

Rupantaran: A Multidisciplinary Journal
Vol. IX: PP 1-14, January, 2025
ISSN(Print) : 2091-0061, ISSN (Electronic): 2738-9960
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/rupantaran.v9i01.73474>
Research Management Cell (RMC)
Dhankuta Multiple Campus, Dhankuta
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Control and Resistance: A Study of Dystopia on Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Arjun Dev Bhatta, PhD¹.

Email: abhatta44@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores the life and situation of the people in an Orwellian dystopian society which is ruled and regulated by an authoritarian government. Living under such a despotic government, the dystopian people always remain in fear, terror, and panic where they lose the sense of humanity, individuality, and identity. Orwell's classical dystopian novel portrays this kind of society in which the totalitarian government treats its subjects as if they were inferior non-humans. I also examine the government's application of disciplinary mechanisms of control such as surveillance, propaganda, manipulation of language, and reproductive control of its citizens. Besides physical coercion, technological devices as disciplinary tools for controlling thoughts and actions are examined from the theoretical perspective of Foucauldian 'discipline', an idea developed in his work 'Discipline and Punish'. Based on Foucault's theoretical insight of power and control, I investigate how the body and mind in a dystopian society are manipulated, exploited, and regimented by the government to achieve the body's subjection to the authority of the state. Likewise, this article attempts to expose how written narrative and an act of sexuality play a role of resistance within a dystopian society to gain liberation from control. Examining the constant conflict between the domineering state power and people's perennial resistance, I conclude that Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a utopia gone awry.

Keywords: control, discipline, dystopia, resistance, totalitarianism

Introduction

The objective of this article is to investigate the notion of dystopia and a dystopian society in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949/2021). Dystopia, a distinctly twentieth-century extension and inversion of utopia, seemingly depicts a nightmarish and harrowing life of the people under absolute political power and constant control of the state to maintain discipline.

¹ Dr. Bhatta is an Associate Professor of English at Tribhuvan University, Tri-Chandra Multiple Campus, Kathmandu.

Orwell's *1984* is a pure dystopian genre which "often depicts a society where individuality is suppressed, independent thought is discouraged, and the government or ruling power remains strict control over its citizens" (Miller, 2018, p. 28). Gordon et al. (2010) view a dystopian society "either completely unplanned or is planned to be deliberately terrifying and awful" (p. 1). In a dystopian society people's situation is grim where they face social maladies such as inequality, disharmony, oppression, physical and psychological torture, and distrust. They feel the loss of their individualism, reason, and creativity. Consequently, they live a life of constant terror, illusion, and hopelessness.

Dystopian novels, like Orwell's *1984*, depict people's bleak and depressing life under a despotic government that intends to strictly supervise and control people's actions and thoughts by employing various disciplinary mechanisms of control such as propaganda, surveillance, and language manipulation. The government's severe and strict discipline tactically manipulates the body and mind of its citizens and restricts their freedom, thoughts, and sentiments. This situation is underlying theme of Orwell's *1984*. Howe (1971) writes: "Orwell is trying to present the kind of world in which individuality has become obsolete and personality a crime" (as cited in Tyner, 2004, p. 135). In this article I intend to look at how the totalitarian government known as Inner Party regiments and surveils the Oceania citizens, making their life stagnant and non-existent in Orwell's dystopian classic *1984*.

The novel is a product of the aftermath of the great historical wars, gradual rise of civil wars, the geopolitical division of the world into three superpowers, extremist politics, state power across Europe, and socio-political transformation. Likewise, the series of traumatic events, such as the Holocaust, mass carnage, explosion of atomic bombs were still felt as unrelieved gloom during the time Orwell was writing this novel. He explicitly portrays all these catastrophes in the novel, and initiates a new dystopian genre. Meyers (2000) states: "In 1984 Orwell breaks the convention of both literary forms that shape the novel, realism and utopian romance, and deliberately disappoints the reader's expectation" (p. 287). Meyers further asserts that Orwell drew the recent war time devastation, cruelty and torture of innocent Russian civilians and he "incorporated contemporary events to create an atmosphere of documentary reality, and the power of the novel comes from a realistic use of familiar materials rather than from imaginary speculation about the future" (p. 281).

