Research Article

‘The Unavoidable Order of Things’: Fabricated Resistance in George Orwell’s 1984

Jan-Boje Frauen[1]

1. Xiamen University, China

This essay reclaims *1984* (1949) from recent reinterpretations by critics that locate it in the ‘fairy tale’ (Bowen) mode of the Gothic fantastic. Orwell’s famous dystopia, it is argued, is a treatise of philosophy and social criticism that depicts a future superorganism, a society in which a totality of social determinism has created a new species of human being that is entirely constructed by the totalitarian superstructure that Orwell saw emerging.

It is argued that even the triangle of ‘thought-criminals’ who seem to have stepped out of Big Brother’s ‘collective solipsism’ and reconstructed their identities as historical persons, Winston Smith, Julia and O’Brien, are collaboratively acting out a bizarre drama entirely scripted by ‘Big Brother’ to provide an antithesis to the Party. This antithesis is a necessary mechanism for ‘Ingsoc’s’ internal stability and thus part of ‘Oceania’s’ inherent logic. All three of them own dissociative identities split between ‘crimethink’ and ‘Thought Police’ and betray their rebellion. In its outlook, the essay discusses Orwell’s relevance today.

Introduction: Eleven

‘Crimethinker’ Winston Smith’s biography seems suspiciously fabricated: he is said to have been born in 1944; his mother and sister ‘disappear’ in 1955; he ‘awakes’ in the Chestnut Tree Café event that foreshadows his own future after eleven almost unaccounted for gap years in 1966, the ‘Inner Party’ member and ‘double agent’ O’Brien gives him a second prophecy of a future meeting in the ‘place where there is no darkness’ in 1977 and one may think that he will likely get executed or ‘vaporized’ in 1988,[1] aged forty-four like his birth year after four distinct periods of eleven years each: childhood, the missing adolescence years, awakening and ‘thoughtcrime’.[2] At first glance, the photograph event

of 1973, which triggers Winston's descent into 'thoughtcrime' when a picture gets passed on to him that disproves the Party narrative, and the year of his rebellion 1984 itself do not fit in. However, it seems peculiar that there are eleven years between these two dates as well. Oddly also, the final 'Eleventh Edition of the Newspeak Dictionary' will end history precisely sixty-six years later in 2050, as we know from the 'Newspeak appendix'. The novel's entire armature seems to revolve around the number eleven and periods that can be divided by it (it is even in 'Room 101'). Possibly, of course, this timeline seems so apparently artificial because George Orwell had to structure his dystopian grotesque somehow. However, it seems likewise suspicious that he would drop enough hints in the text to make it possible for the attentive reader to reconstruct Winston's biography. Might this be a subtle message from the author to the reader that bypasses the protagonist? If so, what it says may be that Winston's memory is not to be trusted. If his life story seems so obviously fabricated, perhaps this is precisely what it is. Regarding this to be something that is important on the plot level, then, it is to be assumed that Big Brother is behind it, who, in many ways, is the transcendent author of Winston's reality just like George Orwell.

This article follows this line of thought and assumes that Winston's history is manufactured. It thus promises a radical re-interpretation of some of the most important elements of Orwell's *1984* (1949). Namely, it will question the authenticity of its protagonist Winston Smith's childhood memories and, by extension, the authenticity of his rebellion. The method chosen to prosecute this argument is linear and accretive. The article will start out with a consideration of 'doublethink' and its bearing on the reality of memory in Orwell's imagined state of 'Oceania'. This 'collective solipsism' is the state of mind that Winston is lifted from when he is triggered to descend into 'thoughtcrime' (Oldspeak). The article will thus move on to an account of 'crimethink' (Newspeak) and what this tells us about Winston's attitude towards the heretic concept of an objective reality that evolves historically. Transitioning from 'thoughtcrime' to the triangle of 'thought-criminals' Winston, Julia, and O'Brien, the essay will discuss betrayal and how this bears on Winston's identity as a convergence point for manufactured and implanted fears. Concluding that all three of the revolutionaries including Winston betray their rebellion, the article closes on the idea of 'blackwhite' and how we might re-read Winston Smith not as a 'thought-criminal', but as an active participant in the structure of 'doublethink' he is usually said to resist. Through these emphases the counter-intuitive idea that Winston's thoughts and actions against Big Brother actually serve Big Brother's authoritarian needs is gradually developed in

the essay, with Winston left as a necessary remainder in a superstructure of enforced domination in which rebellion is encouraged, tolerated, and, more urgently, required.

I. Doublethink

1984 is written in an internal focalization of its main character. As John Bowen lately stated in his introduction to the new Oxford World Classics edition, 'Orwell's book begins, ends, and is lived through an individual body and consciousness'.[3] Seeing Winston's world through Winston's eyes, however, makes the reader think that Winston's fellow citizens are more or less *like him*. Winston, in turn, is more or less *like us*. Thus, we are lured into believing that Winston's 'Ingsoc' comrades are also like us. Winston has distinct memories – both of his life and of Oceania's history – that form a personal history within a social context and thus make him an individual *person*. For Winston, therefore, life in Oceania is miserable. As anyone who remembers the contradictions of a society in which fair turns foul and foul fair constantly would, Winston despises Big Brother and the Party. However, if it is unwittingly assumed that his epistemic lens must be more or less exemplary for his contemporaries, Winston is merely different in opinion; he disagrees with a system that most others seem to support. To begin with, this would entail the problem that it seems pretty much impossible that anyone could genuinely support the Party then. Even more importantly, it would mean that people are *pretending* to believe the 'new facts' when history is changed. Consequently, everyone would be a 'crimethinker', even if their support for the Party was genuine. However, this picture seems odd, as the following passage displays:

> After six days of [Hate Week] [...] the general hatred of Eurasia had boiled up into [...] a delirium [...] – at just this moment it had been announced that Oceania was not after all at war with Eurasia. Oceania was at war with Eastasia. [...].
>
> The speech had been proceeding for perhaps twenty minutes when a messenger hurried onto the platform and a scrap of paper was slipped into the speaker's hand. He unrolled and read it without pausing in his speech. Nothing altered in his voice and manner, [...], but suddenly the names were different. Without words said, a wave of understanding rippled through the crowd. [...] The next moment there was tremendous commotion. The banners and posters [...] were all wrong! [...] It was sabotage! The agents of Goldstein had been at work! [...] Posters were ripped from the walls, banners torn and trampled underfoot. [...] But within two or three minutes it was all over. The orator [...] had gone

doi.org/10.32388/PG8V22

> on straight on with his speech. One minute more, and the feral roars of rage were again bursting from the crowd. The Hate continued exactly as before, except that the target had been changed.
>
> The thing that impressed Winston ***in looking back*** [my italics] was that the speaker had switched from one line to the other actually in mid-sentence, not only without a pause, but without even breaking the syntax.[4]

Besides the 'humorous, brutal' comedy that is typical for the novel's 'blackwhite' style, one may note that there are two very different ways of interpreting the scene.[5] Of course, one could assume that people act the way they do out of fear. However, this would turn the book into a trivial farce. This essay, on the other hand, argues that Orwell, in his grotesque satire, urges us to take the "moment-to-moment flexibility in the treatment of facts" that is "known in Newspeak as doublethink" seriously and to assume that Oceania's common people (meaning Party members, not proles) are genuinely *believing* in the absurd spectacle they perform.[6] Elsewhere, Winston asks himself: 'Was he, then, *alone* in the possession of a memory?'.[7] However, it is not so much that people do not have a memory. They do remember that 'Oceania was at war with Eastasia' and *has always been* at war with Eastasia just fine. They do remember making the right posters and banners, which must have been exchanged by the agents of Goldstein. Accordingly, they do have memories. However, in Winston's reference frame, which checks the present moment against his personal database for continuity, their memories are all *false*. But how can they all collectively have these false memories, and why is Winston the only one who does not share them? Taking the grotesque seriously, the memories and identities of Winston's fellow Party members must be constructed *from the present moment*. In other words, they are not staging a bizarre spectacle for rational fear of punishment; they actually remember making the right posters and banners. Thus, the wrong banners must be sabotaged. Orwell's 'Ingsocs' (English Socialists, meaning Party members), apparently, do not construct reality in our materialist-empirical understanding of a succession of different states, each former state causing the one following from past to present. For Winston's contemporaries, causality is *reversed.* It is substituted by an idealist understanding of time, termed 'collective solipsism' by torturer O'Brien, in which the social environment posits the past from the present moment, a past that has therefore always been true and can thus be remembered without contradiction.[8]

