

I. Political Concept of George Orwell

George Orwell, the pseudonym of English author, journalist, critic and social commenter Eric Arthur Blair was born on June 25, 1903 in India and educated in England at Eton College. Orwell experimented various life styles and wrote his own experience in most of his works, He was a police official in Burma, tramp in England, dishwasher in Paris, worker in bookshop in London, became literary editor of 'Tribune,' worked as producer and broadcaster of BBC talks for India and also fought in Spanish Civil war. Most of his works are politically motivated that trigger the feeling of injustice and oppression in society. Regarding, his political views Orwell is somehow ambivalent. Being true lover of freedom, he sharply condemned totalitarianism and kept on questioning the official or accepted version of truth throughout his life.

His writings are generally occupied with poverty and domination. Origins and nature of poverty and its dehumanizing effects are particular subject matter of his writing in general and especially of *Down and out in Paris and London*. Multiple consequences of economic injustice that leads to poverty is the projection of his own life in London and Paris. In regard to his own life and experiences Orwell, in his essay *Why I Write* says:

. . . in a peaceful age I might have written ornate or merely descriptive books, and might have remained almost unaware of my political loyalties . As it is, I have been forced in to becoming a sort of pamphleteer. First I spent five years in an unsuitable profession (the Indian Imperial Police in Burma) and then underwent poverty and the sense of failure. Thus increased my natural hatred of authority and

made me for the first time fully aware of the existence of the working classes, and the job in Burma had given me some understanding of the nature of imperialism: but these experiences were not enough to give me an accurate political orientation. Then came Hitler, the Spanish Civil War, etc (184).

Describing the poverty of the cities like London and Paris Orwell began his writing career with the publication of *Down and out in Paris and London*. In the book Orwell describes his own experience of visiting London and Paris as tramp. He examined the poverty and its causes. He also experienced and wrote the life of extreme hunger and dirt that made him acquainted with poverty. Living the life of the tramp in London he learned the ordinary people and causes of their suffering. Industrial depression, unemployment social inequality etc. as root causes of the suffering became the subject matter of his writing. Most of his works contain the subject matter of poverty, unemployment, social oppression and inequality and attempts of his hero/ heroine to flight against.

Gordon B. Beadle, regarding the themes of poverty and Orwell's school life writes:

. . . the social and psychological origins Orwell's intense preoccupation with poverty have been a source of considerable speculation. Much has been much has been made of the posthumously published "Such, Such Were the Joys. . ." and the pathetic self portrait it presents of Orwell's preparatory school days as the poor boy among the rich, who was bullied and humiliated and left at an early age with "the deepest conviction" that he was doomed failure in the world that was totally at the mercy of economically governed "armies of unalterable laws". The

memory of his unhappiness at St. Cyprian's was so intense that two decades later Orwell was moved to observe that "probably the greatest cruelty one can inflict on a child is to send it to school among children richer than itself" It may well have been true as Orwell insisted, that an English lower- upper - middle class" child of early years of this century was "conscious of his poverty and destined to "suffer snobbish agonies such as a grown-up person can scarcely imagine". However it's difficult to understand why a real or imagined victim of the social and economic snobbishness of the English preparatory school system should have felt compelled to undergo the experiences described in Orwell's *Down and out in Paris and London* (186).

His autobiographical writing *Burmese Days* is also a recollection of his experience when he was a police officer in Burma. Orwell has projected the sense of hatred towards imperialism. He was a frustrated police officer for he disapproved the role he was given as an authoritarian. Flory, the hero of the novel is representative of Orwell himself as a frustrated, self-critical and ambivalent colonial agent. Gordon B. Beadle, appreciating Orwell as an anti-colonialist in his novel *Burmese Days* writes:

. . . *Burmese Days*, a bitter attack upon British imperialism in the East, but there is no attempt to confront the much larger problem of Asian poverty. Yet in a curious way, the years in Burma (1922-27) appear to have sharpened Orwell's sense of social awareness. As he saw it there was a connected British imperialism abroad. Orwell gradually came to think of the exploited members of the English working class as "the symbolic victims of injustice playing the same part in England as the Burmese played in Burma" (193).

As in other novels Orwell in *Burmese Days* also explores the consequences of poverty and its dehumanizing effect upon the people. Besides, he disapproves imperialism.

In *Shooting and Elephant*; Orwell explores how both the colonized and colonizers are dehumanized. As in his other works, he shows the nascent anti-colonial sentiment in Burmese people. The activities of Burmese people that are motivated to insult the colonizers are presented as tool to fight against imperialism. Regarding the issue of imperialism and anti-imperialism *Shooting in Elephant* can be criticized as ambivalent as the author (narrator) himself, a police officer in the one hand an independent individual on the other. Being a colonial agent, no matter how much he condemns colonialism, he is not very much able to get rid of colonial psyche. The assumption of self superiority and concept of responsibility upon others can be found in this essay. Shooting an Elephant as a metaphor is interpreted as his anti-imperialist psyche or shooting the colonization. The argument that shooting is the projecting of his colonial psyche or his desire to write and define the others is equally strong. However Orwell has written his experience as a police officer in Burma that presents the psychological conflicts in him. The conflict is between his divided self loyalists. Because of tyrannous and repressive rule of handful British, he felt ashamed and resigned his job in Burma.

Orwell has given an existential touch to his semi-autobiographical novel *A Clergyman's Daughter*. The experiences of the major characters in the novel are similar to that of *Down and out in Paris and London* Orwell in the novel has developed the themes of "helplessness" and 'dependency': He is sympathetic towards the protagonist. The protagonist is forced to suffer due to the scandals. Orwell depicts the way scandal affects prominent community members. Dorothy the major character of the novel experiences various lives that is similar to the experiences of Orwell.

She lives as Rector's daughter, a tramp, a hap picker, a beggar and also as a teacher. She lives the life of extreme helplessness. Orwell, to project the theme of dependency due to poverty has portrayed Dorothy (the major character) as a dependent character in almost all the situation. She is dependent upon their father for money, upon a fellow (Nobby) for means of survival and direction while in identity less vagrant, upon the beggars to show her the way of that lifestyle and upon the evil domination of Mrs. Creevy who forces her to work hard and futile hours for a scare amount of food and low wage. The book presents the detail of trials and tribulations of woman. What she (Dorothy) wanted to do was to devote herself to 'good works' was turned upside down. Her existential crisis, depending and helplessness are compared to *Down and out in Paris and London* by J. Carranza thus;

. . . this book illustrates his point by thing as remarkably clear windowpane that reveals destitution as heat rending as any described. Dorothy, the clergyman's dutiful daughter, drives herself unmercifully and performs all the nasty jobs in the church-e.g. Typing sermons, scrubbing the church floor, visiting whining polihioners- until one night she faints from exhaustion. Later, finding her on a strange London street with no idea of who she Dorothy sinks down in the dismal world of all destitute outcasts . . . a world much like the one. Orwell has described so will in *Down and out in Paris and London* (132).

Keep the Aspidistra Flying is better to be analyzed as a confessional novel for it shows the obsessive fear of the author to become a successful writer. Besides, ultimate plunging of the major character to the usual life from the life he was experimenting also resembles the life of Orwell. The major character in the novel

Gordon Comstock is well educated intelligent advertising talent young man who declares war against money dependency. His war against money god of capitalism compels him to live the life of self imposed poverty for he leaves the job in an advertising company to become a poet. Under the stress of his self imposed poverty and exile, Gordon becomes petty, absurd and deeply neurotic, this life without financial ambition and good job all uncomfortable which leads him to humiliation. His determination to sink to the lowest level of society and to the world without money and moral obligation leads him more miserable life for he had to live in even smaller amount of wage after he lost his job at the bark ship. Ultimately he has two options. One is to live the life as it is and the other is to resume his job in advertising company i.e. returning back to old life. He chooses the second one. The central character resembles Orwell in terms of class, family background, education, experimented with poverty and ultimate return to old lifestyle, Gordon B Beadle accompanying the major character and his activities with Orwell and his writing opines:

... a life of poverty quickly destroys his confidence and ability to write, He is unable to complete his " epic" poem, wallows in self pity, and is gradually reduced to a guilt ridden cadging existence. Comstock finally sells a poem to an American literary review, but he makes such a fool of himself in a pathetic attempt to celebrate his success that he sinks even deeper into poverty and disgrace when his long suffering fiancée, Rosemary, whose last name significantly in Waterlow becomes pregnant Comstock succumbs to the inevitable. He marries Rosemary surrenders to the money god and returns to advertising agency to write advertisements for new line of foot deodorants, the

novel ends with the purchase of an aspidistra the symbolic badge of middle class respectability (196).