Orwell observed the ruthless tyranny of the world's three dictators – Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler who shook the world and created massive terror among the citizens. In the novel the Party's use of violence and oppression, fear and uncertainty of the Oceania citizens under the ubiquitous power of an enigmatic leader Big Brother to some extent resemble tyranny of Stalinist Soviet Union and Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. Tyner (2004) elucidates: "The dystopia of Orwell's *1984* is modeled loosely on Stalinist Soviet Union (p. 130) and claims that the novel is a narrative of "nightmarish vision of totalitarianism" (p. 129). Orwell himself explained: "Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understood it." He continues, "I write . . .

because there is some lie that I want to expose some fact to which I want to draw attention, and any initial concern is to get a hearing” (as cited in Tyner, 2004 p. 132).

1984 is Orwell’s fear of the emergence of communism, totalitarianism, and fascism in Europe which, he suspects, might destroy all human values, culture, religion, and human rights. He foretells people’s choices, preferences, creativity, and personal expression are entirely restricted, and any sign of dissident voices, rebellion, and protest result in torture, punishment, and death. In the novel Oceania’s history is manipulated, the past is altered, truth is replaced by a lie, and a new language is devised to restrict human thought, and vision. In so doing, the party entertains people’s conformity and loyalty to its ideology. Portraying such kind of setting, Orwell envisions a terrifying future world of 1984, and admonishes what might happen if history were continue itself. Thus, this article aims to explore the strict control that the totalitarian state performs over its subjects, and the people’s constant effort to discover liberation within the control. It also argues that the written narrative is a means of liberating tool and resistance.

Methods and Materials

This research article explores the theme of dystopia and people’s position in a dystopian society depicted in Orwell’s *1984*. The researcher observes how a totalitarian government employs its controls upon its subjects through the lens of Foucauldian ‘discipline’, and through the discourse of the body.

The article applies qualitative approach to fulfill the research goal. It does not conduct any field study, data collection and analysis, or any interview. To achieve entire information, this article applied a thorough thematic analysis of the novel. For review of literature related to the topic of the study, secondary materials such as internet, e-library, and other relevant books, journals, and articles were used extensively. The sample for this study was limited to the novel itself. The research findings were analyzed and discussed in context of the relevant literature, and conclusion was drawn from the analysis of the text. For theoretical framework, Michel Foucault’s concept of ‘discipline’ was utilized. Drawing on Foucault, I agree that in a dystopian society the government can carry out different disciplinary mechanisms of control such as time table, reproduction, surveillance, and language. Foucault’s concept of strict and incessant surveillance through the mechanism of ‘Panopticon’ has been used in this article.

Results and Discussion

Orwell’s *1984* is a portrayal of a horrific atmosphere in which the Oceania citizens lead a life of terror, uncertainty and fear. It is a society which is itself a war-torn hell scape, where public execution, torture and shooting, trial and punishment, and spying and surveillance are common everyday activities. The people seem to be living in isolation and loneliness with massive apprehension of the dictatorial state power that reinforces cruelty, brutality, lies, and terrorism. The setting of the story is a futuristic 1984 London, the chief city of Airstrip One (formally known England), one of the many provinces of Oceania. The Oceania society is dominated by a political ideology of INGSOC (English Socialism), and the conflict between the

Inner Party and the Outer Party is perennial. The Oceania citizens are not in peace and prosperity since they always indulged in war against two other super states called Eurasia and East Asia with its partial alliance with either of the two countries. The story revolves around three major characters Winston Smith, the protagonist, who belongs to Outer Party; Julia, Winston's co-worker; and O'Brien, the antagonist, and supreme agent of Inner Party.

The socio-political and cultural set ups of Oceania are governed and controlled by a dictatorial leader Big Brother, physically non-existent character who stands the apex of the Oceania social pyramid. He is an omnipotent, all-pervasive, and infallible entity whose function Orwell (1949/2021) describes as "to act as a focusing point for love, fear, and reverence, emotions which are more easily felt towards an individual than towards an organization" (p. 230). His enormous face on a wide poster with the caption 'BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU' (p. 6) is itself more controlling and regulatory force. He is the most powerful and so pervasive: "on coins, on stamps, on the cover of books, on banners, on posters, and on the rappings of cigarette packet – everywhere", and his grip over the people is so strong: "Asleep or awake, working or eating, indoors or outdoors, in the bath or in bed – no escape" (p. 32).

