

Desire/Language/Truth: A Study of Power Relations
in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Letters
and the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of Bilkent University
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in
English Language and Literature

by

Ertuğrul Koç

September, 1992

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.



Dr. Johann Pillai
(Advisor)



Prof. Bülent R. Bozkurt
(Committee Member)

Dr. Hamit Çalışkan
(Committee Member)



Approved for the
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences



Director

Abstract

Desire/Language/Truth: A Study of Power Relations

in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four

Ertuğrul Koç
M.A. In English Literature
Advisor: Dr. Johann Pillai
September, 1992

Among other things, Nineteen Eighty-Four has been described as an apocalyptic novel, and received as a warning for future generations since the power which totalitarian regimes enjoy, destroys man's spiritual and physical existence. These approaches each have their value, but Orwell seems to be indicating something much more subtle.

The theorist Michel Foucault claims that power is what shows itself most and so hides best. In this light Orwell's text reveals what is hidden in the nature of society.

The structures of power pervade the society of Oceania in all its dimensions, in particular, language, sexuality, and politics. An analysis of these dimensions is essential to understanding Orwell's thesis; by exploring the relations between them, the novel reveals the inner structure of collective bodies, and throws into question the concept of individuality in society, as it is created and shaped by power relations.

MLA style sheet has been followed throughout the thesis.

Özet

İhtiras/Dil/Gerçek:

Orwell'in Bindokuzyüzseksendört Romanında

Güç ilişkileri Üzerine Bir Çalışma

Ertuğrul Koç

İngiliz Edebiyatı Yüksek Lisans

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Johann Pillai

Eylül 1992

Diğer eserler arasında, Orwell'in Bindokuzyüzseksendört'ü gelecek nesiller için bir kehanet, bir uyarı olarak görüldü; çünkü, totaliter rejimlerin sahip olduğu güç, insana karşı, onun hem fiziksel, hem ruhsal varlığını yok edici bir eğilim göstermektedir. Bu tür yaklaşımların her biri ayrı değere sahip olmasına rağmen, Orwell'in tanımlamaya çalıştığı olgu daha ince detaylar içermekte.

Düşünür Michel Foucault'un da iddia ettiği gibi, güç kendini en çok gösteren ve en iyi gizlenen olgudur. Bu ışık altında, Orwell'in romanı toplumun doğasında gizli olan bu olguyu açığa çıkarıyor.

Oceania'nın toplumsal yapısı bütün boyutlarıyla -- özellikle dil, seks ve politikada -- güç olgusunda yapılaşmıştır. Orwell'in ortaya koyduğu tezi anlamak için bu boyutların ve bunlar arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi gerekir. Bunların açığa çıkarılmasıyla, roman kolektif yapıların özünde yatan olgu ve olayları ortaya koymakta, toplumda bireysellik kavramını güç ilişkileri ve bunun sonucunda ortaya çıkan bir kavram olarak tartışmaktadır.

Tezde MLA yazım kuralları izlenmiştir.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to my thesis advisor, Dr. Johann Pillai, for his invaluable guidance, support, and suggestions and for providing me with a non-restrictive medium of study.

I am also grateful to my wife, Rahşan Şenalp Koç, for her encouragement and patience.

Special thanks to Taylan Şafak and Şeref Ortaç for their effort and patience in typing and printing this dissertation.



CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Language of Sexuality in <u>Nineteen Eighty-Four</u>	10
III. The Truths of Power and the "Why" of Winston.....	27
IV. Conclusion.....	66
Notes.....	70
Works Cited.....	85

I. Introduction

When Nineteen Eighty-Four¹ was first published in 1949 immediately after the death of George Orwell, it caused a political uproar; the Russian critics took it as an attack on communism, while in capitalist Western societies, it became quite popular for this very reason. Some ideologically committed critics condemned the book and some praised it.² Yet Nineteen Eighty-Four, even from its first publication, has been misunderstood and misinterpreted because "common sense"³ has prevailed over the minds of readers and critics, most of whom have missed the point that the book does not defend or criticize a particular ideology, but is simply about the nature of power relations in a social structure.

Nineteen Eighty-Four is about an imagined future, where the world has been divided into three parts, or superstates: Eurasia, Eastasia, and Oceania. These superstates are perpetually at war, and frequently change allies. All through the novel there appears to be an unending struggle--on a macrocosmic level between the three superstates; and microcosmically, between Winston Smith (the outer Party member) and the state apparatus of Oceania, a struggle in which Winston is ultimately defeated.

The "common sense" critical approaches focus on the defeat of Winston, and arrive at various conclusions: Winston is considered a hero⁴ since he rebels against a totalitarian regime,⁵ hence his end is something tragic; some claim that the book is a

product of a neurotic mind because Orwell draws a grim picture, and this is what most critics do not want to see; others even go to the extent of exploiting our feelings of compassion⁶ because an ideology that Winston represents, and which appeals to the common-sense reaction patterns of the critics, seems to have been defeated.

These kinds of approaches each have their value, but are ideologically determined and therefore one-sided. A close reading of Orwell's text reveals that it is, in fact, anti-ideological, and thus subverts this kind of criticism. In Part II of this thesis, we shall see, for instance, that Winston's opposition to the Party is created and sponsored by the Party itself, and hence that his heroism and individuality become arguable.

Indeed, we will find that Winston has an artificially constructed mind--he is a creation of the Party and serves its general goals. Although he has been watched from the very beginning--they have been watching him for years--they do not touch him until the last moment. But when Winston overtly tries to organize against the Party, he is caught by the Thought Police.

Winston has been chosen as a victim from the very beginning. His existence as opposition has been necessary because the social structure of Oceania needs to define itself in relation to its opposite, i.e.--in terms of what it is not. By assuming the role of an anarchist, Winston stimulates the system which has become

sluggish and stagnant.⁷ His task comes to an end when he attempts to strengthen his organization and destroy the balance⁸--i.e. when he is strong enough to be a threat to the Party. It seems that it is through these opposites that the extreme ends--utopia or dystopia, the states in which progress comes to an end as a result of stagnation; and anarchy and chaos, which mean destruction of the social structure on account of broad individual or social differences--are balanced.

In this respect Nineteen Eighty-Four also makes us aware that concepts are not one-sided by nature, because every concept needs an opposite to define itself, and for this reason, they are not necessarily as they seem to be. There is always the other side of the coin; there is not one single notion and one single truth, but many. As a result, what we call 'common sense', that prudent judgement, ultimately functions as an ideology and deceives us; it becomes a bias. In Nineteen Eighty-Four this is the trap into which almost every critic has fallen, each viewing the book from the perspective of his or her individual ideological biases.

If there is a satire in Nineteen Eighty-Four, it is the satire of these biases and ideologies. The novel argues that ideology comes to mean identity, and it is because of this search for an identity that people organize themselves and produce truths, the ideological bases for their existence. The role of the Party is to satisfy and/or exploit this human demand by forcing people to identify themselves in relation to

the collective identity of the Party.⁹ To do this, the Party must not have any particular ideology, but should contain every ideology in itself; this is the condition for its being the supreme power directing people and acting as a mediator between ideologies--a web of influence. The Party functions as a catalyst among the separate entities--the citizens--and to imitate this natural order, creates oppositions.

Nineteen Eighty-Four also puts into question the relation between language and ideology. Language and ideology depend on each other; the use of language is always one-sided,¹⁰ and in practice determines social conventions and ideologies. The one-sided use of language--i.e. its use by man as an instrument of ideology--has produced social conventions; and by a sort of vicious circle these conventions have, in turn, imposed a law of truth on man, shaping his instincts and behaviours.

Newspeak is the official language of Oceania, and the characters use this language to express themselves. In this language we do not have any antonyms, and the connotations of words have been changed. For example:

The word 'free' still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weeds.'

[1984 p.258]

The Newspeak language creates mechanized minds and mechanized human beings. By destroying the oppositions within

language--irony, ambiguity--a coherence can be achieved in human behaviour; Newspeak, which has become a convention, creates one notion, one ideology.¹¹ But this, too, is dangerous for the health of society because one-sidedness creates stagnation;¹² if the Party in Nineteen Eighty-Four reduces power relations to a minimum, or to an end point, this will weaken the collective body of Oceania--they will have no enemy or opponent to convene and resist against--and this will be the end of collectivism, the end of progress.

To avoid this, Oldspeak, the language which contains opposites and which operates simultaneously with Newspeak, is certain to exist forever, contrary to what Syme, the philologist of the Newspeak Dictionary seems to believe.¹³ Meanwhile, Oldspeak language is used by the Inner Party members and by Winston, another indication that Winston was taught this language beforehand to serve the ends of the Party by opposing it; language and the historical aims of the Party are thus intimately combined. In the novel history functions on two levels: on the first it carries the ideology of Newspeak and imposes a certain truth; while on the second, by frequent alterations of historical events and by asserting opposing "historical facts", it functions as Oldspeak. But all is done for the sole purpose of keeping the unity of the social body and adapting the citizens of Oceania to different circumstances. For instance when a need arises for Oceania to change her ally, this can be done by altering the past, so it appears that

the Party has never been on friendly terms with the old ally, but has always been so with the new one; this is then conceived as the permanent truth and not questioned,¹⁴ because the overall objective of the Party is not the preservation of the past, but the survival of the social body through collectivism.

These aspects of Orwell's novel are considered in the second half of this thesis; in Part I, I deal with the inter-relation between sexuality and language. In the novel sexuality is expressed as an instinctive act, through which we can understand how instincts in man are reversed and directed according to the policies of the Party.¹⁵ Orwell also indicates in Nineteen Eighty-Four that among the instincts, sexuality is the most dominant because it is the core of human desire. The invention of language originates from this desire, and language has become a tool for the repression of every instinct. It seems that the invention of language has changed man's mentality. Words, which are the expression of desires or impulses, have initiated the process of thought. The impulses, which originated from instincts or instinctive needs, have been re-shaped by words, and hence the objective reality, through language, has begun to change. Language has become a feedback for instincts, and it has changed the connotations of the instinctive human desires; thus in Nineteen Eighty-Four Newspeak seems to have changed the impulse of sexuality, made it something ideologically distorted.

At this point, there is also the need for balance. If through Newspeak the system totally destroys innate desire in man, then people will also lose the desire to live together and the social body will be jeopardized. Here Winston, with Oldspeak--and therefore with a different understanding of sexuality--comes as a vitalizing force, and stagnation is avoided.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, then, we have a pre-planned social order, which has been built on power relations. The Inner Party's policies are intended to maintain a balanced network of power relations and to re-establish them if they weaken or fail. What makes the Inner Party members different from the oligarchies of the past is that they know what they are doing, and are experimenting with the social and ideological structure of Oceania. O'Brien, the Inner Party member says,

We are different from the oligarchies of the past, in that we know what we are doing.

[1984 p.227]

These elite are the policy-makers of the world of Nineteen Eighty-Four, and through 'doublethink' they become the supreme power exercised on the people. They have the ability to simultaneously hold two opposing notions and believe in both of them; on the individual level they seem to have established power relations within themselves.¹⁶ The Inner Party member O'Brien is thus both the torturer and the rescuer of Winston; and

Emmanuel Goldstein, the enemy of the people, is also certain to be an Inner Party member--since he is totally against the Party on the one hand, and uses the Newspeak language on the other.¹⁷ In short, these are people who have managed to establish in themselves the already existing double structure in nature--the conflict of opposing forces--and thus gained power and authority.¹⁸ This achievement on the microcosmic level seems to have been achieved on the macrocosmic level as well; Winston versus Oceania, Oceania versus the other superstates.