Homage to Catalonia is Orwell's account of experiences in the Spanish Civil War. It is a piece of reporting of the Spanish Civil War against Francisco's Nationalist. Orwell himself looks part from the republican side. Orwell went to Spain became member of International Labour Party and joined the militia of Worker's Party of Marxist unification (POUM) which was revolutionary party it was his Spanish experience ,which supplied him satirical vision . The experience of poverty he had faced hero-worship of Stalin during the second world war and British alliance in the war influenced him to write his later book against totalitarian regime. Orwell sympathetically describes the egalitarian spirit of revolutionary Barcelona in his book *Homage to Catalonia*. In the book Orwell denounces the lyrical Russian power politics that betrayed a popular revolution that might otherwise have given to true freedom and status to working class. Considering the book as an experience of intellectual journey of Orwell Stephen Schwartz write:

The product of this experience *Homage to Catalonia* (1938) is considered by many Anglo American thinkers to be single most important English language political work of twentieth century: It describes the journey of a sincere English intellectual from a naïve position as an antifascist volunteer through the catharsis of revolutionary enthusiasm to hellish persecution by and flight from agents rise continuously in significance as a key it not the key, to the moral disaster of the *been peasant* progressive pseudo- liberals, and totalitarian reformers at the end of the century (63).

So Orwell's biographical works are in some extent product of his own experiences through the various life styles he experimented. To make a simple generalization he wrote about the people who were marginalized economically, socially politically due to the evil political systems of capitalism in the one hand and Marxism to undercut capitalism on the other. His anti- imperialist sentiment and sympathy towards the agonized is appreciable though his colonial psyche can't be avoided.

Orwell is known as a political writer so the examination of his political views is significant. Orwell's political views changed over time. His experiences in Burma as a police officer made him an opponent of imperialism and he became a socialist after his experience of poverty and dehumanized life while reasoning *Down and Out in Paris and London* and *The Road to Wigan Pier*. To define his idea of socialism his experience in Spain played a great role. After Orwell witnessed the suppression of anarchy syndicalism and other revolution by Soviet- backed communists, he returned from Catalonia being a staunch anti- Stalinist and joined the independent labor party. In some of the books Orwell is able to establish. The books Orwell is able to established himself clearly as an opponent of totalitarianism, The books *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* project his view towards totalitarianism this work *The Road to Wigan Pier* is criticized to be controversial in regard to his political views. *The Road to Wigan Pier* was written when Marxism was at the Wight of its popularity in Britain. Revolutionary practice of Marxism in Russia was proclaimed as the wave of future by the young intellectuals of the left. Orwell refused the way of Marxism considering it to be absurd. He also disliked capitalist. For him the way Marxism undercuts capitalism is wrong. He condemned capitalism as evil economic system that must be replaced and the economic system presented by Marxism as false and dangerous solution to the economic evils of capitalism, The book *The Road Wigan*

Pier projects his political view which are ambivalent and contradictory as well. In this regard Gordon B. Beadle writes;

He was commissioned by the editorial board of the left Book Club to write a documentary report on the living condition of the unemployed workers of the industrial north of England. Orwell spent nearly two months in the depressed region of the north, and the result was *The Road to Wigan Pier* the most controversial book even published by the left Book Club. The book is divided somewhat arbitrarily in to two parts. The first section is moving sociological study of lasting historical interest written in the tradition of William Cobbett's *Rural Rides*, it describes in intimate detail the lives and working condition of the miners them inadequate industrial housing , family life on the dole and the debilitating psychological effects of years of unemployment. It is an appalling picture of squalor and human misery (. . .) the controversial aspect of *The Road to Wigan Pier* appear in the second half of the book which contains perhaps the sharpest attack upon the nature and tactics of modern British socialism even to come from an avowed socialist (196).

Orwell's political views seem to be contradictory because he lived in the present and his views were always shaped by the situation and his own experience regarding the particular situation. It is difficult to politically label Orwell because he was undogmatic theories and who criticizes the doctrinaire socialist, who precisely have forgotten because of them theories that socialism first and foremost is about liberty and justice. Unlike the doctrinaire socialists Orwell viewed socialism as the social aspect of an all encompassing moral attitude. Regarding this view he was in some

extent inspired by the meeting with Spanish anarchist to whom anarchism was moral attitude with political consciousness. In this regard Gordon B Beadle opines:

The present state of affairs offends them not because it causes caser still less because it makes freedom impossible, but because it is untidy; what they desire, basically, is to reduce the world to something resembling a chessboard," This approach to reform Orwell believed, led logically to the " worship of 'great men and appetite for dictatorships" and tendency to see a socialist Revolution as simply" a set of reforms which 'we' the clever ones are going to impose upon them the lower orders (197).

After Spain he was sympathetic to anarchism. After having seen the results that dogmatism may cause m he turned out to be even more undogmatic. He left the international labour party for he didn't want to lead himself to dogmatism. Orwell condemned war had supported international labor party became of the party's pacifism that he thought was the only party that would adopt the right aptitude to the war.

Arriving at *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Orwell was to some extent more vague regarding his political views., As a social critic he condemns all kinds of domination sin society. Most particularly he rejects totalitarianism. *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* are generally considered to e satire against Russian communism. It is not less important to analyze that Orwell never favored capitalism as a good political system. His intention was to condemn any kinds of totalitarianism resulted by any political system. Orwell's political message should not be misunderstood that only left politics leads to totalitarianism. In this regard, Andrew kemp, comparing American Administration to the party of *Nineteen Eighty Four* says;

To hark back to our opening examines,, the atrocities of the Nazi regime or the Soviet regime one still too recent to begin comparison with contemporary government without offending people who have experienced both. We can however compare the Bush Administration to 'The Party' in *Nineteen Eighty Four*, even if Orwell's imagined regime was a lot worse (16).

Orwell was against the contemporary society and evil social systems. He opposed the existing political systems particularly those which may cause the authoritarianism or totalitarianism. He opposed fascism communism and capitalism for his intention was to oppose totalitarian resulted from any of such political systems. *Animal Farm* being an allegory of Russian Revolution 1917 left the misconception on the readers that Marxism or communism or left wing politics results on totalitarian government.

Nineteen Eighty-four is a story of a struggle of a man against various kinds of oppressions of a totalitarian government. The government in the novel humiliates the people by using advanced mind reading techniques to discover the thoughts of people and punish those who show the signs of rebellion against the government. Winston the major character of the novel is a neurotic man who works in the Recording Department under Ministry of Truth. His work there is to alter and rewrite the records such as newspaper-articles. Every personal secret is dangerous for they are forbidden. Telescreen in each room are kept to spy the people and let the people know that no matter wherever they go, they can not escape the watching eyes of the government.

Orwell has used the image of a man who stood in shadow that covered his face. Making such figure anonymous and unrecognizable, Orwell tries to experiment the life of people under such unknown and dominating force or fear. The figure called "BIG BTOTHER" was placed on posters and put all over the places with the saying

"BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU". The government itself was very mysterious and had several parts that were very suspicious to the main character Winston who worked in on part of the government.

The Novel shows what society becomes if things kept on getting worse. Every image that we receive from Winston is pessimistic. Hate week, for example is big event in Oceania for which people prepare like great festival. Instead of jolly songs, with family friends and relatives over punch, that week is celebrated with fists in the air while chanting about death and whatever the party wanted the citizens to disgust.

Winston hates the party and "BIG BROTHER". Winston thinks sometimes that he has gone mad because he wants to be free, to think and remember. Thinking freely and remembering the past are considered as a great crime by the party. Here Orwell illustrates the brutality that man can be capable of when he/ she are given power. The people of Oceania are forced to love "BIG BROTHER". Winston doesn't completely accept the ideology fed by the government through the concept of big brother. The novel presents the negative utopian picture, a society ruled by rigid totalitarianism.

The novel is prophetic for it predicts the society that may be resulted form totalitarian government. There is a tendency to think that the left politics is much more probable in resulting in such government so the novel is considered to be an allegory of Russian Communism. In context of Russian Revolution, the book satires the Stalinist authority. Orwell was to oppose any kinds of totalitarianism resulted by any political systems. It is not the political ideology rather the human nature to be powerful may cause such result.