The Inner Party, another sophisticated repressive agency of control, applies multiple disciplinary tactics to control the inhabitants of Oceania. Reinforcing Big Brother's ideology of power, it deploys the Thought Police and Police patrol to spy and scrutinize people's opinions, beliefs, and thoughts about Big Brother and the Party itself. The coercive and scary disposition of Thought Police Orwell explains: "No one who had once fallen into the hands of the Thought Police ever escaped in the end. They were corpses waiting to be sent to the grave" (p. 87). People's dissident opinions, actions, and rebellious spirit are invariably spied and detected by Thought Police and such people are interrogated, tortured, and vaporized in the Ministry of Love for their thought crimes. Winston Smith, a representative character of dystopian citizens undergoes immense physical and psychological torture in the ministry for his decisive act of expressing his private thoughts in his diary, sexual escapades, and his strong hatred of Big Brother. O'Brien conducts harsh punishment in the ministry and simultaneously supervises all the employees in the Ministry of Truth.

The novel presents the helpless and measurable condition of Oceania's inhabitants under the strong control of the Party. Except the Proles (Proletariats), the Party considers them helpless creatures simply serving for the Party like a mindless robot. Thus, the collective mentality of the state targets body and mind of its citizens to obtain power. Such a helpless body Foucault (1975/1977) variously calls 'inapt', 'pliable', 'manipulable', and 'docile' which may be "subjected, used, transformed and improved" for the benefit of the state (p. 135). He states that these bodies are always in "the grip of the strict powers, which imposed on it constraints, prohibitions or obligation" and become "political puppet" (p. 136).

Foucault (1975/1977) argues that when "the body directly involved in political field; political relations have an immediate hold upon it; they must invest it, make it, train it, force it carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (p. 25). Consequently, the body fails to

expose its performative power, and blindly adheres to the normativity set by the social power. In the novel, the protagonist Winston and all the Inner Party and the Outer Party members have faced the same predicament. O'Brien, who perpetrates violence on Winston and other thought criminals, to some extent works under Big Brother's ideology. All aspects of life of the Party members Orwell elucidates:

In principle a Party member had no spare time, and was never alone except in bed. It was assumed that when he was not working, eating, or sleeping he would be taking part in some kind of communal recreation . . . even to go for walking by yourself, was always slightly dangerous" which the Party calls "OWNLIFE in Newspeak means individuality and eccentricity. (p. 93)

The Party members have no individual choices, freedom, and volition; the Party determines the activities to perform, place to go, things to buy, place to buy, and even the route to walk. The Party has enforced strict rules and monitors people's feelings, emotions, and desires to make people submissive to the Party. In their docility, the Oceanians fail to express their logic and reason as they are incapable of decision-making potential. The political offenders, traitors, and dissidents, if detected, would be executed and vaporized secretly without any trial. Foucault (1977) for instance, affirms that public execution has a juridico-political function and execution is ceremony by which a momentarily injured sovereignty is reconstituted (p. 48). He further elaborates that "The public execution . . . deploys before all eyes an invincible force. Its aim is not so much to re-establish a balance as to bring into play, as its extreme point, the dissymmetry between the subject who has dared to violate the law and the all-powerful sovereign who displays his strength" (pp. 48-49). But, in the novel, Foucault's principle on execution does not work. In Oceania torture and execution are not public spectacle; even the arrest before punishment were conducted secretly especially at night.

The government holds control over production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services, and it deliberately limits citizens' easy access to the resources. In the novel, the Ministry of Plenty creates artificial food shortage by curtailing the ration for general public, whereas the privileged Inner Party members are provided with quality food and sophisticated life style. In this dystopian world of Oceania, the government permeates social inequality and hierarchy. Foucault (1977) states that discipline is affected by ranking: "Discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements. It individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations" (p. 146).

The consumption of food and sophistication based on hierarchy is displayed in the novel. When Winston and Julia visit O'Brien in his apartment, they are amazed at O'Brien's sophisticated rooms, quality of food, expensive drink, branded cigarette, servants, and rapid sliding lifts. Much to the amazement of Winston and Julia, O'Brien deliberately switches off the telescreen. As the act of switching off the telescreen is offensive, Winston exclaims:

'You can turn it off!'

‘Yes’, said O’ Brine, ‘we can turn it off. We have that privilege’ (p. 188).

