

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

GENRE ANALYSIS OF ANTI-UTOPIA IN GEORGE ORWELL'S
WORKS

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Tomáš Jajtner Th.D., Ph.D.

Autor práce: Veronika Teznerová

Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk a literatura

Ročník: 3.

2023

I confirm that this thesis is my own work, using solely the sources and literature properly quoted and acknowledged as works cited.

26. července 2023 České Budějovice

.....

Veronika Teznerová

Poděkování

Děkuji Mgr. Tomáši Jajtnerovi Th.D., Ph.D., za odborné vedení bakalářské práce, podnětné připomínky, rady a věnovaný čas. V neposlední řadě také děkuji své rodině a přátelům za podporu v průběhu psaní.

Anotace

Bakalářská práce *Žánrová analýza antiutopie v dílech George Orwella* si klade za cíl žánrově analyzovat antiutopická díla *Farma zvířat* (*Animal Farm*, 1945) a *1984* (*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 1949) britského spisovatele George Orwella. V první části bakalářská práce krátce představí autorův život nejen jako kritika, ale také jako esejisty a novináře, začátek jeho literární kariéry a proces psaní zmíněných děl. Prostřední část práce se bude věnovat *utopii* a *dystopii*: její definici, historii a vývoji v literatuře jako fiktivním žánru a ideologii totalitarismu. V poslední, klíčové části bakalářské práce přistoupíme přímo k analýze děl *Farma zvířat* a *1984* a budeme zkoumat jejich žánrové zařazení.

Klíčová slova

George Orwell, dystopie, utopie, Farma zvířat, Devatenáct set osmdesát čtyři

Abstract

The purpose of the bachelor's thesis *Genre analysis of anti-utopia in George Orwell's works* is to analyse the anti-utopian works *Animal Farm* (1945) and *1984* (*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 1949) written by British writer George Orwell. The first part of this bachelor thesis will shortly introduce the author's life not only as a critic but also as an essayist and journalist, the start of his literary career, and the process of writing the literary works mentioned earlier. The middle part of the thesis is dedicated to *utopia* and *dystopia*: its definition, history, and its evolution in literature as a fiction genre and ideology in totalitarianism. In the last, crucial part of the bachelor's thesis, we will proceed to the analysis of the works *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and we will be examining their genre classification.

Keywords

George Orwell, dystopia, utopia, *Animal Farm*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Orwell's life	2
2.1	Orwell's childhood	3
2.2	Orwell as a journalist and essayist.....	6
2.3	Becoming a writer	7
3	Utopia and dystopia.....	12
3.1	Utopia.....	12
3.1.1	Utopia as a <i>fiction</i>	13
3.1.2	Utopia as an <i>ideal</i>	14
3.1.3	Utopia as an <i>experiment</i>	14
3.1.4	Utopia as an <i>alternative</i>	15
3.2	Utopia in literature.....	16
3.3	Dystopia	17
3.4	Dystopia in literature	18
4	Totalitarianism	21
4.1	Totalitarianism and its propaganda	22
4.2	Totalitarianism and its organization	23
4.3	Totalitarianism and its ideology accompanied by terror	24
5	Genre analysis	27
5.1	Genre analysis of <i>Animal Farm</i>	27
5.1.1	Summary of <i>Animal Farm</i>	27

5.1.2	Analysis of <i>Animal Farm</i>	29
5.1.2.1	Language as a theme	29
5.1.2.2	Self-projection of the author in the novel.....	31
5.1.2.3	Propaganda in <i>Animal Farm</i>	32
5.1.2.4	Equality as a theme	32
5.1.2.5	Revolution in <i>Animal Farm</i>	33
5.2	Genre analysis of <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	34
5.2.1	Summary of <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	34
5.2.2	Analysis of <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	37
5.2.2.1	Language as a theme and language of The Party.....	37
5.2.2.2	Newspeak.....	38
5.2.2.3	Doublethink	38
5.2.2.4	Humanity	39
5.2.2.5	Self-projection of the author in the novel.....	40
5.2.2.6	Resistance in the form of sexual behaviour	41
5.2.3	Similar themes in both novels	41
5.2.3.1	Autobiography	42
5.2.3.2	An artificial enemy.....	42
5.2.3.3	The constant perpetuation of war.....	43
5.2.3.4	The truth	44
6	Conclusion.....	46
7	Works Cited.....	48

1 Introduction

Eric Arthur Blair, mostly known under the pseudonym George Orwell, is undoubtedly one of the most famous authors when it comes to utopian topics. His two most notable utopian literary works *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* made him famous and recognizable all over the world.

The bachelor's thesis is divided into three main parts. The first part of this study is going to be mainly theoretical – it will familiarise the reader with George Orwell's life, focusing on literary critiques, essays and journal works. It will also introduce how Orwell started his literary career, and what prompted him to write *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

The second part of the bachelor's thesis will be dedicated to the definition of utopia and dystopia – its history and evolution mainly in literature. Subsequently, I will deal with totalitarianism including its propaganda, organization and ideology, accompanied by the terror of the regime.

The third and last part of this study will analyse the two main literary works *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The analysis will be carried out from the viewpoint of genre analysis. Firstly, I will summarize both Orwell's works and then move onto the analysis. I will look at some themes that can be found in the novels and then I will take a look at some themes that are similar in both works. Finally, the main objectives of the bachelor's thesis and analysis will be summed up.

2 Orwell's life

Eric Arthur Blair, known mostly under the pseudonym George Orwell was born at Motihari in India on June 25th 1903, to his parents Richard Walmesley Blair, and Ida Mabel Blair who already had a daughter named Marjorie Frances, born in 1898 in Bengal. During the summer of 1907, Orwell moved with his family to London, however, his father returned to India in autumn. He entered Eton in 1917 where he became a regular contributor to different college periodicals. Orwell served with the Indian Imperial Police in Burma from 1922 to 1927 which inspired his very first novel called *Burmese Days* (1934). After his first novel was published, Orwell was poor for several years. Before moving back to England, he lived in Paris for two years where he worked successively as a private tutor, schoolteacher and bookshop assistant, and provided reviews and articles to a number of publications. Towards the end of 1936, Orwell was injured while fighting for the Republicans in Spain. His account of the civil war can be found in his memoir *Homage to Catalonia*. In 1938, Orwell was admitted to a sanatorium, and he was never entirely fit again after that. He participated in the Home Guard during World War II and from 1941 to 1943 worked for the BBC Eastern Service. He worked for the *Tribune* magazine as a literary editor and regularly contributed a page dedicated to political and literary commentary. Moreover, he also contributed to the *Observer* and later to the *Manchester Evening News*.

Orwell got diagnosed with infectious chronic tuberculosis in his lungs and passed away in January 1950 in London. Before his death, he wrote nine books. Six of them were novels: *Burmese Days* (1934), *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935), *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936), *Coming Up for Air* (1939), *Animal Farm* (1945), *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) and three of them non-fictions: *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933), *The*

Road to Wigan Pier (1937), *Homage to Catalonia* (1938) and published two short collections of essays.

2.1 Orwell's childhood

Orwell got a little less cagey and more easy-going about the past in his few days of popularity. He frequently alluded to his childhood torments. "Such, Such Were the Joys," his posthumously released memoir of his prep school days, is such a dismal and terrifying image of institutional authoritarianism that some have interpreted it as the beginnings of his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, rather than a commentary on the political events in Europe of the 1930s and 1940s. One of Orwell's close childhood friends described him as 'a specially happy child,' and criticized him for retouching, even distorting, his upbringing to add substance to his later, glum political preoccupations. When Orwell wrote about his life either as a child or as a teenager, several things had mixed implications, such as anguish and enjoyment, humiliation and nostalgia. His core recollections were vivid and strong, but the way he used them should not discourage one from having a reasonable picture of what his early upbringing was presumably like when he was still attending the local school (Crick 43-44)

The Blairs were an outing family and if Orwell's mother was away for a few days, the daily assistance, his mother's relatives or acquaintances, his elder sister or a local girl would take him on walks, challenging hikes, true journeys of exploration into the forests or down the riverbank. When his mother came back, she would plan more ambitious trips: blackberrying, hazelnut collecting, selecting wild fruits and flowers for making wine and preserves, or boating on the River Thames. The Blairs had a family doctor named Dakin, and at some moment, the Dakin kids started taking young Orwell fishing with them. Because Orwell adored fishing so much, he never stopped fishing at any point in his life, and therefore the symbolism of fish and fishing would reappear in his novel *Coming Up*

For Air (Crick 57-58). As already mentioned, Orwell had two sisters, an older sister named Marjorie and a younger sister named Avril, who was born after, Orwell's dad Richard, left back to India. Due to the five-year age gap between him and the other two sisters, he felt lonely and isolated and he blamed it on him being the 'middle child'. Throughout his life, he remained sincerely fond of his mother and two sisters, even though he did not show it very openly, but it is possible that there was some ambivalence in his approach. In look and mannerism, he may appear to be a military or colonial gentleman-bachelor, yet throughout his life, he established more friendships with women than with males, and the relationships were typically reciprocal, although there is some lack of perceptiveness in his portrayal of women (Crick 58-59).