Regarding the title of the novel, critic opine differently. As a prophetic novel, it is argued that Orwell was to predict the condition of the world after about forty

years of his writing. Unlike such critics who found the different consequences behind the title of the novel Krishna Kumar opines; This view was always based on a simple but a profound mistake. The year 1984 had no significance for Orwell. It was mere reversal of the last two digits of the year 1948 in which he wrote his novel (405). Krishna Kumar argues that the relation of the title of the novel with date is irrelevant because the novel *Nineteen Eighty Four* for him is a political novel. It is the novel of Futurology or Prophecy.

It is very relevant to observe the novel through the character of Julia that human nature is essentially rebellious. Julia is such a character that she is motivated by natural laws rather than any ideologies. The book also presents the efforts of both the characters to live a normal life. But the characters in context of the novel appear to be rebel. Winston for he has love affair with Julia is separated from his wife who is very much mechanical and consists of the principles and recitation of the party. Julia on the other hand is not concerned with political issues. She is spunky and rebel by nature. She defies authority because she likes to do it. After their affair is discovered by the 'Thought Police' they are imprisoned and brutally tortured. Winston emerges broken in both body and spirit. Winston begins to love Big Brother after he is taken to the dreaded Room 101. This aspect of the novel is worthy to observe the dichotomy that Orwell created between human nature and the nature of oppression.

Most generally the book *Nineteen Eighty Four* is considered by many critics to be political satire. Unlike a utopian novel in which the writer aims to portray the perfect human society, a novel of negative utopia does the exact opposite. It shows the worst human society in an effort to convince readers to avoid and path that lead toward such societal degradation. Orwell postulated such a society a mere thirty - five years in to the future compounded the fear of context of Second World War. His

vision of post - atomic dictatorship in which every individual would be monitored ceaselessly by means of the television seemed terrifyingly possible though the world Orwell had envisioned in *Nineteen Eighty Four* did not materialize. In regard of the intention of the author behind the novel William H Rehnquist citing the author writes:

... he gave a different explanation immediately after the publication of the book: my recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already been partly realized in communism and Fascism (1985).

Orwell seems to opine that the society that he imagined in *Nineteen Eighty Four* may not occur but the Soviet Communism and German Fascism shocked him that something resembling to such Communism and Fascism may happen.

Lawrence Philips, in regard to the society, government and propaganda of the novel *Nineteen Eighty Four* notes how wartime propaganda inspired the depiction of government propaganda in the book. He further suggests that the book has nostalgic tone that the author depicts London as dystopic due to national anxiety of W.W.II. Philips criticizes the novel *Nineteen Eighty Four* as projection of series of near-future dystopian visions of the country. He views:

. . . it has, nonetheless, marked a counting sense of loss of national prestige and an acute anxiety over the future of both the city and modern British society. Strikingly, given the known liberal credentials of these authors, such anxieties have provoked in the novel a conservative fear of change whether represented by socialist

government, a burgeoning youth to culture, or technological development (67-79).

Philips here focuses on the conservative sense of the author that fears with the changes and advancement of the people and country in various fields. Philips here opines similar to many critics regarding the anti-revolutionary attitude of Orwell.

Regarding the Orwell's estimate of human body in 1984, Nomi Jacobs writes:

. . . The devastating pessimism of Orwell's great novel is based upon an inconsistent and ultimately improvised model of body. Orwell underestimates the body's recuperative powers as well as the extent to which the meaning of bodily experience is malleable, shaped by social relation. A disjunction between his rhetoric about the body and his representations of it underpins there limitations on his great work (3-20).

Here Jacobs criticizes the way Orwell presents human body. As in utopian literature, the problem of body is central in the novel *Nineteen Eighty-four*. Body, being the locus of utopian or dystopian transformation, the transformation is to be brought about either by liberating or by more effectively subduing it. In his estimate of human body, Orwell is much hopeless regarding the sustainable, natural and revolutionary human body.

Orwell's another widely read book *Animal Farm* is written as fairly story in which he paints a vivid picture of violent revolution of farm animals against the farmer who owns the farm, makes the animals work very hard, sends their offspring to slaughter and feeds them very little. Through the novel, Orwell describes an all- to - familiar corruption that undermines the goal of revolution in which the leaders rally the masses not so much for the good for masses, but for that the leaders could assume

the role of master. The revolution against Mr. Jones (the farm owner) begins after a meeting of animals led by Old Major. Old Major points out to the assembled animals that no animal in England is free. He further explains that the products of their labour is stolen by man who alone benefits. All animals are convinced that the source of their problem is man and they must remove man from their midst to abolish tyranny and hunger. The animals, under the leadership of Napoleon, rebelled and succeeded in establishing '*Animal Farm*' the new name for 'Manor Farm'. Napoleon slowly begins to change against the spirit of revolution. The book ends with the pigs sitting at a table and eating with human. Napoleon announces to those around the table that the name 'Manor Farm' will be reinstated. The pigs and humans converse and the other animals looking from outside can't differentiate the pigs and humans.

Many critics perhaps, because of the nature of revolution of *Animal Farm* opine that the novel is allegorically significant to Russian Revolution 1917. One of such critics is David Daishes who writes:

Animal Farm (1945) , by far his best known work and his best is a political allegory anchored in a savagely accurate command of the details of the way in which successful revolution betrays the idealists who worked for it. By making the characters animals, Orwell gives a Swiftian dimension to his merciless account of progressive takeover by the sadistic, the corrupt and self interested. He was thinking of Russia under Stalin and more than that his target was on revolutions; the people who make them and the people who take control once they are made (1169)

As the novel is allegorized to Russian Revolution, it would be relevant to examine its historical context in association with the Russian revolution. Russian society in the

early twentieth century was bipolar; a tiny minority controlled most of the country's wealth while the vast majority of country's inhabitants were impoverished and oppressed peasants. Communism arose in Russia when the nation's workers and peasants assisted by class of concerned intellectual known as the intelligentsia rebelled against overwhelmed the wealthy and powerful class of capitalists and aristocrats. They hoped to establish a socialist utopia based on the principle of the German economic and political philosopher Karl Marx. Marx argued that society would naturally evolve from Monarchy and aristocracy to capitalism and then to communism, a system under which all property would be held in common. The dignity of the poor workers oppressed by capitalism would be restored and all people would live equal. Marx followed this sober and scholarly work with the Communist Manifesto an impassioned call to action that argued "workers of the world unite". Marx's dreams appeared to be reality in 1917 Russian Revolution after a complicated political civil war. Tsar Nicholas II, the monarch of Russia was force to abdicate he throne by the revolution in the name of Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin. After the drastic change and improvement in Russian economy under Lenin, there was rise of Joseph Stalin after the death of Lenin. Stalin began to consolidate his power with brutal intensity killing or imprisoning his perceived political enemies and overseeing the purge of approximately twenty million Russian citizens.

Thus *Animal Farm* not only in general but also in detail portrays the events, action and characters of Russian Revolution 1917. If Manor Farm is a model to Russia, Old Major, snowball, and Napoleon represent Karl Marx, Leon Trotsky and Stalin respectively. Besides Mr. Jones, Animalism, Squealer, The Dogs and Boxer which are the major characters and ideas of the *Animal Farm* are respectively equivalent to Tsar Nicholas II, communism, propaganda department of Lenin's

government, secret police and dedicated but tricked communist supporter of the Russian Revolution. Including such commonalties and one to one correspondence, the aims and objectives of both the revolution were same.

Animal Farm is not only a political allegory but also moral allegory. As allegory in traditional definition is a symbolic tale that treats spiritual subject under the guise of worldly one. Not exactly the same but Orwell has exposed the human follies through animals. Besides the allegorical representation of human beings, Orwell has drawn on cultural stereotypes of animals. Pigs are considered to be selfish, dirty, gluttony and stupid animals. Horses have the bad name of beings low witted but strong and gentle where as sheep are recognized as brainless and behave as flock without individuality. Thus behind the innocent animal story there is a strong moral message and also a warning against the abuse of power.

