

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Tlemcen
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English



**Thought Control and Language: Newspeak in George
Orwell's *1984* and the Possibility of Resistance**

**Dissertation submitted to the Department of English as a partial fulfilment of
the requirements for Master's degree in Literature and Civilization**

Presented by

Mr. Hichem NEMMICHE

Supervised by

Dr. Omar RAHMOUN

Board of Examiners

❖ **W. HAMZA REGUIG MOURO**

Professor

President

❖ **O. RAHMOUN**

MCA

Supervisor

❖ **S.BAGHLI BERBAR**

MCA

Examiner

Dedication

To my Family, and my friends in Athens Club

Acknowledgments:

I would like to express my appreciation to all the staff of the English department, and my sincere thanks and gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Omar RAHMOUN. Along with the board of examiners represented in Wassila HAMZA REGUIG MOURO and Souad BAGHLI BERBAR.

Abstract

This study explores the principles of Newspeak, its effectiveness as a thought control tool, and the prospects of resistance towards this project. To achieve this, the research adopts a qualitative analytical approach, examining Orwell's depiction of Newspeak through the character Syme and the appendix of *1984*, evaluating the alignment between the theoretical framework linking cognition to language to Newspeak itself, and assessing the possible avenues of resistance towards the project of Newspeak. The study validates the claim that Newspeak is an effective oppressive tool to reshape reality once it consolidates its status as the common tongue in Oceania. However, Newspeak is vulnerable to failure due to human incompetence within the party members appointed to administer the project itself, or through successful resistance embodied in overcoming the repressive and manipulative measures imposed by Ingsoc which aims to protect the realization of Newspeak.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedications.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of contents.....	IV
General Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: Literature Review.....	4
1.1 Introduction.....	5
1.2 Theoretical Framework: Language and Thought.....	6
1.2.1 The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis:	6
1.2.1.1 Modern Controversy Regarding Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis.....	8
1.2.1.2 Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in Fictional novels.....	9
1.2.2 Althusser and Ideological State Apparatuses.....	10
1.2.3: Foucault on Discourse, Power, and Knowledge.....	11
1.2.3.1: Foucault and Social Constructivism	11
1.2.3.2 Power and Knowledge.....	12
1.2.3.3 Power and Language.....	13
1.3 Propaganda, Euphemism, and Language in the 20 th Century.....	13
1.3.1 Propaganda and Language	13
1.3.2 Euphemism as a Political Strategy of Manipulation.....	16
1.4 George Orwell's Essays on Language and Politics.....	18
1.4.1 George Orwell's <i>English Language and Politics</i> (1946).....	18
1.4.2 George Orwell : " <i>The Prevention of Literature</i> "(1946).....	20
1.5 Conclusion.....	23

CHAPTER TWO: NEWSPEAK in <i>1984</i>	26
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	27
2.2 The Principles of Newspeak: Through Syme a Newspeak Compiler.....	28
2.2.1 The Destruction of English Words.....	28
2.2.2 Euphemistic Speech.....	29
2.2.3 Regularity and Interchangeability of Newspeak Grammar	30
2.3 Newspeak; an Ideological Language of Thought Control.....	31
2.3.1 Newspeak and Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis.....	31
2.3.2 Newspeak and Althusser's Theory of Ideology.....	33
2.3.3 Newspeak and Foucault's Power/Knowledge Dynamics.....	35
2.4 <i>1984</i> and Newspeak: The Ability to Resist Thought Control.....	37
2.4.1 Resistance of the Protagonist Winston.....	37
2.4.2 Syme "Vaporization".....	40
2.4.3 Submission of Outer Party Members: Catherine and Parson.....	41
2.4.4 The Proles as a Hope of Resistance.....	44
2.4.5 The Brotherhood an Active Rebellion or A Party Tactic.....	45
2.4.6 Newspeak Linguistical Challenges	47
2.5 Conclusion	48
GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	52
BILBIOGRAPHY.....	57

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Language is considered a human phenomenon; it plays a significant role in our experiences and perception being one of the tools that link the human being to its environment. According to many scholars, Language even shapes this external physical world for humans, through attributing meaning for our surroundings.

George Orwell explores this theme of relating human thought to language in his iconic novel *1984*. Through writing about the invention of Newspeak in the authoritarian state of Oceania, it was engineered specifically by the party of Ingsoc in order to solidify the rule of its leader “Big Brother”. Newspeak functions to narrow thought, limit individuality, and normalize unpleasant actions done by the party, consequently it makes of the citizens of Oceania an obedient subject. However, academics usually deal with George Orwell’s *1984* as a novel that highlights and warns humanity from authoritarianism, yet only a few have considered to look upon Newspeak as a fictional and political illustration of theories such as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Althusser’s theory of Ideological state Apparatus, and Foucault’s theory about discourse and power all which looked into language as crucial tool to customize the physical world in our awareness as human beings. Although debated against by modernists, these ideas can still be part of George Orwell’s fictional work.

This current research work aims to discover the main principles of Newspeak that enables this language to be an effective tool for oppression and injustice. Along assessing the possibility of human ability to resist, the authoritarian attempts to control thought and influence perception throughout George Orwell's novel *1984*.

Thus, according to such context, the research questions can be formulated as follows:

How does Newspeak function as a tool of thought control and psychological manipulation in Orwell's *1984*?

To what extent is Newspeak effective in achieving its main objective of thought control?

What does the novel suggest about the human ability to resist authoritarian attempts to impose Newspeak as thought control tool?

In order to reach the dissertation's objectives, it will be divided into two parts, a review of the relevant literature, combining the main theories that link language and thought together, in addition to discussing the main elements of political speech. Finally attempting to understand George Orwell's ideas on language and politics through his essays.

The second chapter relies on textual analysis of *1984* written by George Orwell, in order to evaluate the alignment of the theories discussed in the first chapter to the

novel, while assessing their validity through the *1984* characters and relying on George Orwell own essays. The textual analysis will also allow this research to discover the principles of Newspeak as a language of authoritarianism, and to assess its effectiveness in controlling the thought of Oceania's population particularly those living near the protagonist Winston.

CHAPTER ONE:

Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

The link between cognition and language has been widely discussed in the academic fields of linguistics, philosophy, and politics. However, it has rarely been looked upon by many scholars in fiction. George Orwell dystopian novel *1984* presents the fictional language of Newspeak invented by the Ingsoc (English socialism) party under the lead of “Big Brother”, for the purpose of thought control and reshaping reality. For long researchers discussed *1984* as Orwell’s warning about political authoritarianism, focusing on the censorship and banning the novel faced in the United State which gave the literary work his enigmatic nature. Consequently, attributing the theories relating thoughts and language to the fictional language of Newspeak was a lesser priority.