The historian Karl Löwith, claims in his book Meaning in History¹⁹ that

The ancients were more moderate in their speculations...They were impressed by the visible order and beauty of the cosmos, and the cosmic law of growth and decay...They were primarily concerned with the "logos" of the "cosmos", and not with the Lord and the meaning of history.

[M.in.H p.4]

For the Inner Party in Nineteen Eighty Four this is also true. The Party is aware of the cosmic law of growth and decay, which is the 'logos' of the 'cosmos'. The 'logos' of the Party seems to create this order in an artificial way--growth is the growth of collectivism and of society, decay is the decay of Winston and Julia. Hence, Winston Smith, through his struggle against the Party, participates in this artificial order, and he is sacrificed compensation for the deviation from the natural

order which is social life; it is not the Party, but the cosmos and the power relations in the cosmos that claim his vaporization.



II. The Language of Sexuality in Nineteen Eighty-Four

Not merely the love of one person but the animal instinct, the simple undifferentiated desire; that was the force that would tear the Party to pieces.

[1984 p.112]

.

For Winston, this simple undifferentiated desire will cause the end of the system. The major character of the novel defines sexuality with these words, and his fight against the Party seems to take another direction with his concept of sexuality.

Winston defines sexuality as the animal instinct, as an unknown strength by which the system of Oceania can be destroyed.²⁰ Thus from the very beginning of the novel, the Inner Party tries to repress the instinctive behaviour in man; it appears that the sex instinct has been repressed to indicate the existence of authority.²¹ In other words, authority manifests itself through sexual repression, and sexuality is depicted as corrupt and dirty:

Anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope. Who knew, perhaps the Party was rotten under the surface.

[1984 p.111]

Winston too regards sex as 'corruption', but a corruption which fills him with a wild hope. He seems to have come to understand that 'corruption' and 'dirtiness' are not the actual manifestations of sex and sexuality; but rather, concepts

imposed by the authority. Regarding sex as 'corruption' in a different sense, he tries to spread it, and so to destroy the power of the authority.

If sex is potentially powerful enough even to destroy the authority, the question arises: how and when does sexuality manifest itself?

Winston's notion of sex is that of an animal instinct, where the word 'instinct' cannot be explained or analysed logically; this lack of a logical explanation is subversive in a state where everything is bound to logic,²² and if something cannot be explained logically here, then it must be hidden and repressed. The repression of sex and other instinctive behaviour comes, in short, as a result of logic's gaining dominance in the lives of the people in Nineteen Eighty-Four.

In his book The History of Sexuality, the historian Michel Foucault analyzes the socio-historical development of sexuality in relation to censorship.²³ Foucault describes the sexual frankness of the 17th century and the Victorian secrecy surrounding sexuality as follows:

At the beginning of the seventeenth century a certain frankness was still common, it would seem. Sexual practices had little need of secrecy...It was a time of direct gestures, shameless discourse... But twilight soon fell upon this bright day, followed by the monotonous nights of the Victorian bourgeoisie. Sexuality was carefully confined... The legitimate and

procreative couple laid down the law.

[H.O.S.p.3]

The frankness of sexual practices at the beginning of the 17th century disappeared in the Victorian Age; the Victorian bourgeoisie brought secrecy to sex. But this secrecy surrounding sex did not come all of a sudden, as the Victorian bourgeoisie did not appear overnight. The Victorian age came as a result of the Industrial Revolution, and in this age attempts were made to explain everything through logic. Reason and reasoning gained importance. The natural outcome of this age was the repression of the illogical side of existence, and sex, too, was something illogical, and therefore something to be hidden.

The Victorian bourgeoisie had brought secrecy to sex--taboo, non-existence and silence. At a time when social institutions were playing an important role in strengthening social order and discipline, the Victorian society, which had been based on this strict social order, was one of the first to deny sexuality, and hence, Foucault argues, to deny the existence of man.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four this kind of repression is found at its climax: the inexpressible instinct for sex has become a logical act. People are seen as procreative beings, and sex is conceived only in terms of fertility; giving birth to a child accomplishes a duty to the Party. For this reason, the citizens of Oceania are trained to repress their sexual instinct, and through this repression their duty to the Party becomes something

instinctive: duty replaces sex.

The repression of sexual instincts in Nineteen Eighty-Four leads people to a state of non-existence,²⁴ because repression also involves a denial of existence: the Party makes people deny their existence or exist only within the limits of its ideology. When Julia, Winston's collaborator, asks him about his ex-wife, Winston's answer almost defines this non-existence:

'What was she like, your first wife?' said Julia.

'She was--do you know the Newspeak word 'goodthinkful'? Meaning naturally orthodox, incapable of thinking a bad thought?..' She described to him, almost as though she had seen or felt it, the stiffening of Katharine's body as soon as he touched her, the way in which she still seemed to be pushing him from her with all her strength, even when her arms were clasped tightly round him.

[1984 p.117]

Katharine, Winston's ex-wife, only exists within the limits of the Newspeak word 'goodthinkful', which means incapable of thinking a bad thought. Presumably a 'bad thought' here would refer to sex and pleasure, or some other anti-Party sentiment. 'Goodthinkful' characterizes another instinct, if sex is conceived in terms of an instinctive act: Katharine does not know what sex and pleasure are--the only thing she knows is her duty to the Party, which has become an instinctive act; and she does not take it as something repressive.²⁵ It is only Winston and

Julia who are aware of the repression acting on themselves.

Here, other questions appear: What has made Winston and Julia different from people like Katharine? Why has sexuality manifested itself in them and not in others?

Newspeak is the official language of Oceania, and it contains limiting words such as "goodthinkful". Newspeak does not contain any antonyms, and thus does not allow any concept to be identified through comparison. Thus 'good' as a word exists, but the opposite word 'bad' does not, and people can never know what 'good' really comes to mean.²⁶ Language is cut down to the bone, and instead of constructing long sentences to express an idea, people can manage with single words to do the same job. As a result there appears only one ideology, one notion.

It is also important to note that language as a tool for communication still exists. At present Newspeak is spoken by the people of Oceania; and Oldspeak, which was being spoken before Newspeak, has constituted the basis for Newspeak in Nineteen Eighty-Four. Language is then not totally destroyed, but converted to something else. Newspeak as a language includes nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs; the only difference of Newspeak from Oldspeak is that antonyms no longer appear in the language²⁷--and since it contains no opposing words, there appears to be one ideology, and no other option. Language no longer provides the opportunity to create different thoughts, different concepts; and this is the basis for the evolution of Newspeak.

The same evolution process occurs in the case of sex. Sex

did not disappear in Oceania, but as Oldspeak was converted into Newspeak, sex was also converted into 'goodsex', a Newspeak word which means that sex is only for begetting children. In short, a concrete logic has been established for sex, and 'goodsex' has become an instinctive behaviour in the citizens of Oceania.

The citizens of Oceania can theoretically never know that there might be pleasure in sex, as the Party has destroyed the alternative, opposite notions,²⁸ and introduced the notion that the only possible pleasure is to serve the Party. It has repressed all kinds of instincts and instinctive behaviour, and its medium of repression is language. The Newspeak word 'goodsex' has imposed its law on sex, and any ambiguity must be suppressed:

He knew what was meant by 'goodsex'--that is to say, normal intercourse between man and wife, for the sole purpose of begetting children and without physical pleasure on the part of the woman: all else was sexcrime.

[1984p.263]

Sexcrime appears when people get pleasure from intercourse, when language becomes ambiguous. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, then, the Party is not against sex, but against pleasure, and for this reason it represses the sexuality of its citizens by reducing it to a single word--'goodsex'--and limiting people by this word, making them one-sided, unable to think, and closed to other dimensions of life, or pleasure, or ideology.

Winston and Julia are different from the others, because

both of them are aware of the existence of Oldspeak, that it carries a different ideology in itself, and hence they exist in a different mode; their instinctive behaviour belongs to a different dimension. Winston regards sex as something instinctive, but even in him it cannot be said that this instinct truly manifests itself, because he uses language--the language he has been trained to use by the Party--to express himself.

Like sex, language is instinctive: it is an instinctive need for knowledge and expression.²⁹ Sex is something instinctive which needs to be expressed, but it is language that prepares the basis for expression; language appeared because man needed to know the world around him, by naming it. Naming objects enables man to know them, and hence to control them.³⁰

Michael Foucault remarks:

As if it were essential for us to be able to draw from that little piece of ourselves not only pleasure but knowledge, and a whole subtle interchange from one to the other: a knowledge of pleasure, a pleasure that comes of knowing pleasure, a knowledge-pleasure and as if that fantastic animal we accommodate had itself such tuned ears, such searching eyes, so gifted a tongue and mind, as to know much and be quite willing to tell it, provided we employed a little skill in urging it to speak.

[H.O.S p.77]

Sex and sexuality, then, like language, originate from the need to know about pleasure. The sex instinct has a tongue of its own, and a gifted one; it speaks, it wants to know, and it gets pleasure from satisfying this desire. In this respect the origin of both sex and language is the same: the sexual instinct stimulates the desire to know, this desire invents language, and language in turn re-stimulates or represses the desire for more knowledge.

Ultimately, both of these concepts are derived from power relations. The language of man is the indispensable tool for establishing power relations. Power relations between man and nature originate when man gives names to the objects around him. This is an instinctive act by which man differentiates himself from other objects; an instinct for identity. There follows, on a different dimension, a stage where the already existing power relations in nature are brought to a conscious level for the sake of more knowledge; man has learned to think with words and is engaged in community life, which has accelerated the need for knowledge and identity. At this stage, with the advent of social organizations, power relations are legitimized.

Paul Feyerabend, in his book Against Method,³¹ paraphrases Benjamin Lee Whorff's socio-linguistic theory:

I have much sympathy with the view, formulated clearly and elegantly by Whorff, that languages and the reaction patterns they involve are not merely

instruments for describing events (facts, states of affairs), but that they are also shapers of events, that their 'grammar' contains a cosmology, a comprehensive view of the world, of society, of the situation of man which influences thought, behaviour, perception.

[Against Method.p.223]

Thought, behaviour and perception--these are inter-related, because each defines the others. Since thought is achieved through language, it follows that behaviour, which is the manifestation of thought and perception, comes as a result of external stimuli.³² From a strictly behaviourist perspective, if stimuli are the same for each individual, then the responses of individuals will be the same. If not, there will be a variety of behaviour, and different personalities will appear. These different personalities will add to the power relations in a social organization--or, to put it another way, it is for this reason that power relations appear, because, it is through these different personalities that opposing notions, conflicts and contradictions will arise. In his History of Sexuality, Foucault says that

Power is essentially what dictates its law to sex, which means first of all that sex is placed by power in a binary system: licit and illicit, permitted and forbidden. Secondly, power prescribes an 'order' for sex that operates at the same time as a form of

ideology.

[H.O.S p.83]

The Newspeak language in Nineteen Eighty-Four dictates its law to sex with such words as 'goodthinkful' and 'goodsex', leaving no room for other concepts; language is thus the shaper of behaviour and instincts.

It is clear that the Inner Party does not want to allow power relations among the people; it introduces Newspeak language, in which individuals are not permitted to experience different stimuli that would constitute thought itself--and except for Winston and Julia, we hardly see any different types of behaviour; the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four is homogeneous.³³

So, too, is sex. The sex instinct in man has been changed by language, and there is only one acceptable type of sexual act, which is performed for the purpose of procreation. This appears to be the legitimized social order, or power relations put on a normative basis, and sex is legitimized accordingly: if a social contract is not achieved between individuals, there is a danger of chaos, and to prevent this, homogeneity is required; even natural instincts such as sex must be carried to a conscious level to prevent disorder and anarchy. Hence the secrecy surrounding sex which appeared during the Victorian age, came as a result of social consciousness and social organization; in similar fashion, the denial of sexuality in Nineteen Eighty Four has the sole purpose of achieving a homogeneous social body.