It is power hunger that leads to such result. Regarding Orwell's politics Frank Field had a bit different opinion. Collecting the views of various critics Field writes:

The erratic Rayner Heppenstall accused Orwell of sado-masochism fuelled by the frustrated homosexuality. Feminists like Beatrix Cambell have had debatable stimulating analysis, sees him as a victim of the protestant sense of sin and damnation. Bernard Crick in his monumental biography tended to dismiss much of this as profitless speculation, eschewed overmuch psychological explanation, and concentrated on a straightforward account of Orwell's career Crick had to pay considerable price in term of loss of depth by taking this approach but his study is extremely informative and full of common sense advertising it is an approach that has been adopted by John Newsinger in this present book (737).

Frank here prefers Orwell's own childhood experiences, experiences of schooldays his adulthood experiments as the subject matter of his writing to his political message of anti- totalitarianism. It would be better to analyze Orwell as social critic rather than theoretician. Mark Walker in some extent is in opposition to Field. Walker views Orwell's writings not merely the recollection of experiences rather the outcome of his deep commitment to democratic socialism. Regarding the books *Nineteen Eighty Four* and *Animal Farm*, Walker opines;

While few writers exposed the dangers of Soviet Communism as capably, this popular image of Orwell neglected the depth of his political writing and obscured the basis of his anti- Soviet critique. Hopefully such a limited reading of Orwell's as merely anti- communist will go the way of the Cold War [. . .] His theme was not anti- Communism pure and simple but "the negative influence of the soviet myth upon the western socialist tradition (318). He was well and are of the " Unfortunate fail that any criticism of the present Russian regime is taken as propaganda against socialism' (33). There writing provide necessary context for understanding *Animal Farm*, Orwell's classic satire of the Russian Revolution, which is at the center of his collection (107).

John Hyde focuses his idea on the poor characters that are the victim of political betrayal. Besides he is of the opinion that Orwell wrote the book *Animal Farm* to alter the idea of the kind of society they should strive after. Without specifying the characters only to Russian Revolution, he generalizes the political victims through the characters of the novel thus;

..... The characters are strong: I can't re-read it without a wear tear for poor old Boxer. It is in places funny: at least Squealer's explanations of tactics and the bleating sheep amuse this one-time politician. It is however pathos evoking pity and sadness not just for less fortunate animals of the tale but for millions of poor gullible, tyrannized people (32).

As social critic Orwell opposes the existing political systems. But as a political writer he doesn't put any alternatives to the existing political systems. In some extent he is an anarchist for he prefers individual freedom but he could not be a complete anarchist for he could not accept one of the basic tenets of anarchism that is rejection of the state. He put socialism as a solution to the evils and dangers of capitalism communism and fascism. He was not consistent regarding the democratic socialism too. Democratic socialism for him led to at least better world but not the perfect one. Orwell due to his inconsistency is regarded as an ambivalent political thinkers and social critic. Regarding the question of existing systems, Orwell is vague and non revolutionary too.

This research is specified to the two major works of Orwell, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four*. How language is used to manipulate and exploit by the authority and how discourse is created for implementation of certain system or thought that encapsulates and validates the authority are the key points of this research. Foucaultian Theory of discourse and Orwell's use of language has been examined to see how use of particular language is responsible to create some kinds of belief system that as a network operated through language, works as a discourse that leads to a certain truth.

Both the novels are approached by various critics thought various perspectives especially political perspectives seem to be strongly applied. The terror and fear of totalitarianism is well explained. In the root of all those terrors and fears is the practice of brainwash and psychological manipulation. Abuse of power in the one hand is an important aspect where abuse of language to validate such practices on the other hands equally strong aspect of the novel which is not observed yet.

Being this thesis a small part of Orwell's study through Foucaultian perspective, it deals with the concept that hierarchy is created by dominant class through linguistic practices. The thesis has been divided into four chapters including the introductory and last concluding one. The second chapter contains methodological debates and perspectives. The third chapter, textual analysis, contains the implementation of theoretical modality to analyze the texts.

II. Role of Language in Discourse Formation

Language, being uniquely an important human aptitudes, it is everywhere in human speech, writing, thoughts and so on. Language is what we create something through. What we call power (power of prime minister, power of presidents etc.) is linguistically constructed. The status function of language assigns power or physical power. The power constituted by language is conceptual. The status function of language requires collective acceptance so the acceptance of the power of a prime minister for instance is linguistic. Political power, in much extent, is status function of language in a large part which is linguistically constructed. Fact or truth is created by such extremely complex set of verbal phenomena. Besides, as there exists no fact or truth without language, language is much responsible in creating certain truths or facts. Political power is what people accept or regard the status function of language as true. Circulation of language and acceptance of people as if it communicates the truth is the area of human life. Such activities that are possible only through the language (either of any kind) is defined as discourse.

The realm of discourse was confined to literary field especially in linguistic unit of conversation. Discourse analysis as a critical practice was developed in 1970s that focused on interchange of beliefs, attitudes, sentiments and expressions of state of consciousness of human characters. But in post structural criticism, it is not confined to conversational passage rather it has become the matter of particular historical, political and social condition. Discourse is analyzed not as transcendental and universal piece of conversation rather as a product and manifestation of particular social conditions, class structures, political system and power relationship.

Michel Foucault defines discourse in a different way by associating it with history politics or context or particular social conditions. Foucault holds a post-

structural stance in his definition. Discourse in Foucaultian definition is neither true nor false. Certain discourses are created by a system for its regulations which are considered to be true within the framework of the particular system. Truth in such system is matter of power. As the system changes so does the truth.

Language is a dominant factor of discourse. In a sense discourses are bodies of statements that are regulate and practiced systematically. Discourse is also the result of production of discursive mechanisms. Certain belief system is created within a society and also in various fields within society. Whatever goes out of such belief system is considered to be abnormal. To consider such things abnormal is also a practice of discourse formation which is viewed in hierarchical way considering the existing system superior to that of abnormal.

Truth and power are attached to each other. Truth is established in a society along with the regular circulations of language. Generally the voices which come from power holders is considered to be more authentic. Such belief in authenticity of the voice of power gives impetus to create more truths in favor of the power of a particular system. Thus, truth gets shaped by the perspective of existing power.

Mutual co-operation of truth and power thus makes the truth more authentic and the power stronger.

Defining the inseparable attachment of truth and power, Michael Foucault says:

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth is not outside power, or lacking in power: Contrary to a myth whose history and function would repay further study, truth is not the reward of free spirit the child of protracted, solitude, not the privilege of those who have succeed in liberating themselves.

Truth is the thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint and it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is the types of discourse of which it accepts and makes functions as true; the mechanism and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, means by which each is sanctioned; the technique and procedure accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (1144).

Foucault, here is of the opinion that truth and power are encapsulated to each other. Truth is the matter of what discourse is oriented towards. Truth is not spiritual, universal or transcendental rather its matter of politics that as society accepts and makes something function as true. On the basis of binary opposition which accepts one of the aspect of the oppositions, things, works, thoughts etc. are declared to be social/asocial or normal/abnormal. Here, Foucault attempts to break down the boundary between the natural and social sciences, arguing that truths, whatever its domain, are socially produced.

The major concern of power is with the language and the way of its circulation in a society. Language being a social system is associated with knowledge because language is not a individual consciousness of mind and personal component. As the language is attached to the society, it plays dominant role in controlling and losing power. Language, in this sense can be considered to be the means of replacing and displacing power.

Andrew Garner, regarding the Foucaultian discourse opines:

Knowledge is constituted by an episteme and the statement that the episteme governs. The episteme both opens and closes the possibility

within a discourse. It opens by encouraging certain kinds of statements, while closing by prohibiting others. The episteme incites certain types of scientific discourse while shutting down the possibility of others. Power infuses every aspect of knowledge. Power acts through the episteme, through the shorting of statements this inciting the very field of discursive possibility through which knowledge is created. Through the episteme, power makes certain statements functions and habits in one direction over another. Knowledge also suffuses power. Knowledge supports power relations, through the production of true statements. Knowledge also develops new strategies tactics and techniques through which power flows. It's through these connections between power and knowledge that we see why Foucault believed there was a circular relation between the true (355).

Here, Garner focuses a truth and power as two sides of a same coin. Linguistic discourse originates the truth and the truth produces power and again it is the knowledge that brings the better discourse and effective power produced through better knowledge.