The aim of this literary review is to discuss; first the various theories linking cognition and language such as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Althusser’s theory of Ideological State of Apparatus, and Foucault’s principles of power and language. Then moving to highlight the major literary elements used in political discourse, like euphemism and propaganda. Finally, to discover George Orwell’s main ideas on language in his essays preceding his famous novel *1984*.

1.2 Theoretical Framework: Language and Thought

Setting a Theoretical framework is crucial step to set a foundation for the study and to guide the analysis chapter towards answering the research questions, as it links this research with existing knowledge. In this section three different theories will be discussed.

1.2.1 The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis coined by the two linguists: Edward Sapir and his Student Benjamin Lee Whorf, this hypothesis can be depicted through this passage by Sapir, he indicates:

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving particular problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the habits of the group. (209)

While Whorf claimed:

We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds—and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. (213)

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis carries usually two versions having two distinctive definitions. First one is linguistic determinism, second one refers to linguistic relativism:

Linguistic Relativism: considered as the weaker version of The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. In *Language, Thought, and reality* introduced by John Carroll. Whorf suggests that the language a group of people speak ultimately allows them to categorize and organize different concepts of their reality. Thus language influences thought, perception, and the physical world.

Linguistic Determinism: Regarded as the stronger version of The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, it contributes human thought and awareness entirely to his/her own language. In other words, people are not capable of thinking about concepts that do not exist in their own language, thus language completely determines reality. Sapir argued that we are very much at the mercy of our

language(4), reflecting the way humans are limited by their own language in understanding their world.

1.2.1.1 Modern Controversy regarding Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

the superlative adjectives used to describe the two theories “Stronger”/”Weaker” of this hypothesis do not refer to the academic credibility of each one, but rather to the volume of influence attributed to language.

the idea of linking cognition with language which once was highly supported by some key figures such as De Saussure,(qtd in Chen, 30) the founder of structural linguistics writing : “if words stood for pre-existing entities they would all have exact equivalents in meaning from one language to the next, but this is not true” . De Saussure claims that language does not mirror reality, but it rather constructs it. He indicated clearly the role of language in shaping reality, in accordance with the SWH¹(Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis). This latter faces great opposition from modern thinkers referring to its eccentricity, however one of the latest to apply and evaluate such idea was the economist Chen, M Keith in his paper *Effect of Language on Economic Behavior: Evidence from Savings Rates, Health Behaviors, and Retirement Assets*. He claims that economic cognitive decisions such as spending or saving money are linked to how a group of people use language to refer to the future.

1.2.1.2 Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in Fictional novels

George Orwell wrote and published his novel titled “*1984*” in 1949, a period when SWH was still not highly discussed in the academic literature. However, Studies linking thought (cognition) with language were widely common at the time Basel Al-sheikh Hussein writes: “The idea that the language system shapes the thinking of its speakers was first formulated by the German philosophers J.G. Herder (1744-1803) and W.V. Humboldt (1767-1835). However, it was Humboldt’s philosophy of language that influenced linguistics.”(1)

Moreover, while modernists reject the SWH as an accurate representation of science, it can be employed as a storytelling device to convey various themes. Such as the theme of authoritarianism in Orwell’s *1984*. Mika Lojonen suggests that there are usually two ways to utilize the strong version of SWH. First phase is dealing with language in science fiction as engineered device to change human thought. Second phase in which writers did not have to handle it as a scientific fact, allowing them to be more speculative and creative. For example, in “*The Sentimental Agents in the Volyen Empire*” language is treated as a living organism that infects people’s minds. So, language here is not engineered or controllable but has its own consciousness. (4)

1.2.2 Althusser and Ideological State Apparatuses

The Marxist Louis Althusser extends the Marxist theory of state; he conceptualizes another form of state apparatuses which takes the side of repressive state apparatuses (RSA). Althusser calls it Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA), he suggests: “I shall call Ideological State Apparatuses a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions.”(1)

Louis Althusser means through this definition that ISAs are group of material institutions that push certain ideologies. An Ideology by Althusser acts to recruit subjects or turn individuals into subjects in a process he calls interpellation; these ideologies shape and set realities for the recruited individuals.

ISAs for an individual appear as “natural” institutions (Schools, Churches, Culture etc.), they differ from RSA’s by relying on ideologies to represent a distorted reality instead of the use violence. Reality created through the interference of ideology inherently serves the ruling class, by creating what the term Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci coined “Cultural Hegemony”. Gramsci argues that private Institutions (ISAs) are part of the ideological struggle, leading to preserving the state power.(Lears 568)

1.2.3 Foucault on Discourse, Power, and knowledge:

Foucault sees power beyond Marxist theory, meaning that power is not a top-down model. He believes power is diffused and spreads across practices and institutions. Foucault views power as a linking (relational) force that constructs social organizations through producing discourse, relying on discipline and order, thus influencing reality. (qtd, in Karlberg 4)

1.2.3.1 Foucault and Social Constructivism

Although Foucault rejected the label, his works aligned with social constructivism. According to Matthew J. Phillips: Social constructivism informs us of how realities and knowledge can be socially constructed through utilizing language, stories, histories, and narratives that exist within specific interpersonal and social influences (Phillips 3). This definition is in accord with Foucault's ideas about the relationship between power and discourse, Phillips writes "social constructionism asks why, and how, these specific constructions emerge"(3), asking the same questions Foucault did. For example, he asks his famous question in his work *Civilization and Madness* about the possibility (How Possible) of whether madness is socially constructed to control those who are deemed mad, meaning those who do not conform to the dominating

discourse. Foucault asks how and why such conditions emerge and develop through time similarly to social constructivism

1.2.3.2 Power and Knowledge

For Foucault knowledge is produced strictly through discourse guided by the relational force known as power, and nothing has a real meaning outside of discourse. Hall Stuart in his reading of Foucault's work *Power, Knowledge and Discourse*, states "Meaning and meaningful practices are therefore constructed through discourse"(73). Foucault does not deny the fact that things exist physically in the real world outside of discourse, but that is not his claim to begin with. Foucault enters through the concept of discourse with his initial question "from where things get their meaning", to the next level of when these objects become part of the knowledge guided by power. He answers this latter, simply put by arguing that knowledge is organized set of meanings (through discourse) that is interpreted as an absolute truth by the subjects (individuals) of power.