This essential otherness of Oceanian minds has been noticed as early as 1956 by Irving Howe: 'In *1984* Orwell is trying to present the kind of world in which individuality has become obsolete and personality a crime. The whole idea of the self as something precious and inviolable is a cultural idea, a product of the liberal era; and Orwell has imagined a world in which the self [...] is no longer a significant value, not even a value to be violated'.[9] This, of course, rings reminiscent of Orwell's famous claim that the 'autonomous individual is going to be stamped out of existence' from the essay 'Inside the Whale' (1940).[10] Written mainly on Henry Miller, this essay from the beginning of the Second World War describes a ghastly future to come – and how Miller had already foreseen and come to terms with this future when a yet naïve Orwell had met him in Paris, on his way to fight for his political ideals in the Spanish Civil War. Miller, who called Orwell's decision to go to Spain the 'act of an idiot' and his political idealism 'baloney', was convinced that 'our civilization was destined to be swept away and replaced by something so different that we should scarcely regard it as human'.[11] However, the grim prospect 'did not bother him, he said'. In the ideologically charged political climate of the thirties that Orwell describes, Miller must have seemed like an 'out-of-place artifact' from the past or future; somebody holding on to something that almost does not exist anymore against something that has not fully emerged yet, like a person today who is convinced that social media and the Internet will bring the autonomous individual to an end, melt it down into data streams of a collective cloud of omnipresent sousveillance, but does not feel especially bothered by this as there is nothing one can do about it anyway, and there is always the chance that one may live out one's days before it becomes socially unacceptable – and then, inevitably, criminal – not to have a Facebook account. In Orwell's words: 'He [Miller] has performed the essential Jonah act of allowing himself to be swallowed, remaining passive, accepting'.[12] 'Acceptance', of course, is the 'final phase' of Winston Smith's 're-integration',[13] when his mind is swallowed by the whale – the great Leviathan, Big Brother – in the Chestnut Tree Café on the final page of *1984*. When he wrote 'Inside the Whale', Orwell had realized that Miller had been an author in the only authentic way one could still be an author already in the thirties. Miller was living on the 'iceberg' of a soon-to-be-extinct way of being in the world – the age of the 'autonomous individual' – in full awareness that civilization was melting fast. Orwell wrote: 'As for the writer, he is sitting on a melting iceberg; he is merely an anachronism, a hangover from the bourgeois age, as surely doomed as the hippopotamus'.[14] Tellingly, in the first plot sketches for what should become *1984* from the early forties, Winston Smith is still just a 'writer'.[15] It should not be overlooked here that *1984* is essentially the story of the writer's failure to make a

difference, the failure of his writing to liberate himself, let alone society – 'something completely meaningless, a nightmare happening in a void'.[16]

This 'something so different that we should scarcely regard it as human' that Miller saw coming in 1936 has materialized in *1984*. O'Brien says: 'If you are a man, Winston, you are the last man. Your kind is extinct; we are the inheritors'.[17] Though Orwell's depiction is drenched in the grotesque humour of the novel, the way of being in the world that Winston's comrades display is not impossible, scientifically speaking. Greg Littmann lately observed that '"doublethink" is just a formal version of the memory rewriting we all naturally engage in. We often think our memories are accurate records, but in fact, we edit them all the time, forgetting inconvenient facts and remembering things that never happened'.[18] 'Doublethink' is an essentially emotional enterprise. When the individual encounters facts that do not fit the situational Party narrative an emotional response is triggered, like the outburst of hate against 'Goldstein's agents'. The 'other', internally 'Goldstein' or the 'Brotherhood' and externally 'Eastasia' or 'Eurasia', enables Big Brother to superimpose his 'collective solipsism' upon material reality. Foul turns fair and fair turns foul. What actually happened becomes a lie by the enemy and Big Brother's lie becomes the truth. The mechanism relies fundamentally on fanatic hate for the enemy and total trust in Big Brother. Winston, however, is essentially different. He remembers *his own* past, not the one he is supposed to remember. *He has a personal identity in a realm outside of Big Brother's posited reality.* Like memory, perception is another important point that shows Winston's epistemic otherness. As early as 1983, Lillian Feder, in her classic article on selfhood in *1984*, pointed out that 'one need hardly point out that reality is a conception, inevitably an interpretation by the human mind'.[19] More recently, Jan K. B. Friis echoed that 'there is no truth, no reality that has not been sifted through the mind of the observer' and that 'science knows of 180 cognitive biases distorting perceptions'.[20] Winston's contemporaries see the 'Party ideal'. Winston is the only one who can see through the superimposed 'ideal' into material reality. About his unique 'vision of London', he states:

> The ideal set up by the Party was something huge, terrible and glittering – a world of steel and concrete of monstrous machines and terrifying weapons – a nation of warriors and fanatics, marching forward in perfect unity, all thinking the same thoughts and shouting the same slogans, perpetually working, fighting, triumphing, persecuting – three hundred million people all with the same face. The reality was decaying, dingy

> cities where underfed people shuffled to and fro in leaky shoes, in patched-up nineteenth-century houses that smelled of cabbage and bad lavatories.[21]

The London that Orwell's contemporary readers encountered as something familiar – Orwell 'described and perverted a landscape they already knew' according to D.J. Taylor's recent book on the genesis of Orwell's dystopia[22] – does not look like it looked like for Orwell's contemporaries to Winston's comrades. While it has often been noted that Orwell's grotesque depicts the forties rather than the future in terms of scenery and hardships, this does not hold true for the people who inhabit this forties-like world. Whatever their lives look like *from the outside* where Winston is standing, they see the 'ideal' that Big Brother's 'solipsism' superimposes upon London's material reality. Like a model-comrade created by Winston called Ogilvy, they have 'no aim in life except the defeat of the Eurasian enemy and the hunting down of spies, saboteurs, thought-criminals and traitors generally'.[23] Big Brother needs his antithesis to unite the cells that make him in hatred.

'Othering' is crucial for the creation of a common purpose. Internal unity is established through a Dionysian hate cult with strong sexual characteristics, which manifests itself most obviously when the '[Two Minutes] Hate rose to its climax' and when the 'great orgasm was quivering to its climax' at the end of 'Hate Week'.[24] How intrinsically connected sexual desire and violent hatred are in Big Brother's world – lately summed up as 'sadism, wet dreams and misogynistic fantasy' by Lyndsey Stonebridge[25] – becomes obvious not least through Winston's initial sexual fantasies about Julia: 'He would ravish her and cut her throat at the moment of climax'.[26] The 'blackwhite' connection of sex and hate is something he must unlearn to become a 'thought-criminal'. Julia is there to teach him. The secret note she passes to him consists of only three words: 'I love you'.[27] Like in the case of memory, science supports the feasibility of the Orwellian picture: sex and violence happen in the same cluster of neurons in the stem brain.[28] On the one hand, the redirection of the sex drive to daily two-minute outlets ('Two Minutes Hate') and one annual orgy ('Hate Week') makes it possible for Ingsocs to perform sex as merely a mandatory, mechanical 'duty to the Party' to produce offspring without affection.[29] On the other hand, it makes it possible for them to love Big Brother in the same pure way in which God needs to be loved, which is an unconditioned love that can never turn into resistance. To receive this genuine love deprived of love's potential to turn into hate, then, Big Brother needs to create his anti-thesis to offload sexuality's inherent explosiveness in climaxes of hate: 'flaws in the system' like Winston, who breaks through into the material reality underlying 'collective solipsism'

against all odds, which makes them 'thought-criminals' by definition. But how can it be that Winston's mind is so different? The first step to an answer is to realize that Winston's mind was not always different to this degree.