Orwell defined his social class as 'lower-upper-middle-class'. He classified the 'lower-upper' as a member of the upper-middle class: short of money but not in a position to meet the full part expected of them by themselves and others, based on the education they acquired and the prestige they still held. Orwell was accepted at half-fees by Saint Cyprian's, one of the newest but most successful preparatory schools, after being highly recommended by his local Catholic school. It is speculated that the headmaster and the owner of the preparatory school Mr. Vaughan Wilkes and especially his wife Mrs. Wilkes offered young Orwell a scholarship. No one knew about it not even Orwell himself therefore it was a surprise for him when Mr. Wilkes told him about the scholarship, perhaps to work even harder. His personal testimony is preserved in two forms: the notorious and virulent "Such, Such Were the Joys," and some twenty-two boyish letters that he sent to his mother while in school (Crick 63-64).

Orwell struggled with money until the success of his novel *Animal Farm*. He, too, detested a culture 'infected with the mania of owning things' and gone 'money mad' yet he also realised a writer's freedom relied on making some. He was scared that because he

relies on that confidential scholarship, which Mr. Wilkes threatened him with, must have been tormenting at every step of his schoolboy and much of his adult life. It was a misery he would never forget, but he used it to better comprehend the psychology of the impoverished and downtrodden in his early works and, subsequently, to advocate for their interests (Crick 73).

Similar to the bullying problem of today's schools, Orwell experienced bullying himself when he was a young boy. He describes being repeatedly tormented by a boy in great shape and deciding to creep up on him and attack him hard by surprise which he did and wounded himself so badly that he started bleeding from his mouth. The kid then dared him to fight, which Orwell refused, and it took him by surprise that the boy did not want to continue to fight instead he left him alone. On that account, he claimed that it took him twenty years to realise that "the weak in a world governed by the strong" must "break the rules, or perish...have the right to make a different set of rules for themselves". However, he had previously been a victim of bullying (Crick 82). Sir John Grotrian, who was a year below Orwell at the prep school wrote:

And poor Blair didn't only suffer physically from his contemporaries. Mrs Wilkes herself, frequently in a rage of impatience while teaching the children, was not above resorting to violence. ... For that reason, Blair told us, he kept his hair very well greased so that the teacher's fingers would slip off! His hair was quite straight and butter coloured, his complexion cream. His face was moon shaped and all too often streaked with tears. (qtd. in Crick 83)

Given that Grotrian had never read anything written by Orwell and had never heard of his essay "Such, Such Were the Joys," this is powerful and imposing evidence (Crick 83).

Overall, the school appears to have been a horrible place for Orwell. On the one hand, his portrayal of the school appears genuine, on the other hand, it is not literal, and his depiction of his personal relationship with it and of its influence on him is either semifictional or grossly exaggerated (Crick 85).

2.2 Orwell as a journalist and essayist

Since Orwell had been politically conscious, similarly to other intellectuals of his period, the Spanish Civil War turned him into a political activist and therefore it made him a journalist, pamphleteer and polemicist. He went into the war with a powerful but unclear anti-fascist attitude and emerged from it having faith in Socialism and becoming an anti-Stalinist Communist and knowing that he had seen an unfairness that, if he could not correct, he must use his writing skills to document, so that justice might be done at least to the memory of his friends, which fought by his side during the war. He did not start working as a journalist in a genuine sense until he returned from Spain and having not enough money pressured him into journalism to earn his living since the army's medical unit denied him. Yet, he was now also a journalist because he wanted to be active, to speak out against the foolishness, ignorance, and misery he saw and felt, and to try to hold onto his conviction in the free, equal, and humane society he had only dimly seen in the early stages of the Spanish Civil War. Orwell's writing did not make much money and thus he got to the stage where he had to publish everything he wrote, such as his thoughts and feelings in various forms just to make a living and this stage lasted until 1945 (Orwell, *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940* 15).

As a journalist, what he did was argue out his thoughts as he went along, via article after article in the left-wing journal after left-wing journal, in little journals that often paid poorly and did not have many readers, but which he felt stood for something noteworthy,

almost as if he were talking to the reader, evaluating his thoughts in conversation. When viewed as a whole, his journalism performs a similar purpose to other writers' diaries and therefore it was not a replacement for writing novels or books, but it was in some ways the only option he had when he understood he could no longer write them due to the demands of the war. It was the result of a writer who, under better circumstances, would have chosen a different discipline, such as an essay, a novel or a book, but who was only capable of expressing himself in that fashion at that specific time and discovered that the only way he can channel his thoughts is in journalism (Orwell, *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940* 17).

Reprinting his journalism does, however, present one significant issue because he tended to address the same point from many angles and in various publications. According to Sonia Orwell (who edited the book *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940*, used as a secondary source here) this problem occurred especially because it was important for him to earn as much money as possible, but it was maybe because he struggled to think of anything else once he got on a stream of thought (Orwell, *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940* 17-18).

2.3 Becoming a writer

In his essay *Why I Write*, Orwell admits he knew it was destined for him that he should be a writer “from a very early age, perhaps the age of five or six, I knew that when I grew up I should be a writer. Between the ages of about seventeen and twenty-four I tried to abandon this idea, but I did so with consciousness that I was outraging my true nature and that sooner or later I should have to settle down and write books” (Orwell, *Why I Write* 1). He had no easy task ahead of him which was to tell about it his parents. His father was not happy about it as he wanted his only son to serve with the Burma police

not to write books. Orwell, as mentioned earlier, served with Burma police for five years but did not like it there, nor did he like the people.

During his teenage years, he found delight in mere words, meaning that Orwell liked how Milton played with words such as the spelling of 'hee' for 'he' and so on (Orwell, *Why I Write* 3). In his essay, he describes that after reading Milton's poem *Paradise Lost* he knew what kind of books he wanted to write: "I wanted to write enormous naturalistic novels with unhappy endings, full of detailed descriptions and arresting similes, and also full of purple passages in which words were used partly for the sake of their sound" (Orwell, *Why I Write* 3). He then says that his very first novel *Burmese Days*, based on his own experience while serving with the Indian Imperial Police in Burma, meets the requirements he wanted his very first book to meet (Orwell, *Why I Write* 3). However, resigning from the Service and becoming a writer brought into his life one big problem, poverty. During World War II, while he was writing for *American Reference Book*, Orwell describes that he was forced to find another profession to earn some living:

When I came back to Europe I lived for about a year and a half in Paris, writing novels and short stories which no one would publish. After my money came to an end I had several years of fairly severe poverty during which I was, among other things, a dishwasher, a private tutor and a teacher in cheap private schools. (qtd. in Crick 186)

As stated earlier, Orwell classified his social class as 'lower-upper-middle-class'. However, when he failed as a writer and therefore did not have enough money for living, only after that he truly understood and grasped the existence of the working classes. That might have prompted him to write an autobiography called *The Road to Wigan Pier*. In the book, he describes how unbearable was for him to experience poverty, and not have

a place to live. What also changed his perspective on poverty was his former judgements (Crick 309) Orwell states that he always imagined poverty as the absolute horror of having nothing to eat: “When I thought of poverty, I thought of it in terms of brute starvation. Therefore my mind turned immediately towards the extreme cases, the social outcasts: tramps, beggars, criminals, prostitutes. These were “the lowest of the low”, and these were the people with whom I wanted to get in contact. What I profoundly wanted, at that time, was to find some way of getting out of the respectable world altogether” (qtd. in Crick 193). Orwell belonged to the group called ‘respectable’ poverty, that is the kind of poverty that is the worst since it happens to a person out of the blue and especially to a decent person who has a job, but loses it by some unfortunate accident. But this part of poverty did not interest Orwell as he wanted to delve deeper. Due to his decision to live life as the lowest of the low such as tramps etc. he went to Limehouse Causeway to collect information about these people’s habits. (Crick 193). According to Crick, “the conscience of the scrupulous and fastidious man forced him to move into a world of dirt and squalor, but he did so with keen and stimulated discernment, even humour, not pain all the way” and this later turn up in a memoir called *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933) (193).

Subsequently, at the beginning of 1936, Orwell published his book named *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*, a socially critical novel. The novel did not, for the most part, contain any political issues, even though this year was rather full of political events. After writing this novel, Orwell’s focus shifted to more political topics. He set up a goal to write and publish a book every year. During 1938 precisely on March 8th, Orwell’s lungs started bleeding severely from a tubercular lesion which led to his death in 1950. The year 1940 begins and Orwell’s short essay called *My Country Right or Left* is being published in a periodical called *Folios of New Writing*. He describes that he had been dreaming about the war and its beginning (Crick 292, 398). Crick states that “to Orwell, the War became,

from school days, the “supreme sacrifice”; from Burma days, the final round of “the great game”; and from Spanish days, it was “the last fight” against fascism.” and that “Orwell could also plausibly believe that he personally, from his para-military training in Burma and from his discovery of a relationship between ideology and military effectiveness in Spain, had more to contribute to the war effort than most, whether in action or by advice: so his frustration was all the greater when no one wanted his services” (399-400). It is possible that Orwell felt so eager to contribute because he wanted to be heard. Even while the War spurred Orwell’s public spirit, the individual man was terribly disappointed that he was unable to write what he wanted or serve effectively (Crick 401).