The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it.

[1984 p.60]

The pleasure which has been removed, seems to be the eager eye of the search for knowledge. If people get pleasure from sex, presumably they will try to re-stimulate themselves to get more; this search will undermine the power and the authority of the Party, because people will need to know more in their pursuit of pleasure, and will exceed the limits of the one-sided ideology that the Party imposes.

Here again, Newspeak language rescues the system. Through it, sex is reduced to a concrete level, and the abstract human need for pleasure and knowledge is denied by means of censorship. Foucault defines the role of censorship in relation to the logic of power as follows:

...one imagines a sort of logical sequence that characterizes censorship mechanism: it links the inexistent, the illicit, and the inexpressible in such a way that each is at the same time the principle and the effect of the others...The logic of power exerted on sex is the paradoxical logic of a law that might be expressed as an injunction of nonexistence, non

manifestation, and silence.

[H.O.S p.84]

This injunction is achieved in Nineteen Eighty-Four through censorship, and the homogeneity is produced by Newspeak. The social organization of Oceania requires a concentration of people and a consciousness and will--the concepts which have been artificially created by the Party ideology and by Newspeak--to live together.³⁴ In such an organization, the individual has to eliminate his individuality and adapt himself to the norms of society--in other words, accept uniformity. He must also be aware that any deviation from uniformity is punishable by the authority which has created this artificial consciousness. This is particularly clear where censorship of sex is concerned: it produces the social norm, and is a result of the common consciousness that the Party has imposed. This is the common will for uniformity and non-existence; this is the power network man has created for himself.

Power over sex is exercised in the same way at all levels; as Foucault asserts:

From top to bottom, in its over-all decisions and its capillary interventions alike, whatever the devices or institutions on which it relies, it acts in a uniform and comprehensive manner; it operates according to the simple and endlessly reproduced mechanisms of law, taboo, and censorship.

[H.O.S p.84]

In Nineteen Eighty Four censorship is imposed both on language and on sex, because these two can pose a threat if not carefully directed i.e--if people themselves create personal or group relations through these concepts. The Party does not want to destroy them, because these concepts can also be used as tools for repression, and as necessary means to re-create the disappearing power relations. Hence Oldspeak, the language before Newspeak, has become a taboo, but as sexuality it still exists:

It was impossible to translate any passage of Oldspeak into Newspeak unless it either referred to some technical process or some very simple everyday action.

[1984 p.267]

Although it is impossible to translate Oldspeak into Newspeak, Oldspeak still exists, and is used to express everyday actions. As Oldspeak sexuality also exists. But just as Oldspeak is limited to technical processes, sexuality too has become something technical, an everyday action; instead of Oldspeak now there is Newspeak, and this suggests that once there was an Oldsex before Newsex; through Winston and Julia, Oldsex continues to be active.

Sexuality in Nineteen Eighty-Four is not solely important as a political act, although at one point, the narrator tells us:

Not merely the love of one person but the animal instinct, the simple undifferentiated desire; that was the force that would tear the Party to pieces.

[1984 p.112]

Some critics have argued that sexuality in the novel can be considered as breaking social norms, thus posing a threat to the Party.³⁵ Another critical claim is that the Party has created a mechanism for sexuality, for the purpose of expending the surplus energy in the human body.³⁶ This kind of approach is useful to explain the "how" of sexuality. But the "why" of this question is something different. Sexuality, in the novel, can be seen as a political act, because the narrative voice of Nineteen Eighty-Four shapes the reader's reaction--i.e. like the eye of Big Brother, the reader is placed behind a mirror, sees only the reflections of events as one-dimensional.

From a different perspective, taking this into account, we will see that all the events in the novel constitute a long chain, starting from language, and that what connects all the separate links of this chain is power relations. The claims that sexuality is solely a political act, or that it is a means of expending the surplus energy, would be the separate rings of this chain, not the chain itself. To understand the nature of the chain of power relations, one must apply a 'doublethink' approach, because throughout the story we are faced with the problem of one-sidedness--the narrative voice appeals to our common sense reaction patterns, and this misleads us as readers.

As we have seen in this section, sexuality in Nineteen Eighty-Four is not merely a "theme", the dominant determining factor in the plot, because it is sexuality, or instinctive

desire that is the determining pre-condition for languages (Newspeak and Oldspeak) in the novel. But language, invented by an instinctive desire, reshapes this desire, and the reshaped desire in turn reshapes language--a vicious circle, seemingly an unending process.

This process is controlled by Newspeak, the official language of Oceania. Newspeak language creates people whose instincts have been repressed, or converted to something else.

Winston Smith, with a different notion of sexuality (because he uses Oldspeak) is ready to upset this structure in Oceania, in which instinctive desires are considered a malignant threat to the Party. The problem of sex, is thus not only a problem of instinctive desires, but of the inter-relation between instinctive desires and the use of language.

In the next section, we shall consider the practices of the Party with respect to the social life of Oceania. It appears that the Party has created norms and conventions through the alteration of instinctive desires, and channelled them to a unity; and they seem to have achieved this through Newspeak. By introducing and asserting standard norms for the people, Newspeak gives them an identity, a uniformity by which people feel themselves at ease--because all these introduced norms and conventions create harmony, because language itself contains hardly any antonyms.

Here, the problem of Oldspeak arises. Does a harmonious society--and the seemingly harmonious system of Oceania--really

need Oldspeak, which is the opposite of Newspeak?

Newspeak and Oldspeak are the parallel sides, the opposing components of the symmetrical body of language. If this symmetry is upset by the absence of one side, then the other becomes a meaningless and grotesque figure. Although the system of Oceania is unitary, it still needs a definition through its opposite. To avoid this kind of defect or non-identity, the system needs Oldspeak and people like Winston.

The same defect or grotesqueness applies in the case of Winston, since he stands as a defined polarity of this symmetry. Hence our reading and understanding of the text must not be only from the angles of Oldspeak or Newspeak; the reader must alienate himself or herself from common sense, prejudices, biases--in short, from the one-sidedness, from the one-sided ideology of languages. From a non-ideological perspective, we become aware that there are in fact two narrative voices in the novel. Richard K. Sanderson clearly shows the existence of two narrators in Nineteen Eighty-Four.³⁷ Sanderson indicates that this is revealed through a careful reading of the Appendix, and concludes, "Throughout the novel, we are addressed by a third person narrator whose stance coincides with Winston's." This is one of the defined narrative voices in the novel; the narrative voice in the 'Appendix' assumes a different personality:

It was expected that Newspeak would have finally superseded Oldspeak (or Standard English, as we should call it) by about the year 2050....The version in use

in 1984, and embodied in the Ninth and Tenth Editions of the Newspeak dictionary, was a provisional one, and contained many superfluous words and archaic formulations which were due to be suppressed later. It is with the final, perfected version, as embodied in the Eleventh Edition of the dictionary, that we are concerned here....Newspeak was founded on the English language as we know it, though many Newspeak sentences....would be barely intelligible to an English-speaker of our own day.

[1984 p.257]

The speaker in the 'Appendix' is conscious of his audience, and stresses the temporal bond between himself and his reader ("we," "we now," "our own day"). It is only when we hear the other narrative voice, that we can understand the double structure of the political body and the 'doublethink' concept. As we shall see in the next section, Winston Smith is necessary to the collective identity of Oceania, because Winston is, on the level of power relations, the double of Oceania, and by asserting his opposite existence, he helps the Oceanian state to identify itself against a microcosm--that is, against himself; it is in this way that Oceania legitimizes its own existence.

III. The Truths of Power and the "Why" of Winston.

The political question, I believe, is not error, illusion, alienated consciousness or ideology; it is truth itself. [P.N p.133]

says Michel Foucault in his Power/Knowledge.³⁸ What Orwell does in Nineteen Eighty-Four is create two different political truths--the truth of Winston Smith and that of the society of Oceania--and show their inter-relation or their hostile engagement.³⁹ Winston is thus a figure, original only in terms of the society of Oceania, since he differs from the other people by virtue of a different notion of truth in his mind. Throughout the story Winston refuses to belong to the system; or rather, refuses to accept the truth of the superstate of Oceania. In his mind he has an opposing truth, an opposing system. We are thus ultimately confronted by a problem of truth, and as we shall see, there is not only one truth in Nineteen Eighty-Four, but two opposing truths that define and confront each other; two opposing structures that cannot be reconciled.⁴⁰

The Party in Oceania is an organization, a structure, which constantly produces truth by altering the past.⁴¹ The Party dominates and exerts pressure on the citizens of Oceania; it would appear that whoever holds power and is capable of repression has the right to change history, and in this way change the concept of truth.⁴² Truth, then, is the product of power; the truth of Oceania is derived from the power network

or power organization of Oceania; and in turn, this truth creates a right to rule--which cannot be opposed by any citizen, because the effect of repression by the Party is that there appears to be no option other than this truth.

Winston Smith , in other words, has somehow produced another kind of truth, and for this reason he cannot accept the truth of the Party. Nineteen Eighty-Four is the drama of his vain struggle to overcome the truth of Oceania by asserting his own truth, and of his tragic end, his inevitable defeat, since he can never win the war against such a well-established organization of power.

Through the oppositional truth of Winston we see that the truth of Oceania can define itself. As an opposite to the Party, he seems to belong to the past, and Oceania to the present. Winston's yearning for the past, his nostalgia for a different society, his lonely struggle to change the system, and his inevitable end, suggest that the old days were better than the present or the future, and that their truth was different from that of the present society of Oceania.⁴³

Tragedy, he perceived, belonged to the ancient time, to a time when there was still privacy, love, and friendship...

[1984 p.31]

For Winston, there was love and friendship in the old days,⁴⁴ but in 1984 love, friendship, privacy no longer exist. In fact, these concepts are open to discussion, and we do not know what

Winston understands by "love" and "friendship", since these are also Newspeak words, and altered.⁴⁵ But what we understand here is that he is not content with society, with the exercise of power by the Party, or with its production of truth.

His discontent arises from a power-truth relation, and Winston, playing the weaker, will not be able to reach his goals, because the notion he represents is not an organized one, and thus, bound to be repressed. If truth, then, is a production of the powerful, the Party enjoys the authority of being the producer of sole truths. In Oceania we have a system in which the concept of God does not occur;⁴⁶ an indication that the Party does not want to share the power it is enjoying with a metaphysical concept, or with a group of people who claim to be the representatives of a metaphysical authority. Also, the existence of a concept such as God would no doubt damage the structure of the system, which depends on frequent changes of concepts, and thus does not allow people to identify themselves with a permanent concept.

Enacting these frequent changes there seems to be a triangular mechanism at work: power, truth and right mutually reproducing each other. One consequence of this kind of mechanism is that it replaces the concept of God, a concept which imposes a metaphysical identity on the people--i.e. a metaphysical origin for man.⁴⁷ This is something contrary to the notion that the Party imposes, because the Party claims to be the origin of everything, and hence, it does not allow any other truth to be

produced for the people. The production of truth is monopolized by the Party--it is the power of the Party that produces truth and identity for people. This truth in turn gives the Party a right to rule. The pre-condition, then, is to produce the truth that people need to know; truth exists in relation to the origin of man and of society. In other words, truth is produced for identity. The Party, then, by claiming that it is the origin of everything, satisfies the demand of society, and people can identify themselves with it--by this truth a collective body is achieved.