II. Crimethink

'It is impossible to see reality except by looking through the eyes of the Party. That is the fact you have to re-learn', O'Brien announces to prelude Winston's 're-integration' in the 'Ministry of Love'.[30] If Winston has to 're-learn' this 'fact', however, this equally means that Winston *unlearned* it at some point. But how did he manage to unlearn?

Noticeably, there is an eleven-year gap between Winston's blurry childhood memories and Winston's adulthood memories. What happened before the gap in Winston's childhood ending with the 'disappearance' of his mother and sister in 1955 feels to Winston like a misty dream, something without clear contours. Winston wonders what actually happened in the blurry constructions of the mind that come to him in his dreams and gradually translate into memories. The way Winston recalls his adulthood memories from after the adolescence gap differs significantly. The latter memories seem more autobiographical, more like something that is actually retrieved and less like something that might be constructed by the mind from external sources of information. In a way, we always remember somebody else's experience when we try to retrieve childhood memories, according to Orwell. There is a fundamental divide between the state of being a child and the state of being an adult, an epistemic gap as if the child and the adult were distinct species. This picture is put forward most strongly in the ironically entitled and posthumously published essay 'Such, Such Were the Joys' about Orwell's years at the preparatory school St Cyprian, which have been seen as a blueprint for Winston's life in Oceania.[31] However, it is not the 'all-powerful' schoolmaster Sambo who is of interest here. More important is the mind of the child (i.e., little Eric Arthur) that Orwell sought to retrieve in the essay. Tellingly, he writes that 'contradictions can exist easily in the mind of a child' about the paradoxes of St Cyprian life. This stands in obvious analogy to the *Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* from *1984*, which states that Oceania's 'contradictions are not accidental, nor do they result from ordinary hypocrisy: they are deliberate exercises in *doublethink*. For it is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained indefinitely'.[32,33] Orwell stresses how unintelligible the child's thoughts and feelings are for the grownup: '[The child] lives in a sort of alien underwater world which we can only penetrate by memory or divination'.[34] The 'incredibly distorted

[...] child's vision of the world' that Orwell describes in 'Such, Such Were the Joys' strongly resembles the epistemic otherness of Winston's comrades described in the previous chapter.[35] *Personhood*, it seems, is not a biological given but a social construct. Growing up in a vastly different social environment, 'Ingsocs' do not develop it. Their minds stay fundamentally childlike.[36]

Winston, then, is the exception because he matured into a temporal person through thoughtcrime. To understand how he became different, accordingly, one must look at Winston's 'crimethink' years. Winston's first adulthood memory stems from 1966, when he sees three Ingsoc founding members at the Chestnut Tree Café.[37] Most obviously, however, his descent into thoughtcrime starts 'ten – eleven years' before the narrated time in 1973,[38] when a picture gets passed on to him through his office tube, which disproves the current Party narrative concerning the three Ingsoc founding members he had seen at the Café in 1966.[39] He does dispose of the compromising material, but does so only 'a few minutes later'.[40] As he learns later, the traitor Goldstein wrote, which means Big Brother demands: 'a Party member is required to have not only the right opinions, but the right instincts'.[41] Winston's compliance is not pure enough. He hesitates to make the narrative of the Party machinery his ultimate reality when empirical evidence contradicts it. He fails '*Crimestop*, [...] the faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought'.[42] However, his failure in an immediate proper gut reaction before the content of the picture enters his conscious mind is yet the only thing that is wrong with him. Possibly, he only hesitates because he had seen the three in 1966. Before 1973, however, Winston never consciously grasped that he falsified an *objective* reality in the Ministry of Truth. Rewriting reality professionally every day never made him doubt the Party narrative. He always changed the facts in his mind as he went along rewriting them for everyone else. It is only when the 'out-of-place artifact' proves that there is an objective reality underlying Big Brother's 'solipsism', years after reality got rewritten, that his dispositions start to grow into 'crimethink' proper. Having glimpsed at the 'out-of-place artifact', Winston has the first memory that is distinctly detached from the Party narrative. Now, there is a split between Winston in the world and Winston in Big Brother's mind, a crack through which the structure of being can be seen behind the shape of things. This crack is bound to grow as he slowly starts to realize what he is actually doing in the Ministry of Truth. If truth is not made, but independently 'out there' in a material world hidden behind the illusion that Big Brother superimposes upon individuals' perceptions, even the name of the Ministry becomes a lie: the Ministry of 'Truth' does not make truth but distorts it, just like, it slowly begins to dawn on Winston, the Ministry of 'Plenty' may not increase but reduce food rations etc. The

'out-of-place artifact' first introduced Winston to the heretical concept of an objective reality that evolves historically – no matter what attempts at hiding the true course of events have been undertaken it is still *out there,* as the picture proves. However, it is to be assumed that this completely foreign concept matures very slowly in Winston's mind, as he goes on the long road towards personhood by attempting to retrieve individual memories and reconstruct history from them. At about the same time, likely shortly after Winston's failure in instinct, O'Brien starts to make sporadic appearances in Winston's environment.[43] Seven years before the narrated time in 1977, Winston dreams of O'Brien's voice telling him that they will meet in the 'place where there is no darkness'.[44]

Winston's apartment is set up for thoughtcrime: 'For some reason the telescreen in the living room was in an unusual position'.[45] Because it was not 'placed, as was normal', there remains an unobserved alcove.[46] Tellingly, this alcove had 'probably been intended to hold bookshelves'.[47] This oddity – 'by chance' as Winston believes, lately echoed by John Bowen[48] – makes it possible to trigger a further matured failure in the 'right instincts' shortly before the narrated time begins: when Winston sees a 'beautiful' notebook placed for him 'lying in a window', he is struck by 'an overwhelming desire to possess it'.[49] Immediately before the narrated time starts during the 'Two Minutes Hate', O'Brien triggers the onset of Winston's active rebellion: 'he caught O'Brien's eye. […] An unmistakable message had passed'.[50] O'Brien's trigger is crucial because it is only at this moment, through the connection to another autonomous individual, that Winston adopts the bizarre theory of an objective reality outside of Big Brother's 'solipsism' as his belief. Would it not appear to any sensible person that one must be mad when one thinks that one can remember the enemy constantly changing while everyone else remembers a coherent history?[51] Triggered by the 'unmistakable message', however, Winston hurries home and compulsively starts writing 'DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER' into the diary, which, as he later realizes, is written for and to O'Brien.[52,53] He no longer doubts his sanity: 'For, after all, how do we know that two and two equals four? Or that the force of gravity works? Or that the past is unchangeable? If both the past and the outer world exist only in the mind, and if the mind itself is controllable – what then? But no! His courage seemed suddenly to stiffen of its own account. The face of O'Brien […] had floated into his mind'.[54] Now, his rebellion can begin.