Orwell got a job as Literary Editor of the *Tribune* magazine in 1943. As it is well known, he also worked as a broadcaster in the B.B.C., and unfortunately for him, the *Tribune* paid less than B.B.C., however, he did not mind it as this left him more room to write. Working for the *Tribune* magazine, he became a well-known writer and met a lot of people over *Tribune* business such as at protest meetings, pubs and parties. During his job as the editor, he began to work on his most famous allegory novel *Animal Farm* starting in November 1943 and finishing in February 1944, therefore, he wrote the whole novel in four months. He wrote to his friend that he had another novel in mind than *Animal Farm* and that he thinks that he might like it as well: “I am writing a little squib”, he told Gleb Struve in February 1943, “which might amuse you when it comes out, but it is not so OK politically that I don’t feel certain in advance that anyone will publish. Perhaps that gives you a hint of its subject” (Crick 472). We could potentially take this as a sort of evidence that Orwell had a plan on writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four* much sooner than writing *Animal Farm*. After the completion of the novel, he was more than sure that it was a great book, and after years of writing, he was, for the very first time, completely satisfied with his work (Crick 474).

Orwell entered Hairmyres Hospital near Glasgow on Christmas Eve in 1947 and had to be there for seven months. He was devastated because he could not write properly. After all, he was forbidden to write. The percentage from his novel *Animal Farm* was still growing yet, without a little journalism, it was not enough to live on. Even though he was ill he did not let that stop him. He wrote letters to his friends and *Animal Farm* was about to be translated. Before his death, he wrote the notorious known novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Similarly to *Animal Farm*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has never ceased selling because both have become modern classics rather than seasonal sensations (Crick 560, 562, 591).

3 Utopia and dystopia

3.1 Utopia

What is *utopia* is a question that has been raised by several academics. According to Vivien Greene, who is a curator of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, *utopia*:

Can refer to an ideal society, but what constitutes this society remains a point of disagreement. Whether a real utopia can exist and, especially, endure is a knotty question for debate, particularly in the era after Communism's fall, since utopian desires were often linked by twentieth-century intellectuals with totalitarian ideologies and the regimes of the Soviet Union and China. (2)

The term *utopia* was first used by Thomas More in his well-known and most notable work *Utopia* written in 1516. This piece of writing is a tale of a joyful island that a Portuguese traveller named Rafael Hythloday discovered during his journey. King Utopus created a functional state and because of that the existence of a good society was shown as possible. More gives the reader an appearance of likelihood, on the other hand, he indicates to the reader that *utopia* is still a literary genre, especially fiction as the term comes from Greek etymology and it means a non-existent place (Szacki 11). During More's time, the term was not used in any negative ways. In retrospect, the author tried to create an island, a place where people were happy and evil external stimuli were kept out of the 'existence of a good society'. We have to take into account that because it was a new word, a new genre, it was considered a neologism. Nowadays, the term is seen rather negatively than positively. Szacki divides *utopia* into four categories: fiction, ideal, experiment, and alternative.

3.1.1 Utopia as a fiction

Szacki states that in day-to-day communication the term *utopia* most commonly refers to “fiction, chimaera, a figment of the imagination that does not reckon with the facts, a project whose realization is impossible” (12). Not only is this one of the meanings of the term, but it is also questionable if this definition is not putting pressure on people who truly believe that a project can essentially be realised. “The qualification of something as a utopia appears in many cases to depend on the sociological and technological imagination of the qualifier” (13) expresses Szacki. Therefore, we can say with certainty that being born in, for instance, the 20th century is more limiting than being born in the 21st century. The things that were invented in the 20th century such as television, laser or the Internet were seen as impossible for people who existed centuries before. However, no one should be limited by the time in which they live or by the technologies of this time, because what cannot be done today will be possible in the next years as Szacki states “in many cases, it is not that a project is not yet feasible, but that most people are not yet able to imagine its realization, or that it is not possible at the moment but will become possible tomorrow or the day after tomorrow” (14).

The question that might arise is this: Are we talking about *utopia* or reality? And how can we tell the difference? If we look at it purely from the political perspective, many politicians came up with programmes which promised, for example, a bright future, modernisation and other things that were considered possible to fulfil. As Szacki states “fiction is everything that goes beyond the current existing status” (15). Does that quote imply that until the programme is accomplished, all promises are considered unfulfilled, and are hence *utopian*?

3.1.2 Utopia as an *ideal*

The term *utopia*, as stated above, can be understood in many ways. The second meaning that will be presented is how the term is viewed as an ideal. Szacki believed that “the term is often used to describe various visions of a better society, regardless of the chances of their realization” (16). He also states that “utopia becomes a synonym for a moral and social ideal, a utopian is anyone who is aware of evil and seeks protective measures against it” (16). Therefore, people should not conjecture if it is real or not. This concept of *utopia* is, unfortunately, a wide concept. Thus, the term *utopian* refers to a thinking individual rather than to a person who has a certain style of thinking. “Utopia is a dream that becomes a system, it is an ideal elaborated into a doctrine” (17) claims Szacki.

However, one could ask a question such as, what is the difference between *utopia* and myth? In his description of *utopia*, Szacki claims that “the antithesis of utopia, in this case, will be the myth born of life itself and organizing the experience of the masses, for example, Fourier’s phalanstery (which was a building designed for utopian community), meanwhile, Marxian communist society is a myth, for it is the expression of the enthusiasm of a living revolutionary movement” (17). Thus, we must remember that there is a distinction between *utopia* and *ideology*.

3.1.3 Utopia as an *experiment*

The third meaning that will be introduced is how *utopia* is perceived as an experiment. According to Szacki, “the notion of utopia is contained in concepts inspired by Ernest Mach, who found similarities between the social utopian and the scientist conducting a thought experiment to realize all the implications of a hypothesis” (18). Since it is impossible to artificially isolate certain components to investigate their relative relevance, a thought experiment is extremely important. For instance, More’s work

Utopia (mentioned earlier) can be read as an answer to a question: “What would the world look like if there were no private ownership?” states Szacki (19). When communists came to power in Czechoslovakia in the late 1940s, could they have tested what the world would be like if private property did not exist?

Likewise, questions have been raised about the two previous concepts, and this concept will be no different. The problem here is: What is the difference between *utopia* and science? According to Szacki “if utopia borders on fantasy, it is only because even the social sciences are far from it, but it is always animated by the pursuit of a better knowledge of the world by verifying in the mind what is not yet verifiable in reality” (19).

3.1.4 Utopia as an *alternative*

Last but not least, the concept can be viewed as an alternative. What do we imagine when we say the word alternative, second choice, or maybe another option? Szacki sees it as “the possibility of utopia is given along with the necessity of choice, that there is no utopia without alternative. Societies to which social order seemed to be the natural order, and in which being was identified with being must and can be, did not give birth to utopians” (20). Utopians do not see other options than ‘this or that’. There are no other options for them no other alternative. Therefore, it leads us back to our question. What is an alternative precisely? If the utopians cannot focus on other options and believe that humanity can start from the whole beginning (Szacki 20). Could this be considered as an alternative or just total ignorance on their side?

Equally to all the concepts above, this last concept also raises several questions. The first one is: What is the difference between *utopia* and reform? Is there a distinction between a *utopian* and a reformer? The main contrast, as claimed by Szacki, is that “the reformist accepts the old world as the basis of the new world; he sees in it only another

phase or another form of the same order. His element is a compromise, or precisely what the utopian rejects once and for all” (22).

The second question is: Is there a distinction between a *utopian* and a *revolutionary*? It is safe to say that *utopians* and revolutionists share similar values. Szacki believes that “even a revolutionary refuses consent, compromise and the identification of what is with what is to be” (22). On the other hand, he also states that even though they have something in common “most of the utopians were very far from revolutionism, either because they did not try to realize their intentions at all or because they tried to do so on a very limited scale and by moderate means” (22).

3.2 Utopia in literature

Utopia can be examined from many points of view. As stated earlier in 1516 when More wrote his fictional work, the term *utopia* was considered as a neologism. The term *utopia* has also been used to describe a particular genre of writing known as *utopian literature*, despite the fact that it was originally meant to refer to imagined paradisiacal locales. In this sense, it was a new literary genre, hence the necessity for a neologism was undoubtedly justified (Claeys, *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 4, 8). Claeys states that “one of the main features of utopia as a literary genre is its relationship with reality” (Claeys, *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 8). *Utopia* is essentially dynamic, although it is born of a certain set of circumstances, its scope of action is not limited to criticism of the present but presents the idea of projected ideas to be accepted by future audiences, and they can lead to actual changes (Claeys, *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 8). Therefore, talking about the utopian’s relationship with reality it sets the boundaries between reality and fiction. A man can escape or visit a nonexistent island and return to a real place which is home. According to Claeys “utopia is, in fact, a game, and implies the celebration of a kind of pact between

the utopist and the reader: the utopist addresses the reader to tell him about a society that does not exist, and the reader acts as if he believes the author, even if he is aware of the non-existence of such society” (*The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 8).

