isn't true. At the time when it happens you do mean it" (Orwell, 2003, p. 369). Ironically, Julia's statement defines the disintegration of semblance or connection in totalitarian engagement.

In 1984, empathy and bonding with other people are not just private concerns; they are part of the regime's logic of control. They are not extraneous—they are the psychological basis for domination. Trust becomes endangered, affection becomes betrayal, recognition becomes domination. What this delineates is a deeper caution which Orwell illustrated: in a regime seeking total control.

As a collective, the relationship in the symbolic event of the novel are placards of the combat between the non-conformity of a person against an authoritarian totalitarian regime. As Winston reflects, "Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act" (Orwell, 2003, p. 159). On the Lacanian, we see a person as vulnerable to domination through their desire of recognition. On Foucault, we view

proximity, as aligned with the regime observing the seen world that had developed. On Arendt, we view that the regime will enact their isolation and atomization, and when no longer subjected, that person was not only obedient, but absolutely alone and disconnected.

We have established that while this structure appears to be indefinite, the argument of epistemology is that Orwell clearly demonstrates that dictatorships are not maintained simply through violence, even though violence is clearly a part of the equation, by the process of systematically constructing and restricting human connection or what community can even entail. There ain't no love, trust, or even betrayal since betrayal has been transferred over as truth under the regime. Indeed, Orwell chillingly states, "Under the spreading chestnut tree, I sold you and you sold me" (Orwell, 2003, p. 370), and in Winston and Julia's betrayal of each other, the Party has prevailed in destroying any genuine human connection out of fear. This destruction of human connection also addresses the greater struggle for freedom, and the instinctual desire for self-determination to which the regime is only able to exert power, then, by rendering a human incapable of deconstructing the human spirit and breaking it down from the inside out. According to Arendt (1951), totalitarianism tries to engulf everything, the minute detail, and this fight of the characters against it can be symbolic of the universal fight of human rights and dignity.

On the other hand, the antagonist is commonly symbolic of the regime's ideologies, wielding of power, and the moral rottenness that may be generated from untrammelled power. They can even be representative of dangers in blind adherence to a system that tramples on the value of the individual, something even seen in the concept of the "banality of evil" that Arendt discusses "The essence of totalitarian government, and perhaps the nature of every bureaucracy, is to make functionaries and mere cogs in the administrative machinery out of men, and thus to dehumanize them" (Arendt, Eichmann in Jerusalem, 1963, p. 289).

Very often, the roles the characters play in the development of the narrative carry a certain symbolic weight. For example, subsidiary characters who collaborate with this regime may symbolize segments of society that believe in self-preservation or some personal gain at the expense of the collective social good. Similarly, those in resistance could reflect the kind of courage and moral fiber necessary to rise up against injustice, even at great personal risk.

These symbolic roles complete the message projected in the novel about nature, power, control, and rebellion. In reading these characters allegorically, readers explore further the

thematic elements at play and the author's commentary upon the socio-political realities of dictatorship.

3.6 Character Transformation and Narrative Evolution under Dictatorship

In *1984*, character transformation is not a step toward development but the disassembly of identity and the reconfiguration of self according to a logic of domination. Winston's journey from a disillusioned skeptic to a fervent believer affirms how totalitarian regimes do not simply impose obedience upon subjects; they alter desire. His minimal acts of transgression—refusing Big Brother in his diary, seeking love with Julia—are partial resistance. Each of these acts can be surveilled by the Party and repurposed. To say at the end of the novel that Winston loves Big Brother is not simply the act of submission; it is the final success of the regime itself: a subject who desires to be dominated. This illustrates what Foucault calls an "internalization of power", where the subject does not merely obey, but reproduces the underlying order (Foucault, 1995).

Julia undergoes transformation too—not ideology, but the body. Initially, her sexual resistance feels oppositional, but it shatters under tenderness and torture. That which was once instinctual becomes mechanized. Julia's failed bodily resistance proves Foucault's point that power does not only discipline action. It disciplines intimacy, and a regime that has not only punished but drained its subjects of emotional life, reflects Julia's eventually numb and apathetic condition. Her transformation is not a change in belief, but a refusal of feeling—a disappearance of self that is subject to biopolitical control (Foucault, 1978).

Even O'Brien appears to embody the authority of the regime and yet he, too, can only be seen in the context of the regime. O'Brien is not just a villain running outside of the system, rather he is the system. He offers humanity as a mediator of a psychological machine. Orwell is also illustrating how dictatorship continues to reproduce itself not just through violence or propaganda, but through characters such as O'Brien, who embody pleasurable domination and produce the impression of oppression as recognition. He operates in this way as the Lacanian "Big Other", who produces permission and obliterates resistance through symbolic annihilation. They live the regime and seduce others into submission.

Transformation, then, in *1984*, is not cumulative development, but recursion and collapse. This is true of every character, regardless of their relationship with the regime entering the narrative. The narrative shows that tyranny can do more, or better than suppress rebellion; it can turn rebellion to its own advantage. At the point of transformation, it is first illegitimate,

and the act of attempting to resist becomes the process of deeper submission. We might see in Arendt's concept of terror that totalitarian regimes ultimately seek to eliminate the ability to think for oneself, not merely impose a certain ideological position (Arendt, 1951, p. 474). The characters' transformation can therefore represent not growth, but a political extinction, in which all identity is folded back into the regime.

3.7 Tyranny Within: The Silent Erosion of Identity in Orwell's World

What is most revealed in the character analyses of *1984* is not simply an account of totalitarian oppression, but rather a revelation about the fragility of the human self in the presence of such systemic fear. Throughout the novel, personal changes never indicate improvement or resistance, they instead point to deterioration. The characters represent a world where private thought, feelings, and memories are neither private nor personal: they are appropriated by power. The warping of identity corresponds with Lacan's idea of the subject being alienated or dislocated within the Symbolic Order, in which the subject perceives their desire, language, and recognition as owing to external codes - a form of externalized authority - instead of as inner autonomy (Lacan, 2006, pp. 430–433).

In this way, Orwell's fictional characters are no longer limited to the pages of the novel. They now stand as echoes—of innumerable unnamed people under real regimes whose stories have never been told, whose acts of resistance were never visible, whose changes were not the stuff of heroism, but were silent. Instead, the analogy illustrates that totalitarianism is not always flashy or dramatic; it is typically subtle, working through habits, silence, and internalized defeat.

This relates to Arendt's idea that totalitarianism wants to make people superfluous—not just politically zero, but emptied in and of existence (Arendt, 1951) But to remind us that tyranny is not a performance—it is often banal, obscured, and personal.

This whole chapter, unlike the fictive positions of the text, has shown us that literature does not just replicate life. It reveals the structures which deform life. It names what has been unnamed in people becoming strangers to themselves. And in *1984*, this function of narrative is urgent: to trace the burden of forgetting, of compliance, and learning to love what destroys us.

4. CHAPTER 4

4.1 Language and Thought as Instruments of Tyranny: The Linguistic Production of Obedient Subjects in *1984*

In Orwell's *1984*, language represents not only a means of communication but, more accurately, an instrument of control that constrains thought and shapes consciousness. Newspeak is not just a feature of the Party's control of reality, but the mechanism for psychological subjugation of the citizen. The Party states, "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought?" (Orwell, 2003, p. 67). By systematically reducing vocabulary, the Party hopes to provide some thoughts from even being imagined, which not only diminishes thought but the cognitive schema through which one experiences reality.

This manipulation of language aligns with Michel Foucault's (1972) theory that discourse not only re-presents reality, it produces it. In his work *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault argues that what can be spoken determines what can be known the Party's exertion of control through language, becomes a control of knowledge. Newspeak is simply a regime of discourse that eliminates the possibility of rebellion by eliminating the means to construct it imaginatively.

From a Lacanian perspective, the Party represents the maximal 'Big Other' - a symbolic authority that structures the Subject's meaning making. Lacan (2006) asserts that the Subject's desires take form in the signifiers presented to them by the Other (Lacan, 2006, pp. 430–433). In the world of *1984*, with the reduced signifiers available to the citizen, represents a psychic deficit. Winston's increasing difficulties with articulating resistance become apparent; this is not a failure; it is a structural deprivation - he can no longer articulate or desire freedom.

This structural deprivation is compounded with the Party's active dismantling of the truth. The Ministry of Truth, where Winston works becomes the driving force of control over knowledge: "The past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, the lie became truth" (Orwell, 2003, p. 95) This recalls von Arendt's (1951) description of the totalitarian regime's attack on objective reality; when fact is liquid and language is dictated by ideology, the line between belief and obedience disappears. Citizens no longer distinguish loyalty from bewilderment: they adapt to the narrative bestowed upon them, not because they have understood it, but because they cannot oppose it.

Worse yet, Orwell calculates the ineffable horror of not only denying people the ability to dissent, but delineating the possibility of thinking dissent. His example is in the notion of "thoughtcrime." People feared the sudden emergence of disloyal thoughts, which recalls the observations of Foucault (1975), who described the best power is power which incites people to govern themselves. It culminates in Winston's ultimate self-policing, a product of language and conditioning.

In sum, the novel locates language as mediating socially under tyranny; not as merely the closure of dissent, but the "reprogramming of cognition". The Party uses Newspeak to generate a population that cannot even imagine freedom. It conducts ideological speech that rewrites reality. It produces fear and generates subjects who unconsciously embody the logic of domination, thus facilitating the endless reproduction of totalitarianism.

4.2 Shame, Betrayal, and the Internalization of Tyranny: The Emotional Reproduction of Obedience

Any reader of Orwell's *1984* knows very well that tyranny reproduces itself through more than just fear and linguistic control. It reproduces itself by emotionally reprogramming its subjects. In this novel, shame and betrayal become the precise tools by which the regime engineer's compliance—not an imposed compliance, but one that becomes a felt necessity. The genius of the Party is not only that it corrupts meaning and language, or their ideation, but the emotional capital of the subject.

The changes to Julia and Winston serve as an example of this. Julia becomes nothing but an emotionless husk after subjected to the Party's regime. She says to Winston, "I betrayed you," to which he responds "I betrayed you " (Orwell, 2003, p. 369). Although a mutual confession, this does not revive their intimacy, but rather, signals the Party's complete and utter triumph – not through the imposition of violence, but orchestrated emotional violence. The regime indoctrinates subjects not just to betray others, but to betray to a planned emotion that becomes loyalty. In this way, Foucault helpfully reminds us, modern power does not discipline bodies, but also feelings: "It produces subjects who internalize the practice of surveillance and make judgments upon themselves" (Foucault, 1975).

Lacan's definition of the Big Other effectively grounds our reading of these moments. The Other is not just Big Brother, it is the entire symbolic order of thinkable, sayable, and feelable. Lacan (2006) theorizes that it is ultimately the gaze of the Other that constitutes the subject's identity, and so, under tyranny, even one's guilt or loyalty becomes constituted by the

logic of the system (Lacan, 2006, pp. 681–683) . Winston's last confession was that "he loved Big Brother," which was not merely to say he had submitted to tyranny, but rather, collapsed into the ideological structure that produced him in the first place.

Julia's character presents an alternate, yet revealing, depiction of ideological internalization. She describes her emotional detachment from collective responsibility when she says, "I'm not interested in the next generation, dear. I'm interested in us" (Orwell, 2003, p. 196). The totalitarian system creates an active detachment from political virtue and communal ideals, and creates individual acts of survival and pleasure. In her analysis of totalitarian regimes, Hannah Arendt (1951) suggests that totalitarian systems do not function solely on coercion; they also mesh logic and feeling - ultimate loyalty to the regime is no longer coerced but now fits in with each individual's priority. Julia's disinterest in the future demonstrates how she has privatized personal virtue, thereby re-channeling it to a political system that relies on isolation and emotional disconnection.