1.2.3.3 Power and Language

Michel Foucault idea of discourse covers all form of humane practices; Discourse can be seen in the everyday practice of humans. Therefore, discourse is not only text but also action (Pitsoe and Letseka 25). Language being one of the main constituents of discourse according to Foucault carries a great deal of knowledge, consequently altering the language directly changes what is deemed by society right, wrong, worthy of discussion, values, and beliefs.

1.3 Propaganda, Euphemism, and Language in The 20th century

This section discusses one of the most prominent characteristics in political speech during the 20th century which Orwell constantly criticized highlighting their dangerous effects on language and human cognition, he saw these techniques like propaganda and euphemisms as dishonest and evil.

1.3.1 Propaganda and Language

Lynette Finch uses Harold Laswell's definition of the word Propaganda; Laswell defines it as "The management of opinions and attitudes by the direct manipulation of social suggestion rather than by altering other conditions in the environment or in the organism"(Lasswell 34). Lynette explains writing "That is, changing the popular perception of the situation without altering its material

conditions”(368). These definitions suggest that “Propaganda” refers to a tool used to reshape reality, in order to control people without any involvement with the physical world.

Propaganda in itself is a form of communication, in other words discourse. Thus, it cannot be separated from language. Propaganda grew widely used more than ever during the twentieth century with the increasing development of the mass media communications, until winning the propaganda war “the war of ideas on ideas” Lasswell suggested (12) became as crucial as winning the field battle. Leaders realized that convincing or more accurately manipulating the citizens towards the grand scheme of nation’s politics is by far the most effective tool to ensure absolute authority and inhibiting rebellion, especially with the growing influence of citizens on political matters, and their skepticism around the old ways of governance. For example, during the Second World War many think it is safe to assume that propaganda was directed towards foreign enemies, which is not wrong. However, the most important part of propaganda was used domestically for the sole purpose to solidify the home front and control it against other ideologies considered dangerous.

Propaganda was heavily used in the Second World War in different forms, but all had the same goals:

Soviet Union: Stalin's propaganda campaigns never stopped whether before, after, or during the midst of WW2 called by the Soviets the People's War. Nick Ellis in his work *"The People's War: A Chronological Look at the Great Patriotic War Through the Lens of Soviet Propaganda,"* delves deep into this subject states: "Soviet propaganda during the Great Patriotic War was necessary to rally not only troops, but also the entire population in order to combat the advancing German forces. Propaganda was presented in many different forms: posters, music, policies, speeches and declarations, and even fighting tactics." (Ellis 1), Ellis sheds light on the effectiveness of the Stalin's Propaganda Machine in dealing with the defeats of the early periods of war. He highlights the fact that Soviet citizens kept enlisting and looking up to their leader, despite all Stalin's political purges and the police oppressive state he created.

United States: Thomas Howell provided valuable insights on the creation of The Writers' War Board, an organization of thousands of writers across all of the United States cherished for being independent from any governmental control, Howell suggests that it was set to be free from the federal state in a way to relate to the American people which ultimately refused the idea of state control over social life. The WWB⁵ functioned like army not with their guns but

through their pens (Language), delivering thousands of works to strengthen the home front and to face foreign ideas. (797)

Additionally, one of the most iconic forms of propaganda from the American side was through comic books, which depicted American superheroes in heroic situations against Nazi Germany and Hitler himself. It served to present American soldiers as main characters against such villains.

1.3.2 Euphemism as a Political Strategy of Manipulation

Euphemism according to Paul Chilton is primarily negatively oriented in his twin poles diagram of ideological discourse. He suggests that Euphemism is directed and administered for suppression, and dissimulation of reality. Euphemism is implemented linguistically, by altering morphology (words), and syntax (sentences). (15)

Euphemism serves the common or dominant ideology by reducing reality, through softening harsh and unpleasant news, disguising, and concealing the facts from the public.

Euphemism uses linguistic resources such as:

Passivation: which refers to making an “element” (news) less likely to be reactive

Nomilisation: the use of vague expressions instead of actual actions

euphemistic vocabulary: the Alternation and selection of suitable diffusing words

presuppositions: Statements that are taken for granted by speaker, and assumed to be true by listener (15)

Paul Chilton depicts such use of Euphemism through his famous example; the language that the United States adopts when dealing with nuclear projects. Chilton indicates that with the explosion of nuclear bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki over the two cities, new critical questions arise about this new power in what he calls “Critical Discourse Moments”. Government agencies throughout the world used all types of euphemisms to achieve contradictory goals. for example, the Soviet Union legitimized making its own nuclear power in the name of self-defence, while in the United States nukes were represented as a natural step of human development. Chilton argues it is “the most obvious sense of dissimulation”.(16).

1.4 George Orwell's Essays on language and politics

This section aims to uncover George Orwell own political values and his ideas about the English language through his essays preceding the writing of *1984*.

1.4.1 George Orwell's *English Language and Politics* Essay (1946)

English Language and Politics written in (1946), before *1984* novel was published is one of the works that reflects George Orwell's views on Language and Politics the most. He sheds light on the decadence of the English language especially when it deals with politics "Our civilization is decadent, and our language" (3)

George Orwell's acknowledges the political and economical causes of this decay, he claims that these latter made our thoughts foolish and corrupted, and writing with such corrupted thoughts exacerbate this dilemma "It becomes ugly and inaccurate because our thoughts are foolish, but the slovenliness of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts" (3). George Orwell notices bad habits when reading Modern English, especially that written in the field of politics. Orwell claims that most proeses lack precision and vivid imagery. This vagueness according to Orwell is due to four habits:

Dying Metaphors: Orwell here refers to many metaphors that are so overused by writers, to the point where most of them lost their original intended meaning Like; ring the changes.

Operators/Verbal False Limbs: the use of long phrases instead of simple ordinary verbs, such as saying render inoperative instead of break. He criticized further the use of suffixes and prefixes, limiting the range of verbs.

Pretentious Diction: George Orwell refers to disguising simple statements with scientific impartiality, using adjectives that are blatantly pro-war, and adopting foreign terms mostly, French, Greek, and Latin.