Examining the behavioral aspects of Foucaultian theory of truth and power, Tim Richardson states:

Foucault's view of relationship between truth and power is one which refocus inquiry. It suggests that question about the ultimate truth of arguments are misplaced. We should instead ask how why and by who truth is attributed to particular arguments relevance to the understanding of the policy process as political rather than rational form of decision making. It also helps us to understand why Foucault

is not condemning and /or irrational arguments may be appropriated as truth through the exercise of power (289).

Here, Richardson studies the significance of discourse theory and its implication on policy making. Policy making is such a part of society that is significantly associated with discourse. Foucault has provided powerful theoretical tools which point the way towards an understanding of policy making as competition between discourse based on power and/or knowledge dynamics. They allow us to move away from the crisis of rationality and ask instead how arguments are transformed in to the knowledge that we use in policy making. Such questions are based on the agenda of unmasking and challenging power, and the consequent empowering of excluded or weak minorities.

Identification and understanding of relational relationship of power are much significant for planning theory; failure to address any of the issues of power is failure on meanness of a policy and or plan. This idea here is significant to distinctly define for caution power that is non- hierarchical unlike the definition of hard core Marxists.

The things, ideas or feelings that we define as knowledge is also a production of the discourse upon which we have been believing. As participants of discourse we create the criteria through the language we use. Language that we use has such power that it shapes our knowledge and then the knowledge that we create in this way again strengthens the language.

Power and knowledge work through language which is creative and active. The role of language over mind and consciousness is important in holding our rather than role of mind and consciousness over language. Language is tied to society and vice versa. Knowledge is the production of such language and society that is the originator of the power which is related between the subject and the object and/or

ruler and ruled ones. Knowledge which is used to exercise power is generated out of doubts. The determination of power is through the use of knowledge that is the production of linguistic system that has relationship to society.

Unlike traditional concept of hierarchical power, Foucault defines power not as entity that is possessed by someone or some groups that is used over others but as strategic and anonymous that exists in each social body.

Foucaultian definition of knowledge that generates power is genealogical for he believes in modifications and change in different aspects of power and knowledge as role of language in society and language through which the knowledge is produced with the manifestation of power to be exercised. Foucault prefers genealogical study to a archeological for archeological study fixes and stabilizes the meaning of knowledge that is changeable.

Power conceives the idea of hegemony for it is creative, formative and productive. Power is exercised between the mutual understanding of the subject and object. The society doesn't need power seen as denial centralization and central but power that produces things forms knowledge and induces pleasures which is the essence of power or hegemony. Power is rooted in body of knowledge which is attached to the systems of social control. Hegemony has its root in controlling the form of knowledge or understanding through language. The frequent circulation of such language creates certain creates certain kind of belief system the imposer wants. Antonio Gramsci views capitalism as a force that has been imposing its values over the world. Whatever the global networks are being formed by capitalism, Gramsci calls it a form of hegemony. Capitalism has exploited the mechanisms of discourse such as medial influence, statistics, research evidences and so on to establish a global network .The domination is in the form of psychological manipulation the owns who

are being hegemonies are not aware of it. The new belief system created by the capitalism creates new truth in way that people cant of be aware of what is happening. Thus, hegemony has its root in the in be taken as a put of Foucaultian discourse theory. Hegemony is thus a form of domination that is knowledge or unknowingly accepted by the dominated for they are compelled to think being. Put of discourse created by capitalism.

As Foucaultian definition of power includes relational relationship Gramscian ideas of counter- hegemony is equally important. Truth changes with the system upon which it is created so Gramsci is hopeful in the rise counter- hegemony in resistance. Hegemony is necessary counter hegemony and they simultaneously. Hegemony gives birth to counter hegemony and again counter hegemony gives birth to counter- hegemony and again counter hegemony shapes the forms of hegemony. Thus they reciprocally shape each other.

Regarding the Grasci's idea of hegemonic model of civil society Hagai Katz write;

In hegemony according to Grascian thought a certain may of life and thought is dominant and is diffused throughout society to inform norms, values and tastes political practices and social relations (sasson 1982). It is based on specific organization o consent, which had an economic base but is not limited to at (carrol 1992). It results from combination of coercion and consent, the latter achieved through the hegemonic copulation of group in civil society resulting in 'coercive orthodoxy'.

The idea of hegemony is tied to the social forms of knowledge that are generated by basically by language.

Reflection of Foucaultian thought can be found in Edward Said's works *Orientalism*. In a sense, Said's *Orientalism* is a redefinition of Foucaultian discourse theory. Said defines orientalism as a discourse created on the basis of representation as if it is true. Orientalism authorized the views by making statements and describing the orient by representing the orient through language, orientalist restructured, dominated and authorized their thoughts by creating a discourse. The discourse they created stereotypes and binary opposition was to authorize and validate their knowledge about the orient. Examining the proximity and dissonances of Said's *Orientalism* to Foucaultian discourse Karlis Racevskis opines:

...initial appreciation of Foucault's theories would be reflected in Said's own theoretical approach. In the preface to *Orientalism*, Said recognizes his debt to Foucault mentioning the importance of *Archeology of knowledge and Discipline and punish* in particular. It is hardly possible to overstate that *Orientalism* the book most responsible for Said's prominence in the fields of post colonial studies, couldn't have been written as Valerie Kennedy suggests, "Without Foucault's concepts of discourse and discursive formations his discussions of the relationships between power and knowledge and his views that representatives are always influenced by the systems of power in which they are located (84).

Said agrees with Foucault that stereotypical representation on the basis of binary opposition is responsible for creating certain kinds of truth about the orient. Besides, he agrees that the regulation and exercise of language is much responsible in creating discourse. What Said disagrees with Foucault is that true representation is theoretically possible but all representations are necessarily misrepresentation. Here,

Said agrees that representation creates discourse but in the case of Orientalism he is to argue that whatever truth. Orientalism created about orient was out of misrepresentation. Representation is influenced by power and knowledge so Said questions the validity of representation. In the preface of his popular work Orientalism Said says:

I have found it useful here to employ Michel Foucault's notion of discourse, as described by him in the Archeology of knowledge and Disciplined and punish, to identify as discourse. My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse on cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage - and even produce- the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the post- Enlightenment period (335).

Regarding the creation of discourse about orient Said condemns it to be the result of biased attitude of Orientalists and the result of misrepresentation. However Said agrees the Foucaultian concept of discourse formation that constitutes its roots on circulation of language.

Power and knowledge are interdependent for power helps to produce knowledge and knowledge is used to select the techniques of power and apply the chosen practices accordingly. Talking the Foucaultian idea of madness in to consideration C. Stebrnson and J. Cutcliffe, medical professors write:

The idea in short is to clarify that madness is discursive Abnormality of mental state is considered to be madness because it is extra-discursive. Discourse created within certain belief system prevents us

from taking an extra discursive stance and thinking Foucault in a sense says madness is the construction of statements.

Within discourses various forms and effects of truth are created. Knowledge that is constituted by the framework of linguistic system creates truths in co-existence of power. Thus a society and thoughts beliefs consciousness and understanding of its people is controlled by the discourse or people are confined physically and mentally within the belief system created by own language.

Discourse is mechanism or way of presenting, defining, naming something or communicating the things in a way that design the things. Discourse being a set of practices, constitutes the object. Discourse is also a system of constraints or exclusion that sets the boundaries for what can and can't be said or done in day to day life. Language plays a dominant role for it shapes the discourse and circularly the discourse again shapes the language. Through the discourse we are defined and expected to do what is proper and improper that projects the thoughts of certain powerful people or accepted authority. Because power holders form and use the discourse for their own benefit, the discourse and truth created by such discourse shapes when power shifts or when the system changes.

Power is generally perceived to be repressive and negative. Power is also most, of the time, considered to be associated with force that prohibits and dominates. But Foucault is of the opinion that power that induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse, is positive and necessary. So power, equally includes the productive social networks that run in social body. Power inherent in the various social aspects like religion, politics, technology, economy etc. keep on shifting from one to another. During such dynamic process one may appear stronger and dominant power. Foucaultian definition of power denies the hierarchy between these social bodies. Foucault opines that though one of the social aspects of power happens to be dominant, the role of other

aspects of power is equally important and strong though they seem to be marginalized or dominated. What is power in a system is not power in the other system. But it does not mean that such power does not exist. Power keeps on working through the social network.

Various types of practices of exercising power have occurred in the world. The means of exercising power have been changing. The present world is highly intellectualized so traditional tools of exercising power are not applicable. In such society discourse creation is one of the effective ways that intends to change the beliefs and concepts of people. Behind the creation of discourse role and nature of language is very much responsible.