Utopia as a literary genre could be confused with another literary genre, namely *sci-fi* (science fiction). There is a distinction between those two literary genres:

There is a science fiction which continues to claim for itself some predictive or extrapolative function, from the discussion of space travel in the science-fiction magazines of the 1940 to the dystopian forecast of writers as diverse as John Brunner and Margaret Atwood, to an even greater degree, the effect or function of a utopia is for many readers that of a blueprint or representation of a better society.
(Claeys, *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 136)

Although science fiction does positively contribute to the *utopian* genre by raising awareness of the usage and significance of science and technology however, it does not mean transferring visitors to a new society, but the role of technology as a tool of social transformation (Claeys, *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* 139).

3.3 Dystopia

When one says the word *dystopia*, many people imagine a definition primarily used and taught in schools: *dystopia*, like *utopia*, is retrieved from two Greek words which are *dus* and *topos* that mean a terrible, defective, or disadvantageous place and is an idea of a society that has evolved in the wrong direction. In addition to the name *dystopia*, we can also encounter such names as *cacotopia* or *anti-utopia*. Similarly, just as Thomas More in his work *Utopia* wrote about an imaginary island where a ‘good society’ was created, George Orwell in his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* describes how this ‘good

society' developed in a bad direction in the future that was yet unknown to him. Orwell saw nothing good in *utopia*, which is why his most famous novels on the subject such as *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are rather negative and gloomy and thus, *dystopian*. Claeys states that *dystopia* 'conjures very unsettling images' such as apocalypses, death, suffering, misfortune, madness, various images of devastated surroundings, gloomy streets, or the sounds of flying planes, falling bombs and gunfire known as the sounds of war. (*Dystopia: A Natural History A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 3-4). According to Claeys, there are three main forms of the concept which are often connected: "the political dystopia; the environmental dystopia; and finally, the technological dystopia, where science and technology ultimately threaten to dominate or destroy humanity" (*Dystopia: A Natural History A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 5) and he continues with that "amongst these types, it is the totalitarian political dystopia which is chiefly associated with the failure of utopian aspirations, and which has received the greatest historical attention" (*Dystopia: A Natural History A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 5). Perhaps that is why Orwell conceived of his two works in the way he did since he had experienced the political movements.

3.4 Dystopia in literature

Another genre that is the exact opposite of *utopia* is *dystopia*. Assuming that while most literature may exist just to amuse us, dystopian fiction frequently serves a greater purpose. Dystopian books are set in imagined worlds where many things have gone wrong, while occasionally solutions are offered. Individual and (rarely) mass rebellions, frequently against collectivism, do take place, as may escapes from dangerous situations like nuclear war or environmental collapse. The revolts typically represent ideals that the

author wants the reader to identify with. In general, these principles tend to be ‘liberal’ or ‘humanist’ (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 269). That is why most of the literary works, which are written on this subject, are primarily negative. One could say that even though *dystopia* as opposed to *utopia* shows realness and points out what is wrong and immoral it must not be forgotten that the main thought is still about an imaginary society. It is not an easy task to distinguish what exactly *dystopia* and according to Marson:

Determining what is distinctive about the literary genre of dystopia has proven very problematic. Immense variation exists within the genre. Some dystopias are [. . .]. Dystopias are not reducible to the history of ideas, then. But their contribution to it, rather than an analysis of their literary forms, is our central, though not sole, focus here. (qtd. in Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 273-274)

At first glance, *utopia* and *dystopia* appear to be quite similar. Both genres attempt to construct an imaginary civilisation that is habitable and entertaining, yet one of them illustrates how such a society may degenerate into something negative. However, some *dystopias* do not promote anti-utopianism; rather, they develop as a result of current tendencies towards authoritarianism, economic monopolies, the exploitation of the poor, or environmental catastrophes. Some authors appear to repudiate all types of utopianism, while others appear to reject only one or other varieties. Since this bachelor’s thesis is primarily focused on George Orwell’s writing it is his approach to the genre that is most important to us at this time. The year 1914 was a turning point for both utopians and their opponents because the promise and danger posed by technology suddenly seemed to balance each other out and Orwell is viewed as a writer who imagines a future that

may, perhaps even must, arise from the present (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 274-275). Some authors believed that what made Orwell different from the other writers was his great pessimism where ‘even the promise of happiness is withdrawn’ which may appear that Orwell not only satirizes totalitarianism, but the ‘utopian form of society in general’ (qtd. in *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 275).

As in the case of *utopia*, there is a possibility to confuse the literary genre *dystopia* with the literary genre *science fiction*. As science develops, themes that were formerly associated with *science fiction* are now more commonly associated with *utopia* or *dystopia*. Therefore, *science fiction* is sometimes characterised as follows:

Portraying a world radically different from the present. But there are great variations in the degree to which what it projects is clearly impossible in the present, or merely varies in quality or quantity compared to the present state of scientific discovery and technological invention. (Claeys *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 286)

Adding to the confusion, certain factors are constantly changing and in view of the fact that fictional aliens and zombies continue to be a point of contention for humans, nevertheless, once considered science fiction, robots, cyborgs, and androids now exist (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 285-286).

4 Totalitarianism

In history and literature *dystopia*, also known as *anti-utopia*, was most frequently associated with the huge tragedies of despotism in the twentieth century. In an effort to understand how humanity went so horribly wrong and prevent such catastrophes in the future, a huge and complicated literature has emerged. Whatever we think of these efforts, it is certain that we cannot comprehend *dystopia* nor *utopia* without facing this past (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 113). The word *totalitarianism* is typically employed to differentiate modern despotism from its forebears as well as from authoritarianism or the police state. Although its connections with mediaeval Catholicism have frequently been observed, the term was thereafter largely ascribed to Nazi Germany in the 1940s. As stated by Neumann there are five key features: “the promise of security, action instead of program, quasidemocratic foundations, war psychology, and the leadership principle” (qtd. in Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 114). In the standard textbook written by Friedrich and Brzezinski, the research focused more on structure than origins, and it is noteworthy that it does not even mention Inquisition as a predecessor (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 115). Subsequently, Friedrich and Brzezinski claim that according to this definition, *totalitarianism* consists of an *ideology, a single party usually led by one man, a terroristic police, a communications monopoly, a weapons monopoly and a centrally planned economy*. It is also emphasised how historically singular this mix of qualities is. The ‘violent emotion’ that characterises ‘enthusiastic unanimity’ is also present. (qtd. in Claeys *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 115). Most commentators agree that totalitarian states differ from

other dictatorships by seven characteristics: *a one-party state, the use of technology to support the exercise of power by the regime, the willingness to destroy a substantial number of domestic enemies, the use of 'total terrorism' to intimidate the population, the willingness to eliminate many barriers between the individual and the party and/or state, the 'totalist' philosophy or ideology, often dedicated to the ideal of continuous revolution, and a cult of leadership* (qtd. in Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 116). However, this claim was later refuted as the study of totalitarianism changed in the 1960s, and these changes exposed faults and gaps in earlier views. Although the regimes of Stalin and Hitler are frequently regarded as dystopian, little research has been done to pinpoint precisely which idealistic elements of their construction may have contributed to this deteriorated condition (Claeys, *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions* 116).

4.1 Totalitarianism and its propaganda

According to Arendt (who was an American political philosopher born in Germany) the strength of *totalitarianism* lies in propaganda. She states that “wherever totalitarianism possesses absolute control, it replaces propaganda with indoctrination and uses violence not so much to frighten people (this is done only in the initial stages when political opposition still exists) as to realize constantly its ideological doctrines and its practical lies” (Arendt 341). Totalitarian movements are compelled to use what we often refer to as propaganda because the society in which they operate is not totalitarian and unfortunately the nontotalitarian segments of the population at home or in nontotalitarian nations overseas, however, are always the target audience for such propaganda (Arendt 342). When one thinks about *totalitarianism*, one envisions propaganda as well as the following traits of this system: terror. Arendt believes that “propaganda is indeed part and

parcel of "psychological warfare"; but terror is more. Terror continues to be used by totalitarian regimes even when its psychological aims are achieved: its real horror is that it reigns over a completely subdued population” simultaneously she follows with that “terror as the counterpart of propaganda played a greater role in Nazism than in Communism” (344). What is propaganda's real purpose then? Hadamovsky says that it is “accumulation of power without the possession of the means of violence” (qtd. in Arendt 361). Whereupon Arendt complements him by saying that therefore “the true goal of totalitarian propaganda is not persuasion but organization” (361).