Meaningless Words: Orwell views prose in fields such as politics as long passages that lack any coherent meaning. (Orwell 3)

George Orwell hints that this decay of language is deeply embedded in the political speech, for the sole purpose of controlling the masses. He suggests that language can be engineered, to be nothing but a tool to dehumanize thoughts; he says

one often has a curious feeling that one is not watching a live human being but some kind of dummy: a feeling which suddenly becomes stronger at

moments when the light catches the speaker's spectacles and turns them into blank discs which seem to have no eyes behind them

and “ Orthodoxy, of whatever color, seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style” (7) According to George Orwell political speech is vague altered with through euphemisms intentionally, in order to be the “ defense of the indefensible”. Meaning that someone cannot say “I Believe in oppression and killing”, however the same person can say that indirectly through the current political speech relying on inflated style, euphemism, and foreign terms blurring the lines of the truth.

Finally, George Orwell declares that the real enemy is Language dishonesty, and that politics took everything already so there is no running away from it. Orwell mentions the fact that although he is aware of this distortion of language, he still falls for it in his writing.

1.4.2 George Orwell (1946): “The Prevention of Literature”

George Orwell in his essay *the Prevention of Literature* highlights the theme of censorship during the post-war era. He emphasizes the degradation of literary works due to the limited intellectual freedom, and distortion of thoughts.

He argues that the intellectual freedom is facing oppression from two main sides, first from what calls the apologists of authoritarianism, and from bureaucrats and the few rich men controlling of forms of communication(Orwell, “*The Prevention of Literature*”). However, for him this seems to be quite expected and natural result of an authoritarian political system, he sees that the major problem is with the intellectuals themselves for not seeking the freedom of their minds. He writes:

To keep the matter in perspective, let me repeat what I said at the beginning of this essay: that in England the immediate enemies of truthfulness, and hence of freedom of thought, are the press lords, the film magnates, and the bureaucrats, but that on a long view the weakening of the desire for liberty among the intellectuals themselves is the most serious symptom of all.(Orwell, “*The Prevention of Literature*”)

George Orwell claims that writers now fear to stand alone against the wrath of the audience controlled by an efficient propaganda machine, so they become like a minor official who has little to no authority to say anything else other than what his supervisors allow him. According to Orwell, free writers are constantly labeled as selfish, egoists, and valuing their individuality over society by apologists of oppression. The main argument to support such claim is referring

to freedom of thought as undesirable, along with framing the use of authoritarian strategies as necessity to achieve a greater purpose like a classless utopia for the soviets. George Orwell criticizes this notion, he writes:

The organized lying practiced by totalitarian states is not, as is sometimes claimed, a temporary expedient of the same nature as military deception. It is something integral to totalitarianism, something that would still continue even if concentration camps and secret police forces had ceased to be necessary.(Orwell, “*The Prevention of Literature*”)

means that deception, euphemistic speech, and even reconstruction of history is rooted in authoritarianism. Therefore, it would not be any different when the hypothetical need or goal is no longer relevant. For Orwell those who reject the freedom of thought are mostly either communists or conservatives, though they are placed as opposite in any political spectrum. Both believe that the absolute truth is with them, and those who deny it are either fools or heretics which resist it out of selfishness.

Furthermore, Orwell expands on the implication of such limitation of thoughts on the literary scenes. According to him there is no such thing as completely non-political art, and under authoritarianism anything political is altered with, suppressed, or glorified, this process inherently requires from the

writer to deceit and to forget completely his style as referred to in “To write in plain, vigorous language one has to think fearlessly, and if one thinks fearlessly one cannot be politically orthodox.”

Authoritarianism relies either on fraud or force as Orwell suggests; these two processes inherently degrade art and literature, consequently, decay the general thought and cognition of society.

1.5 Conclusion

To further understand Newspeak depicted in George Orwell’s *1984* as language of thought control, this chapter aimed to discover multiple theories that related cognition to language. Such as; the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis known as linguistic relativism or linguistic determinism focusing mainly on the latter which suggests that language itself shapes meaning and feeling of our reality. moving towards Althusser’s Theory of Ideology where he explains how Ideologies take place on a society through its institutions to recruit subjects in a process called interpellation. The last theory dealt with is Foucault, he argues that power functions as a net or framework linking all societal organizations

together through discourse and language which construct a set of meanings, he calls knowledge.

Furthermore, this literary review examined the most prominent literary elements used in political speech represented in propaganda which refers to changing the perception of the masses without altering with the direct issue, while euphemism is using a softer language to deliver unpleasant news, concealing the big picture from the masses.

Lastly this research reviewed George Orwell's essay on language and politics; first *English Language and Politics* was discussed where George Orwell claims that the English language is in decay emphasizing the role of political speech in such decadence, claiming that language can be altered with to be a defence of the indefensible. The second essay was *the Censorship of Literature* where Orwell states that intellectual freedom is facing threats from Authoritarianism apologists, and press lords. However, for him the real issue is the weakening desire of freedom from intellectuals themselves.

Overall, this review suggests that there are a great number of theories linking cognition with language. While showing the main characteristic of political speech, along with delving into Orwell's thoughts about language itself. However, these theories under scope have been criticized for long especially

from modernists stating that language is innate capability that humans are born with, yet such research has not dealt with fictional languages such as Newspeak. So further examinations and research must be conducted to determine the limits of such theories suggesting a link between language and thought, and to assess that further a deep dive on the principles of Newspeak must be taken.

CHAPTER TWO :

Newspeak in George Orwell's

1984

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Newspeak is an engineered language by the party of Ingsoc, in order to force Oceania's citizens to perceive the physical world through the party filtered lens only. It functions as a tool of thought control in George Orwell's *1984*, aiming to provide one single truth which Ingsoc decides. In the literary review Theories linking human conscious were discussed, alongside with Orwell's views on language and politics. Accordingly, this chapter aims to provide a textual analysis of *1984* to discover to what extent do these theories, Orwell's essays, and the construction of Newspeak with each other to assess the effectiveness of this latter in controlling the thought of Oceania's citizens.

moreover, this chapter deals with extracting Newspeak characteristics and principles that allow it to function as a tool of thought control. Along with evaluating its effectiveness and discovering the possibility of resisting the party of Ingsoc, and Newspeak itself or its realization.

2.2 The Principles of Newspeak: Through Syme a Newspeak Compiler

Newspeak aims to amplify several linguistic characteristics to function as a language of thought control that can be extracted from Syme a character in George Orwell's *1984* who is one of the engineers of Newspeak.