On the other hand, the Outer Party members like Winston live in an old worn house with the sort of food. He has to save a hunk of bread for the next day’s breakfast and drink oily smell Chinese rice-spirit ‘Victory Gin’.

The party applies disciplinary control by distorting historical facts and creates a new version of truth making it consistent with current narrative of the Party. Winston Smith, a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth at the Department of Record is well-versed in the task of recreating history. The true information of past is replaced by a false one and original copy is burnt into ashes. All the past documents such as books, pamphlets, films, sound tracks, and photographs which hold political or ideological significance have been forged. Thus, as Winston says, “All history was a palimpsest scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often necessary” (p. 47). Regarding the task of blatant forgery of historical evidences, Winston affirms: “And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed – if all record told the same tale – then the lie passed into history and become truth” which may reinforce the Party’s popular slogan: “Who controls the past, controls the future: who controls the presents controls the past” (p. 41). By erasing the truthful history, the party wants to preclude people from possible revolution and questions against the Party’s orthodoxy. It is the safest option for the Party to claim the present appears better than the past, and also to achieve public support for its current ideology.

The Party has kept no remnants of past for the future generation. Winston explains: “Everything had been different then. Even the names of countries, and their shapes on the map, had been different” (p. 38). He further says: “Everything faded into mist. The past was erased, the erasure was forgotten, the lie become truth” (p. 86). Throp (1984) observes the Party’s mutability of the past “is at the very basis of mind control in 1984” (p. 12). He states that the object of continuous obliteration of historical fact is to make the Oceania citizens unable to compare the present with the past government institutions and people used to live in the past. Thus, the important reason, according to Throp, is “the need to safeguard the infallibility of the Party” and “to preserve the myth of perfection” (p. 12). The party acknowledges that even the smallest residue of the mistake may destroy its image and perfectibility.

In a similar vein, the Party attacks human mind since memory of past events exists in it. For the Party, the past events have no objective existence rather they survive in written records and in memories. It believes that truth can be automatically changed if human mind is altered. By deleting human mind and memory, the Party eliminates the reasoning power, thoughts, and will. The principal aim of the Party is to bring change in both mental and physical world. As O’Brien tells Winston: “The Party is not interested in the overt act: the thought is all we care about. We do not merely destroy enemies, we change them” (p. 278). The change is possible by exerting power over the human mind through inflicting pain and humiliation. O’Brien explains to Winston: “Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing” (p. 293).

Manipulation of language is an important aspect of disciplinary control for the Party. Since language is the basis of human thought which structures and shapes our perception, the Party controls language to limit and narrow human thoughts. For this purpose, the Party has devised its language called Newspeak to serve the ulterior motives of the regime, and also to make subversive thought and speech almost impossible. Syme, the philologist at the Research Department, expresses to Winston the aim of Newspeak “is to narrow the range of thought” (p. 60). Orwell himself explains the purpose of Newspeak in Appendix of the novel: “was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits . . . , but to make all other modes of thought impossible” (329). By so doing, the Party’s Newspeak dictionary does not entail any thought-provoking words such as democracy, freedom, justice, liberty, and individualism. Syme tells Winston: “How could you have a slogan like “freedom is slavery” when the concept of freedom has been abolished?” (p. 61).

The elimination of old words and their linguistic significance indicates the Party’s complete control over linguistic reality. The replacement of Oldspeak with Newspeak, according to Blakemore (1984), is to “narrow human thought by linguistically narrowing the semantic space of language itself . . . and limit their intellectual ability” (p. 349). He seems to be correct when he states, “The novel documents the degradation of man through the murderous assault on his linguistic reality – an assault that is more *sinister* than the clumsy torturing of the spirit’s flesh” (p. 349). Thus, the invention of Newspeak is not only to reduce thought but also people’s free imagination and creativity.

Orwellian dystopia dominates the theme of seclusion. The Party has annihilated people’s individual relationships, intimacy, privacy, and emotional attachment. In the Ministry of Truth, a large number of employees is partitioned and sequestered in their cubicles where each one is unaware of his/her activities. Each one suspects one another an agent of Thought Police as Winston thinks of Julia. This disciplinary separation Foucault (1975/1977) calls ‘enclosure’ which, according to him, “is the specification of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself. It is the protected place of disciplinary monotony”, where “each individual has his place; and each place its individual” (pp. 141,143). This object of the disciplinary enclosure, according to Foucault, “is to avoid distribution in group; breaking up collective deposition; analyze confused, massive or transient pluralities, to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits” (p. 143). This act of separation and assigning each individual an enclosed place refers to the Party’s insufficient opportunity to participate in a state and social affair and communication, on the one hand, on the other; they would not instigate any trouble for the Party by sharing their thoughts and ideas.