III. Betrayal

Winston Smith is a manufactured thought-criminal. Indeed, the idea that Winston's resistance is to be seen as a mere 'simulation of opposition' in O'Brien's 'Game of Power' has been put forward already in 1987 in Vita Fortunati's insightful and too little-known article on Oceania as the 'end of utopia'.[55] But is it true that Winston 'consciously agrees to take part' in O'Brien's game, as Fortunati assumes? [56] On the most superficial level, three people play out this macabre drama with Winston, each of them marked by the 'Oranges and Lemons' rhyme of betrayal:

> Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St. Clement's.
>
> You owe me five farthings, say the bells of St. Martin's.
>
> When will you pay me? Say the bells at Old Bailey.
>
> When I grow rich, say the bells at Shoreditch.
>
> Here comes a candle to light you to bed,
>
> And here comes a chopper to chop off your head!
>
> Chip chop chip chop the last man is dead.[57]

Mr. Charrington, the undercover Thought Police agent of thirty-five pretending to be a sixty-three-year-old prole 'junk shop' owner, provides Winston with the notebook for his diary. When Winston's feet find their way back to his shop 'on their own accord', Charrington presents him with the symbolic paperweight, another 'out-of-place artifact'.[58] Apparently delighted when Winston buys it (which Winston incorrectly attributes to Charrington overcharging him), he shows Winston an upstairs room where 'the furniture was still arranged as though the room was meant to be lived in'.[59] In the room, a picture of St. Clement's Dane covers a hidden telescreen. Charrington tells Winston the corresponding line from the rhyme 'Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St. Clement's' as well as the second line 'You owe me five farthings, say the bells of St. Martin's'.[60] Lighting Winston's way to 'an enormous bed with the mattress still on it' with a candle, Charrington adds that he also remembers the rhyme ending in 'Here comes a candle to light you to bed, | And here comes a chopper to chop off your head' but cannot recall the middle lines.[61] When Winston leaves the shop, he runs into Julia on the street,

who at this time he still suspects is a loyal Party member at least and possibly a member of the Thought Police as well.

Two months later in June on their first secret meeting in the room, after having 'agreed with unexpected readiness' to rent the room as a hide-out for their sexual relationship, Julia adds the line 'When will you pay me? | Say the bells at Old Bailey' to the rhyme.[62] Uncannily echoing Mr. Charrington, she claims that she also remembers the rhyme ending in 'Here comes a candle to light you to bed, | And here comes a chopper to chop off your head' but cannot recall the last missing middle line.[63] This first meeting in Mr. Charrington's room is important in many ways. Julia has brought makeup and scent, which suggests that she knows Winston's secret diary. Oddly, she uses the 'very same scent' used by the prostitute described in his diary, as Winston notices somewhat surprised.[64] Importantly, Julia thus links the scent to the horror of Room 101, where Julia's presence must be suggested to trigger Winston's attempt to trade places with her. To strengthen this link, it is also at this meeting that Winston's deepest fear is raised to borderline consciousness: '[Julia] suddenly twisted herself over the bed, seized a shoe from the floor and sent it hurtling into the corner with a boyish jerk of her arm, exactly as he had seen her fling the dictionary at Goldstein [during the Two Minutes Hate on the fourth of April]. "What was it"? he said in surprise. "A rat. [...]". "Rats" murmured Winston. "In this room"!'.[65] At this point, in June, Winston knows of course that her flinging the dictionary at Goldstein had been a show, the 'boyish jerk of the arm' a well-trained act of disguise. And yet, even though he never sees the rat, it does not occur to him that she might be acting again. Furthermore, she goes on to tell him: 'In some [...] streets a woman daren't leave a baby alone for two minutes. It's the great huge brown ones that do it. And the nasty thing is that the brutes always-----'.[66] Her vivid description triggers a memory from 'a nightmare which had recurred [...] throughout his life' in Winston: '*Don't go on!* [...] Of all horrors in the world a rat!'.[67] In Room 101, O'Brien uncannily echoes Julia when presenting Winston with these huge brown rats in a cage: 'You will have heard of the things that happen [...]. In some streets a woman dare not leave her baby alone'.[68] He then goes on to finish Julia's description of the rats' behaviour, Winston being unable to cut him short as he did with Julia.

One may thus assume that Julia's function is to get Winston talking, to make him *reveal* his innermost, secret fear. A hidden telescreen can hear what Winston says. However, it cannot record what Winston *thinks*. Thus, the illusion of an unobserved hiding place is not enough. It furthermore takes someone to get him talking. Mark Alfano recently wrote that Winston 'is bamboozled into disclosing his

innermost secrets'.[69] Surprisingly, however, O'Brien seems to know subtleties from Winston's dreams that not even Julia had 'bamboozled' him to narrate. In fact, he knows things about Winston's psyche and memories *before* Winston consciously knows them himself. John Bowen lately claimed that 'the most brutal, modern interrogation methods are inseparable from the tropes and time of magic and fairy tales. O'Brien even knows Winston's dreams'.[70] O'Brien knows so much not merely about Winston's life, but more importantly about his inner life, memories, fears and dreams, that it is natural to see the 'black magic' of the Gothic in the novel. About O'Brien's familiarity with Winston's dreams, Bowen correctly concludes that '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'.[71] In Winston's words: '[O'Brien's] mind *contained* Winston's mind'.[72] One way to explain O'Brien's omniscience is to locate the novel in the fantastic, as Bowen does. However, one can also attempt to take the 'implantation' of thoughts seriously on realistic terms, as this article has steadily worked towards. To make this line of argument work, however, one must turn the traditional interpretation upside-down: the Party machinery is not designed to *observe* Winston; it *creates* Winston.

The most important step in Winston's 're-integration' is his betrayal of Julia in Room 101 – the 'singularity' where 'there is no such thing as reality'.[73] This essential act must be well-prepared. If Winston wins here, he has defeated the Party in death: 'To die hating them, that was freedom'.[74] The more surprising it seems that the place of the 'worst thing in the world' that 'varies from individual to individual', as O'Brien says, is a quite ordinary underground room, hardly remarkable besides being 'bigger than most cells'.[75] While O'Brien mentions drowning, burial alive and fire – all fears that feature in Party propaganda movies – it seems obvious that fears as fundamental as acrophobia could not be simulated in Room 101, let alone the more sophisticated panics that many of us fear most. Though O'Brien speaks of 'fifty deaths', there are millions of possible fears and most of them cannot be reproduced in a sparsely equipped underground room.[76] This, of course, is a purely practical argument. However, there is also the problem of the (according to Bowen) 'telepathic or quasi-telepathic' relationship between Winston and O'Brien, which makes it possible for O'Brien to present Winston with his own worst fear.[77] To account for the uncanny efficiency of the less-than-remarkable underground room, Room 101 must be a place for *fabricated fears*.

It has been said that the Party carefully sets up Winston's Room 101 experience by ensuring that Julia's presence can be simulated and by raising Winston's worst fear to borderline consciousness in the

situation that establishes the link, thus making sure that Winston's trauma is recalled in Room 101's 'sensory deprivation'[78] environment when the God-like, omniscient O'Brien announces: 'Do you remember [...] the moment of panic that used to occur in your dreams? There was a wall of blackness in front of you, and a souring sound in your ears. There was something terrible on the other side of the wall. You knew that you knew what it was, but you dared not drag it out into the open. It was the rats'.[79] Julia and O'Brien are building up on something, a repressed memory, as Winston believes, that has grown for a long time in Winston's dreams. There are two constantly recurring motifs in his dreams: the 'disappearance' of his mother and sister and the 'Golden Country'. Though Winston cannot fully comprehend what the dreams signify and which memories they relate to, he realizes that these motifs are 'part of the unavoidable order of things'.[80] He states about the recurring dream of the 'wall of blackness' connected to his mother and sister's 'disappearance' that 'while retaining the characteristic dream scenery, [the dreams] are a continuation of one's intellectual life, and in which one becomes aware of facts and ideas which still seem new and valuable after one is awake'.[81]

What is insinuated though never explicitly put in words since Winston only becomes consciously aware of it in Room 101 himself is that his mother and sister did not simply 'disappear' in 1955. Winston himself believes that he 'murdered' them by stealing their meagre food rations for his own benefit and running away. Then, when he returns, they are gone without a trace as far as he can consciously remember. The repressed part of the story, however, is that it is only his mother who 'disappeared'. His baby-sister's corpse, as Julia and O'Brien force Winston to recall in Room 101, was still in the room, mutilated by 'enormous, carnivorous' rats, which Winston likely chased away from their nasty business by his return, leaving the eleven-year-old boy with the hellish consequence of his sin. As an adult, in spite of all he has learned, he repeats the original sin of his childhood in Room 101. The selfish flesh, to protect his self from his innermost fear, once again overrules the altruistic principle to protect his most beloved other human being Julia in Winston's attempt to swap places with her. Julia thus takes the role of his sister when evil once more triumphs over good. Ingsoc, Winston realizes, is the only cure for the original sin of selfishness, the sin of being an autonomous individual. The crimethinker, the historical person, is broken and the organism returns into Big Brother's super-mind. But how does O'Brien *know* what it takes to break Winston?