In general, power, which produces truth, is a right that stems from the need of society:⁴⁸

We are forced to produce the truth of power that our society demands. [P/N p.93]

says Michel Foucault in his "Two Lectures"⁴⁹. Here 'we' comes to mean the intellectual body of society; and in Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Inner Party members.⁵⁰ The citizens of Oceania need to identify themselves with the Party, because as individuals they have no power. This need of people in Oceania is satisfied through the power-truth-right mechanism which the society has established to satisfy this demand.⁵¹

Winston Smith refuses to accept the truth of Oceania; he remains an outsider to the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four, and never comes to accept the produced truth:

Everything faded into mist. The past was erased, the

erasure was forgotten, the lie became truth.

[1984 p.68]

For Winston, it becomes clear that what is called truth is a lie, and for this reason, to record the truth, he begins to keep a diary of what has happened: he is writing history. The diary begins with a date, 'April 4th, 1984':

He sat back. A sense of complete helplessness had descended upon him. To begin with, he did not know know with any certainty that this was 1984.

[1984 p.11]

Winston's diary, his record of "truth", thus becomes another fiction. He is not sure about the date, but all the same he writes 'April 4th 1984', and produces another truth within the limits of his individual power. In this way, he tries to satisfy his demand for truth by refusing the truth of the Party; he is trying to create another power network for himself in which he will be able to feel his own power and assert his opposing existence. Thus, if we consider the society of 1984 a macrocosm, Winston stands both inside and outside this society as microcosm, an anti-power against the macrocosm.⁵² Although he is not content with the present system, he has no other option than living in Oceania.

Nineteen Eighty-Four, then, can be conceived in terms of a power struggle: it is about the clash of two opposing powers. On the one hand we see a well-organized and established network of

power--the Party; and on the other, an alternative power that tries to organize itself--Winston. Winston's alternative power will be based on the "proles", who live in the slums of Airstrip One:

The proles, it suddenly occurred to him, had remained in this condition. They were not loyal to a party or a country or an idea, they were loyal to one another.

[1984 p.146]

The people referred to as 'proles' are ordinary citizens and labourers, and not Party members. Their existence is not even recognised by the Party because they do not show any sign of intellect; they are no different from animals. They are directed, and all their needs are satisfied, by the Party. The proles differ from Party members in this sense: that they live from instinct, act and speak from instinct. They are also under the surveillance of the Party, specifically the

Ministry of Truth, whose primary job was not to reconstruct the past but to supply citizens of Oceania with newspapers, films, textbooks...There was even a whole sub-section--pornosec,--engaged in producing the lowest kind of pornography.

[1984 p.42]

This kind of pornography is produced to satisfy the sex instinct of the proles. They are too limited for an uprising because they know neither Newspeak nor Oldspeak, and thus are

intellectually non-existent. Winston cannot even communicate with them, and when he tries to speak to an old prole about the past it turns out to be a vain struggle:

A sense of helplessness took hold of Winston. The old man's memory was nothing but a rubbish-heap of details.

[1984 p.82]

Here a question arises: with whom is Winston going to fight the Party? He is thinking of an organization; and he tries to organize an anti-power with the proles, to restore love, friendship, privacy and freedom--ie. the "old days". Although these concepts are obscure, and never clearly explained in the novel, they become pretexts for Winston to rebel against the power of the Party by organizing an alternative network of power; he does not seem to be aware that he cannot influence or manipulate the proles, or any Party member in the direction of an uprising to destroy the power network of the Party.⁵³ Winston thus clearly occupies a position both inside and outside of society.

The relation between Winston and the society of 1984 can be thought of on another level, in biological terms. If the society of Oceania represents a healthy body--it is a disciplinary society and its homogeneity does not give Winston a chance--then Winston stands as a threat to the health of the body of society; and he tries to infect its organs. From this perspective Winston's position as microcosm in society becomes clearer:

I hate purity, I hate goodness, I don't want any virtue to exist anywhere. I want everyone to be corrupt to the bones. [1984 p.112]

Winston wants everyone to be "corrupt" ; he wants everyone to be like himself and to spread his virus in the body of society; he is trying to spread a plague that will contaminate and destroy the health of the body.

But the body has taken all the necessary precautions against such a threat to its existence. The precautions taken by the Party are analogous to the precautions that were taken in the 17th century when a plague appeared in a town. Michel Foucault describes these precautions in his Discipline and Punish,⁵⁴ and applies them to thought itself, considered as a plague. Foucault's thesis is important to understand the precautions taken by the Party of Nineteen Eighty-Four and its extension in the form of 'Thought Police'--since there is only one deadly crime in Oceania, and that is thoughtcrime.

The first precaution is the closing of the area to the outer world:

The closing of the town and its outlying districts, a prohibition to leave the town on pain of death, the killing of stray animals; the division of the town into district quarters.

[D.P. p.195]

In Orwell's story the setting is Airstrip One, a

district of the superstate of Oceania; and its inhabitants are forbidden to leave the place where they live. For this reason Airstrip One is closed to other districts, in which "stray animals"--the Outer Party members and proles--are systematically vaporized, since they are the carriers of infection and the cause of the plague.

Secondly, there is the control and authority necessary to overcome the threatening plague: "the control and authority of a Syndic."

Syndics, or the inspectors of the plague in the 17th century, had the authority to inspect everyone. In the society of Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Thought Police play a similar role, keeping people under surveillance, and being responsible for catching thought criminals. The Thought Police have the right to inspect and watch everyone, and they keep thought plague under control.

The next step is to keep individuals where they are:

Each individual is fixed in his place. And, if he moves, he does so at the risk of his life, contagion or punishment.

[D.P. p.195]

The fixing of individuals in their places saves them from the danger of the plague. Similarly, the citizens of Oceania do not have the right to move from one place to another, to change their places; and there are forbidden places that they cannot go to--the Outer Party members, for example, are not allowed to

go to the slums where the proles live. But Winston goes and has sex with a prostitute, despite the prohibition that

To be caught with a prostitute might mean five years in a forced-labour camp: not more, if you had committed no other offence... The poorer quarters swarmed with women who were ready to sell themselves...

[1984 p.60]

Here Winston commits a crime, goes against the regulations; and destroys the discipline of his body, becoming the carrier of the plague. He leaves his place at the risk of five years in a forced labour camp; and is infected by the proles. This illness, of course, is not biological; the illness that infects Winston is metaphorical. He seems to have found out the instinctive desires, the sexuality in himself whose existence the Party has repressed or denied.

The fourth precaution is that;

Inspection functions ceaselessly. The gaze is alert everywhere. At each of the town gates there will be an observation post; at the end of each street sentinels.

[D.P. p.195-196]

Analogously, in Nineteen Eighty-Four we have helicopters skimming down to see what is happening in the houses, and everywhere we have the watching eye of Big Brother. In the houses of the Party members there are telescreens that watch them

all the time, so the gaze is alert everywhere:

Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it, moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard.

[1984 p.8]

The figure of Big Brother which appears on the telescreen is both omnipotent and omniscient; and his ubiquitous posters have a caption which reads: "Big Brother is watching you". Big Brother appears as the guardian of the mind and of the soul; he is the embodiment of the Party, the visible power at work immunizing the people of Oceania against a thought plague.

Yet despite all the precautions of the Party, although everything and everyone is under the watching eyes of Big Brother, there is still the danger of plague. Merely watching the people is not enough of a precaution; and so the Party has also introduced the concept of "doublethink" to control the illness. 'Doublethink' is a concept which comes to mean having two opposing notions at the same time, and believing in both:

...to know and not know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic. [1984 p.35]

Doublethink, however, is not to be confused with pretense or two-facedness; but it is a genuine mode of belief, as Winston's reflections on O'Brien, the Inner Party member, reveal:

His voice had grown almost dreamy. The exaltation, the lunatic enthusiasm, was still in his face. He is not pretending, thought Winston, he is not a hypocrite, he believes every word he says. [1984 p.220]

This mode of belief is essential to a well-equipped system which confronts threats of contagion with discipline and order. The ultimate goal seems to be to create mass man, who is immune from the danger of a plague--it is individuals who are vulnerable. Here 'doublethink' becomes the best precaution, because it means that one can hold two opposing notions and believe in both of them; depending on the requirements of the present circumstances, mass consciousness can be shifted from one to the other. But the society of 1984 seems not to have completed its evolution to a state of perfect doublethink, as there is still the need for precautions against the threat of a thought plague.

The fifth step for control is that .

The plague is met by order; its function is to sort out every possible confusion: that of the disease, which is transmitted when bodies are mixed together; that of the evil...

[D.P. p.197]

There should not be a mixture, a chaos. People must be kept away from each other, and their minds should be empty and pure. This is why, in Oceania, the most terrible crime one can commit is thoughtcrime.

Thought, for the Party, means confusion and chaos; thought violates order and weakens power. It appears that man can only think with words, and hence the relation between power and thought is linguistic. Accordingly, the Party has taken the necessary measures against the dangers of thought: 'Newspeak', the official language of Oceania--at least this is the ideal--does not give people a chance to think. 'Newspeak' is a language in which the connotations of words have been changed, and which contains no opposite words; antonyms are systematically destroyed. We learn something about the nature of Newspeak from Syme, who works in the Research Department as a philologist, a specialist in Newspeak, and responsible for the eleventh edition of the Newspeak Dictionary:

We are destroying words--scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We are cutting the language down to the bone. The Eleventh Edition won't contain a single word that will become obsolete before the year 2050... Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050, at the very latest, not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?

[1984 p.50]

Syme is aware that the evolution of the language has not yet been completed. But in the future (Syme thinks it will be in 2050), Newspeak language will have taken its final shape. Its final form will not let any thought appear, because people will no longer need to speak to each other--there will be nothing, no concept to talk about. As a result there will be no mixture of people to create thought, and hence no thought plague. Also, since the language will contain no antonyms, people will never be able to identify or define anything; there would be no opposite by which such an identification could be made--eg. without such a word as 'short', people would never know what 'long' could mean.

The precautions against contagion and the linguistic measures taken by the Party reveal the workings of power, imposing its truth through language, and repressing or eliminating thought. Against an extraordinary evil, such as an extraordinary truth, power is mobilized; it makes itself present and visible everywhere; it invents new mechanisms; it separates, it mobilizes, and it imposes a disciplinary functioning--because the opposing truth, if it is not used for power's sake, might weaken or deteriorate the power structure which depends on the truth of the collective.

The visibility of power in relation to discipline, functions as a trap. Foucault, in his Discipline and Punish argues, through an analysis of Jeremy Bentham's ⁵⁵ Panopticon, that power should be visible but unverifiable. Foucault's example is the

'prison tower'; the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline from which he is spied upon. Here, the central tower stands for the visibility of power, but the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any moment; meanwhile, he must be sure that he may always be so. At any given moment, the power exerted on the inmates is unverifiable. Power, then, is essentially that which represses as a result of its being visible but unverifiable.

In Nineteen Eighty Four, we see precisely the same mechanism at work. The citizens of Oceania are not inmates, but are clearly treated as potential criminals; power is visible, but always exists as something unverifiable:

There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment...It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time.

[1984 p.8]

The 'telescreens' make this power visible, like the central tower in a prison. Although Winston cannot be sure whether he is being watched or not all the time, he knows that this might be the case.

But, why must power be unverifiable? Why should it not be both visible and verifiable? The answer to this question is simply that unverifiability guarantees order, because nobody can go against an unknown and indefinite power. If the inmates in the prison knew they were being watched all the time by a

supervisor from the central tower--i.e. if they could verify the specific location of power--they would know that power was concentrated in the central tower; power, in consequence, would not have a pervasive existence to repress, and would be something concrete, local, and specific for the inmates. They would know where their supervisors were, and it would not be difficult for them to come together and establish an anti-power aimed at a specific target, to destroy the central tower (the embodiment of authority). The invisibility of power, then, is a trap by which the repressive mechanism of power can assert a pervasive existence.