These emotional moments are not on the periphery, they are the site through which totalitarianism sustains itself. After all, as Chomsky states (1991), propaganda achieves its greatest effects when it shifts emotional responses, not facts. It normalizes feeling pride, shame, guilt, and morality. Tyranny in *1984* has removed shame and betrayal not only as potentially moral failures, but generates them as adherent moral imperatives in the logic of domination. Therefore, Orwell lays out a terrifying truth, that the most enduring form of tyranny is not via forced imposition of compliance, but is reproduced within the soul of the subject. Emotional responses are not spontaneous they are conditioned, surveillanced, and weaponized. By shame, betrayal, and symbolic reattachment, the subject ultimately becomes the regime's most loyal accomplice.

The polity mercilessly oversees, instrumentalizes, and then redirects love, friendship, and even family relationships for ideological ends. Arendt (1951) argued that totalitarianism destroys organic human relationships, and creates atomized individuals whose natural ties have been severed for loyalty to the state. In this configuration, the emotional death of Winston and Julia is archetypal. Their relationship, which began as an act of rebellion, is neutered and emptied into a space of betrayal and emotional death. As Besenski (2007, p. 29) observes, their act of defiance "grew from a place that was forbidding, but was ripped apart, or indeed dismembered by a larger forces." Here, the metaphor illustrates that the regime does not just stifle emotions, it uproots them altogether. To put it like Foucault does (1975), power does not operate just to discipline behavior, but disciplines subjects to regulate their inner life

- the regime manages not only their emotional life, but aligns their desires with the structure of domination. From a Lacanian standpoint, the regime's symbolic order regulates what subjects do not only think or speak but felt or want. To the extent to which the subject is no longer resisting not out of fear alone, but from the decision that the source of their emotional life has been rewritten, from the inside.

4.3 Memory and the Erosion of the Self: The Psychological Displacement of Identity

In *1984*, memory is not just an individual ability, but a warzone. The Party's historical control is a machine for not just changing collective ideas, but also the people's autonomy. "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell, 2003, p. 313). The pasting logic demonstrates the collapse of identity when the dictating of memory is external.

From the Lacanian perspective, identity formation is dependent on relativistically stable symbolic referents (the Name-of-the-Father), social signifiers, which can give form to the self. If signifiers are manipulated or erased, the subject's coherence collapses. Winston's cognitive dissonance in the Ministry of Truth acts as an incitement to that struggle; by creating historical narratives fabricated in history itself, he is taking part in the destruction of the symbolic capital of his own subjectification. For Lacan, the subject is the trace of the signifier (Lacan, 2006). By rewriting histories, the Party manipulates the individual's organic psychological core.

Michel Foucault presents a similar illustration through the interactions of knowledge and power. The Party's revisionism does not just serve a purpose for facts in abolishing history, but further constructs an epistemological context through which truth criteria are constructed from authority. In this environment, recollection is no longer systematic; it becomes a political act and threat. As a result, characters like Winston find themselves with senses of retained chaos as he can't differentiate what is real, what is fantasized, and what has been forced; the anxieties of cognitive dissonance.

This continual disruption of reality creates a psychological state of disconnection. Winston also acknowledges, "If all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed—if all records told the same tale—then the lie passed into history and became truth" (Orwell, 2003, p. 44). The disjunction is not only ideological complacency but dismantling of the self. As Arendt (1951) notes, totalitarianism exists by severing individuals from reality - rendering them isolated and adaptable. In addition, if there is no memory, there can be no narrative self, and if there is no self, there can be no resistance.

Consequently, Orwell demonstrates how tyranny dominates across multiple continua: in multiple states of singularity under uncreative memory. Real psychological ramifications are paranoia, alienation, and numbness. Identity becomes the fiction of the moment; existing for multiple-stories for the party's account. Therefore, what Orwell does is demonstrate more than just political tyranny; he demonstrates the slow torturous unmaking of the subject.

4.4 Infantilization and the Politics of Obedience: How Tyranny Reduces Citizens to Children

The Party's control in *1984* goes beyond political repression; it includes psychological infantilization of the citizen. The Party doesn't just control behavior; it controls spectacle, desire and creates subjects that are no longer treated as autonomous adults, but as always childish dependents who are obedient and cannot think critically. This process can be envisioned using Jacques Lacan's "Big Other." The Party replaces the symbolic authority that provides a paternal function in constructing subjectivity. Meaning as to what can be said, thought, and desired, is produced by the Party. When Winston starts to think about resistance, he is not just stopped because of fear; he also does not have the psychic resources to support a mental break away from the Party because he has been structurally denied the tools of adulthood. Winston's language and emotional complexity have shrunk to the point of a regression that accesses a reality that makes resistance currently unimaginable (Lacan, 2006).

A complementary understanding of this is Michel Foucault's notion of disciplinary power. The Party not only governs through constraint, but its power is productive; it creates docile bodies by setting up brokering surveillance, rituals of confession and self-discipline (Foucault, 1995). Citizens are habituated to the default being obedient citizens. Like children under the watchful eyes of their parental figures, they will stifle their own behavior before anyone engages in censorship.

Totalitarian regimes want to completely isolate people from the ability to think for themselves, Arendt's concern is that it seeks to turn people into beings without moral autonomy (Arendt, 1951). *1984* represents psychological dependency on the Party's reality. The Party's control is more than political domination; it also adopted a remarkably deliberate strategy of psychological infantilization. As the Party controls not only actions, but internal motivations, it creates subjects who no longer enjoy the status of autonomy as an adult, but a dependent, obedient child where the thoughts of independent, critical thinking could not even occur.

Jacques Lacan's work on the anatomical structure of subjectivity offers a way to think about this activity. The Party is the "Big Other." It takes over the parental function of structuring psyche - it regulates speech, it regulates thought and wishes. When Winston simply began to question the authority of the regime subjectively, I don't suppose he broke down due only to fear, but to psychological absence; he had been, structurally, deprived of adult mental functions. In 1984, he experiences a regression of communicative complexity and emotional complexity that he is unable to think in terms of resistance (Lacan, 2006).

Michel Foucault's concept of disciplinary power adds yet a further dimension to the governing apparatus of the Party. The power of the Party does not merely depend on force, it also produces docile bodies through constant surveillance, acts of confession, and self-discipline (Foucault, 1995). Citizens are, in time, conditioned to live in obedience as an ordinary habit, and their cognizance of power aligns closely with children who constantly assimilate their actions to the gaze of their parent where their civilized act of reasoning has not even had the proper development to appear as something worth oppressing.

Hannah Arendt also cautions that totalitarian regimes set out to inhibit individuals' autonomous judgments so that their decisions are apolitical (Arendt, 1951). In 1984, this apolitical behavioral state of infancy is depicted as psychological dependence on the Party's sole accepted fact. Winston exemplifies this answerless state by stating: "To wear an improper expression on your face... was itself a punishable offense. There was even a word for it in Newspeak: face crime" (Orwell, 2003, p. 79). Each quotient of citizen's behavior is had to be self-regulated as to avoid punishment, as if the individual was so infantile that he could not hold himself mentally accountable for his inner life.

This conscious representation of a reduction to childhood through psychological fiction guarantees a population not just enslaved, but developed less than an imprinted, childish state of behavior. The failure of resistance does not occur because of courage, but because the Party ensures that individuals have taken on childish developmental roles where the imagination does not live. Hence, tyranny is not merely an example of authority's mechanism of surveillance and unending punishment, but is the project of stunting the development of citizens.

4.5 Bureaucratic Machinery and the Anonymity of Oppression: The Rational Face of Tyranny in 1984

In 1984, a system of tyranny is enacted through a variety of means beyond violence and surveillance: existing solely through the sterile mechanisms of bureaucracy. The Ministry

of Truth is a set-up in which people participate in oppression not from a belief in its merit, but as an automatic response to their role in the bureaucratic or policy functional obligations of their job. Winston's job in the Ministry of Truth is rewriting records of history: he is not required to simply "lie", which is illegal, he is directed to "correct" history. The language is bureaucratic, the action is mechanical, and the outcome is tragic; turning lived reality into fiction, signing off on outrageous recontextualization of facts in administrative "rationality". As Orwell describes, "This process of continuous alteration was applied not only to newspapers, but to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters, leaflets... day by day and almost minute by minute the past was brought up to date" (Orwell, 2003, p. 46). This aligns with Max Weber's (1946) notion of bureaucracy as an impersonal, rule-bound system: "the exclusion of love, hatred, and every purely personal feeling from the execution of official tasks" (Weber, 1946, p. 215). In Orwell's dystopia, this leads to participation in state violence not through ideological zeal, but procedural obligation.

So Weber's (1978) writing on bureaucracy as a rationalized accountability structure where the individual is rendered as functionaries in a machine. In these systems the moral accountabilities are diffused: there is not one actor responsible, because everyone is "just doing their job". Orwell exposes how bureaucracy provides a conceptual distance that enables cruelty to manifest within routines. Bureaucracy offers the worker and the rats of bureaucracy like himself as some sort of not an ideological cause but literally through institutional inertia and obligations of their jobs.

Hannah Arendt calls this out in her analysis of totalitarianism, stressing that the deepest horror of modern tyranny lies in the normalizing of evil, as described by the mundane processes of the form to which the apparatus requires unquestioning (and intention-free performances). Because it reconstitutes violence as something impersonal, the dictatorship of bureaucracy makes abominable behaviors unremarkable and perfunctory. In 1984, no one questions whatever they have recorded; not because they are determined to keep up with the exchanges of the Party's systematic manipulations, but because the bureaucracy of the Party has rendered thought and even resistance unnecessary if not obsolete.

From a Lacanian perspective, the bureaucratic apparatus functions as a symbolic order that structures the subjectivity. Lacan argues (2006) that the subject is interpellated by the signifiers of the "Big Other"; and this initiated a symbolic relationship in which truth is defined, behaviour is mandated, and ambiguity is eradicated. In 1984, the bureaucratic machine is the Big Other: in cartoons of forms and memos, the Party continuously exerts its dominance not

just through artefacts but via using a codification of domination as the job of the unquestioning to reperform a "normality". Thus, we have a bureaucratic aspect of governs - a mode of oppression or non-governance which has been so normalized, it can act without the violence of visibility. That is, bureaucracy is totalitarianism's silent partner - bloodless, faceless, and terrifyingly efficient.



5. CHAPTER 5

5.1 Real-World Echoes: Historical Cases of Internalized Tyranny and Fictional Reflections in *1984*

While *1984* is fictional, the tales of characters who become fixtures of internalized power structures ring true to historical facts strongly. In this section we shift from general comparisons of totalitarian states to only talk about those individuals and intrators who not only submitted to tyranny and its Authoritarian systems, but literally become tyrannical oppressors or indeed the tools of repression for regimes, completely unaware. The characters in Orwell walk a narrow symbolic corridor that is far too reminiscent of real-world trajectories, where resistance ultimately becomes complicity, and where victims of power turn violators of oppression. As Primo Levi (1988) describes in *The Drowned and the Saved*, victims of totalitarianism often exist in moral compromises and moral dilemmas in order to stay alive, developing "gray zones" where victims are forced to become participants of the machinery of harm (Levi, 1988, pp. 36-69). Likewise, Althusser's (1971) notion of interpellation speaks to how subjects are interpellated ideologically, becoming "hailed" into roles via the reproduction of the very systems that oppress them but are under the assumption they are doing so autonomously (Althusser, 1971, pp. 170-183).

One of the darker historical comparisons is East Germany Stasi regime propaganda around who was/ could become an informer. Many of them started as average ordinary unwillingly subjugated people and months or years later now collaborators. Unwittingly reminiscent of Winston's mental pathways. Initially Winston has quiet refusal: "To run for life, to get out of the house before it was too late—no such thought occurred to them. Unthinkable to disobey the iron voice from the wall. There was a snap as though a catch had been turned back, and a crash of breaking glass. The picture had fallen to the floor, uncovering the telescreen behind it" (Orwell, 2003, p. 279). Yet, over time, his fear, shame, and trauma begin to quiet his resistance - and leads him towards love and loyalty to the regime.