2.2.1 The Destruction of English Words

George Orwell throughout his novel *1984* delves into the principles of Newspeak, however the fifth chapter from part one is most likely where all these principles are summed up together discussing the theme of language and thought control. Orwell writes about the conversation of Winston and one of the engineers of the Newspeak language; Syme a Philologist, and one of the most orthodox members of the party, who informs Winston about the recent developments of the eleventh edition of the language. Syme says:

The Eleventh Edition is the definitive edition We're getting the language into its final shape—the shape it is going to have when nobody speaks anything else. When we've finished with it, people like you will have to learn it all over again. You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words—scores of them,

hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone.

The Eleventh Edition will not contain a single word that will become obsolete before the year 2050.(Orwell, 53)

Syme here being too honest about the intentions of Newspeak states that the main purpose of the new language is not creating words, and why would they do that? Big Brother the Ingsoc (English Socialism) party leader aims to control the thought of Oceania citizens, not to flourish their minds with new words. So Syme and the other researchers working on Newspeak are restricted to “destroying word”. Orwell discusses this also in his essay mentions in Chapter one of this dissertation “*Prevention of Literature* (1946)”, where he explains how the degradation of language and literature leads automatically to degradation of thought itself. In the case of Newspeak, the whole spectrum of goodness and badness is covered by one word only, the word good stays while its antonym becomesungood. A stronger version would be plusgoodor doubleplusgood, same rule applies to its antonym “ungood”.

2.2.2 Euphemistic Speech

In 1984, Newspeak language carries an exaggerated form of Euphemism, also known as Doublespeak. Euphemistic speech is used to change what sounds evil to its total opposite. The clearest example is represented in the Newspeak term

from class B (political terms) joycamp; the reader or listener would imagine something like a summer camp; however, it indicates to a labor camp. Another illustration would be the ministry of truth (minitrue), following the same path here ministry of truth is in fact ministry of falsification. This process of falsification is referred to as Rectification in the novel.

Euphemistic speech would probably be less noticed in the final versions of Newspeak, however in the period of the novel it is found in every pamphlet, article, newspaper or a speech of Ingsoc officials. This style aims mainly to narrow the perception of Oceania population, a result of the massive number of contradictions they face everyday blurring their awareness of what is true, moral, immoral, fake, or legitimate. After a while all these contradictions become normalized even celebrated.

2.2.3 Regularity and Interchangeability of Newspeak Grammar

There are mainly two distinguishing features of grammar in Newspeak. The first one is that it is completely structure free, and all terms and words can function as verbs, nouns, adjectives, or adverbs. For instance, Adjectives are just a term plus the suffix -full or -less, for example: rapid turns into speedfull. Whereas the second feature is the regularity of the grammar, there is pretty much no specific rule that is exclusive to a phrase. All past tenses finish with -ed, same

for plural forms ending with -s or -es, for instance: the past of eat, ate becomes eated.(Orwell, * *APPENDIX* *The Principles of Newspeak*)

This reduction of English grammar worked hand in hand with the destruction of words. It aims to inhibit any creative use of language, imposing rigidity on the language; interpretation of words becomes inexistent outside of what the Ingsoc party allows, leading to a lack in individual thinking.

2.3 Newspeak; an Ideological Language of Thought Control

Newspeak alignment with the theoretical framework is discussed in this part, for the purpose of assessing its effectiveness as a tool of thought control, Ideological interpellation, and shaping reality.

2.3.1 Newspeak and Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

Newspeak does not facilitate a specific speech preferred by the Ingsoc party, regular English or Oldspeak is already altered enough through the novel to fit the party's narrative. However, Newspeak is engineered strictly to force political orthodoxy upon the people of Oceania, meaning that any way of thinking beyond the teachings of the Ingsoc party would not be possible under Newspeak. The party seeks to impose its way by the destruction of language, Such Notion that there is no meaning without words aligns with the stronger version of Sapir-

Whorf known as linguistic determinism; it attributes human thought and awareness to language. So, people are not capable of thinking about concepts that do not exist in their own language. In 1984 O'Brien while torturing Winston argues that reality is in the human mind, not the individual mind which according to him will soon perish. O'Brien also distinguishes between individual mind and human mind stating that human mind is collective, under the authority of the party itself. (Orwell 144). This dialogue between Winston and O'Brien infers that by the upcoming versions of Newspeak, Oceania's citizens will not be able to develop their own thought (individual mind), but they would be driven by the collective thought of the party itself. In simple terms, Newspeak makes the idea of having a hive mind where everyone is linked to one single entity possible.

Overall, the party controls the thought due to the cognitive restriction theorized in linguistic determinism. It basically suggests that if the party narrows the number of words referring to Individual freedom, that notion or meaning would not be conceptualized by Oceania's population. This destruction of words according to Orwell's essay "*English Language and Politics*" ((1946)) preluding to Newspeak inherently leads to decay of thought allowing the Ingsoc party to invade the individual thought. For instance, in Newspeak in theory, you

can say “Big Brother is ungood”, however formulating arguments to support your claim would not be possible due to this decay of ideas (Orwell 180).

2.3.2 Newspeak and Althusser’s Theory of Ideology

According to George Orwell in his essay “*Prevention of Literature*” (1946) all speech is political, and Newspeak is mainly an ideologically loaded language, meaning no word or expression is neutral, even words that hold literally no political interpretation are stripped away from their political interpretation intentionally by the decay of thought.

The term thoughtpolice or thinkpoli (Newspeak version) is a branch of law enforcement operates through “vaporizing” those deemed to be dangerous to the party doctrines. The thoughtpolice needed no evidence in fact just a weird gesture from someone’s face during a telescreen speech or report is regarded as enough to “vaporize” said person. However, the thoughtpolice will not have a place when Newspeak is completed, not because the situation in Oceania would turn less oppressive. But quite the opposite, since thoughtcrime itself will become impossible.

This Phenomenon falls under Althusser’s Theory of Ideology, since the thoughtpolice presented as RSA (Repressive State Apparatus) is disbanded, only for it to be replaced by Newspeak a form is ISA (Ideological State Apparatus).

This change according to Althusser is much more effective in controlling the masses. In the case of people of Oceania, thinking freely was possible yet dangerous, After the implementation of Newspeak; free thought itself is something no one can do.