Another aspect of power is that it separates.⁵⁶ We have seen that separation is necessary in case of a plague, since the illness can spread easily from one individual to another. Separation also makes the individual more feeble and power stronger. The people of Oceania are separated from each other--they do not know each other, they have no friends, and even their children seem to have been alienated from their parents.

Foucault describes the significance of separation as follows:

Each individual, in his place, is securely confined to a cell from which he is seen from the front by the supervisor; but the side walls prevent him from coming into contact with his companions. He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a

subject in communication. If the inmates are convicts, there is no danger of a plot, an attempt at collective escape, the planning of new crimes for the future, bad reciprocal influences; if they are patients, there is no danger of contagion; if they are madmen there is no risk of their committing violence upon another; if they are schoolchildren, there is no copying, no noise, no chatter, no waste of time, if they are workers, there are no disorders, no theft, no coalitions, etc.

[D.P p.200]

Separation is applicable in every section of society; through it, power can produce a panopticon--the political technology for its own sake. As there will be no riots, no uprisings and no clandestine organizations, the political system will find an opportunity to improve its political structure and develop its own political technology; there will be no threat to weaken it.

Again in Oceania we see an analogous, productive society. People produce unceasingly, and this is due to the separation of individuals from each other. They are not given a chance to divert their energy to other fields, such as thinking--for thinking too, requires energy--or sex; as Julia says,

When you make love you are using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and do not give a damn for anything.

[1984 p.118]

Here power "appears" as repression, specifically in relation to sexuality. It is not that the Party seeks sexless citizens whose instincts of sex have vanished; rather, it is precisely the opposite: the Party is greatly concerned with sex. It uses sex as a tool of repression, making people feel the power of the Party. Sex--or rather, repressed sexuality, is used to show the immutable gulf between those who exercise power and those who are subordinate to it. The Party does not let people use their energy for themselves; people spend their energy in their work as castrated beings. But the Party is aware that the surplus energy which appears as a result of the sex instinct cannot be neutralized solely in work. In fact, this instinct is satisfied in 'Two Minutes Hate' sessions, which replace love-making:

As usual, the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the people, had flashed on to the screen. There were hisses here and there among the audience...Before the hate had proceeded for thirty seconds, uncontrollable exclamations of rage were breaking out from half the people in the room...In its second minute the hate rose to a frenzy...But in the same moment, drawing a deep sigh of relief from everybody, the hostile figure melted into the face of Big Brother.

[1984 p.15]

The 'Two Minutes Hate' session turns out to be a sexual orgy

in which the citizens experience arousal, climax and orgasm. In reality, they are making love with the authority, and thus getting rid of the surplus energy of their bodies. Here the state is not responding overtly to the needs of citizens; it covertly responds to their needs. Although this activity does not produce the full satisfaction of love-making, it functions on two different levels; it has a dual function. On the one hand it reduces, but does not eliminate surplus energy--for sexual repression is never lifted, and the full satisfaction of love-making never fully experienced; on the other, this action displaces and re-directs the sex instinct towards Big Brother, making people adore an omniscient and omnipotent figure, and creating a desire to unite with Big Brother. As a result people identify themselves and their instinctive desires with the state apparatus--the Party ultimately has nothing to do with rationality, but with exploiting instincts and desires. It acts to weaken people like Winston, and prevent them organizing themselves against itself--for if the opposing power became as strong as the ruling power, there would appear the danger of an overthrow of the ruling power, and its replacement by the opposition.

The Inner Party members manage to overcome this possibility through 'doublethink', which enables them to shift from one ideology to the other, or assume different identities--this is done for the sole purpose of maintaining collectivism. To maintain a collective body, it seems that there must always be

an opposition, or a threat to the collective identity--such as Emmanuel Goldstein, the enemy of the people; and that against this threat, the collective body must assert its strength and existence.⁵⁷

If, as Orwell seems to be suggesting, this is so, then it is clear that the apparent one-sidedness of the system in Oceania will never be able to complete its evolution. The philologist Syme says that by the year 2050 people will not have a need to speak and utter a thought, because then, as a result of the destruction of words, there will be no thought. What Syme is describing is a hypothetical neutral state in which there will be no thought, and hence no opposition. The Party, of course, does not want to arrive at such a state, because it implies the destruction of power--there would be no opposition against which its power could assert itself and demonstrate its existence. Consequently, the Party needs people like Winston, and the aim of its 'panopticism' is to produce a technology, an autonomous system, to control oppositions and create power mechanisms for power's sake. The Party's policy will be first to separate, and then to collect these separate entities--and this will go on unceasingly, because power can only operate in a collective social body:

'We are the priests of power' O'Brien said. 'God is power. But at present power is only a word so far as you are concerned. It is time for you to gather some

idea of what power means. The first thing you must realize is that power is collective. The individual only has power in so far as he ceases to be an individual.

[1984 p.227-28]

O'Brien considers himself and the other Inner Party members the priests of power, teaching the outlaw the existence of power. Without outlaws like Winston, their priesthood would come to an end; for if collectivism means power, there must always be individuals and separate entities to collect. Collectivism can only be achieved insofar as the individual ceases to be individual; but there must first be an individual and individuality to cease. In short, individuality is not a threat to power, but a necessary condition for it: power asserts itself and gains domination when it is used to put an end to individuality.⁵⁸

What, then, does the term 'individuality' mean? If individuality entails a kind of separation and difference, what distinguishes one individual from the others, from society? Orwell individualizes Winston by making him remember his past; this distinguishes him from the others in that he becomes dissatisfied by the alteration of the past. He seems to have a notion that there is some sort of truth other than that which the Party imposes, and he tries to find this truth in the past. However, we can never be sure that Winston remembers his past correctly. He attempts to record the history of the present

time, but the truth of the present is also filtered through Winston's brain, and his vague memories of the past play an important role in recording the history of the present. Ultimately, his diary becomes another fabrication. Again, since we are not sure whether his past is a fabrication or not, there is also the possibility that his past, too, has been created by the Party--and if so, Winston's diary becomes no different in kind from the Party's alteration of the past.

But there is still the need for opposition in Oceania. The Party creates opposition in the form of "the enemy of the people", and so forces them to unite against this fabricated enemy and achieve collectivism.⁵⁹ When Winston is in the Ministry of Love, he sees other people who have been caught by the Thought Police; it seems that there are also other 'thought criminals' like Winston:

The majority of them were common criminals, but there were a few political prisoners among them.

[1984 p.196]

We might think that Winston is not alone in his rebellion against the Party, since there are also a few political prisoners. Indeed, the Party claims that there is a movement called the 'Brotherhood' that is trying to destroy not only the Party, but the ordinary people living in Airstrip One as well. In actual fact there is such an organization--but it is not an anti-organization led by Emmanuel Goldstein,

the enemy of the people; rather, it is just the opposite-- it is an organization led by the Inner Party. It is only at the end of Nineteen Eighty-Four that we learn that the blasphemous book which is called 'The Book' has been written by O'Brien, the Inner Party member; the rocket bombs that kill people every day, and the sabotages that cause the deaths of innocent people, are sponsored by the Party itself:

O'Brien had turned himself a little in his chair so that he was facing Winston...

'You are prepared to commit murder?'

'Yes.'

'To commit acts of sabotage which may cause the death of hundreds of innocent people?'

'Yes'

[1984 p.153]

The State, then, has created an opposition against itself--but why? If Winston stands in relation to the body of society as a virus that affects and infects its organs, then the body has created a defence against such a threat; it has developed an immune system. Artificially, immunity against a plague is achieved by vaccination; with vaccination, there is no danger of an epidemic. But in the construction of any vaccine, weakened microbes of the disease itself are used, so weak that they cannot damage the body, but can be used by its immune system to develop defense strategies. If the body is never vaccinated, it can never be aware of the existence of the

viruses which threaten it; there is also a need for periodic re-vaccination in case the body, over time, forgets the existence of the viruses within itself. The citizens of Oceania, analogously, are vaccinated by propaganda; the 'Two Minutes Hate' sessions are vaccinations, and through them the Party makes the people immune to the plague--by inoculating them with it periodically, in small (short) doses:

As usual, the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the enemy of the people, had flashed on to the screen....He was denouncing the dictatorship of the Party, he was demanding the immediate conclusion of peace with Eurasia, he was advocating freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, he was crying hysterically that the revolution had been betrayed--and all this in rapid polysyllabic speech which was a sort of parody of the habitual style of the orators of the Party, and even contained Newspeak words: more Newspeak words, indeed, than any Party member would normally use in real life.

[1984 p.16]

Goldstein's anti-propaganda, his opposition to the Party, turns out to be a vaccine that is used to strengthen the immune system of the Party itself. Thought plague is achieved by words, because only with words can man think; words can be seen as the constructing cells of thought. The words used by Goldstein are not "strong", in that they do not have

different connotations. They have only one meaning each, and refer to something concrete;

The word 'free' still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as 'This dog is free from lice' or 'This field is free from weeds.' It could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free' since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts...

[1984 p.258]

These weakened words cannot affect the people of Oceania in terms of content, but their function as form is to strengthen the enmity of the people against Emmanuel Goldstein, who is in reality a fabricated rebel. This kind of opposition is vital to the existence of the Party--because opposition means vaccination; and also refreshes the people--since they can become relaxed by redirecting their surplus energy in these sessions.

Indeed, when O'Brien speaks for the future Oceania, he does not say that there will not be opposition, but just the contrary:

The espionage, the betrayals, the arrests, the tortures, the executions, the disappearances will never cease. It will be a world of terror as much as a world of triumph. The more the party is powerful,

the less it will be tolerant: the weaker the opposition, the tigher the despotism. Goldstein and his heresies will live for ever. [1984 p.231]

O'Brien, in fact, never talks of a future in which there will be no opposition. Goldstein and his heresies will live forever, because they are the strengthening tools of the structure. Similarly, people like Winston will never disappear, because their existence is needed to activate the immune system; and they will never be triumphant, they will always be defeated:

Every day, at every moment, they will be defeated, discredited, ridiculed, spat upon--and yet they will always survive.

[1984 p.231]

In short, the Party's attempt to develop a political technology is analogous to its developing the exact vaccination for the people.

Foucault's essay on "The Subject and Power" describes the duplicitous policy of a state--the state tries to impose two personalities on the individual at the same time:

The fact that the state's power is both an individualizing and a totalizing form of power. Never, I think, in the history of human society--even in the old Chinese society--has there been such a tricky combination in the same political structures of

individualization techniques and totalization procedures.

[A.A.M. p.421]

Analogously, Winston's individuality is created by the Party; he differs from the others. But the state never lets Winston violate the totality of the structure that depends on collectivism--because it is the law of truth of Oceania that collectivism and collective identity are the only means of surviving.

Winston is thus an individual who has developed his individuality within the limits of the Party's permission; if not, the Thought Police would have been able to stop him from the very beginning, since they have always been watching him:

'We are the dead' he said.

'We are the dead', echoed Julia dutifully.

'You are the dead.', said an iron voice behind them...

'It was behind the picture.' breathed Julia.

'It was behind the picture.' said the voice.'

[1984 p.189]

The telescreen has been behind the picture from the very beginning; the Thought Police have known everything about them, but have let them lead a different life--let them enjoy the sense of being different, and till the last moment never disturbed them. The Party has tolerated, encouraged Winston's

individuality; it is as if he had been chosen for a task from the very beginning.

Since weakened microbes are necessary for vaccination, Winston, in poor health and physical condition is an ideal candidate:

The pain of the coughing fit had not quite driven out of Winston's mind the impression made by his dream, and the rhythmic movements of the exercise restored it somehow.