The act of partition, distrust, and suspicion is also foregrounded within family. The Party retains strong control over filial affection, loyalty, and emotional feelings. The children are indoctrinated and brainwashed by the Party’s propagandistic teaching that they are supposed to pursue social duty and contribute to the nation as ideal and patriotic citizens. Children’s inclination toward the Party’s ideology is more significant than toward the parents. O’Brien

explains: “We have cut off the links between the child and parents, and between man and man, and between man and woman” (p. 294). He further explains: “Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes eggs from a hen. The sex instinct will be eradicated. Procreation will be an annual formality like the renewal of a ration card. We shall abolish the orgasm There will be no loyalty, except loyalty toward the Party” (p. 294). The young children have been admitted to an organization called the Junior Spies in which they are trained to become loyal to the Party and are even encouraged to spy on their parents’ unorthodoxy and deviation from the Party.

The children are involved in processions, the hiking, the yelling of slogans, the worship of Big Brother, and systematically turned into “ungovernable little savages” who always “adored the Party and everything connected with it” and “their ferocity was turned towards, against the enemies of the state, against the foreigners, traitors, thought criminals” (Orwell, 1949/2021, p. 30). In the novel, Mr. Parsons’ two children are examples of the misguided children who denounced their father to Thought Police when they heard Parsons speaking ‘Down with Big Brother’ in his dream. His children are so blind devotees to Big Brother that they set fire to a skirt of a woman when she was wrapping up sausages in a poster of Big Brother. Similarly, Parsons’ son hit the back of Winston’s neck an agonizingly painful blow calling him a traitor, a thought criminal, and Eurasian spy in his house when Winston is called to repair the kitchen sink. Observing the boy’s ferocity and indecent behavior, Winston predicts that Mrs. Parsons “must lead a life of terror” and the children “would be watching her night and day for symptoms of unorthodoxy” (p. 29).

In a dystopian society as presented in *1984* people’s natural sexual instincts and reproduction are strongly controlled. Human love, eroticism, and lust inside as well as outside marriage are considered disgusting and illegal by the Party. The Party demands sexual puritanism in both sexes. The Party demands sexual puritanism in both sexes by removing people’s sexual pleasure. The marriages between the Party members have to be sanctioned and approved by committee for both sexes. Artificial insemination has been practiced for reproduction and the children are brought up in public institutions. Thus, women are literally perceived as bodies without right to their children.

Among various disciplinary mechanisms of control, surveillance through telescreen and microphones is the most reliable technique for the party to sustain its power and monitor people’s lives, activities, and events. The telescreens have been installed almost everywhere in public areas, private rooms, and working places which simultaneously receive information, broadcast messages, and even conduct daily exercise. Microphones are installed in the country side to track the sound of people. The Party’s scrutiny and regimentation of people everywhere Orwell explains: wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected” (232). Further, Winston comments people’s life under surveillance: “You had to live – did live, from habit that become instinct – in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and,

except in darkness, every movement scrutinized” (p. 7). Not only the activities but also people’s facial expressions (face crime) on the screen are exposed. As Winston explains:

It was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in any public place or within range of a telescreen. The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself – anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face . . . was itself a punishable offence. (p. 71)

The condition of people under the disciplinary mechanism of surveillance Winston continues: “To keep your face expressionless was not difficult, and even your breathing could be controlled, with an effort: but you could not control the breathing of your heart, and the telescreen was quite dedicated enough to pick it up” (p. 90). These illustrations echo Foucauldian concept of surveillance of the inmates in a prison through panopticon, an architectural apparatus at the center of a prison which was used to “alter behavior, to train or correct individuals” which “gains in efficiency and in the ability to penetrate into men’s behavior” (1975/1977, pp.202, 204).