Thus, under the rule of Ingsoc party, any thought process happening is deeply embedded and rooted in Ideology that Big Brother, the party leader, allows to thrive. For example, there are the two phrases “goodthink” and “oldthink”; oldthink for instance refers to any idea that existed before the revolution of Ingsoc such as, Individuality and Democracy. It serves the party through the delegitimization of such forbidden thinking (Oldthink), in other words it serves the ruling class according to Althusser. Syme statement sums it all up saying “Ingsoc is Newspeak and Newspeak is Ingsoc”.

Overall, Ingsoc party manifests its Ideology in Newspeak language, while spreading it through all the institutions of Oceania’s. This aims to recruit individuals or subjects, in a process Althusser calls “Interpellation” making the party and “Big Brother” control consciousness and perception of the citizens of Oceania. Thus manipulates reality itself’

2.3.3 Newspeak and Foucault's PowerKnowledge Dynamics

Foucault suggests that power functions as a framework, in which it manipulates discourse creating set of meanings called knowledge. This Theory of Foucault applies to Newspeak, where the power balance leaning towards the party of Ingsoc, so it manipulates the use of language through the invention of Newspeak creating alternate truths or meanings. Consequently, the party of Ingsoc shapes a different reality, for the purpose of imposing control. Many examples from Newspeak can verify this attribution.

Duckspeak:

In chapter 5 *1984*, Winston Smith hears a weird quacking coming from a conversation nearby, confused by the sound he hears Syme explains to him the word of Duckspeak; The act of quacking like a duck, if applying to an opponent to the party it is an abuse, whereas if directed towards an ally to the party it is a praise(Orwell, 30). This notion is an example of Foucault idea about the dynamics of power and knowledge, since the party of Ingsoc dictates truth, so any speech is just a reproduction of the same power. it reshapes an entire reality, where the teachings of the party are valid and unnegotiable, and all what is left is a thought crime.

Doublethink:

Doublethink in *1984* means holding two contradictory meanings together and accepting that both are correct (Orwell 124). The idea of doublethink in itself sounds contradictory and wrong, however the party of Ingsoc having the power make it seem like an absolute truth that cannot be contested. Basically, the party has altered the set of meanings through discourse. This shows after Winston Smith was broken by the party, he agreed that $2+2=5$. Yet he also knows that this equation is equal to 4 accepting the two solutions. Another example is the name of ministries, and slogans of the party; saying “Freedom is slavery” is accepting that being free is being a slave, which contradicts itself. Similarly naming the ministry of torture as ministry of love attributing the term love to torture. So overall, the party creates this whole new reality, where it is hard for us to comprehend the current truths, facts, and beliefs we have. But it is a predicted result according to Foucault’s idea about meaning and truth follows power itself.

To sum up, Foucault’s power/knowledge dynamics seeks to explain how truth is made. In *1984* by George Orwell truths are constructed through the party manipulation of discourse creating a whole other reality and beliefs.

2.4 *1984* and Newspeak: The Ability to Resist Thought Control

As the title of the novel suggests, George Orwell sets his fictional novel in *1984*. And the language of Newspeak aims to take over Oceania as a main language in 2050, so to estimate the possibility of resistance toward Newspeak someone must observe and analyze the level of awareness of the citizen of Oceania by taking Winston, Syme, and Catherine as an example. While understanding the linguistical nature of Newspeak.

2.4.1 Resistance of the Protagonist Winston

Since the beginning of *1984*, Winston is in constant mental battle to resist the invasion of his thoughts from the party. Winston starts with showing skepticism when dealing with the concept of Newspeak language and Ingsoc Ideology, he constantly prevented himself from journaling his thoughts more specifically his thoughtcrimes. Such awareness and skepticism were considered dangerous for the party.

In the fifth chapter, Syme notices that Winston does not appreciate Newspeak, claiming that Winston is still thinking in Oldspeak just by reading his articles in the Ministry of Truth (Orwell 29). This observation of Syme reflects the initial

stages of Winston's resistance and awareness of the doom that Newspeak would bring, since just before Winston shakingly begin Writing in his diary in Oldspeak the regular English used nowadays. The first statement he wrote was "Down with Big Brother" multiple times (Orwell 10), These words would probably still exist in 2050; however, that statement itself in Newspeak carries no political meaning. Winston knowing that his diary is powerless against the party itself, he writes to be read in a free world in the future and to win the battle where he defends his consciousness from Ingsoc ideology only; not striving for any open rebellion highlighting his realism at the time.

In the second part of *1984*, Julia confesses "love" to Winston. Through Orwell's description Winston seems to understand that word in its "Oldthink" context or meaning (61), This feeling from Winston itself exhibits a great resistance to the realization of Newspeak. Since even if a small number of Oceania's citizens can think like the old ways, the plan of the party for a language which inhibits thought itself would never prevail. This act between Julia and Winston breaks the interpellation process of Ingsoc, As Julia refuses the party separation between the concept of love and the word itself. It also gives us a glimpse on Julia own thought about rebellion, for her resistance is something private and personal. Unlike Winston who held idealistic views on

freedom believing there is an objective ideological political truth, he says that “sanity is not statistical” (Orwell 126) meaning that even if everyone agrees to believe in something that is untrue; it does not make clinging to the truth madness. The contrast between Julia and Winston views on politics appears when O’Brien approached Winston to recruit him to the brotherhood not knowing it was a trap, Winston was delighted and motivated for the struggle against Ingsoc for his idealistic views about freedom; however Julia did not have any motives for joining the brotherhood, she says “I’m not interested in the next generation, dear. I’m interested in us” (Orwell 90). Through this, similarly to his essay George Orwell criticizes how those who are in comfort do not fight the propaganda when it does not affect them. Julia does not concern herself with the other people in Oceania, as long as she believes herself free from it.

Being idealist for justice, while realist in his resistance against Ingsoc; suggests that Winston Smith the protagonist reflects George Orwell himself, Orwell is a realist as he speaks about the dangers of totalitarianism, surveillance and censorship, on the other hand he is a moral idealist when dealing with freedom, honesty, and seeking the truth.

Winston being detained after the trap of O’Brien took him to the Ministry of Love, a building where he is tortured and interrogated bearing the name of the

word that once excited him. Such irony blurred his understanding of the term “love” itself. O’Brien broke Winston in three stages as he suggests learning, understanding, and finally acceptance (Orwell 151), the aim of this process was not a punishment for their attempts to resist. But to recruit subjects or slaves for the party, at the end both Julia and Winston betray each other.