John Bowen recently claimed that 'there can be no naturalistic explanation' for O'Brien's uncanny knowledge of Winston's dreams, that it must be 'telepathic communication [...] via occult or superhuman power'.[82] However, as the 'souring sound' and absence of images, the 'wall of

blackness', indicate, these nightmares may be manufactured by audio signals coming from the 'telescreen' while Winston sleeps. There is an obvious connection to the 'place where there is no darkness' dream, in which Winston 'had dreamed that he was walking through a pitch-dark room'.[83] In a realistic reading, there is little doubt that O'Brien's voice prophesying a future meeting in what has lately been called the 'nightmare of total illumination' in the Ministry of Love came from the telescreen.[84] After all, O'Brien pretty much admits to it when he speaks of the 'drama that I have played out with you during seven years'.[85] This 'Sleep-Hacking by the Party', as it was recently described by Jason M. Buchanan, goes beyond surveillance: 'Sleep is just another moment in the day when [Winston] can receive messages from the Party'.[86] These 'messages' gradually translate from dreams into memories. Regarding Winston's childhood memories, or at the very least Winston's memories of his mother's disappearance, there is thus doubt whether his recollections are more than mere implantations, which would explain O'Brien's uncanny omniscience with regard to not only the dreams themselves but to what they relate to even before Winston knows himself. Though Winston never quite grasps the concept, O'Brien clearly states that the Party has the power to build entire personality structures upon manufactured trauma: 'Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in shapes of your own choosing'.[87] Even more obviously, he states: 'The command of the totalitarians was "Thou shalt". Our command is "Thou art"'.[88]

Julia's function, then, lies in her linkage to Winston's deepest fear, which is established by her raising it to borderline consciousness in a situation that can be reproduced in Room 101. Immediately before the secret meeting with O'Brien, Winston has made up his mind about betrayal: 'The one thing that matters is that we shouldn't betray one another, although even that can't make the slightest difference. [...] If they could make me stop loving you – that would be the real betrayal'.[89] Winston, at this point in time, feels confident: 'With all their cleverness they had not mastered the secret of finding out what another human being was thinking. [...] The inner heart, whose workings were mysterious even to yourself, remained impregnable'.[90] Winston's 'inner heart', however, remains 'impregnable' not 'even' but primarily to himself. Having carefully constructed it over decades, it is an open book to the Party. In this 'impregnable inner heart', Winston always knew this. When he parts from O'Brien at the secret meeting that initiates him and Julia into the 'Brotherhood', O'Brien says '"We shall meet again---"'.[91] Winston completes his sentence for him: '"In the place where there is no darkness"? he said hesitantly. O'Brien nodded without appearance of surprise. "In the place where there is no darkness", he said, as though he had recognised the allusion'. In return, O'Brien completes

the nursery rhyme for Winston by adding the last stanza line ‘When I grow rich, | Say the bells at Shoreditch’. With this, all is said, and what must be done shall be done. The two are conspirators in the same plot against their rebellion.

IV. Blackwhite

Winston, Julia, O’Brien and, probably, Mr. Charrington are unlike their Ingsoc comrades. They do not partake in the ‘reconciliation of contradictions’ through the constant re-emergence of reality and history. They have their *own* memories. To some degree, they stand outside of ‘collective solipsism’. And yet, they are deeply embedded in the structure of doublethink. While they do not partake in what has been called ‘controlled insanity’[92] and ‘institutionalized madness’[93] by critics lately, they are equally constructed by Big Brother in their personal histories. Most importantly, they are constructed in a dissociative way, containing more than one personality. Winston describes it best himself: ‘if you want to keep a secret you must also hide it from yourself. You must know all the while that it is there, but until it is needed you must never let it emerge into your consciousness in any shape that could be given a name’.[94] Winston thinks that he is talking about his hatred for the Party here. Actually, he quotes what is written by O’Brien about ‘doublethink’ without realizing it:[95] ‘The process has to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it must also be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity. [...] To forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just as long as it is needed [...] is indispensably necessary’.[96] Winston, like O’Brien and Julia, owns dissociative identities oscillating between his rebellion and a deeper level, on which he sabotages his manufactured resistance.

‘Blackwhite’ signifies the simultaneous truth of binary opposites in the same mind. In their ‘blackwhite’ minds, the traitors are unaware of being Thought Police while rebelling. It is to be assumed that the Outer Party members that Julia slept with ‘hundreds of times – well, scores of times, anyway’ shared Winston’s fate in the Ministry of Love.[97] However, this does not mean that Julia remembers it this way. She may well be working with great dedication *for* Big Brother on a deep structural level beneath her conscious actions *against* him. O’Brien, as well, seems to be able to switch from thought-criminal to Thought Police almost instantly, containing both characters in a genuine, ‘blackwhite’ way. Winston, also, is manufacturing his crime *for* Big Brother, not against him, on a deep-structural level. He is perhaps best seen as a character, who never leaves the stage set for him.

He *thinks* that he is rebelling, but these thoughts remain the thoughts of a character in a play written by Big Brother (and, of course, by George Orwell). He never breaks through to the actor behind that character. His thoughts and actions *against* Big Brother are just as much *for* Big Brother because they provide him with the antithesis he needs for the internal unity of 'collective solipsism', which is achieved by canalized hate of the 'other' without and the 'other' within. His rebellion, accordingly, is as real as the war, which means that it is 'blackwhite' real, real on one level but staged on another. Winston is thus working *with* the three traitors, not against them, in a collaborative effort to breed thoughtcrime. The examples of his subconscious refusal to see the obvious are numerous. He never asks what became of Julia's other men. It does not strike him as odd that he meets Julia outside of Mr. Charrington's shop even though he has just finished a long internal monologue about how unusual it is for Party members to go to the prole quarters. Julia is obviously connected to O'Brien, entering the Two Minutes Hate together with him to trigger Winston's rebellion. Like O'Brien, she is obviously an Inner Party member with access to Inner Party privileges, which Winston merely accepts as a convenient contradiction. He makes a huge, risky effort to squeeze memories out of a drunk, demented old prole, but never asks the knowledgeable and trustworthy Mr. Charrington.[98] It also seems very unlikely that Winston could *actually* believe that a healthy Inner Party member of thirty-five is an old prole of sixty-three unless we assume that Winston's perception is still distorted to some degree. Thus, Winston, Julia and O'Brien are collaboratively acting out a bizarre drama written by Big Brother. O'Brien welcomes Winston to the Ministry of Love with the words 'You did know it – you have always known it'.[99] Winston realizes: 'Yes, he saw now, he had always known it'.