Foucault contends that panopticon as a perfect surveillance object is not only confined to prison but also in society because it allows power to both “visible and unverifiable” (p. 201). For him, panopticon is one of the regulatory modes of power. It also offers a powerful and sophisticated internalized coercion through constant observation. He elucidates that “the prisoner should be constantly observed by an inspector” and always “have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied on”, however, “the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so” (p. 201). The body is made ‘docile’ through continuous gaze and scrutiny of which the body has to be aware. Thus, individual’s self-awareness generates discipline as there is no way to be certain whether he is being watched or not. Foucault elaborates that “the perfect disciplinary apparatus would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly” (p. 173).

Within the novel, it is the telescreen which the Party has used as the major apparatus of surveillance, hence, discipline. The telescreen sees and hears people’s thoughts, opinions, and activities no matter how slow they speak, is overheard. As Orwell (1949/2021) says, “Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it”. (p. 7). The Thought Police would plug in on any individual wire called guess work. The citizens of Oceania have been imposed discipline under direct and interminable watch. Their every move is meticulously gazed and tracked without their knowing whether they are being watched at any given moment. The Party’s continuous control materializes in perennial surveillance which reinforces the subjection of the citizens and, as suggested by Tyner (2004), “produce total conformity” (p. 137). Tyner observes that all-pervading telescreen “becomes the literal embodiment of the “gaze” and a perfect apparatus to implement discipline over the bodies” (p. 137).

The application of telescreen is not only to survey people but also to present series of pictures of traitors of the Party. The Party fools its subjects with false propaganda. The display of Emmanuel Goldstein, the enemy of people, on telescreen in Two Minutes Hate session is an apparent example of it. Goldstein, who is reported to have been a former leading figure of the Inner Party equal to Big Brother, is the Party's myth to identify people's reaction against him. He is said to have been denounced to death because of his treachery and defilement of the Party's purity. The subsequent crimes such as treachery, sabotage, heresies, and deviations against the Party are supposed to have sprung directly out of his treachery. He is also reported to have founded an organization called 'Brotherhood' committed to the destruction of the Party. Goldstein and his so-called series of treachery are exposed on telescreen to win public support and their love for Big Brother, which successfully works in the Two Minutes Hate.

Despite the Party's constant surveillance and control, we observe the role of Winston and Julia, who initiate rebellion against the Party's tyranny. Orwell exposes the revolutionary role of Winston and Julia to tell that even in brutal and autocratic regimes like totalitarianism in Oceania there is possibility of resistance against exploitative and propagandistic regime. He seems agree with Foucault, who in his book 'History of Sexuality' (1976/1990) envisions the possibility of resistance and disobedience within terrifying political system. He argues: "aside from torture and execution which preclude any resistance, no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remains the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groups" it is because "where there is power, there is resistance; and their resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power" (p. 95). Similarly, Moylan (2000) contends that dystopian narrative presents "an alienated character's refusal of the dominant society. Through this refusal, the protagonist counters the narrative of the hegemonic order. The action leads to a climatic event that does or does not challenge the society" (p. 147).

Winston and Julia do not seem to change the political ideology. Foucault proposes that power is not something to be acquired, possessed, or shared, but a force to affect others. In this regard, Winston and Julia's purpose of rebellion does not target power but a semblance of individuality and humanity. Tyner (2004) affirms their resistance "is manifest as a means to stay human within a de-humanizing environment", and the actions of Winston are "directed firstly towards a personal liberation rather than a complete revolution" (p. 142). Thus Winston's rudimentary motivation is to achieve humanity, not succumbing to the tyranny of the Party. However, Winston's role in the novel seems like an antihero, who despite continuous struggle cannot achieve his goal. Meyers (2000) calls him a failed hero and coward. He writes:

Although a faint flicker of Orwellian humor survive in the chapter . . . the end of the novel is totally bleak. Winston, neither rescued nor rewarded, is reduced to infantilism, cowardice and self-pitting alcoholism. His enlightenment about the meaning of his life – that he is merely subject to a monstrous lust for power – coincides with the extinction of all hope. (p.287)

In a similar vein, Watt (1983) contends that Winston “is not a conscious or a heroic protagonist of moral and intellectual conviction” (p. 112). These critical appraisals are drawn from the fact that Winston becomes alcoholic, betrays Julia, and above all, he capitulates to Big Brother after undergoing massive brutal punishment by O’Brien. But this seems to be misreading of Winston and undermining his revolutionary spirit.