4.2 Totalitarianism and its organization

The totalitarian movement does not use terrorism as a support for its propaganda - in contrast to other political movements -, but rather, the movement is quite serious about spreading misinformation. This seriousness manifests itself in a far more terrifying way in the organisation of his supporters than in the actual physical annihilation of his opponents (Arendt 364). Similarly, as in the previous subsection on propaganda, terror and propaganda go hand in hand; now it is the case here, where, on the other hand, organization and propaganda go hand in hand (qtd. in Arendt 364). Before *totalitarianism* takes power, a few steps are needed, among which is the creation of political front organizations that serve to divide who belongs to the party members and who, on the contrary, is a mere supporter of the political party or sympathizer (Arendt 364). On the other hand, Arendt argues that “the so-called ‘leader principle’ is in itself not totalitarian; it has borrowed certain features from authoritarianism and military dictatorship which have greatly contributed toward obscuring and belittling the essentially totalitarian phenomenon” likewise she adds that “much the same is true for the organization of an army and the military dictatorship established after its model; here, absolute power of command from the top down and . . . which is precisely why they are not totalitarian”

(364). If we continue to talk about the aforementioned ‘party members’ and ‘the sympathizers’ these two terms, if we call them this way, go once again, hand in hand, with the difference that they are now joined by members of the militant group. Arendt states that:

Just as the sympathizers constitute a protective wall around the members of the movement and represent the outside world to them, so the ordinary membership surrounds the militant groups and represents the normal outside world to them. A definite advantage of this structure is that it blunts the impact of one of the basic totalitarian tenets—that the world is divided into two gigantic hostile camps, one of which is the movement, and that the movement can and must fight the whole world—a claim which prepares the way for the indiscriminate aggressiveness of totalitarian regimes in power. (367)

Luckily for the totalitarian movement, there is one more advantage according to Arendt. The totalitarian model also has the benefit of being repeatable forever, which keeps the organisation flexible and allows it to perpetually add fresh layers and define new levels of militancy (Arendt 368). Another important thing that every movement needs is a leader. Every leader must fulfil certain functions. However, Arendt claims that the leader’s primary responsibility is to mimic the dual functionality that each tier of the movement has which are following: “to act as the magic defence of the movement against the outside world; and at the same time, to be the direct bridge by which the movement is connected with it” (374).

4.3 Totalitarianism and its ideology accompanied by terror

As in the previous chapter, where we discussed propaganda using terror as a tool to intimidate, this chapter will tackle something similar. According to Arendt, one could

interpret *totalitarianism* as “some modern form of tyranny, that is a lawless government where power is wielded by one man” (461). The goal of the totalitarian policy is to make humans active, reliable carriers of the law, as opposed to passively and grudgingly being subjugated to it in the absence of such a policy (Arendt 462) which we could say did not happen as most of the people did submit to this law not because they truly believed in it or were satisfied with it, but because of fear of what might await them if they decided to oppose it. Throwing them into concentration camps, if they were the lucky ones then just (to put it bluntly) into prison, killing them etc in short, terror. Totalitarian policy is so sure of itself and so blinded by itself that as believed by Arendt “its defiance of all, even its own positive laws implies that it believes it can do without any *consensus iuris* whatever, and still not resign itself to the tyrannical state of lawlessness, arbitrariness and fear” (462). So, when does terror reach its zenith? In Arendt’s view, “terror becomes total when it becomes independent of all opposition; it rules supreme when nobody any longer stands in its way. If lawfulness is the essence of non-tyrannical government and lawlessness is the essence of tyranny, then terror is the essence of totalitarian domination” (464). Because a totalitarian government must act like a tyrant in its early phases and obliterate the lines of created law, absolute terror is sometimes misunderstood as a sign of tyranny (Arendt 465). What is Arendt suggesting here is therefore that terror and tyranny are not the same or at least they are not used for the same purposes. Thus, we could say that *totalitarianism* or any movement of such kind uses terror for its start.

Ideology as such is according to Fuchs “a strategy of reproducing domination and exploitation that operates in the realms of communication, culture, psychology, emotions, and beliefs” (217). Arendt elaborates further that “the real nature of all ideologies was revealed only in the role that the ideology plays in the apparatus of totalitarian

domination” (470) which she supplements by saying that “there appear three specifically totalitarian elements that are peculiar to all ideological thinking” (470).

At first, Arendt states that ideologies often attempt to describe what will be, what is developing, or what is disappearing rather than what is, that they mostly concentrate on history and adding that the promise of entire interpretation includes the ability to explain all historical occurrences, fully understand the past, fully understand the present, and accurately forecast the future (470).

Thereafter, she talks about how the ideological way of thinking loses interest in experience because it insists that it cannot take anything new from it thus it is created a new reality which she refers to as ‘truer’ where the five senses, that man normally possesses, are no longer sufficient, but a sixth sense is required to be aware of this reality, which is provided by this exact ideology (Arendt 470-471).

Eventually, Arendt claims that the ideological way of thinking starts at some assumption and then from that it derives everything else where the derivation can be either logical or dialectic and when the assumption and the starting point are set up by the ideological way the experiences no longer obstruct ideological thought, nor can reality teach it (471).

5 Genre analysis

In order to analyse both Orwell's novels, it is important to define the term genre analysis. According to Kennell "genre analysis is a way to examine a model text to determine how that type of text is written—what features are necessary in order for the text to be considered part of that genre" and it also "focuses on what the author is doing" (Kennell). It is appropriate to summarise the novels' plots before we get started with the actual analysis.

5.1 Genre analysis of *Animal Farm*

5.1.1 Summary of *Animal Farm*

The story is set on a Manor Farm which belongs to Mr. Jones who is also its keeper. However, he is not very good at it. One could say he neither cares about the farm nor the animals there. All he does is drink beer. This administration does not satisfy the animals. Especially the old white boar called Old Major, and as he feels the need to protect or rather to take the situation into his own hands and after Mr. Jones is safely put to bed, he calls the animals into the barn for a meeting. Old Major is a very much appreciated animal there, so there is no surprise that the animals do not hesitate to show up at the barn. The boar tells the animals about the dream he has been having and that animal life is a cruel life, full of misery and slavery. He is attempting to convince the animals that a Rebellion is necessary for this to change. Three days after the meeting the Old Major dies and the animals have a new purpose.

Since animals regard pigs as the most intellectual of all of the animals there, the responsibility of Rebellion lay on their shoulders, particularly two young boars named Snowball and Napoleon and a small fat pig named Squealer. At night, these three pigs called meetings in the barn and taught the other animals the ideology developed from Major's teachings. As a result, they labelled this ideology as animalism. The Rebellion

started one night when Mr. Jones did not feed the animals and resulted in Mr. Jones, his wife and other farm workers fleeing and the pigs taking control over the farm. Soon after they renamed the farm Animal Farm and its hymn became a song called *Beasts of England*, their motto was *Four legs good, two legs bad*, and they also created *The Seven Commandments* that must be obeyed. According to animalism's principles, expanding it to other farms was required in order for the animals to flourish there as well, which other farm owners found objectionable. Therefore, the consequences were mainly battles and one significant which was named the Battle of the Cowshed, from which the animals emerged victorious. Another problem the animals faced was a rivalry between the two main pigs who ran the farm. However, Napoleon was more prepared than Snowball thus, the fight resulted in Snowball's defeat. He was banished from the farm for good. Hence Napoleon took control of the entire farm by himself and Squealer was his speaker.

After Napoleon took over, he ordered the construction of a windmill, which was originally Snowball's plan, but Napoleon began to pass it off as his own. The windmill is built three times. Once it falls and the second time it is destroyed by people. The animals have worse and worse conditions to live in, they work too hard and lack food. Squealer throws numbers and statistics at them about how their situation is getting better every year, and unfortunately, the animals blindly believe him. Meanwhile, the pigs, led by Napoleon, begin to inhabit Mr. Jones' house. They are just as indolent as people. They alter *The Seven Commandments*, sleep in beds, and consume alcohol. For instance, they alter the rules so that no animal may consume excessive amounts of alcohol or sleep on a bed made of sheets and say that all animals are still equal, but some are more equal than others and they kill other animals.

The most dedicated worker is a horse named Boxer, whose motto is that he must work better and with gusto. However, he works so much that he overworks himself. He

does not retire as promised but is taken to the slaughterhouse and animals who can read find out that Boxer is going to die. Squealer tells them that Boxer was taken to the hospital in a car that used to belong to a butcher, but was now bought by a doctor. The pigs became fully human because they learnt to walk on two legs and treat other animals like slaves, for example by whipping them and playing cards and drinking with other humans. The rest of the animals start to realize that they are not able to tell apart the humans from the pigs.

After all, the teaching that the Old Major preached was turned into dust as the pigs acted like humans. The *Seven Commandments* were forgotten and the farm was renamed back to Manor Farm and became a Republic with Napoleon as the President. The animals were once again suffering under the domination of a tyrant, only now it was not a man, nevertheless an animal.

5.1.2 Analysis of *Animal Farm*

In the analysis, we will take a look at *language, self-projection of the author in the novel* (autobiography), *propaganda, equality and revolution*.

5.1.2.1 Language as a theme

Usually, animals do not speak our language. They might understand what we say or recognise what we want them to do from the tone of our voice. Similarly, they cannot read. In Orwell's novel, the opposite is true. At the beginning of the novel, we can read that one of the pigs, particularly Old Major, speaks to the animals. It is safe to say that the animals can understand Mr. Jones. However, he is not able to understand the animals. That changes at the end of the novel because the men the pigs play cards with are actually able to understand what the pigs are saying.

What also distinguishes the other animals from the pigs is that most of them could not read. The only exceptions were the dogs, Benjamin the donkey, Muriel the goat, Clover and Mollie the mares and Boxer. The horse and other animals were not able to get further than to letter A.