In Soviet Russia, Andrei Vyshinsky, not unlike O'Brien, did not simply carry out the ideological cause of orders - he created intents of guilt and constructs of reality. This represents O'Brien's epistemology "We are not content with negative obedience, nor even with the most abject submission. When finally you surrender to us, it must be of your own free will... Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing." (Orwell, 2003, p. 321). This instance shows how the Party doesn't just want

agreement; it wants the self to be reconstituted. Truth is not found, it is made, created from pain and ideological reconstruction.

The people referred to as the Red Guards during Mao's Cultural Revolution are not unlike the children of the Party in 1984. Orwell captures this betrayal well, "It was my little daughter,' said Parsons with a sort of doleful pride. 'She listened at the keyhole. Heard what I was saying, and nipped off to the patrols the next day. Pretty smart for a nipper of seven, eh? I don't bear her any grudge for it. In fact I'm proud of her. It shows I brought her up in the right spirit, anyway.'" (Orwell, 2003, p. 295). The children, enduring a loyal indoctrination by the regime, are fully complicit and cast their parents as enemies, reminiscent of culturally rewriting moral allegiance as other regimes historically have.

Similarly, Rudolf Höss in Nazi Germany has traveled a parallel journey to O'Brien. Like the functionaries of the Ministry of Truth who write history, Höss has internalized duty as ideology as he labored for the Third Reich: "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 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..." (Orwell, 2003, p. 44). The psychological apparatus of state reproduction becomes an administrative banality of horror.

Even in a more insidious way, many of the citizenry in Fascist Italy/more Francoist Spain are managing the regime's moral lexicon and adjusting to Survival. In a way representative of this type of selective complicity, Julia has moments that can be construed as rebellion, but ultimately reproduces under pressure - she is operating with a survivalist coping mechanism, not revolutionary: "I'm not interested in the next generation, dear. I'm interested in us" (Orwell, 2003, p. 196). These historical vantages affirm the thesis of Orwell - tyranny is not only a top-down oppression, it is horizontally reproduced through the minds and acts of everyday people. His characters are not revolting against the hypothetical, but rather exhibiting and enacting the emotional, psychological and symbolic conditions of self-replication, maintenance and totalitarianism. The fear, confusion, betrayal, and shame of Winston and all the other subjects of tyranny, are not implausible fictional works, but psychologically plausible, and consistent with documentation of historians in conjunction with survivors of existential authoritarianism.

By investigating the historical, internal metamorphoses, Orwell depends on not only critiquing domination, but diagnosing the capacity of domination to be sustained in time. The following section of this assignment will examine these dimensions in history and how they exist as pathological-meditations of time in mediated, and allegorical relationships to *1984*; essentially engraving lived experiences (or history) into symbols, and political mnemonic insight towards primordial permanence.

5.2 **Allegory as Political Critique: Symbolic Representations of Historical Dictatorships in *1984***

George Orwell's *1984* goes beyond dystopian fiction in the sense that it forms a political allegory that literally decomposes then reconstructs historical totalitarian experiences into an allegorical structure of meaning. *1984* is more than a cautionary tale; it constitutes an intellectual reenactment of the internal mechanisms of tyranny, delivered through the scaffolding and symbols of narration. By embedding elements such as control, surveillance, memory manipulation, and semantic distortion into the fictional framework, Orwell constructs an allegory that simultaneously critiques recognizable authoritarian regimes and exposes the psychological mechanisms that sustain them. critiques specifically identifiable authoritarian regimes while exposing the psychological processes that make them possible.

The depiction of Big Brother serves as a multifarious symbol--an embodiment of the omnipotent state, an abstraction of power, and a psychological chimera of fear and loyally vested devotion. His image is everywhere. However, his conspicuous absence embodies the symbolic purpose of his image; he naturalizes the psychological function of the internalization of power. This parallels Foucault's theory of disciplinary power, in which the subject governs themselves in part through the capacity to self-disciplined themselves through the internalized possibility of being surveyed (Foucault, 1995). The telescreens thus become more than surveillance devices, they become internalized fear and control representations of psychological coercion, replacing visible violence with continuous psychological compliance. "People simply disappeared, always during the night. Your name was removed from the registers, every record of everything you had ever done was wiped out, your one-time existence was denied and then forgotten. You were abolished, annihilated: vaporized was the usual word." (Orwell, 2003, p. 24)

Furthermore, the destruction of historical memory by the Party through the Ministry of Truth is an allegory for the method by which totalitarian regimes destroy the continuity of

history. It's fair to say that Winston's task of creating facts is not an exaggeration, it is a lived version of epistemic violence. For Lacanian theory, subjectivity is organized through a symbolic order based on signifiers, including history, language and the family. By displacing these signifiers, the Party dismantles the subject's coherence by grounding them in the Party's ideological grammar. Winston's identity is disjointed as he flounders between the residue of history and the virtual falsities of the regime. as Lacan (2006) suggests, the Subject is formed in the Symbolic Order through available signifiers, and any disruption in this order can destabilize both meaning and identity (Lacan, 2006, pp. 430–433).

The Party's slogans - "War is Peace," "Freedom is Slavery," and "Ignorance is Strength" - operate as contorted allegories of ideological inversion; they demonstrate, not just the state's control over language, but the state's ability to engineer logic. This is reflected in Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), where totalitarian forms of control do not limit their influence solely to abstract thought, they inject language spasms into society so that space for dissent is only that of passive absorption into ideology. This construction of meaning is insidiously magnified through the Party's official language, Newspeak, whose only goal is not to facilitate language, but to simply to make resistance literally unthinkable.

Another strong allegory is Room 101, which exposes the regime's ability to manufacture truth through subjective fear. This room does not contain universal horror but exposes each subject to their most private psychological trauma. Room 101 is where the Party instantiates victory, not because it captures ideological sentience, or beats them with brute force, rather, its unfurling of its own custom torture for its subjects is a perversion of power's ritualized code of power. Lacan's formulation of the Real - that which is un-symbolizable, that can only return via to traumatic revisiting, is a kind of agreement. The Party, it seems, does not access the Real in an avenue to ameliorate, but rather destroy resistant proclivities through extracting the last vestiges of interior autonomy. "The thing that is in Room 101 is the worst thing in the world." (Orwell, 2003, p. 357).

As the character O'Brien is an allegorical representation of ideological seduction, O'Brien does not simply stand-in as agent from the Party, he represents also an intellectual dimension of the Party, offering tyranny not in ignorance, but in epistemic coherence. In Winston's exchanges with O'Brien, truth translates as obedience declaring "We control matter because we control the mind. Reality is inside the skull. You must get rid of those nineteenth-century ideas about the laws of Nature. We make the laws of Nature." (Orwell, 2003, p. 334) a delegation of a reality of external authoritarianism replaced by a naturalized totalitarian

episteme, whereby individual subjectivity consistently re-invests power's definitions, as their own (Foucault, 1978, pp. 92–95).

What makes Orwell's allegory so striking is the capacity to visualize not just the modalities of tyranny in space, but its psychological reproduction of self through individual participatory complicity. The slow submission of his character's will - particularly Winston's decline from dissenter or conscious to believer, allegorizes how authoritarian regimes replicate themselves via subject formation that is rooted in emotional black hole, against symbolic substitution. As Arendt (1951) notes, totalitarianism isolates not just socially, but in allowing the individual to feel totally alone, breaching their identity connected to others as well as themselves.

In closing, *1984* is especially significant when compared to standard historical value, you see it emphasis psychological erosion as opposed to physical violence. Regimes like Hitler's and Stalin's relied on massacres and external coercion, while Orwell's allegory, focuses on Faith's invisible tyranny or horror of complicity in one's own view not borne of force but inner collapse. Accounts of level of dystopia are seldom emphasized historically but are powerfully symbolized in Orwell's story, so that the text is not only a reflection of the past, it amounts to prophesy in how ideology can quietly destroy resistance via self-relational implosion.

5.3 From History to Narrative Collapse: How Real Regimes Shaped 1984's Themes of Psychological Control

George Orwell's *1984* is more than a dystopian fiction, but rather a historical text ultimately shaped through a historical consciousness. Published after World War II, the novel has the historical fingerprints of a world marked and scarred by totalitarianism. As noted above thematic elements are surveillance, propaganda, history, memory and identity removal/erasure. These elements invoke the political climates of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia. Orwell turns the memory of these regimes into literary devices that can operate as warnings and critiques of contemporary mechanisms of tyranny.

This use of historical propaganda can be vividly seen in the Party's use of the "Ministry of Truth" where Winston works. Directly modifying past records in an organizational scheme demonstrates the continuation of historical acts of information manipulation. As Winston realizes: "The past not only changed but changed continuously. What most afflicted him with the sense of nightmare was that he had never clearly understood why the huge imposture was

undertaken.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 101). This relates to how Nazi propaganda was, according to Arendt (1951), the imagined representation of a collective memory process used not only to affect opinion but to manufacture a reality in the imaginations of its victims. In *1984*, however, Orwell extends this notion, as historical truth disappears and becomes a vehicle for reshaping identity.

Similarly, the concept of surveillance is a feature rooted in reality, evident in the state surveillance body apparatus (e.g.: Stasi, KGB, etc.), but in this case becomes a totalizing structure through the influence of telescreens and the Thought Police. Foucault’s interpretation of the panopticon assists in deciphering this process, whereby the internalization of surveillance leads to self-policing (Foucault, 1995). Orwell intensifies this conception into despair. Winston does not only fear being watched; he fears a state of unknowing—being uncertain whether he is being watched at any given moment—thereby this unknowing state compromises autonomy altogether. As the text states, “If you want to keep a secret, you must also hide it from yourself.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 354).

Furthermore, Orwell’s experiential knowledge of authoritarian control - notably experiences of disillusionment during the Spanish Civil War - influences his re-presentations of resistance. In *1984*, resistance lacks any collective structure. It is fragmented, individualistic, and in the end, co-opted. Perhaps Winston and Julia’s experiences of resistance are not futile simply from external forces; rather, they succumb to the Party’s capacity to reshape their internal worlds. Arendt observes that totalitarian regimes work by isolating individuals as a strategy to eliminate any potential for collective resistance. In Orwell’s narrative, this strategic approach is most evident when Winston, while beholding the reality of the Party’s pervasive control murmurs to himself, “They can’t get inside you,” she had said. But they could get inside you.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 367).

Importantly, this utterance does not denote simply despair; it signifies his internalization of the regime’s logic—the understanding that any instantiation of rebellion is already expected, contained and permitted, within the structures of the system. In other words, the illusion of resistance becomes part of the apparatus of control. Winston’s acceptance of death indicates a psychological submission: it demonstrates how totalitarian power frames not only physical domination, but monopolizes even the limits of thought, hope and imagination.

Unlike historical instances of resistance such as the French Résistance, in *1984* there is no movement towards successful escape or counter-narrative. The difference is significant:

Orwell deliberately challenges idealized notions of rebellion by depicting a resistance that is ultimately absorbed and neutralized by the regime. and rearticulate resistance as a mechanism of co-optation. In this sense, *1984* is not purely an echo of the historical but becomes, in ways, a radical extrapolation—a depictions of future authoritarianism that are able to hone and perfect strategies for controlling resistance that we have witnessed in the past.

Finally, the narrative stylistics in Orwell's *1984* also have a clear pedagogical dimension. By fictionalizing and exaggerating the totalitarianism as the context, the novel offers a reality that, while dystopian, is nonetheless plausibly conceivable. This extravagance does not misrepresent truth; it ultimately represents and amplifies truth, forcing the imagination to confront the precariousness of our freedoms and the psychological dimensions that engender complicity in subjugating oneself (Bhattacharya & Chattopadhyay, 2015, p. 5). In drawing on the specters of historical authoritarian regimes, Orwell not only depict the historical but looks forward: a direct cautionary tale that simply warns how democracy erodes as soon as critical vigilance is abandoned.