From the very beginning of the novel, Winston conceives the idea of resistance by writing a diary filling up almost half a page with a phrase in neat capitals “DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER” (p. 23), an offensive act of which Winston is certain that, if detected, “[he] would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labour camp” (p. 10). His diary is not only his indignation over Big Brother but also revive the historical records which have already been manipulated and rewritten by the Party. His diary also contains his memories, his self, and the English society before the Revolution. Gotlieb (1984) observes Winston’s dauntless effort to connect his past through the diary:

“The effect of articulation his thought in his diary leads to more and more profound levels of mental activity in the dream mind, which, in turn, leads to increasing higher levels of conscious understanding, pointing to the liberation of the suppressed memory” (p. 68).

The suppressed memory is brought to the surface through his written narrative which unfolds his inner self, his mother, his guilt for his mother and sister’s death, and the past events which have completely been wiped out by the totalitarian regime. Thus, his diary is suggestive of his rebellion and warning against the monopoly of the regime and a means of communication “for the future, for the unborn” (p. 11).

Winston is well-versed in manipulating history, information, and alteration of facts in Newspeak. However, his use of Oldspeak in his diary and day to day conversation is symptomatic of his resistance to the Party’s linguistic manipulation which tends to erase Oldspeak’s concept of love, friendship, and freedom. Using Oldspeak in his diary, he wants to reconsider his past and “subvert the Party’s effort to destroy the textual past” (Blakemore, 1984, p. 350). To expose his true self, he retains the meaning of humanly emotional words such as love, compassion, loyalty, and affection in his diary. He wrote an important axiom: “Freedom is freedom to say that two plus two makes [sic] four. If that is granted, all else follows” whereas the Party’s false dogma tells that “two plus two equal [sic] five” (p. 92). Additionally, He claims that mutability of past is almost impossible. As he states: “And yet the past, though of its nature alterable, never had been altered. Whatever was true now was true from everlasting to everlasting” (p. 41). Equally, he is more suspicious of the new invention and new version of history. Winston wants to renew the missed historical events through memory which he is carving in his diary.

Winston’s resistance to the Party is observed when he raises question regarding the existence of Big Brother. In response to O’Brien’s question regarding his feeling towards Big Brother, he retorts: “I hate him” (p. 320). He considers himself to be morally superior to the

Party members, their lies and cruelty, and objects to the Party's civilization which is based on fear, hatred, and brutality. He detests the Party and its members and tells "to die hating them, that was freedom" (p. 309). In *Two Minutes, Hate* while everyone rhythmically chanted Big Brother and condemned Goldstein, he is the only one who clandestinely hated Big Brother, the Party, and Thought Police, but loved Goldstein, instead.

Winston's resistance to the disciplinary function of the telescreen, though simple and fleeting, is significant as well. He tries to remain outside the range of telescreen's detection. Even while facing the telescreen, he deliberately wants to affect his appearance. Winston's physical location and physical layout of his apartment are also helpful in opposing the surveillance of the telescreen:

"By sitting in the alcove, and keeping well back, Winston was able to remain outside the range of the telescreen, so far as sight went. He could be heard, of course, but so long as he stayed in present position he could not be seen (p. 10).

Julia, a mechanic of novel-writing machine in the Fiction Department, foregrounds a crusade against the Party. Before her rebellion with Winston, she was quite unknown to him, who thought her an agent of Thought Police and amateur spy. However, they soon fall in love when Julia secretly passes a piece of paper to Winston expressing her love. Although the Party would consider love making a though crime, illegal, and using up energy, both of them secretly meet inside and outside the city and indulge in sexual intercourse, an act of rebellion against the Party. Julia, who, before falling in love, was a member of the Anti-Sex League, but sought out sexual relations with many party members. Winston adores her sexual openness because he hates purity, virtue, and goodness. Winston explains to Julia: "The more men you've had, the more I love you I hate purity, I hate goodness: I don't want any virtue to exist anywhere. I want everyone to be corrupt to the bones" (p. 139). It is also expressed in the novel that both Winston and Julia's "embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act" (p. 140). Their sexual act, thus, taken as rebellion, not simply a fulfillment of carnal pleasure.