[1984 p.32]

Winston reached down and cautiously scratched his varicose ulcer.

[1984 p.66]

Winston suffers from a varicose ulcer, and coughing fits that make him weak and ill; his unhealthy body reflects his politically unhealthy mind, and it is for this reason that he has been chosen by the Party. Even in the early chapters we have hints that he has been chosen:

For some reason the telescreen in the living room was, in an unusual position. Instead of being placed, as was normal, in the end wall, where it could command the whole room, it was in the longer wall, opposite the window.

[1984 p.10]

This "unusual" situation gives Winston the opportunity to write

the diary to record his memory, and thus differ from the others in that he refuses the fabricated history of the Party. He is made to believe that the telescreen cannot see him, and this encourages him. Also, O'Brien, the Inner Party member, always seems to be on Winston's side, encouraging him to rebel:

Momentarily he caught O'Brien's eye... 'I am with you' O'Brien seemed to be saying to him. 'I know precisely what you are feeling. I know all about your contempt, your hatred, your disgust. But don't worry, I am on your side.'

[1984 p.19]

Thus Winston seems to have been sacrificed from the very beginning for the ulterior motives of the Party. His inevitable end has been pre-planned by the Party, because his end ensures the visibility and existence of power, serving as an example to make people aware that if they do not obey, the same thing might happen to them all. Hence it is only through opposition that people become aware of the existence of power and its repressiveness. Without opposition, power would not be visible, and as a result of this one-sidedness, there would be neutrality. The existence of one ideology without alternatives would be the most dangerous phenomenon for the Party, because it would violate the double structure on which the collective identity is built. One-sidedness would be the end point of the production of truth, a state analogous to an 'utopia'. Utopia, after all, signifies the end of power relations, and hence the

end of production and progress--of the inevitable needs of man, and hence also of the social body.⁶⁰

The Party's introduction of Newspeak is thus something potentially dangerous to the collective body, and to the Party itself, because Newspeak neutralizes power relations. The Party's stand against Oldspeak, then, is ironical--it seems that it is only through Oldspeak that 'utopia' can be avoided.⁶¹ But Oldspeak in itself, taken to its extreme, would be utopic like Newspeak, because it, too, represents a one-sided ideology. Thus Winston, who speaks Oldspeak and yearns for a different system, is really only yearning for a different utopia.⁶²

Although the Party is aware that there will never be such a state, it tries to establish the notion, as if one day there will be an utopic system. This then becomes the ultimate goal of the Party, while yearning for it must, ironically, be repressed. The attempts to neutralize thought through Newspeak, and the destruction of Oldspeak, can be seen as attempts to neutralize the mind; by the year 2050, it is expected that people will not need to speak to each other because there will be no thought to utter. This is an idealized neutral state; but coexisting with it, there will always be people to violate its structure and produce a hierarchical power relationship, which will give way to the production of truth and hence to progress and development. Winston, in his own way, re-enacts the Party's ironical yearning for utopia; he, too, is after a system that is utopic, and must be punished as a result--the Party punishes

itself through Winston, because what Winston represents also exists in the structure of the Party.⁶³

To maintain this power relationship in Oceania, then, requires an equilibrium. There has to be a delicate balance--between neutrality on the one hand and power hierarchies on the other--which at the end should not be violated.

Consequently, the role of the Party is that of mediator. It simultaneously creates two opposite notions, two power structures, on condition that one of these structures must always be suppressed by the other, and that neutrality must never be attained; in this way, power becomes visible and the people repressed. The duty of the Party is to create on the one hand mass-man, who is directed from a command centre and only has reflex responses that are shaped by Newspeak; and on the other "individuals", who are also covertly directed from the same command centre. In the end both types are bound to one command centre, the Inner Party of Oceania, which exists above the individual, and is formed of the combination of opposing power structures.

The Party is aware that throughout history there have always been power structures; and in the blasphemous Book, it is revealed that

They fell, that is to say, either through consciousness or through unconsciousness. It is the achievement of the Party to have produced a system of thought in which both conditions can exist simultaneously. And

upon no other intellectual basis could the dominion of the Party be made permanent.

[1984 p.184]

As the Book says, these were not permanent structures and were bound to fail, since in their construction there was a deterioration of the balance of power; there were unending struggles, because the opposition to these systems gained strength after a while, and replaced the preceding rule. But eventually this new power structure also deteriorated, lost control, and was replaced by a new structure, and so on unceasingly. Power could still assert itself through wars and rebellions, but it was also destroying and weakening itself, since the wars, coups, and rebellions were destroying the social organization.⁶⁴ Again, in the Book this is revealed:

In past ages, a war, almost by definition, was something that sooner or later came to an end, usually in unmistakable victory or defeat...So long as defeat meant the loss of independence, or some other result generally held to be undesirable, the precautions against defeat had to be serious... But when war becomes literally continuous, it also ceases to be dangerous.

[1984 p.172]

The wars in the past came to an end, and the price for this end was defeat--the destruction of a nation's social body. The wars

in 1984 never come to an end, because war is a means of accelerating power relations in the social structures of nations.⁶⁵

Power in Nineteen Eighty-Four means collectivism; the more people come together, the more power asserts itself, and power, as O'Brien tells us, is the only significant reality.⁶⁶ If the one must live, then the other must die; this is the condition for life to go on, and there must always be 'others' to die so that life can go on. Every progress, every development, is a result of this power relation. The Party experiments with the already-existing power structure, since it is trying to develop a political technology to cope with the destructive side of power; the Party does not destroy its opposition, because it knows that that would mean destroying itself:

The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of the others; we are interested solely in power...only power, pure power. We are different from the oligarchies of the past, in that we know what we are doing.

[1984 p.227]

Here O'Brien makes it clear that they are developing a new and different system, ideally a system that will be eternal. If they destroyed people like Winston, or made peace with the other superstates, there would be no enemy to fight against, and no motivation for production and progress--the needs of the social

body--and hence, no hierarchy and power relations among the people. As the blasphemous Book says,

The war is waged by each ruling group against its own subjects, and the object of war is not to make or prevent conquests of territory, but to keep the structure of society intact. The very word 'war', therefore, has become misleading. It would probably be accurate to say that by becoming continuous war has ceased to exist.

[1984 p.173]

If a balance is not achieved, or the war comes to an end, this destroys the collective social body. In order not to violate the collective body, the forefathers of the system should be able to apply a contradictory mentality: the Inner Party members should be both enemy and friend, black and white, believe and not believe in concepts. In short, they must imitate this macrocosmic order of opposites, and make it continuous. Doublethink, for this reason, becomes the only means of their survival, because they cease to be one-sided and hence avoid a possible defeat; they survive.

The existence of a character like Winston is thus a contradiction, but as contradiction is necessary for survival, the Party does not destroy him as soon as possible. We never know what happens to Winston in the end; we do not know whether he is going to be vaporized or not; and our inability to decide echoes the doublethink nature of the problem:

We do not destroy the heretic because he resists us;
so long as he resists us we never destroy him,

[1984 p.219]

says O'Brien, one of the forefathers of Party ideology. O'Brien is a doublethink realist in that he accepts both contradictory notions simultaneously. He is also superior to Winston because he is aware that truths can change, and that as a result there can never be a perfect utopia. For him it is not difficult to betray logic, because there is nothing logical. Doublethink, which accepts this paradox, becomes the only means of mental survival.

Doublethink means;

To hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them.'

[1984 p.35]

Through this concept one can cope with power: one must betray one's logic, repress one's previous notion and replace it with a new one. If the Party says that Oceania has always been at war with Eastasia and not at war with Eurasia, people must believe in it. If the Party says that two plus two makes five, then this must be perceived as the reality of that moment, of that situation, and there must be no confusion about it. Doublethink trains people mentally to adapt themselves to the natural rules that stem from the nature of power, and they are obliged to do so

because they have an instinct to survive. Doublethink is a multi-dimensional thought--it accepts everything, every concept, as the conceivable reality; this attitude gives way to power to operate on a harmless level and hence never lets an utopic state appear.

In the Ministry of Love Winston is trained in how doublethink functions. Doublethink is the betrayal of logic on the one hand, and legitimization of this betrayal on the other; the torture of Winston thus ends when he betrays Julia:

'Can you think of a single degradation that has not happened to you?'

Winston had stopped weeping, though the tears were still oozing out of his eyes. He looked up at O'Brien.

'I have not betrayed Julia.' he said.

O'Brien looked down at him thoughtfully. 'No', he said. 'No, that is perfectly true. You have not betrayed Julia.

[1984 p.235]

At this stage, Winston is still stubborn and competitive with O'Brien, because he has not yet betrayed his unity and divided himself into two, as required by doublethink. Throughout the story he searches for a unity, and seems to find it with Julia--in contrast to O'Brien, who believes that one can achieve unity by holding two contradictory notions. As a result, although both Winston and O'Brien are after some kind of unity, the betrayal of logic--which is an irrational unity--and the love between Winston and Julia--which is another unity on a different level--clash in

Nineteen Eighty-Four. If as readers we apply doublethink, we can accept both of these unities; it is only when we apply "common-sense" conventions and conventional mentality that we see the unity of O'Brien as something absurd.

In Nineteen Eighty-Four, the Party is not concerned with whether Winston's ideas are right or wrong. What matters is his holding one notion and rejecting the diversity of truth; in doing this Winston jeopardizes the double structure of the individual and of the system, and this too violates the balance, the balance of power which has been built on opposites. Even the superstates betray each other by frequently changing their allies--and yet, none of these superstates disappears, because the wars and changing allies are the natural outcome of the power structure.

In this respect, Winston, too, must change; he must be able to apply himself to different circumstances, and to do this he has to betray his unity. All the torture carried out on Winston is intended to change his one-sided notion, his bias, and replace it with doublethink--and O'Brien succeeds in it. When Winston is taken to Room 101, he finally betrays Julia:

'Do it to Julia! 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!'

[1984 p.247]

By betraying Julia, Winston in fact betrays himself; and as a result of his self-betrayal his individual power is destroyed,

and this individual power, through doublethink, is transferred to the collective power of the Party. Winston becomes an ordinary citizen in the end, listening to the news from the telescreen of the victory the Oceanian superstate has won. The Party has finally imposed its truth on Winston:

Under the table Winston's feet made convulsive movements. He had not stirred from his seat, but in his mind he was running, swiftly running, he was with the crowds outside, cheering himself deaf. He looked up at the portrait of Big Brother...He thought how ten minutes ago--yes, only ten minutes--there had still been equivocation in his heart as he wondered whether the news from the front would be of victory or defeat.

[1984 p.256]

When O'Brien says that they--the Party--are different from the oligarchies of the past in that they know what they are doing, he seems to be indicating that there is no pure epistemology; pure knowledge would be beyond human perception.⁶⁷ Yet all the struggle and rebellion of Nineteen Eighty-Four lies covertly in the fact that its society unconsciously strives towards such an unattainable utopia. The Party, knowing this, rejects the order of rationality of logic, and believes in power, believes in the inevitable struggle because this struggle is for survival; it knows that power relations exist on all levels, and life is conditioned to power relations. Hence

rationality and logic, if not used for power's sake, are dangerous, because they might detach themselves from the sole objective reality--power relations--and engage in a search for utopia.

Winston is trained to learn doublethink in the torture chambers of the Ministry of Love, but he is a failure. Although he is changed, he cannot perceive the double nature of existence. After the torture ends, we see him in search of another utopia--the utopia that the Party ironically suggests. Winston, in the end, becomes a perfect citizen:

Two gin-scented tears trickled down the sides of his nose. But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother.