According to Elbarbary, “Orwell’s repeated insistence on plain, firm language reflects his confidence in ordinary truth” (35). On the other hand, the animals particularly the pigs use language as a tool. The Old Major uses his words to persuade and manipulate the animals, just as a great speaker should or like Hitler or another speaker of that kind. Major in contrast to the narrator uses emotionally charged words and is more expressive, thus the reader could potentially feel his emotions. Major creates a paternalistic (the superior person’s belief that they alone know what is best for the subordinate) ambience with his elocutionary manner and exhorting accent which creates a disconnection between the freeing posture and authoritarian linguistic structure (Elbarbary 36). Therefore, instead of imparting his knowledge to the animals and trying to bring them together, he fits himself into the role of a saviour. He also refers to them as ‘comrades’ which is an official address in many countries with communist regimes hence it can indicate that the society in which the animals live already bears signs of that regime.

Besides Old Major, there is also Squealer who could be considered as a speaker after Major’s death when the pigs take over the farm. Elbarbary claims that even though the animals listen to him “in him we see nothing but convoluted words” (37). His name also captures his character as when he speaks, he speaks fast and squeals. On the other hand, he is quite skilful since he was able to convince the animals that Boxer was indeed taken to the hospital and not to the slaughterhouse.

5.1.2.2 Self-projection of the author in the novel

Benjamin the donkey, is at first glance an uninteresting character. He sees everything negatively, does not talk much and the reader could forget about him while reading. According to Kingsley, the character of Benjamin is “where his (Orwell’s) idealism and disillusion has landed him” Benjamin as stated above might be seen as boring, but in reality, he was more of an observer. He was very smart since he could read and write the same way the pigs did, although he never told anyone, never read anything to anyone and was negative all day and every day. The animals sometimes did not understand his thoughts and did not understand his statements. What is most interesting about him is that he never believed in the revolution. He did not care about it since he knew that nothing would change and eventually, it will end up in disaster. He was not only pessimistic but also sceptical. The only time he could not bear it anymore was when he tried to save his friend Boxer. However, he did not succeed and Boxer was taken to the slaughterhouse. Unfortunately, the animals, after all the events that happened after the revolution, could not remember what it was like before the revolution. The only one who did remember it was Benjamin. Therefore, Benjamin’s concerns came true.

Did Orwell self-project himself into Benjamin? Since he was pessimistic about the regime? According to Kirschner

Internally, however, what matters is that Benjamin tells the animals what they cannot 'read' for themselves, as the author/narrator has been doing for us. By usurping authorial function, Benjamin suddenly becomes the author-not by prudently keeping silent, but by placing sympathy before safety. He becomes Orwell when, through him, the 'author' suddenly seems to drop his mask and show where his heart lies.

(765)

5.1.2.3 Propaganda in *Animal Farm*

Since propaganda is also debated in this bachelor's thesis, as a part of *totalitarianism*, it is no surprise that it could be found in the novel as well. As a lay reader, one could not see the novel as a useful tool for propaganda. In the novel pigs use propaganda for the same purposes as the regimes do. Old Major tries to manipulate the animals to his advantage by scaring them and telling them that there are no better tomorrows thus there must be a revolution. After Mr. Jones is banished from the farm and the farm is renamed, the pigs start to work on a new teaching, a new regime. Discreetly, they are taking over the whole farm and in the process preaching the teachings they picked up from the Old Major. Needless to say, remaking them for their use and benefit and consequently, creating *The Seven Commandments*. Fleay and Sanders claim that "Orwell was not surprised by the use of his book as propaganda, because he intended that *Animal Farm* should be a work of propaganda" (65).

5.1.2.4 Equality as a theme

When the pigs take over the farm after Mr. Jones was banished, they come up with the *Seven Commandments*. One of the commandments is "All animals are equal" (Orwell, *Animal Farm* 42) which a reader understands as that indeed all animals are equal at the farm. No animal has the right to have more than others or to have any privileges. In short, they are equal. This was also the idea of the communist regime, or at least they promoted it as such, that everyone is equal no one has more no one has less everything is common and the same for everyone, but they secretly took more. Later the commandment changed to "All animals are equal but some are more equal than others" (Orwell, *Animal Farm* 126). It is now obvious that other animals than pigs are equal, however, pigs are better than the rest of the animals, thus only pigs are equal to each other.

Kearney claims that there might be another meaning that the slogan could carry which is “if ‘equal’ can mean something desirable and good, it can also in a primary sense mean no more than ‘identical’ or ‘same’. It is this meaning, I believe, that predominates in the slogan. The slogan should read, ‘some animals (not the pigs) are more equal (are more the same) than others (the superior pigs)’” and continues with “in the obvious reading of the slogan, equality is a desirable state of affairs, with the pigs claiming more of it for themselves; in the second reading it is distinctly undesirable, and the pigs want nothing to do with it” (63-64). Therefore a lay reader could also understand the word differently.

5.1.2.5 Revolution in *Animal Farm*

Animal Farm criticizes not only the totalitarian regime but ideology in general. In particular, Orwell criticises the Soviet regime under the rule of Stalin. Kingsley compares the two Bolshevik leaders, Josef Vissarionovich Stalin and Leon Davidovich Trotsky, with Orwell’s characters in the novel, Napoleon and Snowflake, where Napoleon takes over the role of Stalin and Snowflake takes over the role of Trotsky (45). Napoleon himself is not a great speaker, thus he needs Squealer to take this lead. On the other hand, Snowflake does not require such a helper, which may have fuelled Napoleon’s fear and the need to get rid of him.

What was the real purpose of the revolution then? According to Connolly, a revolution is “the forcible removal of an obsolete and inefficient ruling-class by a vigorous and efficient one which replaces it for as long as its vitality will allow” (47). Thus, the animal’s revolution aimed to overthrow and then banish Mr. Jones from the farm and make the farm a better place for the animals to live in, without being mistreated. However, what the animals got for carrying out that revolution was indeed a better life at

first, although later everything went back to the way it was, with only a change of leader at the head post.

5.2 Genre analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

5.2.1 Summary of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

It could be said that the story is divided into three parts. In the first part, the author describes the environment in which the main character Winston Smith lives, as well as his first thought, processes about whether the society he lives in is right. In the second part Julia, a girl with the same intention to stand up to the party and with the same ideas as Winston, is introduced and the rest of this part shows how the relationship between these two characters and their efforts to join the resistance develops, and the third part focuses mainly on Winston and Julia's discovery of their love affair and the revelation of their plan to join the resistance, and also it focuses on O'Brien's efforts to 'program' Winston back into their puppet, of course by violence.

The whole plot takes place in the year 1984. The world is divided into three Powers which are: Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia, which are constantly at war. The totalitarian tyranny of the Big Brother Party and Ingsoc rules Oceania where the Big Brother is the absolute ruler although no one ever saw him and the citizens must believe that he is real. Winston Smith lives in Oceania and is a member of the Inner Party. He works at the Ministry of Truth where his job is to rewrite the old issues of the newspapers to more current events primarily about the war. As time goes by, Winston starts to think increasingly about the past, about his sister and his mother who disappeared and he never saw them again. As well as about the doctrine which the Party passes on. Thinking that Big Brother is not real, he begins writing a journal and considers joining the resistance, but at the same time, he is seeking someone who shares his beliefs and ideals. In this matter, a girl named Julia, who is also a member of the Inner Party and who, like Winston,

doubts the Party and Big Brother's regime, becomes his ally and, later, his lover. They have to hide because in Oceania it is forbidden to make love and if two people want to be together or enter into a marital relationship, they must be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose. In fact, they enter the marriage into marriage only to give offspring for the service to the Party. The two people must not be attracted to each other in any way, and certainly not sexually. Unfortunately for Winston and Julia, this is their unfortunate curse, as they are not only sexually attracted to each other but actually fall in love.

They first meet when Winston decides to go to the toilet and Julia just appears at the end of the corridor and as she walks towards him, she stumbles and falls down on her face. He helps her up and she slips something into his hand. It is a small piece of paper with 'I love you' written on it. From then on, they began to see each other more often, first meeting in the woods and later renting a small room above Mr. Charrington's shop, from whom Winston also bought his diary. Naively, they think there are no televisions in the room to watch them, so they think they are safe from the Party and Big Brother and can talk to each other openly about everything. Later Winston also meets a man called O'Brien whom he perceives as an ally and who does not agree with what the Party promotes as well. Despite the fact that both O'Brien and Winston are Inner Party members, their lifestyles could not be more unlike. O'Brien has servants, food that is high quality and even the privilege of turning off the television hence not being constantly watched by Big Brother. He assures both Winston and Julia that there is indeed a resistance which tries to overthrow the Party. He asks them several questions such as what they are willing to give up and sacrifice for them to succeed. They both agree to everything O'Brien suggests except when he asks if they are ready to separate and never see each other again, whereupon Julia promptly replies in the negative that they are not.

Even so, they are determined to stand up to the regime. He then sends them the book which Goldstein wrote which is supposed to be ‘a compendium of all the heresies’ (Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 7). Winston reads through it and in the morning as he and Julia talk about the fact that the society they live in is dead, that they are dead, a voice behind the painting says that they are indeed dead, then they both realize that Mr. Charrington lied about the fact that there are no televisions in the room and that one is hiding behind the painting and therefore Big Brother has been watching them all this time and knew about everything.