In sum, this Chapter has illustrated clearly how Orwell's *1984* is not just a fictional historical portrait of authoritarianism, but rather a complex literary vehicle for re-coding past experiences, imagining psychological dispositions—a literary gutted for political trauma—as fictional representation. With allegory, adaptational character development, and thematic reconstruction, Orwell has encoded lessons for precisely how tyranny is not only maintained through external institutions but reproduced through human subjects. This moment changes the scope for comparison from frozen representations to dynamic articulations of processes that involve internalizations, complicity, and symbolic submission.

As we now move into Chapter Six, we will shift to the theoretical implications of these processes. If totalitarianism can be internalized and re-cycled through emotive, memory, identity, and symbolic obedience, then Orwell's *1984* exists as both a text to be taken as a political warning but also a psychological case study that both asks to consider not just who has power, but how we as subjects have come to embody it “To die hating them, that was freedom.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 354). This final statement represents the last bastion of individual psychology: the individual can maintain internal revolt even if every outward dissent has been quashed. Orwell proposes this manifestation of psychological disobedience as, ultimately, the last (and, admittedly, sad) expression of freedom in a world where totalitarianism exerts control not only over actions but over ideas as well.

6. CHAPTER 6

6.1 Themes of Rebellion and Resistance in *1984*

In the novel *1984*, rebellion and resistance are not illuminating signs of hope, but are devices through which the regime reestablishes control. Defiance by Winston Smith, at first, seems to describe a moral and emotional awakening to the tyranny of the Party. But, as we see, Orwell expertly reveals just how all resistance, even when there might appear to be some freedom, is anticipated, navigated, and brought to a standstill by the system itself. Rebellion becomes a simulation, a device to give the subject the impression they have been given a measure of freedom while being brought back into complete failure “The choice for mankind lay between freedom and happiness and for the great bulk of mankind, happiness is better.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 331).

Winston’s journey, moving from passive compliance to active defiance in *1984* could be perceived as typical awakening, in terms of its trajectory, under a tyrannical regime. Orwell’s narrative quickly subverts our expectation. The Party does not simply repress Winston’s rebellion, but anticipates its outcome and absorbs it back into its matrix. Rebellion is reduced to a demarcation of the subject whose sense of agency is only belied to reveal the utter futility of their permitting action. “He was a lonely ghost uttering a truth that nobody would ever hear.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 35). Not only will Winston simply lose the physical out, this statement is symbolic of the death of the self “Thoughtcrime does not entail death: thoughtcrime IS death.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 36).

This dynamic echoes Lacan’s notion of the Symbolic Order; the subject whose identity is shaped by spoken language, authority, and meaning, suggests that desire (the quality of our love) for truth, freedom, and love (in particular the passion for Julia) is mediated by a symbolic schema which renders his rebellion a misrecognized demand suffocated by the Schematic order (Lacan, 2006, pp. 430–433). His love is not outside ideology; it expresses the very means through which ideology coils its way inside paralogic “It was not by making yourself heard but by staying sane that you carried on the human heritage.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 35).

Room 101 is the epitome of this process. At the location of his ultimate fear, rats, we are shown that the access point through which the Party collapses is loyalty. When Winston betrays Julia, encouraging “Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don’t care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me!”, (Orwell, 2003, p. 362) it is not a

mere act of self-preservation; it represents the consummate reengineering of the self, to fit the Party's psychological program.

Marcuse's (1964) theory of false needs in here is particularly useful: it can be used to frame Winston's desire towards rebellion that in and of itself was allowed to develop, not to succeed at, but a constructed failure. His longing is relegated to a "permitted transgression" that are orchestrated by the system, so its eventual outcome is used to reflex the Party's capacity. What looks like a fissure in the structure, turns out to be a structural violation "Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious." (Orwell, 2003, p. 90).

Ultimately, *1984* captures the idea that tyranny cannot exist on the merits of brute force alone; it can exist on the idea of reprogrammed resistance. As Foucault (1995) suggests, modern power succeeds not only by repressing bodies but by producing subjects who internalize discipline and become agents of their own control (Foucault, 1995, pp. 135–169). Orwell saw this marked point, stood-up, and ultimately prophetic insight: totalitarian control does not need to silence a rebellion or resistance, it needs to script it "The object of power is power." (Orwell, 2003, p. 332).

6.2 Forms of Resistance Depicted in the Novel

Resistance in *1984* is not portrayed as dignified or successful; it is broken, illusory, and ultimately subsumed by the identical regime it seeks to reject. Resistance is represented by Orwell not as organized rebellion or heroic opposition but rather as a spectrum of covert, psychological acts—private thoughts, feelings of opposition, and ephemeral acts of defiance that the Party has anticipated and been rendered impotent "Sanity is not statistical." (Orwell, 2003, p. 274).

The first form of resistance is Winston's internal resistance. His act of writing "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (Orwell, 2003, p. 23) is a symbolic rupture from ideological complicity or compliance. This seemingly subversive gesture—the act of writing—does not constitute a genuine rupture from the system, but rather illustrates how dissent can be domesticated and channeled into permitted frameworks. Foucault (1978) argues that power operates not solely through prohibition but through the "incitation to discourse," whereby individuals are encouraged to speak, confess, and define themselves in ways that ultimately reinforce dominant structures (Foucault, 1978, pp. 17–18). In this light, Winston's diary becomes less a tool of liberation and more a confessional device, whereby the regime elicits

and registers his deviance, allowing power to reassert itself not through silence, but through exposure and containment. “To mark the paper was the decisive act.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 10). The act of writing, then, is not so much an act of liberation as it is a pre-scripted response, revealing the Party’s capacity to accommodate and neutralize dissent from within.

Similarly, sex between Winston and Julia, although it appears to violate the Party's orthodoxies, is informed by a Lacanian understanding of desire in the symbolic order—ideology in this case. The act, and potential for resistance, cannot exist apart from control, and thus is mediated and ultimately extinguished. In saying "I betrayed you" (Orwell, 2003, p. 369), Winston reveals the capacity of the regime to manipulate even love as a mere extension of domination and oppression “Your worst enemy, he reflected, was your own nervous system.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 81).

Cultural memory Reciting nursery rhymes, or recalling pieces of history like, "Oranges and lemons say the bells of St. Clement's," is indeed a performative resistance (Orwell, 2003, p. 124). But memory is neither wholly reliable nor distorted. This cultural memory, like the recitation of “Oranges and lemons...,” evokes the same concern raised by Primo Levi (1988), who warned of regimes that aim to obliterate the very ability to bear witness (Levi, 1988, pp. 11–13). In 1984, memory is not just unreliable—it is assaulted, rewritten, and deployed as a weapon against identity itself. Newspeak in the novel serves as a useful example of a language designed to obliterate subversive thought at the linguistic level.

One of the most dubious forms of resistance comes from *The Book*, attributed to Emmanuel Goldstein. While it appears a theoretical analysis of the Party, it is merely part of the Party's surveillance strategy. This text is not liberating, but serves to pinpoint antagonists. This reflects the idea of repressive tolerance, as dissent may be tolerated on a very limited level, such as pacifying opposition “The heresy of heresies was common sense.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 102).

Widespread economic opposition is practically non-existent. Minor transgressions, and black-market exchanges, lend the appearance of subversion, but these acts of resistance are at least tacitly permitted and surveilled, and therefore become part of the Party's apparatus “The proletarians will never revolt, not in a thousand years.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 330). Meaningful opposition, however, does not reside in an economy of opposition, but in a psychological one, where fear, betrayal and submission become the only functional currency.

Perhaps the most debasing form of resistance is doubt, and even doubt is regulated in an accurate way. As Winston learns in Room 101, "reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else" (Orwell, 2003, p. 314). In this way, the Party has control of the process of perception. The theories of totalitarianism advanced by theorists such as Hannah Arendt, argue that the regime isolates individuals to annihilate the basis of solidarity. In *1984*, this logic is taken to the very end: not even the self can evade the reach and structure of the state.

In the end, *1984* does not celebrate rebellion; instead, it lays bare how rebellion is dismantled and reconstituted. Orwell's vision tears down the romanticization of resistance. Every whisper of rebellion is absorbed, remade and remapped into evidence of the regime's capacity to neutralize even dissent.

6.3 Psychological and Emotional Dimensions of Resistance

Resistance in Orwell's *1984* does not happen through a celebration of heroism. Instead, it occurs through a cataclysmic implosion of emotion and psychology. Resistance does not empower Winston because the system dismantles interior defiance. The Party does not just demand surveillance of bodies; it monitors the mind to alter one's interior narrative that could ignite actions of rebellion, functioning precisely like what Althusser (1971) describes as Ideological State Apparatuses that operate through institutions and cultural practices to ensure consent rather than coercion. Winston's first resistance begins in thought. His confidential and illegal diary is conducted on a stage of contestation between memory and repression. Yet even at this point, the Party has preempted this inward defiance. Foucault contends that power does not just punish behavior in authoritarian systems, it produces behavior and acts as a disciplining, internal force that can make the subject internalize domination. It is not guilt and fear that Winston feels when he breaks the rules; it is the idea that the interior cannot imagine remaining private and safe. Writing, "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (Orwell, 2003, p. 23) is sanctioned for performance and taken on a stage that is already owned by the regime.

Winston's emotional disturbance is derived from his simultaneous desire for tenderness and closeness, along with his great fear of intimacy and closeness. The relationship that he had with Julia, one that promised freedom, is later turned into a weapon by the regime. In the end, Orwell suggests that no matter how powerful an emotional bond may be, the moment we experience great physical pain, we surrender that bond, and heroism is impossible.

Not only is one noble heroically defeated, but it represents fear and torture can sever relationships of love in the face of pain. The Party achieves the most fundamental dislocation of the individual: it robs us of our social and collective attachments, such that our connections with one another are performed within boundaries of failure. On the issue of totalitarianism, Arendt's perspective illustrates the mechanisms to wherein political regimes dismantle the space for solidarity, compassion, and empathy. Instead, we experience the terror of isolation and domination rather than the importance of community.

The emotional impact of resistance it reenters the text in Room 101. In Room 101, the character of Winston is not broken physically but emotionally remade. In Room 101, Winston's greatest fright - rats - collapses his last line of defense in terms of emotional protection. This echoes Lacanian theory, where the symbolic order of the regime remakes desire and identity, where even emotional terror has language, and becomes the tool to remap the subject (Lacan, 2006, pp. 430–433). When Winston screams for Julia to take his place, this represents the final submission, not of external power but of submission to the internalization of helplessness “You want it to happen to the other person. You don't give a damn what they suffer. All you care about is yourself.” (Orwell, 2003, p. 369).

The novel also critiques the myth of emotional strength as collective strength made real. Unlike standard tropes of revolution, there is no remaining memory of a community of resistance in *1984*. There were only fragile alliances, which are easily betrayed and engineered to collapse. This alienation of real solidarity embodies Gramsci's theorizing for the possibility of successful resistance, which relies on collective consciousness and collective agency of which is utterly annihilated in Orwell's world. In orchestrating an image of isolation, the Party prevents any potential for emotional unity from developing into a political threat “If you kept the small rules, you could break the big ones” (Orwell, 2003, p. 163).

In the end, *1984* echoes a psychological loop of resistance - origin in the self, produced by fear, crushed by emotional trauma, and absorbed into the ideological machinery of the regime. Orwell demonstrates that rebellion cannot advance or progress; he illustrates that totalitarian power produces its own reproduction from the unused feelings and thoughts that could oppose it.

6.4 The Role of Individual versus Collective Action

In *1984*, Orwell makes the collapse of resistance a failure not just of one, but a failure of 'collective' resistance. The novel shows how Winston's various acts of rebellion—his writing

of the diary, his temporary relationship with Julia, and his marginal desire for truth—only can represent personal attempts at resisting, they cannot actually become systematic or organized resistance. There is a greater fragmentation in two ways: being monitored, and the regime consuming those gestures.