[1984 p.256]

The Inner-Party, which is the core of this mechanism--by which it creates oppositions, and re-integrates these oppositions--has the same structure, and includes Party members of opposite poles--not only rebels are destroyed; the people who are devoted to the system are also systematically killed. It is because of the nature of power that the Inner Party must have struggles in itself, since this is what enables the Party and Big Brother to live.

IV. Conclusion

Friedrich Nietzsche, in his essay "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense",⁶⁸ describes the relation of truth to language. Nietzsche defines the 'word' as 'the image of a nerve stimulus in sound', and shows us that what matters with words is never the truth, because words are never adequate expressions of nerve stimuli. However, we construct the truth with words, and truth for Nietzsche is:

A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms--in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically...

[D.in.C p.219]

From this perspective, be it Oldspeak or Newspeak, there seems to be no permanent truth for man beyond the language he uses. Oldspeak, which contains antonyms and which has constituted the basis for Newspeak, is in this sense ultimately no different from Newspeak, because it cannot contain adequate expressions of extra-linguistic realities in itself. Oldspeak and Newspeak are intertwined as a single, contradictory language, like the unified and self-contradicting system of Oceania, and this language is the source of the creation of different poles.

The Inner Party in Oceania produces truths which are temporary, and has a mobile structure--that is, they can easily

be changed. These truths are one-sided and ideologically determined. In other words, truths are produced for the collective body, and these truths enable the citizens to adapt to different circumstances. The Party achieves these truths through language; through Newspeak, and coexisting with Newspeak, the Oldspeak language is also a source of truths in Oceania. Nietzsche, in this respect, shows us that language, or the structure of language is not something permanent and immobile, but mobile; hence truth, which is achieved through language, is also mobile .

The political structure in Nineteen Eighty-Four seems to have been constructed on the diversity of truth, because the system is based on internal oppositions. The policy-makers of Oceania are well aware of this fact, and for this reason they are not committed to a single ideology. The logic of the system is expressed as 'doublethink'--holding simultaneously two opposite notions and believing in both of them--because "the diversity of truth" is the necessary pre-condition for establishing power relations; a power relation is always conditioned to have opposites in itself.

Truth, for the Inner Party members, then, can be found in another dimension: truth is power itself, because it is the power relation that constitutes the basis for existence. Existence, then, is conditioned by this double structure. What we call 'reality' or 'truth' comes to have meaning by omitting or repressing one of the opposite poles by which it is defined, and

destroying--superficially--the double structure. Truth--that is, ideology--operates as a unity without alternatives, and as a defined pole: Winston defines himself in relation to Nineteen Eighty-Four as an opposing polarity with his own "truth" in his mind; the society of Oceania defines itself in relation to Winston; and with these opposites a balance of power is achieved.

Power relations are constituted by language, and since Newspeak and Oldspeak make up the opposite poles, these contrasting languages assume the role of definers; they too establish a balance, because both exist simultaneously and define each other. We have seen that languages have a mobile structure, and if we think of the mobility of Oldspeak in a positive sense, the mobility of Newspeak would be negative; neither of these languages is more important than the other because it is through these opposites that power relations are defined in the language of Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Inner Party members, who are the policy-makers of the system, develop their strategies for unity according to this double structure, and therefore it seems unavoidable to have opposing poles--such as Emmanuel Goldstein--among the members themselves.

When Winston is defeated and accepts authority, presumably his task will have come to an end, and he will be vaporized. But this will not be the end of the struggle. Opposites like Winston and Goldstein will live forever, because their existence is the guarantee of the power relations and order of the system.

Finally, it can be said that Nineteen Eighty-Four reveals the power relation to be a three-dimensional concept. For a power relation to exist there must first be two different poles, each defined and unique in itself, which, when they come together establish a balance which has a different kind of existence--a unity. Within this three-dimensional frame the role of Winston is simply to create one of the defining poles; when the unity is achieved, Winston too has to change his configuration.

Nineteen Eighty-Four was written in 1948 and the book was received as an allegory of Nazism or Stalinism--the reference points for the critics of the time. But its significance is not limited by this date; it is applicable to all generations, past, present and future--because the novel is simply about power relations, and it suggests that this shifting, mobile structure of power is perhaps the only permanent order in the cosmos.

NOTES

1 George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984) 258. All future citations from this work will be denoted by 1984, followed by a page number.

2 Most critics on Orwell have had something to say about Nineteen Eighty-Four, and the debates have centered on whether the novel was an attack on communism and fascism, or a paranoia of the author. For instance, Alex Zwerdling's "Orwell's Psychopolitics", (Twentieth Century British Literature, ed. Harold Bloom [New York: Chelsea House, 1987] 2159) discusses Nineteen Eighty-Four as a sadomasochistic fantasy. Zwerdling denounces Orwell, because Orwell is thought to have betrayed the left-wingers. In contrast, Lionel Trilling, in "The Opposing Self" (Bloom, p. 2125) describes the virtues of Orwell. Trilling is obviously seeing the novel from the point of view of 'human rights'--his value judgements are those of western societies. Again in "Language, Truth and Ideology: Orwell and the Post-War Left", (Bloom, 2151) Christopher Norris takes the novel as an argument of communism, while Lillian Feder, in "Selfhood, Language, and Reality: George Orwell's 1984" (Bloom, p. 2145) indicates the importance of self, Winston Smith and sees him as the "greatest challenge" to totalitarian regimes. Feder, however, fails to explain the concept of "individuality".

Dealing with the psychology of the author, Isaach Deutscher, in "1984--The Mysticism of Cruelty", (Twentieth Century

Interpretations of 1984: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Samuel Hynes [Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, 1971] 38) takes the novel as a Freudian sublimation of Orwell's persecution mania. Similarly, Anthony West's "George Orwell" (Principles and Persuasions: The Literary Essays of Anthony West [New York: Harcourt Brace, 1957] 172, 175-76) regards the novel as the "paranoid" product of Orwell's unconscious mind, and concludes that the existence of a hidden wound can account for such remorseless pessimism.

3 The "common sense" critics include Thomas W.Cooper, who in "Fictional 1984 and Factual 1984" (The Orwellian Moment ed. Robert L.Sawage, James Combs, Dan Nimmo [Arkansas: Arkansas UP.,1989] 84) claims that Orwell recreates the worst aspects of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia in the Oceanian state; and Philip Rahv, who in "The Unfuture of Utopia", (Modern Critical Views: George Orwell, ed. Harold Bloom [New York: Chelsea House, 1987] 14-15) regards the novel as a satire on Stalinist nations, and claims that Oceania is obviously modelled on Stalinist society. These critics seem to be unable to go beyond the already existing political structures, and to see that Orwell is doing something new and quite different.

4 Rahv's "The Unfuture of Utopia", (Bloom, p.16) shows Winston Smith as a hero, undergoing a dreadful metamorphosis which burns out his human essence, leaving him a wreck who can go on living only by becoming one of "them". Rahv cannot explain what this

'human essence' means, or how it is created. See, also Robert A. Lee, Orwell's Fiction (London: Notre Dame UP., 1969) 130.

5 Lee 137.

6 Lee 140, 145, 155.

7 Vita Fortunati, in "A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency" (Bloom, p.147) argues that the system of Oceania is utopic and that it does not unite, but separates and isolates. Fortunati discusses the impossibility of an utopia, because to create a perfect and harmonious society, there has to exist the constant, watchful regard of power. But clearly, the society of Oceania is in no way an utopia founded on love and justice: Fortunati cannot see that 'utopia' is a state of stagnation, and it jeopardizes the 'collective body', as there will be no progress and motivation; Winston is obviously motivating the stagnant system.

8 Mark Connelly, in The Diminished Self ([Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP., 1987] 152) discusses "happiness" in utopias, and concludes that man's last untamed instinct (sexuality) will prevent him from being happy in utopia, because the stagnation that utopia creates, will also repress the instincts in man.

9 Michel Foucault, in "The Subject and Power" (Art After Modernism, ed. Brian Wallis [New York: Godine, 1984] 421) explains the new political structure in which totality comes into prominence. In this structure, the state has to apply double

nature--it should individualize and totalize, it should contain differences in itself, but the state must be able to collect the separate entities it has divided (or individualized). If there were no individual to oppose this collective identity, the Oceanian state could not identify itself through its opposite, and it could not assert its identity for its citizens.

10 See George Orwell's "Politics and the English Language", The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986) 156-170.

11 See Roy Harris, "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak", in Bloom, ed. Modern Critical Views: George Orwell, (p.114)

12 See Mark Connelly, The Diminished Self, (p.152)

13 Harris, in "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak" (Bloom, p.114), claims that Newspeak will eventually replace Oldspeak entirely. This is an odd idea, and Harris, true to his title, has misunderstood Newspeak; such a replacement would mean the end of power relations as there will no longer be opposites.

14 See George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984) 227.

15 Nineteen Eighty-Four (p.35)

16 Rahv, "The Unfuture of Utopia", 16. See, also Anthony Burgess, "Ingsoc Considered", (George Orwell's 1984 ed. Harold Bloom [New York: Chelsea House, 1987] 38). Burgess indicates

the double nature of man.

17 Daphne Patai, in "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism", (Bloom, p.42) takes this as a necessity for a collective body to flourish.

18 See Anne Freire Ashbough, Plato's Theory of Explanation (New York: State UP., 1988) 58,59.

19 Karl Lowith, Meaning in History (Chicago: Chicago UP., 1949) p.4. All future citations from this work will be denoted by M.in.H., followed by a page number.

20 See, for instance, Mark Connelly's The Diminished Self: Orwell and the Loss of Freedom (p.152)

21 William Casement, in "Another Perspective on Orwellian Pessimism" (The International Fiction Review 15.1 [1988]: 48-50.) indicates the repressive mechanisms in Oceania that the Party members' sensuality have been repressed, especially the sexual impulse.

22 The historian Michel Foucault, in an interview ("The History of Sexuality: Interview", trans. Geoff Bennington [Oxford: Oxford Literary Review, 1980] 4.) stresses that sexuality can be spoken of, but only in order to forbid it, because the reality of institutions dominates over sex and this reality stems from the logical regulations of social life.

23 See Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality, trans. by, Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978) 3. All future references to this work will be denoted by H.O.S, followed by a page number.

24 See Connelly, (p.134-136)

25 Thomas W. Cooper, in "Fictional 1984 and Factual 1984" (The Orwellian Moment p.84, 93) discusses the concept of language and the creation of mass man. Cooper calls the one-sidedness of language 'enculturation' and sees it as a danger to individuality, because this 'enculturation' thoroughly and tragically crushes individual perception and experience.

26 See Nineteen Eighty-Four, p.259

27 Ibid 259.

28 Foucault, in "The History of Sexuality: Interview" (p.10-11) talks about the alternatives which are called "madness", "delinquency". In fact, "madness" and "delinquency" are the other alternative notions, because these concepts upset the logical structure of a social body.

29 Marshal McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, in War and Peace in Our Global Village ([New York: Bantam, 1968] 59) claim that a word gives power over the thing named: or manipulative magic. This power over the object seems to be exerted to know the object.

30 Ibid 59.

31 Paul Feyerabend, Against Method (Norfolk, England: Thetford, 1984) 223.

32 According to Whorff the background linguistic system (in other words, the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing system for voicing ideas, but rather is itself a shaper of ideas, the programme and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Language Thought and Reality, MIT Press, 1956, p.121. See also Christopher Norris, (p.2151)

33 See, for instance, The Orwellian Moment (p.96)

34 Anthony Burgess, in "Ingsoc Considered", (Bloom, p.35) emphasises the knowledge of the Party in reconciling the opposites through doublethink. This is obviously done to prevent disintegration.