Everything collapsed in his hands. Mr. Charrington was eventually a member of the Thought Police and came to arrest them through violence, of course, even though neither of the lovers resisted. Winston was separated from Julia, did not know where she is but was still committed to her. A long, painful, and shameful days followed for Winston led by O’Brien’s presence. He tried to reprogram Winston back, in short, to make him a figurehead as easily manipulated as the rest of the population. A figurehead who focuses not on what was but what is now and is loyal to the regime and above all to Big Brother. Eventually, Winston relented and allowed himself to break and capitulate. He no longer tried to fight for the humanity he thought he had left in him, no longer tried to resist the regime. One day Winston was brought to room number 101 which was a room everyone was scared of and nobody knew what was happening in there. In this room, Winston was tied to a chair and O’Brien told him that a cage of rats would be put in his face and they would tear him apart. Not wanting to suffer any more, Winston betrayed Julia and asked O’Brien if she could get this punishment instead. O’Brien agreed.

The last time Winston is seen is at the Chestnut Tree Café sitting alone and drinking the Victory Gin. He and Julie met again, quite by chance, in Hyde Park. They had no chemistry, Winston hugged her, but that was as far as he could go as he noticed a

scar on her face. Even though they agreed to meet each other again they never did. Winston was left alone with nobody to love but Big Brother.

5.2.2 Analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Similarly to the analysis of *Animal Farm*, we can find various themes in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, such as *language, doublethink, newspeak, doublespeak, humanity, self-projection of the author in the novel* (autobiography) and *totalitarianism*.

5.2.2.1 Language as a theme and language of The Party

Since Oceania is already divided by the consequences of the war and it has an established system, everyone belongs somewhere. Either you are a member of the Party or a prole, who has no affiliation and is in fact, a disgrace to the whole society. The proles are of no use to the Party since they do not believe in the Party and do not support it. According to Bailey, Orwell finds symbolic the presence or absence of the initial *h*, because in Great Britain it separated the social classes. Therefore, he used it in his novel to distinguish the Party members from the proles (62). However, we can read in the novel that even though Winston is a member of the Inner Party, he is somewhat sympathetic to the proles. Indeed, he wrote in his diary that he once visited the place where the proles lived. Bailey states that speech variations in the novel are the result of societal divides rather than their origin (63). Therefore, it did not matter where you were from or if you were a member of the Inner Party, but where you stood socially. Winston was indeed a member of the Inner Party and as we know he was not socially as highly positioned as O'Brien was, although they were both Inner Party members. Bailey claims that Orwell in his novel uses an accent called 'cockney accent'. It was allegedly spoken by those of lower standing such as proles, Winston, Julia and others (63-64).

The so-called language of the Party is expressed in a number of interrelated varieties that are briefly mentioned, quoted, or described. As is customary in this novel

(cf. Cockney), there is not much speech in this category, but the samples are memorable because they are exaggerated in a striking way (Fowler 93).

5.2.2.2 Newspeak

Newspeak is a language which the Party created for its own personal purposes. It is based on Oldspeak (standard English); however, its grammar is simpler. It is favoured by the Party to manipulate its members, and, simultaneously, propagate its ideology. Its main goal was to restrict human thought and the ability to think freely. It was supposed to reach such a stage that people would become no more than puppets repeating the Party's slogans. However, that is exactly why the Party came up with such language, i.e., to manipulate people and brainwash them.

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought—that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc—should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words. (Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 174)

According to Fowler “newspeak seems rather to be presented as the implausible fantasy of an overconfident regime” (93).

5.2.2.3 Doublethink

The word *doublethink* means that there are two versions of one idea, and you have to be able to accept them both, even though you know one of them is wrong. The Party required this of all its members. No one was allowed to think independently. No one was allowed to express an opinion that refuted the Party's claims, and if they did, they would be

summarily and appropriately punished. But since most Party members were afraid to express their own opinions, there was little need for such punishments. Except for Winston, who was dominated by a desire to think freely and to declare that two plus two make four and not five as the Party claims. However, this phrase hides more than the mathematical fact that Winston's calculation is correct. It hides the idea that what the Party proclaims is not always, or most of the time, true. This is how Orwell's character Winston, describes *doublethink*:

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

(Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 19)

5.2.2.4 Humanity

The Party uses people for its purposes. Because people do and say what the Party tells them, it is therefore easy for the Party to control them. We do not know what Oceania was like before the endless war, we do not even know what the people were like before it. In the novel, the people of Oceania are presented to us as walking bodies without souls, doing their jobs in the ministries, like Winston. With him, we get a glimpse into his past, which, gives us a little insight into the character, although nothing is said about the past.

At the end of the novel when Winston is tortured and re-educated back into a manipulative figure. He tells O'Brien that he still believes that the Party will be overthrown. O'Brien then laughs at him and responds by saying that there is no one to overthrow them and if Winston thinks there is he shall tell him who. Whereupon Winston replies that it will be the spirit of a Man. O'Brien then asks Winston if he considers himself human and Winston replies in the affirmative and with conviction. "If you are a man, Winston, you are the last man. Your kind is extinct; we are the inheritors. Do you understand that you are alone? You are outside history, you are non-existent" (Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 156) that is O'Brien's response to Winston and to further ridicule Winston he finally unties him from the bed and puts him in front of a mirror, saying "you are the last man," said O'Brien. 'You are the guardian of the human spirit. You shall see yourself as you are. Take off your clothes'" (Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 156). What Winston see was nothing more than the remains of the 'man'.

5.2.2.5 Self-projection of the author in the novel

It is safe to say that while writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Orwell may have projected himself, intentionally or unintentionally, into the character of Winston. They are both unsatisfied with the regime and both cling to the past. In the same way that Winston finds a lovely paperweight in an old shop and clings to it as if it were a type of life preserver, Orwell hailed junk shops in the Evening Standard in 1946, extolling the delights of 'useless' artefacts from a period before Hitler, Stalin, and atomic bombs (Shelden 96). Thus, both of them try to return to the times before the war and the horror, at least in their memories. At the end of the story, although Winston is active all the time and tries to think of various ways to overthrow the Party and wants to join the resistance, he becomes a broken man, deprived of all his dreams and optimism, just like Orwell, who

was already very ill when he wrote this novel and perhaps this is what caused his decision to deal with Winston's fate as he did.

5.2.2.6 Resistance in the form of sexual behaviour

In Oceania, a relationship between two people has to be approved by a committee, and children produced by sexual intercourse are to become party members. Winston had a wife, Katharine, with whom he tried to have a child. Unfortunately, each time it was unsuccessful until his wife finally left him because she felt she had betrayed the Party by not giving them a child. Winston once also had sex with a prostitute on the day he visited a place where proletarians live. about He later noted it in his diary. But his most important sexual relationship was with Julia. Their sex was not merely an obligation to procreate another member, but one of love, affection and passion. Eroticism was banned by the Party. Sex drive produced a universe of its own uncontrollable by the Party and that, as a result, ought to be eliminated at any cost. More crucially, sexual deprivation causes frenzy, which is desired since it may lead to battle fever and hero worship (Beauchamp 46). The so-called Junior Anti-Sex League was created to spread the message that sexual pleasure is evil and that sexual activity is only beneficial for the birth of children for the Party to assure that people would only adore Big Brother. According to Beauchamp "the rulers of Oceania have grasped the threat to utopianism posed by man's sexuality and are moving drastically to destroy or displace it" (46).

5.2.3 Similar themes in both novels

Since both novels are written in the same genre and on the same theme, it is no surprise that we can find identical or similar themes in both of them. These are: *autobiography, an artificial enemy, the constant perpetuation of war and the truth.*

5.2.3.1 Autobiography

In both novels, it is possible to find references to the author himself.: whether as Benjamin the donkey in *Animal Farm* or the main character in his novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In both cases, we can find signs of the author.

However, the two characters are different in nature. Where Benjamin is negative, pessimistic and simply does nothing to change the expansion of the pig's regime, Winston on the other hand, is very active. He wants to join the Brotherhood, he is always thinking about overthrowing the regime of the Party and Big Brother and is actively taking action. Benjamin, on the other hand, will not let the regime and ideology change him, and does not actively fight against it, he despises it internally. These two characters also differ in how their story ends in the novels. Benjamin goes through the revolution and is one of the few who remembers life as it was before the regime, but he remains as pessimistic as he was at the beginning. The revolution and regime change has neither brought nor taken anything away from him.

Winston, on the other hand, was scarred by the consequences that befell him, despite his involvement during the regime. He lost the battle, violence was used against him, his love was snatched from him, and he was shamed into becoming a guy he would never be recognised again.

5.2.3.2 An artificial enemy

For the regime to maintain its power both on the farm and in Oceania, it was necessary to create the so-called artificial enemy whom the other members could hate and blame. In this way, both regimes maintained their position and power, as anything that came in the way of their power could easily be blamed on the enemy.

On the farm, it was Snowball who was declared an enemy by Napoleon after the pigs kept arguing and arguing over who should be the leader. Since Napoleon was, let us say, more cunning in this regard, Snowball paid the price (with exaggeration), was banished and all the animals hated him and blamed him for everything that went wrong on the farm.