At first glance, *The Brotherhood* presents itself as the 'collective' resistance to the Party, a secret organization working covertly to overthrow the Party. However, when we look closer, we can see that what Orwell has constructed is a perfect illusion of a 'collective', a trap of ideology designed to capture and expose those dissenters. What emerges as an organization—a collective—of rebellion is simply an extension of the regime. This process solidifies Marcuse's understanding of "repressive tolerance," or the idea that the regime might tolerate the appearance of some freedom and some dissent, only to neutralize the force of dissent by making it an object of the regime. The regime allows someone to at least think that there is a collective in order to erase the capacity of where such a theory could develop.

We can see this to be in line with Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony—this is a process in which domination is enabled by violence, but also through a recreation of consciousness in a cultural sense. In *1984*, the Party isolates its citizenry in an ideological sense and certainly an emotional sense "There was a word for it in Newspeak: own life, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity." (Orwell, 2003, p. 105). The Party does not merely hinder organization; it actually extinguishes the necessary mental framework for collective solidarity. As Newspeak compresses the totality of thought, it also dissolves the language that makes collaboration imaginable—making "justice," "equality," or "revolution" not simply anti-regime concepts, but utterly unthinkable "Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it." (Orwell, 2003, p. 67).

Hannah Arendt's point in her analysis of totalitarianism adds a perspicuousness to the argument: regimes thrive on the severing of the bonds between people to create a condition of radical isolation. In Orwell's world, the individual does not just fear trusting another; they are able to trust that they do not need them. When Winston attempts to share his fears with O'Brien, we learn that even his gestures of connecting are mediated performances, entirely choreographed and scripted as an extension of the regime which reminds the individual of their own isolation "They got me a long time ago." (Orwell, 2003, p. 301).

In a twist of the predicating absence of political organization, we are left a political void in which one cannot become quasi-political (Arendt, 1951, pp. 322–323). We have no memory of shared struggle, no actual underground, no continuity in oppositional throw-back. The entire notion of shared and secret reading of *The Book*—attributed to Goldstein—is part of the Party’s false opposition designed to expose would-be rebels. This makes the notion of rebellion infinitely reproducible and containable, rather than revolutionary.

In so emphasizing the structured disintegration of the collective, Orwell also establishes a reversal of the tradition of the arc of resistance found in political fiction. Where we might typically read from an individual awakening, to a collective uprising, in *1984*, we read from the troubled solitude of hope, to the silence of the collective. And importantly the final submission—Winston loving Big Brother—can be read through Weber’s (1978) concept of charismatic authority, where the figure of Big Brother, mythologized beyond human form, becomes a vessel for absolute control. The regime sustains itself not through logic, but through emotional devotion to a leader who may not even exist.

6.5 The Cost of Rebellion

Rebellion in Orwell’s *1984* does not occur as a pathway to liberation, but simply as an anxious and depressing collapse into an emotional and ideological prison. The trajectory of resistance that Orwell sets out in the novel never presents opposition as a triumph of the human spirit, rebellion is systematically enabled to be crushed. Rebellion costs not just physical damage, it costs the very dissolution of self.

Winston serves as the vehicle for these ideas. His repressed acts of rebellion—writing a diary, clandestine sexual relations with Julia—may be considered acts of agency, albeit amounts of agency that are safely contained when one considers the confines of the regime (Foucault, 1995, pp. 135–169). Systems of surveillance do not just punish as Foucault argued, they surveil and establish the field of possible reactions. The Party expects rebellion and confines it so that all conduct, deviant as it might be or appear, can be preserved and not a separate agency. The Party excessively permits the illusion of transgression in order to manage resistance and diffuse it.

In terms of emotional effects, rebellion can deliver isolation, betrayal and despair. According to Hannah Arendt (1951), totalitarian regimes do their best to eliminate human bonds and isolate people in order to disallow hope of solidarity. In *1984*, isolation is not only external, but an internalization. Initially, the bond of love shared between Winston and Julia, as well as

shared opposition, serves as the vehicle for the emotional and psychological process of destruction. Winston's ultimate betrayal of calling out Julia to be taken instead of him, translates the intimacy of two people into a weapon of domination. The Party's capacity for power lies in its commands made synonymous with a subject's defeat at their own hands "It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act." (Orwell, 2003, p. 159).

In terms of psychological effects, and perhaps the most damaging, is how rebellion outdatedly works. Lacan might have suggested that Winston's desire to rebel, in its various initiatives, comes from within the symbolic field invented and privileged by the Party. The Party control's not just the actions of Winston, it defines Winston's subjectivity as previously mediated through the ideology he was taking up a stand against. Room 101 signifies more than just a physical ability to torture as its depicted in the novel; it embodies the remapping of one's identity via the use of their fear. Winston at that capacity for resignation, does not merely succumb to the Party's ideological formatting, but it is embodied erasure of even Winston or some feedback of resistance. The point has less to do with courage, but more with a structural inevitability that will always account for the smothering of resistance. "There were things, your own acts, from which you could never recover. Something was killed in your breast: burnt out, cauterized out." (Orwell, 2003, p. 367).

Marcuse's one-dimensional man concept further establishes how totalitarian regimes also welcome opposition, but offer limited and controlled forms of rebellion that replicate the system. The Brotherhood described in the novel, which the Party recognizes as an active collective to strive against the Party, morphs into a deceitful mirage. There is never a true underground of resistance; no residue of memory shared by generation, continuity or organization. It is as if the regime allows for fantasy factions of rebellion, only to counter it with their softening mechanisms of eradication.

In the end, the cost of rebellion takes shape is not just a measure of physical punishment, but rather the reduction of an interior life. The Party will accept nothing less than thorough devotion; they do not only want obedience, they want love from those it oppresses, as represented by Winston's last submission of "He loved Big Brother". The result is a complete colonization of thought, emotion, and identity. Rebellion in Orwell's depiction does not collapse from external processes, it implodes from within, leading to silence, rather than revolution.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has been a thorough exploration of the systems of tyranny and dictatorship and their reproduction in George Orwell's *1984*, noting that an understanding of authoritarianism must be extended beyond a text-based reading of repression through instruments of overt control, to account for the continual reproduction of the system through the internalization of ideology by the subjects of the regime. Throughout this research, there are moments where it was indicated that dictatorship in *1984* is not simply a static structure of oppression imposed by actors at a higher level, but a dynamic system that constantly reproduces itself through individuals that willingly or unwillingly become agents of their own subjugation. As indicated through my drawing together of theoretical work from Foucault and Arendt, Lacan, and others, this study has shown that the continuance of tyranny is endured not only through tactics of surveillance, propaganda, and repression but also through the re-ordering and constituting of the psyche of the subject, which is an insidious and psychic method of subjugation which leaves no clear space between compliance and resistance.

While the previous two studies revolved around action and resistance, the structural implications surrounding the subject's internal collapse were noted and considered one of the most significant findings of this research. While colorful but still productive gestures of rebellion are made by characters like Winston and Julia, throughout the narrative they are still actors forming part of the logic of the regime, of which their rebellion is unable to overcome. This is not just a matter of a will not controlling or being able to engulf the whole being, but rather a structural part of how regimes like the one learned of in *1984* operate. In a system where perception is reconfigured, memory is reconceived, and understanding is dissolved, new truths are created and reclaimed as the identities of the subjects who may have originally been without will constellations. While Lacan's psychoanalysis involves the understanding of the subject as being produced via lack and wishful misrecognition - which in this case becomes a tool of control (the Party is not only monitoring their actions, but refining and reconstructing desire), Winston's desire and melancholia for truth is the very path via which he is broken. The novel does not provide a stark separation between oppressor and oppressed, but rather exposes a grey space in which resistance can be appropriated; a space where even our innermost thoughts are crafted by the architecture of the system. In this respect, *1984* is not only a tale of political dystopia, but also a guide for understanding how systems of authoritarian control will create a grip across time and generations. Arendt's notion of totalitarianism as political power which infiltrates the public and private realm is fully realized here. The Party's ability to succeed

is not simply based on violence but rather through erasing the gap between our inner-beliefs and external conformity. This thesis confirmed that language (Newspeak), memory (the Ministry of Truth), and even love (the betrayal from Winston to Julia) were all manipulatively repurposed against themselves for state utility. It was shown how not only a compliance is instantiated, but the very reality used to enact rebellion is obliterated.

In addition, this research has demonstrated how *1984* foreshadows contemporary anxieties about surveillance normalizations, the weaponization of truth, and the psychological mechanisms people use to internalize and reproduce systems of domination. The thesis examined the Party as a metaphor for modern authoritarianism, adding to discussions regarding how citizens in democratic societies might even find themselves silently slipping into a totalitarian reality. With thinkers such as Chomsky and Marcuse, the relevancy of the novel to current sociopolitical landscapes is further fortified by the ideological saturation blurring the lines between reality and fiction, with media that fills that gap for power, and, where individuals freely relinquish their freedom for an illusion of security. The second, no less important contribution of this research is the reconstruction of resistance. In conventional political theory, resistance is embodied in collective action or revolutionary politics. In contrast, *1984* interrogates this notion. Resistance, according to the novel, is precisely what the regime has taken away from language, memory, and intimacy. In fact, even Winston's rebellion is already produced and brought within the system, thereby concretizing Foucault's point that power is not simply repressive, but also produce and is productive; it produces the subject, the body, and the terrain of resistance itself. Thus, rather than being seen as an act of outraging or opposing a clearly identified enemy, resistance is an unending confrontation with the world in the ongoing struggle of reclaiming the self, with the fact that even the self has already been colonized (Foucault, 1995, pp. 136–138).

The research also advances the argument that *1984* can be read as a psychological allegory capturing the deployment of fear, guilt, and moral disorientation as a curtailment to dissent. The founding argument is that the authority of the Party is being maintained, not just through institutional apparatuses, but within the emotional structure of its citizens. The Lacanian gaze, the constant feeling of being watched, becomes an internalized presence, an internal voice within the subject that controls desire. That internalization forms the basis for the period, even without direct repression. It is this form of psychological control that guarantees the Party's survival beyond physical methods of violence. From a literary perspective, the structure of the work, and the implied narrative choices, are part of the very subject matter. The

breakdown of linear time, the unreliability of history, character development, and a still reality under tyranny are all reflected in the experience of reading. *1984* is a literary performance of authoritarian logic. To resist ideology in its totalizing position, literature must sacrifice coherence. Fredric Jameson explains literature's subversive power does not derive from a coherent narrative; its power resides in the distortion of dominating ideological forms, the fragmentation of both form and time. Sacrificing coherence is the price of revealing hidden ideologies, because fragmentation of narrative displays historical layers and contradictions in literature (Jameson, 1981, p. 20). The inevitability of failure was not the protagonist's; it is a necessity of narrative within a world where meaning is repressed, undermined, disrupted, or annihilated altogether. This research demonstrated how Orwell engages the very form of the novel to produce a space for interrogating the reader's preconceptions about truth, agency, and the possibility of resistance.

The implications of this thesis extend far beyond Orwell's novel. If we understand how *1984* reproduces tyranny through character, symbol, and psychically through reading, then we can identify a useful analytical tool for understanding how other kinds of authoritarian narratives operate in literary texts and other forms of discourse. I suggest that further research needs to more intentionally examine how tyranny is reproduced not only through political systems of power, but also through cultural forms, social rituals, and, subsequently, individual subjectivities. Comparative studies with texts like *Brave New World*, *The Handmaid's Tale*, or contemporary Arab dystopian fiction may also reveal similar structures of power in their reproduction of tyranny and resistance of tyranny. Cross-disciplinary approaches that draw upon trauma studies, political psychology, and media theory may allow researchers to better understand how people come to be agents of their own domination.