But what does 'always' mean here? Winston Smith is presented with his final future for the first time at the 'lonely hour of fifteen' on some day in 1966 at the Chestnut Tree Café.[100] This memory also happens to be his first adulthood memory after the almost unaccounted-for adolescence gap and his possibly manufactured childhood memories (at least referring to his mother's disappearance). Here, he sees the three Ingsoc founding members Jones, Aaronson and Rutherford from the picture that he will receive in 1973 reach the final phase 'acceptance' of their 're-integration' into Big Brother's mind, the annihilation of their individual persons to become vessels to be filled by Big Brother's spirit again. Winston describes this moment as 'the really relevant date' compared to the 1973 incident.[101] Even more tellingly, Winston states that this memory was when 'the story really began'.[102] When Winston reaches the final phase 'acceptance' at the 'lonely hour of fifteen' on the last page of the novel in the same way as the 1966 traitors at the same place in 1987, it is naturally assumed that he

will also get rearrested and shot shortly after. The nursery rhyme 'Oranges and Lemons' must be completed, and it must be completed after the narrated time ends – the final line 'Chip chop chip chop the last man is dead' is not included in the lines cited in the novel. But it is alluded to by O'Brien calling Winston the 'last man' before comforting him that 'it will not last forever'.[103,104] The final eleven-year cycle must be completed, culminating in Winston's death in 1988, ending his life at age forty-four, thus mirroring both Winston's birthyear, 1944, and Orwell's age when he wrote *1984*. Charrington, Julia and O'Brien provided all lines except for the final 'chip chop'. Winston, the fourth traitor, completes the rhyme in death.

However, this is not the only possible interpretation. Ultimately, it relies on Winston's naïve belief that he will get shot eventually. But Big Brother, it has been displayed, does not think this way. 'Power is forever', he reveals through his 'priest of power' O'Brien.[105] About Winston's first adulthood and possibly first authentic memory from 1966, we are told that 'Winston could not now [in 1984] remember how he had come to be in the Café at such a time. The place was almost empty'.[106] In fact, it is extremely odd that he would be there at all. The Chestnut Tree Café is for crimethinkers released from the torture chambers of the Ministry of Love. Here, filled up with gin or (probably) worse, they empty their selves, they reach 'acceptance', the 'final phase', and transcend into the mind of Big Brother without a trace of the persons they were remaining. In Winston's words, here, the 'long-hoped for bullet was entering his brain'.[107] However, it is a metaphorical bullet, which destroys the temporal mind acquired through thoughtcrime, but not the physical brain. Julia also survives, if with a minor injury, just like she had been minorly injured when she first turned her attention to Winston. Winston, likewise, has 'false teeth' already when he meets Julia, before his false teeth get pulled out (again?) and replaced (again?) in the Ministry of Love.[108] On the final page of the novel, in the Chestnut Tree Café at the 'lonely hour of fifteen' on some day in early April 1987 (possibly the fourth), Winston Smith has come full circle from 1966, not remembering how he got there. Likewise, then, this means that he awakes once more to a new life. Given his age, he might well have another generation of crimethink in him. And Julia, of course, is much younger than him and seems to operate in much shorter cycles, since we know that there were 'scores' of men before Winston. Unlike a novel, a circle has no end. Perhaps then, the next cycle of Winston and Julia's bizarre drama is about to start from here. For once, Winston's recurring dreams of the 'Golden Country' are so unlike the phantasmagorical dreams of his mother and his sister, so visual, detailed, vivid and real, that one cannot but wonder whether Winston has actually been there before when it turns out that the place

exists: 'The landscape that he was looking at recurred so often in his dreams that he was never fully certain whether or not he had seen it in the real world'.[109] And, of course, O'Brien openly announces that the 'drama I have played out with you during seven years will be played out over and over again'.[110]

Concluding Remarks

The very first written correspondence regarding what was to become *1984* – a letter by Orwell to his publisher Fred Warburg from the spring of 1947 – characterizes the novel as 'in a sense a fantasy, but in the form of a naturalistic novel'.[111] Tellingly, Orwell added 'that is what makes it a difficult job'. Having finally received the manuscript from Orwell at the end of 1948, Warburg described it as a 'horror novel'[112] and his associate David Farrar declared that it was 'a fantasy world so real that the reader minded what happened to the characters'.[113] Locating Orwell's 'blackwhite' novel between realism and the fantastic is a 'difficult job' indeed. Recent writing on *1984* has often focused on these tonal and formal ambiguities as a novelistic object. D.J. Taylor describes it as 'horribly realistic'.[114] Dorian Lynskey is very good, in his book, on the 'phantasmagoric' properties of the novel, as is John Bowen, both critics reading Orwell's novel as a profoundly unstable narrative that cuts against clear-cut readings throughout.[115,116] David Dwan's recent claim that there is no such thing as 'truth' to be found in the novel echoes these discussions.[117] Indeed, that the novel was intentionally designed to produce a 'phantasmagorical effect' has been explicitly stated by Orwell already in the very first known plot outline from a notebook that is now in the Orwell Archive at University College London and may well date back to 1943 or even earlier.[118]

However, an 'effect' is not an ontology. In the essay 'Looking Back on the Spanish War' (1943) about Orwell's experience in Spain that has been identified as the root of the thoughts that ultimately became *1984* by Lynskey, Orwell made the famous claims that the '*concept* [my italics] of objective truth is fading out of the world' and that '*for all practical purposes* [my italics] the lie will have become the truth' if a totalitarian regime rewrites history.[119] However, these are different statements from saying that the lie will have become the truth in an ontological sense. It is too often overlooked that Orwell ends his famous essay by explicitly holding on to the conviction 'that however much you deny the truth, the truth goes on existing'.[120] Consequently assuming that Winston, at least partly, breaks through into an objective reality against claims of total relativity or black magic, Orwell's novel

becomes a study of the malleability of the human mind. This sheds new light on his famous statement that the 'autonomous individual is going to be stamped out of existence'.[121] In the reading proffered here, the autonomous individual, the temporal person, went extinct in *1984*. In a realistic interpretation, then, Orwell thought that the totalitarian future he saw coming would do much more to the human condition than mere mechanical oppression. Orwell saw the dawn of a new species, beings with minds that are constantly constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed. Big Brother, the social superstructure, is omnipresent through the augmentation of the Oceanian environment with two-way 'telescreens'. His ubiquity does not merely translate into omniscience through his omnipresent eye. More importantly, it translates into omnipotence through his omnipresent word.[122] 'Reality control' is a post-human way of being in the world. The Ingsoc-mind is a hybrid, a cyborg made of network information and a human organism. The 'inheritors', as O'Brien calls this new species, give rise to Big Brother in the same way in which our billions of brain neurons ('Inner Party'), trillions of human DNA-carrying eukaryotes ('Outer Party') and the body's ninety percent of non-human procaryotic cells ('proles') constitute the entity that calls itself by a single name in human consciousness.[123] O'Brien says: 'Can you not understand, Winston, that the individual is only a cell?'.[124] In a very literal way, he is right when he claims that Big Brother exists but Winston does not.[125] Reminiscent of *The Matrix*'s (1999) sequel instalments, even the inevitable flaws in the system, the last men and women who manage to regain personhood against all odds, are not their own persons, but mirages of rebellion and choice made by a meta-consciousness that encompasses all of their thoughts and deeds.[126]

Dwan writes that what makes Orwell a 'great political educator' might be first and foremost the 'questions he allows us to ask'.[127] Though the future Orwell envisioned did not come to pass in a totalitarian way, then, his message is still valid and urgent today. Are we turning ourselves into neuron-like 'Ingcaps' (English Capitalists) through the omnipresent Internet and social media, through reciprocal social pressure relations that make it increasingly impossible for the individual not to be connected, not to display all of what used to be private selves online for everyone else to see, defame, deform and degrade? The new sousveillance, other than Orwell's surveillance, is dynamic-decentralized and far more advanced than Orwell could have imagined in 1948. Are we perhaps already like Winston, performing thoughts and actions for an emerging entity we cannot see while fooling ourselves into believing that we are autonomous individuals? A revised-realistic rereading makes it possible to still employ *1984* in the way that Orwell, arguably, intended for all his writing, fictional or

nonfictional: to analyse and evaluate the real world, to question the existing and caution against the potential. We need to hold on to our *selves*, Orwell is still warning, in 2022 as much as in 1948 and 1984.