After they left the ministry of love, both were broken and not able to think at all. Winston for example could not play chess or answer 2+2 without O’Brien guidance, he was unable to resist anymore. Such inability can be regarded as an exaggerated depiction of Orwell’s own realist recognition in his essay “*English Language and Politics (1946)*” that himself cannot write in a decent clear English, although he is aware of the mistakes that are made in the modern English. So, linking the two ideas together knowing that Orwell uses his protagonist to reflect his views in *1984*; Winston after O’Brien broke him is vulnerable completely to Newspeak, and will not be able to resist it.

2.4.2 Syme “Vaporization”

Syme throughout chapter 5 in *1984* is a supporter of the party, however he appears to be a smart, critical person. Syme can develop arguments, explain how Newspeak would function, and attacks the enemies of the party intellectually. Basically Syme can think, such thinking is contradictory to his statement where

he highlights that Newspeak requires a state of no thought. Syme asserts that Ingsoc wants Orthodoxy only, and Orthodoxy is unconscious. Syme though all the signs are in front of him, he does not realize that the inner party members do not want him to support them intellectually; they want submission (Orwell 30).

George Orwell claims the same position about the dynamics of orthodoxy and totalitarian regimes in his essay *“English Language and Politics”* (1946), he says “Orthodoxy, of whatever color, seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style” (7). Accordingly, Winston knew that Syme one day will be vaporized by the party eventually, after a while Syme vanished becoming an “unperson” someone who ceased to exist without any reference to him or his history. No one ever noticed that Syme disappeared, only Winston did.

If this proves anything, it proves that the main challenge the party and Newspeak face is the awareness of the population. Ingsoc rejects even those who support the party from thinking, knowing that one day they may turn against it.

2.4.3 Submission of Outer Party Members: Catherine and Parson

Following the revolution Ingsoc, most of the citizens of Oceania fell for the party’s propaganda almost instantly. This theme of submission in *1984* is delivered in Winston’s surroundings through his wife Katherine who became after the revolution of Ingsoc a parrot for the party’s slogans, Winston called her

“the Human sound track” (Orwell 38). According to Winston’s testimony Katherine had nothing behind her face, she was empty and vague, She could not think of anything other than the party. When comparing her with other characters of *1984*, Katherine thought degradation and decay progressed in a faster pace. Katherine is the polar opposite of Julia, she was an orthodox who cares about the party only neglecting herself.

Parson’s Family; using the term “Family” here loosely, were another example of the total submission to Ingsoc. Parson himself was blindly loyal to the party and unintelligent. Parson could swallow anything the party throws at him, this appears in the cafeteria as Parson enthusiastically attend to the announcement of the party about the quarter figures; he praised the ministry of plenty work. However, just after he asked Winston if he has razors to shave(Orwell 33), proving how Oceania citizens and Parson learned to accept contradictions. Therefore, concepts such Doublethink do not seem like a far fetch anymore, as people’s mind are rewired to accept things that are not natural.

Parson’s wife, Mrs Parson represented a hopeless figure who feared for her life. She is on constant stress living with her loyal husband and children to the party, so she had no other alternative other than to submit also to the party.

Parson's children were the most dangerous in Winston's perspective, they were loyal by indoctrination. They were members of a youth league called the Spies, where they learned and grew to be loyal and love nothing else than big Brother. Winston predicted that one day those children would denounce their mother to the Thoughtpolice (Orwell 35), however Winston was wrong Parson's daughter denounced her father, Tom. She denounced him for a thoughtcrime he committed while sleeping by saying "Down with Big Brother". After his arrest Parson was proud of his daughter "I do not bear her any grudge for it. In fact, I'm proud of her. It shows I brought her up in the right" (Orwell 135), he did not even try to defend himself. He just cried and said "You do not think the Party would arrest an innocent man, do you?" (Orwell 135). This part shows how even a dream can be considered as a major crime, and the people closest to you are the most dangerous. Privacy with telescreens and informants becomes something that is physically impossible, and traditional relationships cease to exist in Oceania.

Consequently, Ingsoc Propaganda succeeded in subjugating most of the population of Oceania through their propaganda, indoctrination, and fear. While using repressive measures to shut off any attempt even unconscious ones to resist the party.

2.4.4 The Proles as a Hope of Resistance

Winston believes if a hope exists it is within the proles (40), They account for around 85% of the human population of Oceania; and considered to be the lower class. The proles were neglected by the party; they were not constantly monitored with telescreens or thoughtpolice. And most importantly, it was not of the party plans to make them use or learn Newspeak (Orwell 29) as they were seen harmless. And unable to organize themselves without the middle class known as the outer party members, Winston reads from Goldstein's book who was a member of the party:

The aim of the Low, when they have an aim -- for it is an abiding characteristic of the Low that they are too much crushed by drudgery to be more than intermittently conscious of anything outside their daily lives is to abolish all distinctions and create a society in which all men shall be equal. Thus throughout history a struggle which is the same in its main outlines recurs over and over again. For long periods the High seem to be securely in power, but sooner or later there always comes a moment when they lose either their belief in themselves, or their capacity to govern efficiently or both. They are then overthrown by the Middle, who enlist the Low on their side by pretending to them that they are fighting for

liberty and justice. As soon as they have reached their objective, the Middle thrust the Low back into their old position of servitude, and themselves become the High. (Orwell 118)

Goldstein's words reflect the party's own perspective, they believe that the low class is nothing but a tool the middle class uses to overthrow the high class. Accordingly, the party control the outer party, while lets the proles go freely on their lives. In the timeline of the novel the proles are only concerned with having fun, however O'Brien later mentions that if any prole tries to climb the ranks of the party he would be dealt with.

Nevertheless, in a world where Newspeak is the common tongue of the party members. The proles may have the upper hand in speaking a language that enables them to think for the least, consequently such an advantage may swing the balance of power in favor of the proles potentially leading to a successful rebellion

2.4.5 The Brotherhood an Active Rebellion or A Party Tactic

In *1984* the only active rebellion and form of resistance is that of a group called "The Brotherhood", however its existence is never confirmed. Winston throughout the whole novel sought to find an answer to this dilemma, the only concrete physical evidence of the existence of the brotherhood was Goldstein's

book. Nevertheless, this book claims to explain the deep ideals of the inner party and rarely deals with the tools of rebellion or the aftermath of taking down the party of Ingsoc. Someone cannot know for sure, but the book itself may be a creation of the party to control opposition itself and rule rebels into a trap.