Individually, Julia's resistance is more physical and practical. Abrahams (1983) observes Julia's rebellion through sexuality. He opines Julia as "a secret rebel against the regime, expressing her rebellion through the illegal enjoyment of sex" (as cited in Tyner, 2004, p. 135). Besides her act of sexuality, she actively participates in the procession as a troop leader in the Spies and spends most of her time attending lectures and demonstration to remain safe. Unlike Winston, Julia's major goal, according to Meyers, "is to circumvent the rules rather than challenging them" (284). She protests the Party working within the system, not overthrowing it. She hates the Party and has no interest in its doctrine, but she makes no general criticism of it. It is explained in the novel that for Julia "Any kind of organized revolt against the Party, which was bound to be a failure, struck her as stupid. The clever thing was to break the rules and stay alive all the same" (p. 146).

Julia's "breaking the rules", according to Tyner (2004), "did not constitute a serious act of resistance in that her transgressions constituted an individuality that was the antithesis of the Party doctrine" (p. 143). In this respect, Julia's physical resistance based on sexual intercourse seems to be more egregious to the Party. Further, Julia refuses the Party's convention of woman that she must be pure, simple, and conventional without any pride in appearance. She uses rudimentary make up, makes her lips reddened, cheeks roughed, nose powdered, makes her hair very short, and wears boyish overall. Certainly, though simple and fleeting, these activities represent Julia's bold resistance to the Party.

Conclusion

Orwell's *1984* is a typical picture of a dystopian society in which the totalitarian government creates illusion, coercion, and terror in its subjects and exerts power to monopolize them. In the dystopian society of Oceania, the Party variously monitors, controls, and exploits the citizens' body and mind through disciplinary coercions to ensure its productivity-potential and complete submission. To this end Orwell envisioned a world of totalitarian state so disciplined that all remnants of individuality and humanity remained subsumed under the massive control of the state. The state practices physical and mental torture along with the implications of modern disciplinary mechanisms of control such as telescreen, microphones, and cameras to survey the thoughts and activities of Oceania citizens. Additionally, it destroys socio-cultural norms and values of Oceania by erasing historical evidences to make people ignorant to the past. In its power, the Party manipulates language and people's convictions, and instigates influence through propaganda. Portraying harrowing life of Oceania people, Orwell warns us to be aware of the potential dangers and be conscious of our identity, human right, and freedom

In a dystopian novel, there is constant conflict between monopolizing government and dissident individuals. Among various forms of resistance, writing can be considered a weapon to attack a dictatorial government system. Winston resists and protests against the domineering Party through his diary. Julia, on the other hand, objects to the Party's discipline through her sexuality. Thus, within the discipline there exists resistance. No Oceania citizens are in peace and prosperity rather they are in terror, fear, and trepidation. Hence, Orwell's *1984* is a novel about a utopia gone awry.

References

- Blakemore, S. (1984). Language and Ideology in Orwell's 1984. *Social Theory and Practice*. 10(3), 349-356. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23556571>
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality*. An Introduction. (Robert Hurley Trans). Vintage Books.
- - - (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (Alan Sheridan Trans). Penguin Books Ltd.

- Gordin, M. et al. (Eds.). (2010). *Utopia /Distopia: Condition of Historical Possibility*. Princeton University Press.
- Gotlieb, E. (1984). Political Allegory and Psychological Realism in Orwell's 1984. *The Aligarh Journal of English Studies*. 9(1), 64-89.
- Meyers, J. (2000). *Orwell: Wintry Conscience of a Generation*. W.W. Norton & Co.
- Miller, A. (2018) The Dystopian Novel and its Popular Appeal. *Journal of Contemporary Literature*. 28(3), 23-37. <https://uwpress.wisc.edu/journals>
- Moylan, T. (2000). *Scraps of the Untained Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Westview Press.
- Orwell, G. (2021) *1984*. Valley Publishing House.
- Throp, M. R. (1984). The Dynamics of Terror in Orwell's 1984. *Brigham Young University Studies*. 24(1), 3-17. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43041004>
- Tyner, J. A. (2004). Self and Space, Resistance and Discipline: A Foucauldian Reading of George Orwell's 1984. *Social and Cultural Geography*. 5(1), 129-149. DOI: 10.1080/11464936032000137966
- Watt, I. (1983) Winston Smith: the Last Humanist. *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. (Peter Stansky, Ed.) W. H. Freeman and Com. 103-113.