Footnotes

[1] At the end of the narration, it seems unclear how long Winston spent in the Ministry of Love. However, the 'telescreen bulletin' announces the merry news that the 'Tenth Three-Year Plan's quota' has been 'overfulfilled' in the 'preceding quarter'. We know from the very beginning of the novel that the 'overfulfilment of the Ninth Three-Year Plan' has been announced on the fourth of April 1984 in the same way. Accordingly, it seems to be 1987 and likely April, possibly even the fourth. The narration ends here with Winston reaching 'acceptance' by 'winning the victory over himself' when the 'yellow note' plays from the telescreen, in the same way in which he had witnessed Jones, Aaronson and Rutherford reach 'acceptance' in 1966. However, we know that the three got rearrested and executed only a year later. More generally, we know that those who get released from the Ministry of Love are 'allowed to remain at liberty for as much as a year or two', which makes it likely that Winston will get rearrested and killed in 1988. See Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Penguin Books, 2000), 261, 6, 269, 71, 43.

[2] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 110, 10, 29, 146, 69-71, 25, 261. In this essay, the American title *1984* is used for its conciseness.

[3] George Orwell and John Bowen, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), Oxford world's classics, p. vii. This essay cites from the Penguin edition (2000).

[4] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 163–64.

[5] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 13. O'Brien's face is described in this 'blackwhite' way.

[6] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 191–92.

[7] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 55.

[8] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 241.

[9] Irving Howe, 'Orwell: History as Nightmare', *The American Scholar*, 25.2 (1956), 193–207 (p. 195).

[10] Orwell, 'Inside the Whale', III.

[11] Orwell, ‘Inside the Whale’, III.

[12] Orwell, ‘Inside the Whale’, III.

[13] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 236.

[14] Orwell, ‘Inside the Whale’, III. That the hippopotamus, the writer and the autonomous individual have proved to be more resilient than Miller and Orwell imagined does not mean that there is nothing to their premonition, this essay will go on to argue (with regard to the writer and the autonomous individual; the hippopotamus, with a little help of a Colombian drug lord, seems to be thriving as of late).

[15] D. J. Taylor, *On Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Biography* (New York: Abram Press, 2019), p. 52.

[16] Orwell, ‘Inside the Whale’, III. The essay refers to post-WWI poets here.

[17] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 244.

[18] Greg Littmann, ‘Why Don't the Proles Just Take Over?’, in *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, ed. by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie (Chicago: Open Court, 2018), volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 23–35 (p. 30).

[19] Lillian Feder, ‘Selfhood, Language, and Reality: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*’, *The Georgia Review*, 37.2 (1983), 392–409 (p. 408).

[20] Jan K. B. Friis, ‘The Irrelevance of Truth’, in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 243–54 (51, 46).

[21] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 68.

[22] Taylor, p. 6.

[23] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 45.

[24] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 12, 163.

[25] Lyndsey Stonebridge, *Placeless People: Writings, Rights, and Refugees* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 92.

[26] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 17.

[27] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 99.

[28] See Dayu Lin and others, 'Functional Identification of an Aggression Locus in the Mouse Hypothalamus', *Nature*, 470.7333 (2011), 221–26; Clifford B. Saper, 'The Nexus of Sex and Violence', *Nature*, 470.7333 (2011), 179–81.

[29] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 62.

[30] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 226.

[31] Taylor, pp. 72–76.

[32] Orwell, 'Such, Such Were the Joys', IV.

[33] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 225.

[34] Orwell, 'Such, Such Were the Joys', IV.

[35] Orwell, 'Such, Such Were the Joys', IV.

[36] Before the concept of personhood is developed, the child's mind is characterized by 'a lack of differentiation from the physical world and others'. See Seán Ó Nualláin, 'Ask Not What You Can Do for Yourself: Cartesian Chaos, Neural Dynamics, and Immunological Cognition', *Biosemiotics*, 3.1 (2010), 79–92 (p. 91). Interestingly, neuroscientist Ó Nualláin explicitly states that the 'brain imposes an Orwellian rewriting of history' (p. 86). For a more technical discussion of the situational construction of our sense of temporal selfness, see also Jan-Boje Frauen, 'Self, Singularity, Super-Self? On Subjectivity in Super-Connectivity', *Journal of Posthuman Studies*, 5.2 (2021), 130-49; Jan-Boje Frauen, 'The End of the I? A Biosemiotic Approach to Super-Connectivity', *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, 17.1 (2021), 159-95.

[37] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 70.

[38] Not knowing the title of his narration, Winston is not entirely sure if it actually is 1984.

[39] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 141.

[40] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 141.

[41] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 190.

[42] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 191.

[43] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 13.

[44] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 25.

[45] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 9.

[46] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 9.

[47] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 9.

[48] Orwell and Bowen, p. xxii.

[49] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 9.

[50] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 18–19.

[51] David Dwan, in his recent book, claims that 'it is never made clear what truth in the novel actually is'. See David Dwan, *Liberty, Equality, and Humbug: Orwell's Political Ideals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 152. O'Brien insists that Winston is brought to the Ministry of Love to be 'cured' and restored to 'sanity'. Also, he obviously assesses Winston's state of mind at the secret meeting, which results in Winston declaring a willingness to commit unspeakable acts of terrorism. See Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 229, 156. One has thus to note that there actually is good reason to lock the delusional (?) and potentially dangerous Winston away into an asylum. Furthermore, the madhouses of Orwell's time did not look all that unlike the Ministry, including details like the electro-shock therapy that Winston undergoes. Are we perhaps reading the story of a madman? How certain are we that Winston did *not* kill his wife, as he claims? Does the dictatorship he describes even exist outside of his mind? A medical analysis of Winston's insanity, which unfortunately stops short of asking these questions, and Orwell's post-binary stance on the topic can be found in Lisa Mullen, '"The few Cubic Centimetres inside your Skull": a Neurological Reading of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*', *Medical Humanities*, 45.3 (2019), 258–66.

[52] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 20,93.

[53] While conciseness does not permit a detailed discussion here, the importance of writing as an enabling technology of cognitive enlargement has been dealt with lately in Tony E. Jackson, 'Oceania's Totalitarian Technology: Writing in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*', *Criticism*, 3.1 (2017), 375–93; Theo Finigan, 'Into the Memory Hole: Totalitarianism and Mal d'Archive in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *The Handmaid's Tale*', *Science Fiction Studies*, 38.3 (2011), 435–59.

[54] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 74.

[55] Vita Fortunati, ''It Makes no Difference:' A Dystopia of Simulation and Transparency', in *George Orwell's 1984*, ed. by Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea Press, 1987), pp. 109–20.

[56] Fortunati, p. 113.

[57] There are different versions of the old nursery rhyme. The one we encounter in *1984* seems to be the shorter one of the two most well-known versions. However, even this shorter version includes two additional lines between the 'last line' of the 'stanza' and the ending couplet, which are not in the novel: 'When will that be? say the bells of Stepney. | I do not know, says the great bell at Bow'. See Iona Opie and Peter Opie, *The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

[58] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 85.

[59] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 88.

[60] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 89–90.

[61] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 89.

[62] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 127, 133.

[63] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 89.

[64] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 130.

[65] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 131.

[66] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 131. The inspiration for this important plot feature probably stems from a baby's death that was reported in the local newspaper on Jura, where Orwell composed most of *1984*.

[67] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 131.

[68] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 257.

[69] Mark Alfano, 'The Seduction of Winston Smith', in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 153–62 (p. 156).

[70] Orwell and Bowen, p. xviii.

[71] Orwell and Bowen, p. viii.

[72] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 232.

[73] T. Sandefur, 'Love, Truluv', in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 104–17 (p. 112). For a detailed discussion of Big Brother as a 'singularity', see also Jan-Boje Frauen, 'From Big Brother

to the Big Bang: Self, Science, and Singularity in George Orwell's *1984*', *Utopian Studies*, 33.3 (2022), 406-23.

