

Review of: "'The Unavoidable Order of Things': Fabricated Resistance in George Orwell's 1984"

Rafaela Božić¹

¹ University of Zadar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is very interesting, and it makes you rethink your views about the novel "1984". However, I don't think I agree with all the conclusions. For example: "Winston is the only one who can see through the superimposed 'ideal' into material reality". Not so, because we don't know what others see – it is a society of hidden truths. "But how can it be that Winston's mind is so different?" – but it is not. It seems different, but he is just a character through whose eyes we see the world of "1984". Obviously, he is not the only one who is an enemy of the state since the state then wouldn't need the police and O'Brien. So, I think author should introduce that there are some other "Winstons" that we (readers) know nothing about, and that there are others that understand the situation but do not rebel. Also, there are more subtypes of individuals than just two (rebels and followers). There are, of course, the manipulators, "O'Briens", who understand the situation and manipulate with it. It would be interesting to compare characters in "1984" and "We" by E. Zamyatin. How and why D-503 never doubts the ideology of the One State, and how and why I-330 does? What is the source of her being not satisfied with the seemingly ideal utopian life of the One State. Is Winston's "rebellion" result only of poor economical state, or lies bother him? Or lack of freedom, like I-330?

I appreciate the fact that the author pays his attention to the time "outside" the novel. I think that when we read novels, we should incorporate such "empty spaces" in our "reading", but this method should be applied consistently. If we know only about Winston's "rebellion" it doesn't mean that he is the only one who is a "thought criminal". I agree with the authors idea that Winston Smith is a manufactured thought criminal. But I think that he is not the only one – that is O'Briens' job – to set "traps" and catch the "ideologically weak ones". We should be careful not to assume too much. For example: "O'Brien could not have recognized it [the "place where there is no darkness" dream in this case] unless he had either read Winston's mind or implanted the thought himself". But people often have more or less very similar desires and fears, and O'Brien has a great experience in questioning "Winstons" of that world. We are not to assume that O'Brien exists only for one thought criminal. I think that it only proves how good and experienced O'Brien is.

All in all very interesting article.