Discourse is constructed to achieve certain social goals like experimenting a particular political system rather than representing the facts. Discourse is formative, dynamic or action-oriented so it helps power-holders to control people by different means. People are made to believe (by manipulating) the truth that are presented. Because the discourse works that way, people confine themselves within the framework of discourse and believe the way authority wants. The discourse manipulates the people to use the language that supports it. Thus, the use of language prescribed by a certain discourse further strengthens itself.

The key idea that 'language is in the crux of discourse formation' that can sometimes be exploited by some individual or authority in a society. *Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four*, by George Orwell deal with such individual or authority who exploit the forms and sources of knowledge that leads others to the parameters formed by such authority. It is danger and destructive if one controls the process of discourse formation and forms of knowledge through the circulation of language because it confines people to live in the truth created by the particular discourse and power that again supports the truth.

III. Language as a Tool to Control

Both the novels *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-four* deal with the political issues in which use of language either by manipulating or by convincing creates such a discourse that validates the domination and authorizes the impositions made upon the ruled (people/animals). Language use is at the base of both the novels to gain power by discourse formation. Languages have power to stabilize, change or modify the discourse. In both the novels language has been used sometimes to change, frequently to modify and often to change the discourse. Thus language in the novels work as a powerful device that by controlling the discourse, controls the whole characters (especially the ruled ones). Not only the ruled characters but also the rulers are sometimes governed by the discourse created by themselves.

The revolution in *Animal Farm* begins with the speech of Old Major in which use of language by Old Major is intended to change the existing discourse. Old Major, by speaking a touching language convinces and moves the animals towards what he believes. Old Major successfully triggers the feelings of the animals by speaking emotional language. Old Major's speech about life, nature, freedom, and animalism touched the animals in such a way that the rebellious song that he taught to the animals was liked by animals in the way that; even the stupidest of them had already picked up the tune and a few of the words, as for the clever ones, such as pigs and dogs; they had the entire song by heart within a few minutes (8). Old Major in a proper time exposes his ideas coloured by beautiful and touching language that easily motivated the animals towards the revolution. The animals felt and internalized the words spoken by him in the way that the whole life they devoted themselves towards what Old Major said. The entire novel moves around the idea the Old Major gave short before his death.

The revolution that occurred in the 'Manor Farm' has the root cause on Old Major's speech and use of language that is visionary and dreamy with the concept of equality and freedom. By giving a short and moving speech, major changed the concept of animals. The animals are convinced about their miserable condition. As the Old Major explains the causes of their misery and slavery, he also states the possibility of their freedom. After the explanation of the miserable condition, in his lofty, moving and touching language Old Major convinces the animal that 'Man' is the root cause of all their misery. Using such linguistic discourse that has special power, Old Major is able to alter the concept of animals regarding 'Man'. The linguistic power immediately changes their master (man) in to the most dangerous enemy. "Man is the only creature that consumes without producing. He doesn't give milk, he does not lay eggs, he is too weak to pull plough, and he can not run fast enough to catch rabbits. Yet he is lord of all animals" (4).

Thus language in the initial part of the novel is used as a powerful device that can change or alter the discourse. The discourse that was in favour of 'Man' (the master) turns against him. Had Mr. Jones used stronger and more manipulating language to defiance himself than that of Old Major, the animals might not have been rebelled. The event that changes the concepts of animals (in a sense changes the discourse) is because of language use. Language here controls the animals by controlling the discourse.

The animals, under the leadership of Napoleon heartily agree the seven commandments that are so persuasive and cohesive in structure. The touching spirit of the commandments moves the animals to learn and comprehend by heart. Such commandments are very much productive for Napoleon for the commandments made him easy to unite all the animals under him. The commandments were considered by

all animals as law and also were devoted by heart to follow it. The animals were so devoted to the commandments that they accepted it as a formula that may lead to free equal and paradisaal life.

The commandments denote the animals to another discourse created on the basis of thoughts of Old Major was later modified under the leadership of Napoleon. In a closer examination, here we can find the power of language to create different truths in different contexts and systems.

Orwell uses one character Squealer to turn and twist the language to manipulate the animals. Every time his speech is intended to validate the activities of the leaders, especially Napoleon. Squealer has the capacity to make everyone believe on what he says. Other animals appreciating his capacity said; “he was a brilliant talker, and when he was arguing a difficult point he had a way of skipping from side to side and whisking his tail which was somehow very persuasive. The others said of squealer that he could turn black into white” (9).

Regarding the issues of language and discourse, Squealer is one of the most important characters who are very much responsible in betraying the animals. His art of appropriating the activities of leaders confines the animals especially Boxer to such a depth of blind belief that they begin to believe whatever Napoleon does is good. Even if someone noticed that Napoleon was wrong, he/she was practiced to think in a way that encouraged Napoleon to go a step ahead on the way of domination. As Napoleon through squealer, successfully won the belief of other animals, Squealer kept on appropriating it and animals kept on believing. Language is used as a tool to drag the thought of all animals towards the direction that the leaders want.

Squealer frequently uses the words; one false step, and our enemies would be upon us. Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back? (35) that is to strengthen the

belief of animals towards Napoleon as the best leader. Squealer frequently uses such words because all the animals by heart do not want Mr. Jones (who was a cruel master) back. Squealer is able to manipulate the animals by triggering their real feelings about Mr. Jones.

Squealer solves the problem of milk and apples. There was a problem of whom to eat them. Squealer makes the animals believe that their fate depended upon Napoleon. Till Napoleon is healthy, their fate is strong if not there was the possibility that Mr. Jones could return. So it is agreed without any comment that the milk and apples are to be preserved for pigs. Squealer justifies how and why milk and apples should be preserved for pigs thus;

. . . many of us actually dislike milk and apples. I dislike them myself. Our sole object in taking these things is to preserve our health. Milk and apples (this has been proved by science, comrades) contain substances absolutely necessary to the wellbeing of a pig. We pigs are brain workers. The whole management and organization of this farm depend on us (. . .) do you know what would happen if we pigs failed in our duty? Jones would come back! (22).

Thus Squealer's brilliant language use creates the discourse under which all animals are controlled.

A successful practice of language and its straightforward effect can be seen in Boxer, a character devoted physically and mentally to the revolution. Snowball, a brilliant and devoted rebel was to be proved betrayer. Napoleon and Squealer were practicing it. Squealer raising the question of discipline against Snowball and appreciating Napoleon says; 'Bravery is not enough' said squealer. Loyalty and obedience are more important. And as to the battle of cowshed, I believe the time will

come when we shall find that snowball's part in it was much exaggerated (35). This practice was to prove snowball wrong. Such practice works on Boxer in such a way that he says; 'if comrade Napoleon says it, it must be right'. And from then on he adopted the maxim 'Napoleon is always right', in addition to his private motto of 'I will work harder' (35). Ultimately Squealer proves snowball a criminal and Napoleon the real hero by persuading the animals with logical discourse that the rod of measurement of one's good character depends on iron discipline and loyalty rather than bravery.

Many animals were executed for they were suspected to be allied with Snowball against '*Animal Farm*'. The scene of execution was horrific and filled with blind nationalism as well. Nationalism as a tool was used against a good leader Snowball and to get support on killing the so called enemies. Someone remembered one of the seven commandments that 'No animals shall kill any other animal'. Clover one of the characters fetched Muriel to read the commandment. Muriel read the sixth commandment thus; "No animal shall kill any other animal *without cause*" (56). The fear of the event of execution and exercise of power in such a manner compelled the animals that they might have forgotten the last two words. Besides they found the commandment not violated at all. Exploiting the situation of terror and fear due to execution, "Beast of England" the revolutionary song of animals was declared useless. By justifying that the song was appropriate during the revolution and now the revolution was at end after the execution of traitors, Squealer says:

. . . it is no longer needed, comrades' said Squealer stiffly. "Beasts of England" was the song of rebellion. But the rebellion is now completed. The execution of the traitors this afternoon was the final act. The enemy both external and internal has been defeated. In

“Beasts of England” we expressed our longing for better society in days to come. But that society has now been established. Clearly this song has no longer any purpose (55).