35 See Connelly's The Diminished Self (p.135)

36 See The Orwellian Moment (p.101)

37 Richard K. Sanderson, "The Two Narrators and Happy Ending of Nineteen Eighty-Four" (Modern Fiction Studies 34-4 [1988]: 587-594)

38 Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge, ed. Colin Gordon (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1980), p.91. All future references to this text will be devoted by P.N. followed by a page number.

39 Michel Foucault argues in Power-Knowledge, that the relations of power lie in the hostile engagement of forces. (Ibid 91)

40 Daphne Patai, in "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in 1984", (Bloom, p.50-54) sees this hostile engagement as a "game"; because power is pursued for its own sake. Patai indicates that the Party is not independent in this game, because to play the game of power, it needs opponents--a kind of resistance.

41 Anthony Burgess, in "Ingsoc Considered", (Bloom, p. 38) also talks about opposing structures and sees these opposites in life itself: "Man is a double creature in whom flesh contradicts spirit, and instinct opposes aspiration...Birth is the beginning of death." Burgess emphasises the importance of the opposites, and takes human life and society as juggling with opposites. The necessity of opposites for Burgess is that unity of thought can only be achieved by forging a deliberate technique for dealing with contradictions. The Party's having an opposite like Winston, in this respect, is a deliberate technique aimed at unity of the social body.

42 Again, as Burgess remarks in "Ingsoc Considered" (Bloom, p.38) the deliberate technique can apply different methods. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, to create contradictions, the Party alters the past. Burgess indicates that what is at stake is the question of who is to be the master. Patai, in "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism" (Bloom, p.53) takes this situation as the theatrical play of the Party, and claims that in this way,

O'Brien has gone to a great deal of effort to turn Winston into a serious opponent. For Burgess and Patai, all these alterations have the sole purpose of creating contradictory characters like Winston and Julia. See also Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish, p.200, on the necessity of contradiction.

43 William Casement, in "Another Perspective on Orwellian Pessimism", (International Fiction Review 15-1 [1988]:48-50), indicates that these produced truths are for the citizens of Oceania, not for the Inner Party members. Casement claims that there is, in fact, a permanent file in which the unaltered truths are kept for the Inner Party members. If we accept that there is really a 'permanent file', then the Inner Party members become actors and liars. But we know that when the Inner Party members--such as O'Brien--apply 'doublethink', they do not pretend. See Nineteen Eighty-Four, (p.213) where O'Brien applies 'doublethink'.

44 See, for instance, Nineteen Eighty-Four, (p. 31) where Winston meditates and thinks of the "Golden Country", an expression which indicates that he is glorifying the past.

45 Roy Harris's "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak" (Modern Critical Views: George Orwell p.113-121) discusses the structure of Newspeak and the Orwellian logophobia--the interconnected doubts about the trustworthiness of the connection between words and meaning. In this respect, the words 'love' and 'friendship' might not be expressing an absolute impulse. When Winston utters

these words, it is clear that they suggest or evoke a different impulse in Winston than in the reader. It must not be forgotten that Winston Smith might have been affected by Newspeak. See also Nietzsche's "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense", in Deconstruction in Context ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: Chicago UP.,1986) 219.

46 Carl Freedman, in "Antinomies of Nineteen Eighty-Four" (Critical Essays on George Orwell ed. Bernard Oldsey, Joseph Brown [Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.,1986] 98-99) talks about Orwell's satire on religion. Freedman takes the novel as an anti-Catholic and anti-Christian work, in particular attacking the Roman Catholic Church, whose practices are no different than those of the Oceanian state. Freedman says that the Christian formula "God is power" is the basis for creating a totalitarian system.

47 Freedman (Ibid 99) discusses the meaning of love in terms of Christian love, and indicates that "love as a social principle, is potentially totalitarian. The aim of Christian love, after all, is not to demand adherence to a legalistic code in the manner of the Old Testament, but to produce a new kind of individual." Winston Smith is clearly that kind of individual.

48 Michel Foucault, in Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) 207. gives the example of prison tower, which stands as the embodiment of power. Foucault asserts that anyone may come and exercise in the central tower and he can gain a clear idea of the way in which the surveillance

is practiced.

49 Michel Foucault, "Two Lectures" (Power/Knowledge p.93)

50 Foucault, in Power/Knowledge (p.93) claims that there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. Foucault argues that the ruling class is subjected to the production of truth through power, and asserts that this class cannot exercise power except through the production of truth.

51 Foucault, in "The Subject and Power" (Art After Modernism ed. Brian Wallis [New York: Godine, 1984] p.421, 425) claims that the collective Western state originated in Christian institutions, and that power relations, which originated from personal or group relations were, in this way, developed to the form of state.

52 Foucault's account of individuality in "The Subject and Power" (p.427) is that power relations can only be articulated on the basis of two elements which are each indispensable. In Nineteen Eighty-Four these two elements are the Party and Winston Smith.

53 Daphne Patai, in "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in 1984" (George Orwell's 1984 p.59-62) says that Winston, despite his complicity, is not a fully informed player of the game of power. Patai also claims that Winston actually wants to win in the game of power. Remarkably, instead of keeping quiet and retaining his

belief while he is being tortured, he declares that he has not betrayed Julia--a challenge to O'Brien, and clear indication that Winston cares more about winning.

54 Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) p.195. All future references from this work will be denoted by D.P., followed by a page number.

55 "Panopticon" is a term first used by Jeremy Bentham. The meaning of "panopticon" is 'broad vision'--an eye that sees everything. Michel Foucault makes use of this term, and discusses "panopticon" in terms of power relations. See also Vita Fortunati, "A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency" (George Orwell ed. Harold Bloom [New York: Chelsea House, 1987] p.145)

56 Michel Foucault, in "The Subject and Power" (p.428) argues that power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free. Freedom also comes to mean separation, because through separation individualization process begins and this gives way to freedom. Consequently, there is no face to face confrontation of power and freedom, which are mutually exclusive--freedom disappears everywhere power is exercised.

57 Daphne Patai, in "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in 1984" (p.51) indicates the importance of resistance. Patai sees the power relations as a game, where overcoming the resistance creates a thrill for the powerful. This "game theory" is not enough to explain the power relations in the novel. What the

Party does in Oceania is create power relations and in this way achieve collectivism and survive; it is for this reason that it needs opposites like Winston to establish power relations and hierarchy.

58 Foucault, in Discipline and Punish (p.203) regards the "panopticon" as a laboratory; it can be used as a machine to carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individuals.

59 See Michel Foucault "The Subject and Power" (p.428)

60 Anthony Burgess, in "Ingsoc Considered" (George Orwell's 1984 p.37) talks about the importance of diminishing the individual to achieve a collective body. What Burgess says is true, but individuality should not totally be destroyed, because collectivism can only be achieved through opposites, or individuals.

61 Frederick J.E. Woodbridge, in The Son of Apollo: Themes of Plato (Connecticut: Ox Bow Press, 1989) 78. talks about Plato's notion for a perfect and ideal city. Plato argues that in the 'perfect city', the citizens should not be perfect, because if the citizens were perfect, they would not be happy since there would be no virtue to defend and differ from the others.

62 Vita Fortunati, in "A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency" (p.149) claims that Orwell brings around communist, theocratic,

right-wing, and left-wing utopias on the same level.

63 Anthony Burgess, in "Ingsoc Considered" (p.38) argues that the Party is literally accusing itself of telling lies through the mouthpiece of an invented enemy.

64 Raymond Williams, in Orwell ed, Frank Kermode (London: Fontana, 1991) p.107. asserts that the perpetual war is because that the rulers of the three superstates cannot risk an atomic war. This might be true, but the wars in 1984 take place for the sake of achieving collectivism.

65 Again in Burgess' "Ingsoc Considered" (p.35) it is indicated that the Oceanian state (or the Party) has learned how to reconcile opposites, not through dialectic, which is diachronic and admits absence of control over time, but through the synchronic technique of doublethink.

66 See Nineteen Eighty-Four (p.228)

67 Ibid 214.

68 Nietzsche, in "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense" (Deconstruction in Context: Literature and Philosophy ed. Mark C.Taylor [Chicago: Chicago UP., 1986] 219.) discusses the concept of language and claims that language cannot express the objective reality. Nietzsche takes the 'word' as a nerve stimuli in sound; a nerve stimulus, first transposed into an image--first metaphor. The image, in turn, is imitated by a sound--second

metaphor. Therefore, the language used by man is a mobile army of metaphors.



Works Cited

- Ashbough, Anne Freire. Plato's Theory of Explanation. New York: State UP., 1988.
- Burgess, Anthony. "Ingsoc Considered". Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.
- Casement, William. "Another Perspective on Orwellian Pessimism". The International Fiction Review 15.1 (1988): 48-50.
- Connelly, Mark. The Diminished Self. Pittsburg: Duquesne UP., 1987.
- Cooper, Thomas W. "Fictional 1984 and Factual 1984". The Orwellian Moment. Ed. Robert L. Sawage, James Combs, Dan Nimmo. Arkansas: Arkansas UP., 1989. 83-109.
- Deutscher, Isaach. "1984--The Mysticism of Cruelty". Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984. Ed. Samuel Hynes. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, 1971. 38.
- Feyerabend, Paul. Against Method. Norfolk, England: Thetford, 1984.
- Feder, Lillian. "Selfhood, Language, and Reality: George Orwell's 1984". Twentieth Century British Literature. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 2144-50.
- Fortunati, Vita. "A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency". Modern Critical Interpretations. Bloom 109-121.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power". Art After Modernism. Ed. Brian Wallis. New York: Godine, 1984. 417-32.
- , trans. Robert Hurley. The History of Sexuality. New York:

Pantheon Books, 1978.

- , trans. Geoff Bennington. Interview. "The History of Sexuality: Interview". Oxford: Oxford Literary Review, 1980. 3-19.
- , ed. and trans. Colin Gordon. Power/Knowledge. Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1980.
- , trans. Alan Sheridan. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Freedman, Carl. "Antinomies of Nineteen Eighty-Four". Critical Essays on George Orwell. Ed. Bernard Oldsey. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1986. 90-111.
- Harris, Roy. "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak". Modern Critical Views: George Orwell. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 113-121.
- Lee, Robert A. Orwell's Fiction. London: Notre Dame UP., 1969.
- Löwith, Carl. Meaning in History. Chicago: Chicago UP., 1949.
- McLuhan, Marshal., Fiore, Quentin. War and Peace in Our Global Village. New York: Bantam, 1968.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense". Deconstruction in Context. Ed. Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: Chicago UP., 1986.
- Norris, Christopher. "Language, Truth and Ideology: Orwell and the Post-War Left". Twentieth Century. Bloom 2150-56.
- Orwell, George. Nineteen Eighty-Four. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.
- Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language". The

Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell.
Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Harmondsworth: Penguin,
1986. 156-170.

Patai, Daphne. "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in Nineteen Eighty-Four". Modern Critical Interpretations. Bloom 47-87.

Rahv, Philip. "The Unfuture of Utopia". Modern Critical Views.
Bloom 13-21.

Sanderson, Richard K. "The Two Narrators and Happy Ending of Nineteen Eighty-Four". Modern Fiction Studies 34-4 (1988): 587-595.

Trilling, Lionel. "The Opposing Self". Twentieth Century.
Bloom 2159-67.

Williams, Raymond. Orwell. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Fontana,
1991.

Woodbridge, Frederick J.E. The Son of Apollo: Themes of Plato.
Connecticut: Ox Bow Press, 1989.

Zwerdling, Alex. "Orwell's Psychopolitics". Twentieth Century.
Bloom 2125-28.