In closing, this thesis argues that literature continues to provide a space for unpacking the internal workings of tyranny itself—how it penetrates into emotion, fractures identity and rewrites morality. *1984* suggests that the most grave tyrannies are not those that break bone, but those that remake the soul. With the rise of authoritarianism resurgent around the world, Orwell's loss is even more clear. Accordingly, this study serves as contribution to the field of literary study and, I think, also represents an ethical obligation. We are called to identify the manifestations of tyranny wherever they appear, to combat their naturalization, and to bring imagination back as a space of political possibility.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Viking Press.
- Allen, A. (2016). *The End of Progress: Decolonizing the Normative Foundations of Critical Theory*. Columbia University Press, pp. 164–165.
- Bhattacharya, S., & Chattopadhyay, A. (2015). Democracy, Resistance, and the Practice of Literature. *Sanglap: Journal of Literary and Cultural Inquiry*, 1(2), 1–26.
- Besenski, S. A. (2007). *The year of the rat: Images of betrayal in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan). University of Saskatchewan Repository.
- Chomsky, N. (1991). *Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda*. Seven Stories Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Greenblatt, S. (1980). *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jani, B. J. (2023). Terroristic torture in George Orwell's 1984 and Abdul-Sattar Nasir's Eggplant Peels. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 15(2), 1–12
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Beacon Press.
- Levi, P. (1988). *The Drowned and the Saved*. Vintage International
- Lacan, J. (2006). *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English* (B. Fink, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company
- Orwell, G. (2003). *1984*. Penguin Books.
- Paxton, R. O. (2004). *The Anatomy of Fascism*. Vintage Books.
- Patil, A. (2025). *George Orwell's 1984: A Mirror to Totalitarianism*. New Delhi: Academic Press.
- Snyder, T. (2017). *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. Tim Duggan Books.
- Sontag, S. (1975). *Fascinating Fascism*. New York Review of Books.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press.
- Slavoj Žižek (2008). *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, 2nd edition. London: Verso.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu çalışma, George Orwell'ın distopik eseri "1984" aracılığıyla baskıcı yönetimlerin bireyler ve topluluklar üzerindeki etkilerini kapsamlı bir şekilde ele almaktadır. Orwell'ın tasarladığı Okyanusya dünyası, sadece hayali bir gelecek görüntüsü sunmakla kalmaz; aynı zamanda modern toplumlardaki eleştirilerin de bir yansımasıdır. Bu evrende birey, kendi kimliğini tanımlama hakkından, düşünce özgürlüğünden ve tarihsel bellekten yoksun kalmış, sistemin tam gözetimi altında bir varlık haline getirilmiştir. Bu çerçevede, tez Orwell'ın eserini sadece bir distopya metni olarak değerlendirmekten ziyade, psikanalitik, sosyolojik ve ideolojik bakış açılarıyla derinlemesine bir analiz yapmaktadır. Özellikle Slavoj Žižek'in ideoloji üzerine düşünceleri, Michel Foucault'nun bilgi ve iktidar ilişkisini ele alışı ve gözetim teorisi, Jacques Lacan'ın özne olma süreci ile bilinçdışının yapıları, Hannah Arendt'in totalitarizm anlayışı ve Louis Althusser'in ideolojik aletler teorisi çerçevesinde incelenmiştir. Bu teorik çerçeve, Orwell'ın oluşturduğu kurgusal evreni yalnızca bir hikaye alanı olarak değil, aynı zamanda bireylerin zihinsel, duygusal ve davranışsal olarak ne denli derin bir ideolojik baskıya maruz kaldığını da ortaya koyar.

Romanın ana karakteri Winston Smith, sistemin katı gerçekliğine karşı içsel bir mücadele vermeye çalışan; ancak sonunda başarısızlığa uğrayan bir kişilik olarak tasvir edilmektedir. Onun bu süreçte deneyimlediği zihinsel ve duygusal çöküş, yalnızca fiziksel baskılardan kaynaklanmıyor; aynı zamanda sistemin ideolojisini benimsemesiyle de ilgilidir. Winston'ın Julia ile kurduğu ilişki, başlangıçta bir özgürlük alanı olarak algılansa da, aslında bu alanın da sistem tarafından kısıtlandığı ve yönlendirildiği oldukça belirgindir. Jacques Lacan'ın özne teorisi çerçevesinde, Winston'un benlik algısının dağılması ve bastırılan arzularının sistemin kontrolüne maruz kalması, bireyin içsel özgürlüğü üzerine bir sorgulama getirir. Winston'ın "ayna evresi"nden tam olarak kopamamış olması, onu bir birey olarak bütünleşmekten alıkoyar. İhtiyaçları sistem tarafından şekillendirilir; sevgi yeteneği üzerinde oynamalar yapılır ve sonuçta sadakat, Büyük Birader'e olan "aşk"a dönüşür.

Foucault'nun panoptikon modeli, Okyanusya'daki gözetim olgusunu kavramak için önemli bir açı sağlar. Big Brother yalnızca bir lider değil; aynı zamanda bireylerin zihinlerinde derinlemesine yerleşmiş olan baskıcı bir otoritedir. Bu içselleştirilmiş izleme, kişinin kendini sürekli olarak denetlemesine yol açar ve birey, içsel kontrol mekanizmasının etkisi altında kalır. Foucault'nun bilgi ve iktidar ilişkisine göre, Parti bireylerin davranışlarını kontrol etmekle kalmaz, aynı zamanda bilgiye erişim yöntemlerini de düzenleyerek insanın bilgi dünyasını yeniden biçimlendirir. Orwell'ın YeniSöylem olarak adlandırdığı dil politikaları da bu ideolojik baskının en

önemli unsurlarındandır. Dil baskısı yalnızca düşüncelerin oluşumunu kısıtlamakla kalmaz; aynı zamanda kişinin hafıza geliştirme yeteneğini de olumsuz etkiler. İki artı iki beş eder inancının sorgusuz bir şekilde benimsenmesi, ideolojinin bilinçaltındaki etkisini gözler önüne serer. Louis Althusser'in ideolojik araçlar teorisi çerçevesinde medya, eğitim ve dil gibi unsurlar, bireylerin ideolojiye maruz kalma biçimlerini belirleyen önemli mekanizmalardır.

Bu süreçte birey, kendi bilincini geliştiremez hale gelir. Hafıza sürekli olarak değiştirilir, tarih yeniden yazılır ve gerçeklik Parti'nin tanımladığı şekle indirgenir. Susan Sontag'ın faşizmin estetikleşmesi üzerine olan düşünceleri, Parti'nin korkuyu ve itaatı nasıl etkili bir şekilde sergilediğini de gözler önüne serer. İki Dakikalık Nefret gibi törenler, bireylerin duygusal enerjilerinin sistem tarafından yönetilmesini sağlamak amacıyla kullanılan bir yöntemdir. Bu aşamada Arendt'in "kötülüğün sıradanlığı" kavramı yeniden ön plana çıkmaktadır; zira Winston gibi karakterlerin sisteme boyun eğmesi, bir cesaret eksikliğinden değil, sistemin bireyleri nasıl kendi araçları haline dönüştürebildiğiyle ilgilidir. Orwell'in eserinde dikkat çeken bir diğer önemli unsur, bireyin içsel dünyasıyla dışsal gerçeklik arasındaki çatışmanın sürekli olarak bastırılmasıdır. Winston'ın yaşadığı her duygusal başkaldırı, sadece fiziksel bir tehdit ile değil, aynı zamanda zihinsel bir çözülme süreci aracılığıyla da bastırılmıştır. Parti, bireyin yalnızca eylemlerini değil, aynı zamanda hislerini, inançlarını ve belleklerini de şekillendirebilir. Bu bağlamda, hafızanın politik hale gelmesi, bireyin kimliğini yeniden oluşturma'nın önemli bir aracı haline gelir. Winston'ın çocukluğuna dair bulanık anıları, onun geçmişle bağ kuramamasının yanı sıra, bugününü de kavrayamamasına yol açar. Bu tarz bir belirsizlik, sadece bireyi değil, aynı zamanda toplumu da tarihsel anlamda köksüz bırakmaktadır. Bu durumda tarih, kolektif bir hafızadan çok; iktidarın keyfi müdahaleleriyle biçimlendirilmiş bir anlatı aracı haline gelmiştir.

Bu anlatım, Parti'nin mutlak gerçeği inşa etmesinde merkezi bir öneme sahiptir. Artık hakikat, deneyimle, bilgiyle ya da kanıtla bağlantılı değildir; yalnızca Parti'nin ifade ettikleri kadar var olmaktadır. Bu durum, günümüzün "hakikatsiz" (post-truth) çağının doğrudan bir yansımasıdır. Orwell'in yarattığı evrende gerçeklik, ideolojinin bir yansımaları haline gelir. Bu nedenle, bireylerin gerçeği arama çabası daha baştan eksik kalır. Sonuç olarak, insanlar yalnızca düşünsel açıdan değil, etik olarak da sapmalar yaşarlar. Doğru ile yanlış arasındaki sınır belirsizleşmiş ve kişinin ahlaki rehberi zayıflamıştır. Bu da, Orwell'in dil kullanımında kendini belli etmektedir. Newspeak sayesinde kelimeler birer birer ortadan kaldırılmakta, anlamlar daraltılmakta ve düşünce yeteneği sistematik olarak zayıflatılmaktadır. Bu durum, yalnızca bireylerin değil, aynı zamanda toplumun genelinde bir çürümenin de habercisidir. Çünkü kelimeler azaldıkça düşünceler de kaybolur; eğer düşünceler yok olursa, direniş mümkün olmaz.

Romanın anlatım yapısı, bu ideolojik yapıların bireyin içsel dünyasındaki yansımalarını gösterecek şekilde tasarlanmıştır. Anlatının zaman akışı, belirsizlikler ve tekrarlarla sarılmıştır. Okuyucu, bazen anlatıcının gerçeklik anlayışıyla kendi algısı arasında sıkışmış hisseder. Bu kasıtlı belirsizlik, Orwell'ın hem anlatım yöntemi hem de düşünsel perspektifinin bir uzantısı olarak görülebilir. Zira sistemin birey üzerindeki en büyük yıkıcı etkilerinden biri, gerçekliğin değişmezliğini yitirmesidir. Winston için gerçek, artık yalnızca anlık deneyimlerle sınırlıdır. Dünün ne olduğu ve yarının ne getireceği belirsizdir. Bu belirsizlik, bireyin zihinsel dengesini bozar ve kimliğini biçimlendiren sürekliliği yok eder.

Winston ile Julia'nın ilişkisi, bu zihinsel çözülmenin farklı bir yönünü temsil eder. Başlangıçta romantik bir kaçış gibi görünen bu beraberlik, kısa zamanda ideolojik bir tuzağa dönüşür. Aşkın kendisi, Parti'nin belirlediği sınırlar içerisinde varlık gösterir. Julia ile olan ilişki, Winston'a kişisel bir direniş alanı sunuyormuş gibi görünse de, aslında bu alanın Parti tarafından şekillendirildiği ve denetlendiği anlaşılır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, Julia karakteri özgürlüğü simgeleyen biri değildir; aksine, sistemin bireylere kurduğu tuzakları gizleyen bir yanılsamadır. Winston'un deneyimlediği aşk, aslında sistemin dayattığı, onlara sunduğu ve sonuçta kendi mekanizması tarafından yok edilen bir tecrübedir. Bu durum, Lacan'ın arzusun özneye ait değil, Öteki'nin (sistemin) bakış açısına göre belirlendiği fikriyle paralellik göstermektedir. Winston, istediğini düşündüğü şeyin gerçekte sistemin ona isteyip de dayattığı bir şey olduğunu geç şekilde anlamaya başlar. Bu farkındalık onu özgürleştirmek yerine ruhsal çöküşünü daha da hızlandırır.