Orwell, to deal with the power of language, first uses the language to alter the discourse and slowly afterwards to change and modify the discourse to appropriate it to the perspective of authority. Through the other characters, Orwell successfully presents how a discourse confines someone to think or how one is trapped within a chain of discourse. After the most faithful animal Boxer was deceptively sent to slaughter, Squealer making the death of Boxer, a tool to re-activate the animals to the work, driving the sense of sorrow and the sentiments of rebellion to the direction of wind mill, says; and at the end, almost too weak to speak, he whispered in my ear that his sole sorrow was to have padded on before the windmill was finished. ‘Forward, Comrades! He whispered. Forward, in the name of the Rebellion (77). Squealer, the mouth piece or the speaker of Napoleon thus diverts the sense of dissatisfaction and sorrow of Boxer’s death to energy for the completion of windmill.

The last part of the novel deals with full of corruption and abuse of power. ‘*Animal Farm*’ is again declared to be ‘Manor Farm’ pigs are seen drinking with people (who once were their master and also enemy) at the same table. Other animals, watching them instead of getting angry or rebelling against such betrayal do not know what to do. They have been shaped by the discourse that whatever their leaders do, was for their betterment. Though the animals are betrayed they are shaped the way that they are habitual of supporting the leaders blindly.

Similarly, *Nineteen Eighty-four* deals with the practice of an authority to control various aspects of society and individual by controlling the use of language. Unlike *Animal Farm* in which overuse of language is prominent, in *Nineteen Eighty-*

four, Orwell experiments the situation caused by the prohibition on language use. The goal of 'The Party' is to reduce the language to only one word and to eliminate the past by reducing the use of language. Reduction of language further carries the ambition of eliminating any kinds of thoughts and rebellions. Thus 'The Party' uses language as a weapon to control every aspect of a society and individual by prohibiting its use.

'The Party' restricts its subjects with psychological stimuli that are designed to overwhelm the mind's capacity to think freely and independently. Winston is an employee of Ministry of Truth under the technique of 'Doublethink' is politically necessitated idea that is to ensure the infallibility and the stability of the political system of Oceania. Under threat of 'Doublethink' Winston must know that he does the falsification while at the same time he must suppress the memory of ever having done so. Thus 'Doublethink' ensures that the people who do the falsification can do it accurately and at the same time suppressing the memory of ever having done so. The technique involves the permanent dislocation of the sense of reality so that no external or objective reference point exists by which the independent truth and reality of something can be judged. The party says who controls the past, controls the future. So to control the future, past is controlled by altering the truths the way 'The Party' wants.

Winston is psychologically dominated by 'The Party'. This fear, as he saw a girl, can project his sense of dominated psyche thus; "but this particular girl gave him the impression of being more dangerous than most. Once when they passed in the corridor she gave him a quick sidelong glance which seemed to pierce right in to him and for a moment had filled him with black terror (12)". To think about the activities which the party has restricted are considered to be 'thought crime'. Extramarital

physical or sexual relation is the great crime. Even to think so, without the purpose of producing is crime. Any kind of imagination, made against the authority is 'thought-crime'. Winston's fear of the girl further leads him to suspect the girl to be an agent of 'thought-police'. Behind such thoughts, lies the fear and dominated self.

'Thought Police' is another strong tool of the party to control the people. The concept of 'Thought Crime' is intended not even to let the people think negative about the government. 'Thought-police' in the same way was to catch the thought criminals. Rather than the activities of thought police, the concept of 'thought police' works better to control the people. The unrecognizable agents of thought police who were considered to be spread all over Oceania, was the matter of greater fear. One could not believe another for he/she could be an agent of thought police. Winston suddenly puts his hands up after he suddenly hears a savage voice "up with your hands" (23). A child shaped in the language of Newspeak treats him thus; "you are a traitor! Yelled the boy. 'You're a thought-criminal! You're a Eurasian spy! I'll shoot you, I'll vaporize you, I'll send you to the salt mines! (23)". The child speaks the language that is imposed by his mother, a blind follower of the party. The child here is the victim of initial stage of the word reduction campaign. The child is in some extent able to work as 'Thought Police' for he catches a 'Thought-Criminal'.

Various types' of exercises and punishments are defined as physical language. The party forces its members to undergo mass morning-exercise called the 'Physical Jerks' and then to work long, grueling days at government agencies, keeping the people in general state of exhaustion. One who manages to deny the party is punished and 'reeducated' through systematic brutal torture. Winston was subjected to months of intense physical treatment after he was arrested. His condition as a result of teaching of physical language i.e. punishment is described thus; "He put the white

knight back in its place but for the moment he could not settle down to serious study of the chess problem. His thoughts wondered again. Almost unconsciously he traced with his finger in the dust on the table: $2+2=5$ (262)”.

Thus Winston accepted the new version of truth that the party wanted. For him it was far better to forget his unfaithfully traditional and illegal concept in which two and two made four.

After he was out of his learning of physical language, he was cold towards his beloved Julia. The language that he was taught in ‘Room 101’ inspired him to be so. O’Brien defines Room 101 as “The thing that is in Room 101 is the worst thing in the world (565). After Winston is taken into the room 101, O’Brien in threatening language defines it further in the way that leads Winston to greater fear. “The worst thing in the world’, said O’Brien, varies from individual to individual. It may be burial alive, or death by fire or by feowning, or by impalement, or fifty other deaths. There are cases where it is some quite (rival thing, not even fatal (256). Due to the imposition of the physical language through torture, Winston as well as other people is narrowed in his thoughts and memory is also effectively shortened. The party deprives the people of their own words to deprive them of their memory of the past. After O’Brien forces Winston to embrace Ingsoc, Winston’s imagination delays so ‘he could never fix his mind on any one subject for more than a few moments at a time (260). This has happened to the majority of public for they are robbed of their thoughts through the words. Due to the restriction in words, the memories of the people go unrehearsed so most of the old memories are forgotten ultimately.

To reduce the rebellious thoughts against ‘The Party’ the words are reduced. ‘Newspeak’, the official language of Oceania, is designed to make the ideological premises of Ingsoc which is Newspeak is engineered to remove even the possibility of

rebellious thoughts. The words by which such thoughts might be articulated have been eliminated from the language. Newspeak contains no negative words and terms.

The party employs torture as part of its control regimen but the psychological control tactics are the dominant ones. While physical punishment is difficult to administer, psychological manipulation through language is continuously applied to the general public in which the strength of the manipulation lies. Instead of forcing people to learn newspeak, the party successfully creates pressure to employ it simply in order to communicate economically. Frequent circulation of certain terms and concepts like Doublethink, Urban Decay, Big Brother, The [Telescreens, Room 101, The place where there is no darkness, etc through media is designed to create a kind of pressure to the people so that they would use Newspeak. After all, behind such terms and concepts lies the purpose of manipulation and control.

By design, Newspeak narrows the range of thought and shortens the memory of people because it is ideal for totalitarian system in which the government has to rely on a passive public which lacks independent thought and which has a great tolerance for mistakes, both past and present. The party prefers such narrowed public thoughts because a public that lacks the ability to think vividly poses less of threat than one that can readily criticize the government and defend itself from any kind's harms and oppressions.

Lexicon by its nature is expanding and generally people strive to expand their lexicon whereas the government in *Nineteen Eighty-four* actually aims to cut back the Newspeak vocabulary. One of the newspeak engineers says "Newspeak is the only language in the world whose vocabulary gets smaller every year" (49). By manipulating the language the government wishes to alter the public way of thinking. Psychologists opine that such manipulation can be done because the words that are

available for the purpose of communicating thought tend to influence the way people think. In absence of words that describe the particular thought, thought becomes more difficult to think of and communicate. The party aims at imposing an orthodox reality and making thought crime impossible. The newspeak engineer says in the end

. . . we shall make thought crime literally impossible because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidity defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten (49).

Besides the manipulation of minds, the ‘Telescreens’ are used for physical control of the people. Through the ‘Telescreens,’ bodies of the people are controlled by constantly watching any kinds of disloyalty. Even a small mistake could lead to an arrest. Due to the physical control, one’s nervous system becomes his/her own enemy.