In Oceania, it was Goldstein whom the Party created to preserve power. He was the leader of the Party, but he betrayed and was therefore sentenced to death, but escaped and hid somewhere unknown. Although the people of Oceania are supposed to believe in him, no one has ever seen him like Big Brother. Goldstein is the arch-enemy of the Party and all the attacks come from his side, so everything evil that happens to the citizens of Oceania is his fault. The only thing that supported the idea that Goldstein really existed was a book that did not even have a name, it was just called *a book*. It was considered Goldstein's doctrine, and therefore, forbidden.

5.2.3.3 The constant perpetuation of war

As in the previous chapter, the regime needs another thing to maintain power besides the creation of an artificial enemy. That is the constant perpetuation of war.

The first disturbances on the farm were between animals and people, especially with Mr. Jones. However, we would not call that a war yet. After the pigs Napoleon and Snowball came to power, there were also disagreements between them which did not lead to war as such. The war started after Napoleon expelled Snowball. The three farms constantly at war were Animal Farm, Pinchfield Farm and Foxwood Farm. It was always two of the farms against the third. Of course, Napoleon controlled everything, especially the alliance. So whichever farm offered him what he needed at the time was the ally. The farm that offered him nothing for his own needs at the moment he called Snowball's Asylum, therefore an enemy farm. However, Napoleon did not tell anyone about his

decision with whom he was allying, and therefore the animals lived under the assumption that the state of the alliance was still the same, even if it was not true.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, three powers are also constantly at war with each other. Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia. Similar to *Animal Farm*, the war between these powers is controlled by the Party. It decides with whom it will be at war and with whom it will maintain an alliance. Although the animals do not question Napoleon, Winston and Julia do question the Party. Julia does not believe in the war at all and considers it a lie that the Party tells its members. Winston is confused as to why they are at war with Eurasia when they were in alliance with it. Of course, as mentioned in the thesis, the Party does not support the individual views of its members, thus what the Party says is always true in all circumstances.

5.2.3.4 The truth

The truth is something that, in both novels, becomes part of the manipulation of both regimes on the farm and in Oceania.

When the animals took over the farm and the pigs took over the government, they wrote down the aforementioned commandments. *The Seven Commandments* were supposed to be holy and no one was allowed to break them. However, the pigs began to modify *The Seven Commandments* to suit them and their own advantage. The animals were thus manipulated into thinking that the commandments were written properly and correctly. The same case then happens with Boxer. He is supposedly taken to the hospital, which does not seem right for Benjamin the donkey, as he is the most intelligent of all the animals, and can read and write, thus he notices that something is not right with the car. Therefore he tries to tell the animals that Boxer was not taken to the hospital but to the slaughterhouse. Squealer takes the floor and convinces and manipulates the animals that

Boxer was indeed taken to the hospital, but unfortunately, he did not make it and died. He makes them believe that he was with him and listened to his very last words.

I was at his bedside at the very last. And at the end, almost too weak to speak, he whispered in my ear that his sole sorrow was to have passed on before the windmill was finished. 'Forward, comrades!' he whispered. 'Forward in the name of the Rebellion. Long live Animal Farm! Long live Comrade Napoleon! Napoleon is always right.' Those were his very last words, comrades'. (Orwell, *Animal Farm* 117)

Likewise, on the farm, there is only one truth in Oceania and that is what the Party says. What the citizens think or seem to remember from the past is wrong. Winston works at the Ministry of Truth, so it is he who is involved in the falsification of truth, but at the same time, he is the one who seeks the truth. He tries to discern what is true and what is the falsehood the Party disseminates amongst its members. The Party modifies the truth for its benefit and above all for the way the war is being fought. Winston has to rewrite a lot of news and reports during his working hours. Sometimes he has to delete a person whose picture has appeared in the newspaper, mostly to make others forget about them because the Party considered him a liability. The truth was unwanted and therefore it threatened the Party and its regime it had to be destroyed. The Party modified the truth not only about the war but also about the environment in Oceania. However, no one but Winston noticed or questioned how the newspapers might have been reporting something that the standard of living did not reach. The Party has discovered that there will not be any challenge to their government and, as a result, no reason to overthrow them if they lie about their history and distort the facts to their benefit.

6 Conclusion

The purpose of the bachelor's thesis entitled *Genre analysis of anti-utopia in George Orwell's works* was to analyse the anti-utopian works *Animal Farm* (1945) and *1984 (Nineteen Eighty-Four, 1949)* written by George Orwell. It had three main parts that were introduced individually.

Firstly, it was important to look at Orwell's childhood, and his life and career, which helped us understand why the author himself was drawn to dystopian elements. During his career, Orwell came into contact with war and the fledgling regime which prompted him to write his two novels.

Secondly, it was also necessary to focus on the genres themselves. What exactly defines *utopia* and *dystopia* and how these two genres differ. *Dystopia* is to be understood as a reaction to *utopian* thought, because 'dreaming' the best can lead to the threat of the worst. Both utopia and dystopia 'dream' of creating a perfect society, except that in dystopian thinking this society collapses. Similarly, *totalitarianism* and its ideology 'dreams' of a perfect society and what is best for them. This 'dreaming', however, proved problematic, as the society created by the ideology was far from perfect, nor was it the best that the ideology could offer to people. Therefore, to understand Orwell's works, it was necessary to define totalitarianism and the things that accompany its power. These tools used by the regime can also be found in Orwell's works.

Lastly, the analysis of both novels was carried out. I first outlined the plot of the novels and then analysed different themes. I examined each novel separately, as there are themes in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that would not be found in *Animal Farm*. The analysis shows that the tools used by the regime to get into power and especially to maintain its power appear in both novels. I also focused on themes that can be found in both novels at the same time. Although the main characters in one novel are animals and in the other

fictional people, it is possible to find common elements in both works. This is what makes Orwell's works all the more interesting. From the concept of a fable, he pointed out the conditions of the time and thus, got into the subconscious of the people and at the same time, he was so consciously fighting against the injustice that surrounded him.

Although the subject is not a current one, even though there is a possibility that in the future someone will reawaken a fondness for totalitarian ideology and will try to restore the regime. Our society will not let it go that far when these days we can reach our hands to, thanks to many and Orwell is one of them, literature which fulfils the task not only of entertainment and reading pleasure but also of spreading awareness of the dangers of that very system. Thus, Orwell still has much to offer, either as a person or as the author of two interesting novels that I believe, will continue to be a source of entertainment and enlightenment.

7 Works Cited

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Company, 1985.

Bloom, Harold, and Anthony Kearney. "Anthony Kearney on the Meaning of Equality." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2006, pp. 63–65.

Bloom, Harold, and Cyril Connolly. "Cyril Connolly on the Betrayal of the Russian Revolution." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2006, pp. 46–48.

Bloom, Harold, and Gorman Beauchamp. "Gorman Beauchamp on Sexual Behavior as a Form of Resistance." *Bloom's Guides: 1984*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2004, pp. 45–47.

Bloom, Harold, and Martin Kingsley. "Kingsley Martin on Orwell's Cynicism and Benjamin." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2006, pp. 44–46.

Bloom, Harold, and Michael Shelden. "Michael Shelden on Autobiography and the Novel." *Bloom's Guides: 1984*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2004, pp. 95–97.

Bloom, Harold, and Richard W Bailey. "Richard W. Bailey on the Use of Language." *Bloom's Guides: 1984*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2004, pp. 61–67.

Bloom, Harold, and Roger Fowler. "Newspeak and the Language of the Party." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: 1984, Updated Edition*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2007, pp. 93–109.

Bloom, Harold, and Samir Elbarbary. "Language as Theme in *Animal Farm*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Animal Farm—New Edition*, Bloom's Literary Criticism, New York, United States of America, 2009, pp. 35–44.

Bloom, Harold, et al. "C. Flyay and M. L. Sanders on George Orwell and Propaganda." *Bloom's Guides: Animal Farm*, Chelsea House, New York, United States of America, 2006, pp. 58–62.

Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia: A Natural History: A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions*. 1st ed., Oxford University Press, 2017.

Claeys, Gregory. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Crick, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Life*. Sutherland House, 2019.

Fuchs, Christian. "Ideology." *Communication and Capitalism: A Critical Theory*, University of Westminster Press, London, United Kingdom, 2020, pp. 217–234. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv12fw7t5.13>. Accessed 19 Apr. 2023.

Greene, Vivien. "Utopia/Dystopia." *American Art*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2011, pp. 2–7., <https://doi.org/10.1086/661960>. Accessed 16 Apr. 2023.

Kennell, Vicki R. "Genre Analysis & Reverse Outlining." *Genre Analysis & Reverse Outlining - Purdue OWL® - Purdue University*, Purdue Writing Lab, 2020,

https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/graduate_writing/thesis_and_dissertation/genre_analysis_reverse_outline.html. Accessed 20 Apr. 2023.

Kirschner, Paul. "The Dual Purpose of 'Animal Farm.'" *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 55, Nov. 2004, pp. 759–786., <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3661599>. Accessed 28 Apr. 2023.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. 50th ed., Signet Classic, 1996.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Signet Classic, 1984.

Orwell, George. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters And Letters Of George Orwell: An Age Like This, 1920-1940*. Edited by Ian Angus and Sonia Orwell, vol. 1, Penguin Books, 1970.

Orwell, George. *Why I Write*. Penguin Books, 2004.

Szacki, Jerzy. *Utopie*. 5th ed., vol. 1, Mladá Fronta, 1971.