[74] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 254.

[75] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 255.

[76] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 256.

[77] Orwell and Bowen, p. xi.

[78] Sandefur, p. 112.

[79] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 256.

[80] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 29.

[81] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 29–30.

[82] Orwell and Bowen, vii, viii.

[83] Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four, p. 25.

[84] Laura E. Ludtke, 'Sleep Disruption and the "Nightmare of Total Illumination" in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Dystopian Fiction', *Interface Focus*, 10.3 (2020).

[85] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 242.

[86] Jason M. Buchanan, '24/7 Newsleep', in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 95–104 (p. 102).

[87] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 241.

[88] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 231.

[89] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 150–51.

[90] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 151.

[91] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 161.

[92] Iskra Fileva, 'Bad Faith and Make-Believe', in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 175–86 (183, 185).

[93] Sarah Yoon, 'History and Truth-Telling in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four', *British and American Fiction*, 26.2 (2019), 117–39 (p. 135).

[94] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 253–54.

[95] Goldstein's *Principles* were actually written partly by O'Brien. See Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 236.

[96] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 193.

[97] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 114.

[98] Though Winston does not get it, a close reading of the old man's answer reveals that *1984*'s timeline split from ours in 1926. See Jan-Boje Frauen, 'Winston's Parallel Universe: On History in Orwell's *1984*', *The Explicator*, 80.1-2 (2022), 49-52.

[99] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 217.

[100] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 70.

[101] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 69.

[102] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 69.

[103] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 246–47.

[104] In a nod to Mary Shelly's final novel *The Last Man*, Orwell originally intended to call his book *The Last Man in Europe*, which further highlights the importance of the phrase from the nursery rhyme.

[105] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 239.

[106] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 70.

[107] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 268.

[108] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 110.

[109] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 30.

[110] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 242.

[111] Taylor, p. 107.

[112] Taylor, p. 99.

[113] Taylor, p. 100.

[114] Taylor, p. 107.

[115] Dorian Lynskey, The Ministry of Truth: The Biography of George Orwell's 1984 (New York: Doubleday, 2019).

[116] Orwell and Bowen.

[117] Dwan.

[118] Taylor, pp. 52–54.

[119] Orwell, 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', IV.

[120] Orwell, 'Looking Back on the Spanish War', IV.

[121] Orwell, 'Inside the Whale', III.

[122] In 'the book' it is written that with 'the technical advance which made it possible to receive and transmit simultaneously on the same instrument, private life came to an end'. See Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 185.

[123] The idea of Ingsoc as a 'hive mind' has been mentioned lately in Alba M. Sanchez, 'Thoughtcrime or Feelingcrime?', in *1984 and Philosophy*, ed. by Di Nucci and Storrie, pp. 199–209 (pp. 200–02).

[124] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, p. 239.

[125] Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, pp. 234–35.

[126] In *The Matrix*, humans subconsciously know if there actually is an opposition, which would explain why it is not enough to frame loyal Party members, like Winston's neighbor Parsons, as thought-criminals. Parsons's daughter heard a voice in Parsons's bedroom saying 'Down with Big Brother' while Parsons was asleep, listening through an 'ear trumpet' she had received from the 'Spies' at the keyhole of his door. Even Winston, who saw Syme's end coming but had been sure that Parsons of all people 'would never be vaporized', cannot help but feel that there must be some sort of mistake. Given what we know about Parsons, it is highly likely that the voice came out of the 'telescreen'. See Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 212, 58, 57.

[127] Dwan, p. 2.

Bibliography

- Alfano, Mark. 'The Seduction of Winston Smith'. In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 153–62.

Chicago: Open Court, 2018.

- Buchanan, Jason M. '24/7 Newsleep'. In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 95–104. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Dwan, David. *Liberty, Equality, and Humbug: Orwell's Political Ideals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Feder, Lillian. 'Selfhood, Language, and Reality: George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four'. *The Georgia Review*, 37.2 (1983), 392–409.
- Fileva, Iskra. 'Bad Faith and Make-Believe'. In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 175–86. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Finigan, Theo. 'Into the Memory Hole: Totalitarianism and Mal d'Archive in Nineteen Eighty-Four and The Handmaid's Tale'. *Science Fiction Studies*, 38.3 (2011), 435–59.
- Fortunati, Vita. ''It Makes no Difference:' A Dystopia of Simulation and Transparency'. In *George Orwell's 1984*, edited by Harold Bloom, pp. 109–20. New York: Chelsea Press, 1987.
- Frauen, Jan-Boje. 'From Big Brother to the Big Bang: Self, Science, and Singularity in George Orwell's 1984'. *Utopian Studies*, 33.3 (2022), 406-23.
- ——. 'Self, Singularity, Super-Self? On Subjectivity in Super-Connectivity'. *Journal of Posthuman Studies*, 5.2 (2021), 130-49.
- ——. 'The End of the I? A Biosemiotic Approach to Super-Connectivity'. *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, 17.1 (2021), 159-95.
- ——. 'Winston's Parallel Universe: On History in Orwell's 1984'. *The Explicator*, 80.1-2 (2022), 49-52.
- Friis, Jan K. B. 'The Irrelevance of Truth'. In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 243–54. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Howe, Irving. 'Orwell: History as Nightmare'. *The American Scholar*, 25.2 (1956), 193–207.
- Jackson, Tony E. 'Oceania's Totalitarian Technology: Writing in Nineteen Eighty-Four'. *Criticism*, 3.1 (2017), 375–93.
- Lin, Dayu et al. 'Functional Identification of an Aggression Locus in the Mouse Hypothalamus'. *Nature*, 470.7333 (2011), 221–26.

- Littmann, Greg. ‘Why Don’t the Proles Just Take Over?’ In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 23–35. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Ludtke, Laura E. ‘Sleep Disruption and the ‘Nightmare of Total Illumination’ in Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Dystopian Fiction’. *Interface Focus*, 10.3 (2020).
- Lynskey, Dorian. *The Ministry of Truth: The Biography of George Orwell’s 1984*. New York: Doubleday, 2019.
- Mullen, Lisa. ‘“The few Cubic Centimetres inside your Skull”: a Neurological Reading of George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four’. *Medical Humanities*, 45.3 (2019), 258–66.
- Ó Nualláin, Seán. ‘Ask Not What You Can Do for Yourself: Cartesian Chaos, Neural Dynamics, and Immunological Cognition’. *Biosemiotics*, 3.1 (2010), 79–92.
- Opie, Iona, and Peter Opie. *The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Orwell, George. ‘Inside the Whale’. In *Inside the Whale and other Essays*, pp. 9–51. London: Penguin Books, 1957.
- ——. ‘Looking Back on the Spanish War’. In *Shooting an Elephant and other Essays*, pp. 157–85. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968.
- ——. ‘Such, Such Were the Joys’. In *Shooting an Elephant and other Essays*, pp. 291–347. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968.
- ——. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.
- Orwell, George, and John Bowen. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Oxford world’s classics.
- Sanchez, Alba M. ‘Thoughtcrime or Feelingcrime?’ In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 199–209. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Sandefur, T. ‘Love, Truluv’. In *1984 and Philosophy: Is Resistance Futile?*, edited by Ezio Di Nucci and Stefan Storrie, volume 116: Popular culture and philosophy, pp. 104–17. Chicago: Open Court, 2018.
- Saper, Clifford B. ‘The Nexus of Sex and Violence’. *Nature*, 470.7333 (2011), 179–81.
- Stonebridge, Lyndsey. *Placeless People: Writings, Rights, and Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Taylor, D. J. *On Nineteen Eighty-Four: A Biography*. New York: Abram Press, 2019.

- Yoon, Sarah. ‘History and Truth-Telling in George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four’. *British and American Fiction*, 26.2 (2019), 117–39.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.