Bu psikolojik çöküş, romanın en etkileyici bölümü olan Room 101'de belirginleşir. Bireyin en derin korkusunun bir işkence aracına dönüştürülmesi, yalnızca fiziksel bir yok oluş değil; aynı zamanda varoluşsal bir silinme yaratır. Winston'un Julia'yı feda etmesi, onun kendisine, geçmişine, kimliğine ve duygularına yabancılaştığını ortaya koyar. Temel insani duygular olan sevgi, sadakat ve bağlılık, sistem tarafından manipüle edilerek bireyin aleyhine kullanılmaktadır. Bu sahne, bireyin en son kırılma noktasıdır. Artık o bir özne olmaktan çıkmış; Parti'nin ideolojik kurallarına boyun eğen bir karakter haline gelmiştir. Romanın sonunda yer alan "Büyük Birader'i seviyordu" ifadesi, bu tam teslimiyetin en çarpıcı göstergesidir. Bu sevgi, duygusal bir bağdan ziyade; korkunun, çaresizliğin ve zihinsel teslimiyetin bir ürünüdür.

Winston'ın son teslimiyetinde öne çıkan başka bir unsur, özgürlüğün sistem tarafından nasıl anlamını yitirdiğidir. "Özgürlük, iki kere iki dört eder diyebilmek demektir" gibi basit bir matematik gerçeği bile, Parti'nin mutlak gücü karşısında bir tehdit sayılmaktadır. Çünkü özgürlük, bu bağlamda sadece fiziksel kısıtlamaların bulunmaması değil; aynı zamanda zihnin bütünlüğünün korunmasını

da ifade eder. Ancak Parti, bireylerin yalnızca eylemlerine değil, aynı zamanda düşünme tarzlarına, hafızalarına ve hayal gücüne de müdahale ederek özgürlüğü sadece yok etmekle kalmaz; aynı zamanda onu yeniden şekillendirir, tanımlar ve etkisiz hale getirir. Bu şekilde, özgürlük bireyin talep ettiği bir hak olmaktan çıkar ve sistemin belirlediği, sınırlarını çizdiği bir ayrıcalık haline gelir. Bu durum, bireyin iktidara karşı gösterebileceği her türlü muhalefeti kökünden yok eden bir ideolojik yapı oluşturur.

Romanın ilerleyen kısımlarında Winston'un "Kardeşlik" adlı direniş örgütüne duyduğu ilgi, bir umut ışığı olarak belirmeye başlar. Fakat bu yapı da diğerleri gibi, Parti'nin yarattığı bir aldatmacadan başka bir şey değildir. Bu sahte yapı, bireylerin direnme yeteneklerini sistemin içine çekerek etkisiz hale getiren bir mekanizma olarak çalışır. Parti sadece direnişi bastırmakla kalmaz; aynı zamanda bu direnişi üretir, yönlendirir ve nihayetinde ortadan kaldırır. Bu durum, Herbert Marcuse'un "baskıcı hoşgörü" terimiyle doğrudan bağlantılıdır. Sistem, dışarıdan bir muhalefet alanı gibi görünse de, bu alanın sınırlarını kendisi çiziyor ve muhalefeti kendi yöntemleriyle kontrol altında tutuyor. Winston'un ümitle bel bağladığı her düşünce, kişi ve ilişki, nihayetinde Parti'nin etkisi altında bir teslimiyet aracı haline geliyor. Bu durum, bireyin hem dış dünyadan hem de içsel bir süreçten etkilenmesini sağlar. İçsel çözülme, yalnızca bireyin öz algısını etkilemekle kalmaz; aynı zamanda zaman ve mekânla olan bağını da zayıflatır. Geçmişin sürekli olarak yeniden şekillendiği ve anıların silindiği bir ortamda, birey sabit bir bağlılık hissinden yoksun kalır. Winston'un ailesiyle ilgili anıları, çocukluk deneyimleri ve geçmişe dair görüntüleri parçalı ve belirsizdir. Bu durum, sadece kişisel bir unutkanlık değil; aynı zamanda sistematik bir manipülasyonun sonucudur. Parti, tarih yazımını elinde tutarak hem toplumsal belleği hem de bireysel hafızayı şekillendirmektedir. Tarih artık yalnızca geçmişin bir anlatımı olmaktan çıkmış; geleceğin kontrolünün sağlanmasında da bir araç haline gelmiştir. Bu çerçevede Orwell'in tasarladığı sistem, yalnızca bireyin mevcut durumunu değil; aynı zamanda geçmişini ve geleceğini de kontrol altına alarak tamamen bir baskı oluşturur.

Bireylerin duygusal ilişkilerinin kontrolü, bu otoritenin en derin yönlerinden birini oluşturur. Aile, aşk ve arkadaşlık gibi bağlar, sistemin belirlediği sınırlar içinde sürdürülmektedir. Çocuklar, ebeveynlerini ihbar edecek kadar sisteme entegre olmuş durumda ve aşk ilişkileri, Parti'ye olan sadakatten sapıldığı an bir tehdit olarak görülmeye başlanıyor. Julia ile Winston'un ilişkisi açısından bakıldığında, bu ilişki duygusal bir kaçış yerine, sistemin yarattığı geçici bir yanılsama olarak değerlendirilebilir. Bu ilişki, duygusal ve fiziksel olarak kısıtlandığında, kişinin içsel bir çöküş yaşaması kaçınılmaz hale gelir. Aşk artık bir özgürlük ifadesi olmaktan çıkar; Parti'nin etkisi altında şekillenen bir tür işkence hâline gelir. Sevgi, bağlılık ve sadakat gibi kavramlar, sistemin ideolojik

araçları tarafından yeniden şekillendirilir; böylece en özel ilişkiler bile kontrol altına alınır. Bu aşamada Orwell'ın distopyası, sadece bir politik eleştiri olmaktan çıkıp aynı zamanda ontolojik bir incelemeye dönüşür. Çünkü birey sadece haklarından, duygularından veya kimliğinden değil; aynı zamanda varoluşsal bütünlüğünden de ayrılmaktadır. Romanın final sahnesindeki “Büyük Birader’i seviyordu” ifadesi, Winston’un özgür iradesinin, bilinçli düşüncesinin ve duygusal bağlarının tamamen sistemin etkisi altında şekillendiğini ortaya koyar. Bu sevgi, sadece bir duygu ifadesi değildir; aynı zamanda Parti'nin ustalıkla yarattığı bir bağlılık biçimidir. Bu noktada Orwell, bireyin özgürlük arayışının nasıl sistematik bir şekilde dönüştürüldüğünü ve bastırıldığını ortaya koyarak okuyucuya sadece bir distopya değil, aynı zamanda modern toplumların ideolojik temelleri hakkında derinlemesine bir sorgulama sunar.

Bu sistemin etkili olduğu bir diğer alan, bireyin düşünsel yeteneklerinin düzenli olarak kısıtlanmasıdır. Partinin benimsediği "Yeni Söylem" sadece dilsel bir değişim değil; bireyin düşünme, hayal kurma ve sorgulama yetilerini belirleyen bir araçtır. Dili sınırlamak, doğrudan düşünceyi kısıtlamak demektir. Bir kavramı tam olarak ifade edemeyen kişi, o kavram hakkında derinlemesine düşünemez; düşündüğü bir şey olamayacak kadar belirsiz olanı sorgulamak ya da ona karşı koymak mümkün olmaz. Bu sebeple, Yeni Söylem’in temel hedefi sadece mevcut dili sadeleştirmekle sınırlı kalmaz; aynı zamanda düşüncenin karmaşıklığını ortadan kaldırarak muhalefeti daha gelişmeden engellemeyi amaçlar. Parti, kelimeleri silerek yalnızca sözlüğü değil, aynı zamanda bireylerin zihinsel haritasını da yeniden şekillendirir. Bu durum, her bireyin Parti'nin belirlediği düşünce çerçevesine hapsolmasına yol açar.

Bu zihinsel kısıtlamanın en belirgin belirtilerinden biri, düşüncelerin duygularla olan bağının kopmasıdır. Winston'un zamanla hissettiği duygusal yabancılaşma, sadece sistemin baskılarından kaynaklanmamakta; aynı zamanda duygularını ifade etmek için gereken dilin eksikliği nedeniyle de daha da derinleşmektedir. Parti, kişinin sadece davranışlarını değil, aynı zamanda duygularını da şekillendiren bir yapı oluşturur. Sevgi, nefret ve korku gibi hisler artık yalnızca bireysel tecrübeler olarak kalmaz; bu duygular sistemin etkisiyle ortaya çıkan otomatik tepkilere dönüşür. İnsan, hissedilen bir varlık olmanın ötesine geçer ve sistemin yönlendirdiği yanıtlar bütününe hâlinde gelir. Bu duygusal süreç, kişinin direnme gücünü daha önce bir şey başlamadan yok eder. Zira özgürlük isteği, yalnızca hissedilen bir eksiklik ile değer bulur. Ancak sistem, bireyin bu eksiklik hissini bile ortadan kaldırır.

Winston'un bireysel direnişi bu eksiklik etrafında oluşur. Fakat bu direniş, Parti tarafından önceden planlanmış, kontrol altına alınmış ve nihayetinde etkisiz hale getirilmiştir. Winston'un

kaleme aldığı günlük, Julia ile olan ilişkisinin yanı sıra Kardeşlik'e duyduğu inancı ve Goldstein'in eserinden edindiği bilgileri içerir; tüm bunlar sistemi tanıyan sınırlar içinde şekillenir. Özgürlük peşinde koşan Winston, her adımında daha derin bir kontrol mekanizmasının ağına yakalanır. Bu durum, sistemin en tehlikeli tarafını gözler önüne seriyor: bireyin direnişinin bile sisteme entegre edilmesi. Bu aşamada Orwell, özgürlük kavramının sadece baskılanmadığını, aynı zamanda yeniden tanımlanarak sistem içerisinde eriyip gittiğini ortaya koyuyor. Bireyin kendini tanıma yetisini yitirmesi, sistemin kesin başarısını temsil eder. Winston, artık hangi değerlere inandığını, nereye ait olduğunu ya da neleri arzuladığını bilemez duruma gelir. Bu mesele yalnızca kimlik kaybı ile sınırlı değildir; aynı zamanda derin bir varoluşsal çözülme anlamına gelir. İnsan, kendini ifade etme imkanlarından yoksun kaldığında, sadece bir boşluk haline gelir. Partinin birey üzerindeki etkisi, onu susturmakla kalmaz; aynı zamanda kendi sesini unutturur. Bu unutma durumu, en tehlikeli boyutlardaki teslimiyettir. Çünkü birey artık sadece itaat etmekle kalmıyor; aynı zamanda neden itaat ettiğini de sorgulamıyor. Bu aşamada Partinin başarısı, yalnızca fiziksel bir kontrol sağlamakla sınırlı değil; zihin, duygu ve bilinçdışı boyutlarda da tam bir hâkimiyet kurmasında yatmaktadır.

Romanın sonunda Winston'un Julia'ya karşı hislerinin kaybolması, bu değişimin tamamlandığını ortaya koyar. Daha önce umut, özgürlük ve sevgi gibi değerleriyle tanımlanan kavramlar, artık boşluk, korku ve kayıtsızlıkla değiştirilmiştir. Winston artık ne sevgi hissediyor, ne umut besliyor, ne de sistemle ilgili bir kaygısı var. O, Parti'nin ideolojik yeniden üretim sürecinden geçmiş ve "tamamlanmış" bir birey haline gelmiştir. Bu durum, Orwell'in distopyasının en karanlık yönlerinden birini temsil eder. Çünkü insan artık yalnızca bastırılmış değil; aynı zamanda dönüştürülmüştür. Dönüşüm gerçekleştiğinde, direniş olasılığı bile sona erer. Böylelikle Parti, sadece zafer elde etmekle kalmaz; insanın ruhunu da ele geçirir. Bireyin içsel değişimi, yalnızca ideolojik bir müdahalenin değil, aynı zamanda sürekli travmaların da bir sonucudur. Winston'un zihnindeki parçalanma, onun sadece bir mağdur olmadığını; bununla birlikte sistem tarafından yeniden üretilen bir varlık haline geldiğini ortaya koyar. Partinin uyguladığı zihinsel baskı yöntemleri, kişinin kendi gerçekliğinden kuşku duymasına yol açar. Zihin, artık güvenilir bir rehber olmaktan çıkar; çünkü ne geçmiş kesinlik taşır, ne duygular açıktır, ne de gerçeklik sabittir. Bu sürekli değişim durumu, bireyi içsel dünyasında bile yalnız hissettirir. İnsan, hafızasına, duygularına ve isteklerine yabancılaştığında artık kendisini tanıyamaz hale gelir. Bu tür bir yabancılaşma, sistemin en tehlikeli zaferidir: bireyi kendi düşmanı yapmaktır.