‘Doublethink’ is an important consequence of the party’s massive campaign of large scale psychological manipulation which exactly in the capacity to hold two contradictory ideas in one’s mind at the same time. As the party’s mind control techniques break down one’s individual capacity for independent thought it becomes for one to believe anything that the party tells. At the ‘Hate Week’ rally the party shifts its diplomatic allegiance to the nation it has been at war with, suddenly becomes its ally and its former ally becomes new enemy. While the party speaker suddenly changes the nation he refers to as an enemy in the middle of his speech the crowd accepts his words immediately. The same way people are able to accept the party ministries names, though they contradict their functions: the Ministry of Penalty oversees economic shortages, the Ministry of Peace wages war, the Ministry of Truth

conducts propaganda and historical revisionism and the Ministry of love is center for party's operations of future and punishment.

The figure of 'Big Brother' works as a psychological threat to the people. Making the concept of 'Big Brother' unrecognizable, the party exercises a kind of pressure on the people. The effect of the figure, through the eye of Winston is like this; on the each landing, opposite the life-shaft, the poster with enormous face gazed from the wall. It was one of those pictures which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move (1). Everyone sees posters showing a man gazing down over the words 'BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU' everywhere he goes. Big Brother is the face of the party. The citizens are told that he is the leader of the nation and the head of the party, but Winston can never determine whether or not he actually exists. In any case, the face of Big Brother symbolizes the party in its public manifestation; he is reassurance to most people, that the warmth of his name suggests his ability to protect, but he is also an open threat for one can not escape his gaze. Big Brother also symbolizes the vagueness with which the higher ranks of the party present themselves. It is impossible to know who really rules Oceania, what life is like for the rulers, or why they act as they do.

By deliberately weakening people's memories and flooding their minds with propaganda, the party is able to replace individuals' memories with its own version of truth. It becomes nearly impossible for people to question the party's power in the present when they accept what the party tells them about the past- that the party arose to protect them from bloated, oppressive capitalists, and that the world was far uglier and harsher before the party came to power. Winston vaguely understands this principle. He struggles to recover his own memories and formulate a larger picture of what has happened to the world. Winston buys a paperweight in an antique store in

the prole district that comes to symbolize his attempt to reconnect with the past. The old picture of St. Clements's Church in the room that Winston rents above Mr. Charrington's shop represents the lost past. Winston associates a song with the picture that ends with the words; "And by the way, while we are on the subject, Here comes a candle to light you to bed, here comes a chopper to chop off your head!" (202).

Through the novel Winston imagines meeting O'Brien in 'the place where there is no darkness'. The words first come to him in a dream, and he ponders them for the rest of the novel.

. . . it was still impossible to be sure whether O'Brien was a friend or an enemy. Nor did it even seem to matter greatly. There was a link of understanding between them, more important than affection or partisanship. 'We shall meet in the place where there is no darkens', he had said. Winston did not know what it meant, only that in some way or another it would come true (24).

Eventually, Winston does meet O'Brien in 'the place where there is no darkness'; instead of being the paradise Winston imagined, it is merely a prison cell in which the light is never turned off. The idea of 'the place where there is no darkness' symbolizes Winston's approach to the future: possibly because of his intense fatalism that he believes that he is doomed no matter what he does, he unwisely allows himself to trust O'Brien, even though inwardly he senses that O'Brien might be a party operative. Winston is thus victimized and exploited emotionally and psychologically.

Besides, the omnipresent Telescreens are constant monitoring of its subjects. In their dual capability to blare constant propaganda and observe citizens, the Telescreens also symbolize how totalitarian government abuses technology for its own ends instead of exploiting its knowledge to improve civilization.

IV. Conclusion

Orwell's novels *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* carry a well founded warning about the power of language that shows how language can shape people's sense of reality. The novels portray how authority either by restricting or by overusing a language can conceal or manipulate history. Language is presented as an instrument for political dominations. By placing a great focus on Newspeak, Orwell gives the message that language has the power in politics that can mask and for twist the truth and mislead the public. Demonstrating the repeated abuse of language by the government in the novels, Orwell shows how language can be used politically to deceive and manipulate that leads to such a society in which people unquestioningly believe and obey their government and mindlessly accept all propaganda reality. Language has become a tool to distrust and control the will and imagination of the people.

As a result of imposition of language that shapes and strengthens the discourse of the authority the characters in the novels are detached from them own past, alien to their own family and unaware of what exactly is happening to them. The characters in the novels are slaves of media for they reverse it as an oracle. The media is so much strong because the public is widely exposed to it in the one hand the public is made to believe the media on the other. The government uses such a language to create discourse by means of telescreen and spokesman (squealer) of the authority that narrows and distracts the range of thinking.

The party in *Nineteen Eighty Four* is interested on making the truth, and so the media manipulates language to present a distorted reality. By distorting the reality and masking the truth, the party distracts public's attention away from the negative side of the authority. Besides, the media relies on the principle that the pieces of information

that are frequently repeated become accepted truth. Thus the authority makes its media skilled at engineering 'truth' through language in such a way that in the novel, the party has ultimate control over history.

Along with the control of people knowledge about present reality, the party in the novel has an ingenious plan to break link with the real past by introducing a language barrier. After all, language is the link to past or history. But when, by introducing a language barrier, knowledge about past is destroyed, people are no longer capable of decoding information from the past.

Regarding the possession of power or authority on the basis of hierarchy, Orwell's novels *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty four* are distinct. *Animal Farm* deals with the concept that accepts the naturalness and appropriateness of hierarchy. Hierarchy is the matter of personality of the actors in the *Animal Farm* where as in *Nineteen Eighty four* hierarchy is matter of situation rather than personality. Both the novels are Orwell's understanding regarding power, its use and abuse. The inseparable role of language to shape the discourse is presented as a warning to correct the future society. *Animal Farm* shows the manipulation through close and emotional attachment of character with language being used by authority whereas *Nineteen Eighty four* projects the result of detachment of characters with language that aims to create a gap between two generation by breaking one of the periods of history.

Work Cited

Beadle, Gordon B. "George Orwell's Literary Studies of Poverty in England."

Twentieth Century Literature 24.2 (Summer 78): 188-99.

Brander, Lawrence. *George Orwell*. New York: Longman, 1954.

Carranza, J. "A Clergyman's Daughter by George Orwell." Ed. Mark Annichiarico.

Library Journal 117.8 (Jan.1992): 132.

Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Vol.4. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1996.

Field, Frank. "Orwell's Politic." *The Historical Association* 85.280 (Oct. 2000): 736-37.

Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rainbow. London: Penguin, 1991.

Garnar, Andrew. "Power, Action, Signs: Between Peirce and Foucault." *Transactions* 42.3 (summer 2006): 347-366.

Hyde, John. "George Orwell." *Top Twenty Books You Must Read Before You Die* 113.7 (July 2006): 32.

Jacobs, Nomi. "Dissent, Assent and the Body in Nineteen Eighty-four." *Utopian Studies* 18.1 (2007): 3-20.

Katz, Hagi. "Gramsci, Hegemony and Global Civil Society Networks." *Springer* 17 (Voluntas 2006): 333-348.

Kemp, Andrew. "It's all in Orwell: Eric Blair's uncertain legacy." *Review* 7.3 (October 2007): 15.

Kumar, Krishna. "Nineteen Eighty-Four: Orwell and our Future." *Utopian studies* 117.23 (Fall 2000): 404-408.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. Calcutta: Orient Longman, 1985.

- - -. *Decline of the English Murder and Other Essays*. London. Penguin, 1965.

- - -. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London. Penguin, 1990.

Philips, Lawrence. "Sex, Violence and Concrete: The Post-War Dystopian Vision of London in Nineteen Eighty-four." *Critical Survey* 20.1 (2008): 69-79.

Racevskis, Karlis. "Edward Said and Michel Foucault: Affinities and Dissonances." *Research in African Literatures* 36-3 (Fall 2005): 83-97.

Rehnquist, William H. "1984." *Michigan Law Review* 102.6 (May 2004): 181-87.

- - -. "1984." *Michigan Law Review* 102.981 (2003): 981-987.

Richardson, Tim. "Foucaultian Discourse: Power and Truth in Urban and Regional Policy Making." *European Planning Studies* 4.3 (Jun. 1996): 279-293.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Schwartz, Stephen. "Rewriting George Orwell." *The New Criterion* 20.1 v(September 2001): 63-65.

Stevenson, C & Cutcliffe, J. "Problematizing Special Observation in Psychiatry: Foucault, archeology, geneology, discourse and power/knowledge." *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing* 13 (2006) 713-721..

Walker, Mark. "Book Reviews." *American Communist History* 1.1 (2002): 107-108.