Winston'ın içsel çöküşü, Parti'nin birey üzerinde tamamen hâkim olduğu gerçeğini ortaya koymaktadır. Artık fiziksel bir direnişin ya da düşüncesele bir karşı duruşun temeli kalmamıştır. Direniş, sistem tarafından yeniden şekillendirilmiş, anlamsızlaştırılmış ve biçimsel bir ritüele

dönüşmüştür. Bu durum, kişinin yalnızca dışsal baskılarla değil, aynı zamanda içsel bir boşlukla da etkilenmiş olduğunu gösterir. Parti, bireyin korkularını, hayallerini ve ilişkilerini yönlendirerek onu pasif bir varlık haline getirir. Bu şekilde kişi düşünmekten ve hissetmekten uzaklaşır; sadece sistemin sunduğu gerçeklikte yaşamaya başlar. Bu varoluş, özgürlükten yoksun olup sadece itaat ve tekrar üzerine kuruludur. Parti tarafından oluşturulan sistem, bireyin kimliğini yalnızca baskılamakla kalmaz; aynı zamanda onu silip yeniden şekillendirir. Bu yeniden şekillendirme süreci, sistemin devamlılığı için elzemdir. Birey, geçmişini hatırladığında veya alternatif bir yaşam düşüncesi oluştuğunda, sistemin bütünlüğü tehlikeye girer. Bu sebeple, geçmişin yeniden şekillendirilmesi sadece tarihsel bir müdahale değil; aynı zamanda bireyin kimliğine yönelik bir saldırıdır. Bir kişinin geçmişine dair her iz silindiğinde, o kişinin kendini anlamlandırabileceği tüm referanslar da kaybolur. Bu durumda insan, yalnızca mevcut ana hapsedilmiş bir varlık haline gelir. Bu “an” ise Partinin belirlediği tek ve değişken bir zaman anlayışından ibarettir.

Romanın sunduğu evren, sadece bir distopya olmakla kalmayıp modern toplumlardaki gerçeklere de dikkat çeken bir uyarı niteliğindedir. Orwell, iktidarın yalnızca silahlarla değil; aynı zamanda dil, bilgi, duygular ve hafıza aracılığıyla da nasıl egemenlik sağlayabileceğini sergilemektedir. Bu kontrol, yalnızca otoriter yönetimlerin değil, aynı zamanda serbestlik iddiasındaki sistemlerin de benimsediği yöntemlerle oluşur. İktidar görünmez hale geldiğinde daha tehlikeli olabilir. Çünkü birey kendisini baskı altında hissetmediği için sorgulama yapmaz, itiraz etmez ve direniş göstermez. Bu gönüllü boyun eğiş, özgürlük anlayışının sistem tarafından yeniden şekillendirilmesinin bir sonucudur. Romanın sonunda Winston'un Parti'ye beslediği sevgi yalnızca bir kabulleniş değil; aynı zamanda bireyin varoluşunun parçalanmasıdır. Artık kendisine ait bir kimliği olmayan biri haline gelmiştir; Parti'nin oluşturduğu yeni bir karakterdir. Bu değişim, direnişin sona erdiği yerdir: birey özgürlüğü arzulamaz, geçmişini unutmuş ve aşkı istemez olmuştur. Parti, onun kendi benliğini silmiş ve yerine yalnızca kendine bağlı bir gölge yerleştirmiştir. Bu aşamada Orwell'in mesajı daha belirgin hale gelir: özgürlük, sadece dışsal zincirlerin kırılmasıyla değil; aynı zamanda içsel benliğin korunmasıyla elde edilebilir. Eğer bireyin iç dünyası kontrol altına alınırsa, bedenin fiziksel olarak bağlı tutulmasına gerek kalmaz.

Winston'un aşk, umut ve direniş gibi insan duyguları zamanla değerini kaybeder. Bunun nedeni, sistemin bu hisleri ya tamamen ortadan kaldırması ya da onları kendi menfaatine uygun hale getirmesidir. Sevgi, sadece Parti'ye olan itaatiyle anlam kazanır. Umut ise yalnızca Parti'nin belirlediği çerçeve içinde varlığını sürdürebilir. Direniş sadece sembolik bir eylem haline gelir. Bu dönüşüm sürecinde kişi, duygularını sorgulamayı bırakır, düşünce geliştirmekten uzaklaşır ve hayal etme yeteneğini yitirir. Bir insan, bu sistemin yapısını ne kadar çok içselleştirirse, o kadar az acı

çeker. Ancak bu içselleştirme, bireyin varlığını da ortadan kaldırır. Düşünmeyen, sevmeyen ve geçmişe sahip olmayan bir kişi, yalnızca sistemin işlevsel bir unsuru haline gelir. Bu bağlamda Orwell'ın eserinin, günümüz dünyasına yönelik bir eleştiri olarak yorumlanabileceği söylenebilir. Medya, eğitim ve dijital ağlar vasıtasıyla bireylerin yönlendirilme biçimi, hangi bilgileri unutmaları ve hangilerini hatırlamaları gerektiği sistemli bir şekilde belirlenir. Tıpkı George Orwell'ın "1984" romanındaki Gerçeklik Bakanlığı gibi, günümüzde "gerçek" olarak adlandırdığımız şey değişkendir; bu durum, anlatılar, politikalar ve algılar tarafından şekillendirilmiştir. Gerçekliğin değişken bir hale gelmesi, bireyin inançları konusunda belirsizlik yaşamasına yol açar. Bu belirsizlik, aynı zamanda bireyin kimlik oluşturma sürecinde bir eksiklik meydana getirir. Artık kişi kendi özünü değil, sunulan kimlik tasarımlarını benimsemeye başlar.

Roman boyunca ele alınan direniş hikayesi, geleneksel kahramanlık anlatılarından farklıdır. Winston ne dünyayı dönüştürmeyi başarır ne de sistemin dışına çıkmayı deneyebilir. Onun öyküsü, yenilginin, teslimiyetin ve kimliğin kaybının hikayesidir. Bu durum, direnişi romantikleştirmenin sorgulanmasını da beraberinde getirir. Direnmek her zaman umudu beraberinde getirmeyebilir. Bazen bu direniş, sistemin içine yerleşmiş bir unsur haline gelir. Sistem, bireylerin karşı koyma çabalarını önceden tahmin eder, bu direnişi yönlendirir ve etkisiz hale getirir. Böylece muhalefet bile denetim altında bir alan oluşturur. Bu yapıda özgürlük sadece bir yanılsamadır; bireyin kafasında yarattığı fakat asla elde edemeyeceği bir hayaldir. Winston'un sonu, bireyin sisteme karşı tamamen yenilgiye uğradığını temsil eder. İçsel çözülme, sadece ideolojik bir süreç değil; duygusal, bilişsel ve varoluşsal boyutlarda da gerçekleşir. Romanın sonunda Winston, yalnızca Parti'ye değil, kendi geçmişine, hislerine ve isteklerine de yabancılaşmıştır. Julia'ya duyduğu sevgiyi, kendine olan güvenini ve özgürlük isteğini yitirmiştir. Bu kayıplar, bir insanın en temel insani niteliklerinin sistematik bir şekilde ortadan kaldırılabilceğini ortaya koyar. Bu aşamada, Orwell'ın eleştirisi sadece siyasi yapılarla sınırlı kalmıyor; aynı zamanda bireylerin psikolojisinin nasıl şekillendirilebileceğine dair endişe verici bir resim çiziyor.

Roman, okuyucuya özgürlük, gerçeklik ve kimlik gibi temel kavramları sorgulatır. Orwell'ın evreninde bu kavramların hepsi sistemin tanımlarıyla şekillenir. Gerçeklik, Partinin söylediklerinden ibarettir. Kimlik ise Partinin belirlediği çerçevede oluşur. Özgürlük, yalnızca sistemin sağladığı ölçüde mümkün olmaktadır. Bu bağlamda birey, sadece toplum içinde değil, aynı zamanda kendi zihninde de bir esaret yaşamaktadır. Düşünce sınırlarını çizen sistem, bireyin zihin duvarlarını yükselttikçe onu daha da pasif hale getirir. Zamanla bu pasiflik, bir kabul etme durumuna dönüşmektedir. Kabil ise nihayetinde aşkı getiriyor: Winston'ın Büyük Birader'e duyduğu sevgi, bu kabullenişin son aşamasıdır. Romanın sonunda Winston'ın benimsediği bu kabul süreci, bireyin

sisteme karşı tamamen boyun eğişinin bir ifadesidir. Bu teslimiyyetin arkasında korku, yalnızlık ve aidiyet ihtiyacı yatar. Parti, bireyin tüm sosyal bağlantılarını koparıırken ona yeni bir bağ sunar: Büyük Birader'e karşı duyulan sahte bir aidiyet. Bu ilişki, bireyin varoluşsal boşluğunu doldurmanın yanı sıra direnişi de imkânsız hale getirir. Sevgiyle boyun eğmenin iç içe geçtiği bu durum, modern iktidar biçimlerinin ne denli karmaşık ve derinlemesine içselleştirildiğini gösterir. Winston, artık düşünmeyen, sorgulamayan ve yalnızca mevcut olan bir birey haline gelmiştir. Bu varoluş şekli, insanın gerçek benliğini yitirdiği, duygularının zayıfladığı ve hayal gücünün ortadan kalktığı bir sona işaret eder.

Orwell'in "1984" adlı kitabı, bireyin içsel yaşamını zorlayan, kimliğini değiştiren ve onu pasif bir nesne haline getiren sistemlerin eleştirisini detaylı bir şekilde ortaya koyar. Bu sistemler sadece fiziksel cezaya odaklanmaz; aynı zamanda bireyin düşünceleri, hisleri ve hafızası üzerinde de kontrol kurar. Romanın sunduğu hikaye geçmişte donup kalmamıştır; aksine, günümüzde yeni şekillerde yaşamaya devam etmektedir. Sosyal medya denetimi, bilgi çarpıtma, dijital engellemeler ve bireylerin duygusal kapitalizmin etkisi altında kalmaları, Orwell'in tahminlerinin günümüzdeki yansımalarıdır. Bu yüzden "1984", sadece geçmişi ele alan bir distopya değil; aynı zamanda günümüzü ve geleceği kavramaya yönelik bir çaba sunan bir eser olarak da değerlendirilebilir. Bireyin özgürleşme çabasının nasıl sekteye uğradığını, arzularının nasıl değiştirildiğini ve hafızasının yeniden yapılandırıldığını ortaya koyarak; hem edebi hem de felsefi, sosyolojik ve psikolojik bakış açılarıyla derin bir analiz sunmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bu tez, bireyin ideolojiye karşı duruşunu inceleyen, kimliğin nasıl şekillendiğine dair ipuçları sunan ve totaliter sistemlerin hem bireyler hem de gruplar üzerindeki yıkıcı etkilerini ortaya koyan karmaşık bir çalışmadır. Orwell'in tasvir ettiği dünya sadece bir hayal ürünü değil; düşüncelerimizi canlandırmamız, sorgulamamız ve direnme gücümüzü yeniden değerlendirmemiz için bir uyarıdır.