On the other hand, if the Brotherhood exists and is active in Oceania; it would be still a resistance attempt from the party itself. Goldstein was a high-ranking official in the inner party of Ingsoc, he leads the revolution alongside Big Brother (Orwell 6). As a result, Goldstein and the brotherhood will not be affected at all by the enforcement of Newspeak, as they know everything Ingsoc hides and falsifies.

Simply put, The Brotherhood knows the past, and conscious of the present are unable to be manipulated by the party through Newspeak. Since this latter depends mostly on wiping the old way of thinking and demolishing the standards that human lived of for generations. Therefore, the existence of the Brotherhood as a rebellious organization would seriously threaten the Party's main project of Newspeak, and its reign with it.

2.4.6 Newspeak Linguistical Challenges

Newspeak as a language faces a lot of backlashes debating its linguistic viability. For example, many linguists argue that Newspeak cannot function or replace other languages, arguing with Chomsky's notion of universal language competence that is the innate capability of humans to acquire language. Alongside De Saussure Structuralist theories. However, The Ingsoc party seems to cover this ignorance of linguistic theories with the use of force and repressive measures, especially taking into consideration the fictional aspect of the language and the abnormality of the world itself.

Saussure for instance, claims that language develops through the linguistic community collectively, meaning that all language speakers do contribute in the development of the language itself. However, for Newspeak there are only a few people that work on the language, and they are directed by Big Brother himself. But here comes the fictional abnormal nature of the language comes into play, as the party of Ingsoc applies some of the most dreadful and manipulative actions to ensure the success of their projects. Accordingly, the fulfilment of Newspeak is linked to the success of Ingsoc manipulation of reality.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined the principles of Newspeak through analyzing Winston Smith dialogue with one of Newspeak “scientists” Syme and relying on *1984* appendix of Newspeak, three main characteristics of Newspeak were found. First, the destruction of words and vocabulary, mainly those opposing the party doctrines and aiming to narrow and degrade the thought of the population. Moreover, Newspeak utilizes Euphemism or doublespeak especially within the political speech of the party, in attempt to conceal reality and legitimize the actions of Ingsoc. Furthermore, the most striking feature of Newspeak is its regular and interchangeable grammar, preventing any creative use of language and imposing rigidity of meanings.

Newspeak can be regarded as a fictional representation of the theories dealt with in the literary review, as it aligns with the ideas of each. *1984* can be seen as a dramatization of the strong version of Sapir-Whorf Theory known as linguistic determinism, since the party attributes human thought and awareness to language itself. Consequently, if they delete words and terms referring to concepts that oppose Ingsoc, those same concepts will not exist in people’s mind. Next, Newspeak is set to replace repressive measures of control, such attempt reflects Althusser theory of Ideological State Apparatus. Ingsoc

Ideology is deeply embedded in Newspeak, while spreading it through all the institutions of Oceania's. This aims to recruit individuals or subjects, in a process Althusser calls "Interpellation" making the party and "Big Brother" control consciousness and perception of the citizens of Oceania. Meanwhile, Foucault's idea about power, discourse, and knowledge manifests in phenomena such as "duckspeaking" and "doublethink"; whereas the modern human would perceive these concepts as contradictory and do not make sense, these two phenomena are accepted and represent a kind of a fact in Oceania. This can be explained by Foucault's idea about power and knowledge, as he seeks to explain how truth is made. In *1984* by George Orwell truths are constructed through the party manipulation of discourse creating a whole other reality and beliefs.

This alignment with theories that link cognition and awareness to language makes of Newspeak an effective tool for thought control.

Finally, this chapter discussed the avenues of resistance towards either the party or the realization of Newspeak. It is found that the vast majority of Oceania submitted to Big brother and Ingsoc at least from Winston's lens. As for those who remained resisting even in their conscious or sub-conscious were either broken to accept the party such as Winston or killed like Mr Parson. There is also a difference between the way people seek to react against the party. Julia

for example finds it a personal struggle, while Winston though a realist in his action; he views freedom and liberty as truth to be achieved.

Through Parson's children we can take a glimpse on the future generations of Oceania. These children as they were raised under the indoctrination of Ingsoc are more Orthodox for the party and more dangerous to freedom. As a result of such brainwashing done by the party, there were no relationship between parents and children. This can show up when Parson's daughter denounced him to the thought police for something he said while he was asleep.

Throughout the novel, the party made use of repressive measures mostly to deter any form of resistance, especially to protect its project of creating Newspeak, since it is regarded as a long-term goal to achieve for the sake of controlling the masses.

Meanwhile, The Brotherhood and the proles represent the only hope of freedom in Oceania, however not without doubts. As the existence of the brotherhood is never confirmed, while the proles are destined by the party to stay as the lower class of Oceania.

Newspeak emergence as the only common tongue faces many linguistical challenges, it contradicts many of the language theories we consider as the backbone of linguistic studies. However, it is important to highlight that the

party to a certain degree succeeded in altering reality for its citizens, some contradictions and unnatural behaviours seem to be accepted by the outer members of the party. Consequently, these linguistic challenges may not persist in such unnatural environment.

GENERAL

CONCLUSION

This paper addresses the lack of interest in Newspeak inside literary circles, which represents a major section of Orwell's depiction of authoritarianism and totalitarianism in *1984*. The dissertation aimed to understand the principles of Newspeak and evaluate its effectiveness as a tool of thought control, along with assessing the ability of people inside Oceania to resist Newspeak. Therefore, this research was divided into two major chapters. The first was a literary review where it sets the theoretical framework needed to understand how cognition and language are linked together focusing mainly on its implication on politics, along with reviewing Orwell's essays preceding his writing of *1984* to grasp his ideas on language and politics. The second chapter relied on a textual analysis of *1984* to extract the principles of Newspeak in order to assess whether Newspeak aligns with the theories referred to in the literary review chapter. Furthermore, the analysis allowed us to discover the possibility of resistance in Oceania.

The results of the analysis revealed that Newspeak is characterized by the extensive use of Euphemisms, narrowing vocabulary, and enforcing a regular interchangeable grammatical pattern leading ultimately to the decay of human thought which aligns with Orwell's views in his essays. Also, it was proven that Newspeak is an efficient tool and crucial step for the party plan to ensure absolute control over their holdings, as it aligns with the theoretical framework reviewed in the

first chapter like Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, Althusser's Theory of Ideology, and Foucault description of power and knowledge dynamics. Therefore, the possibility of resistance when Newspeak becomes the common tongue is minimal, however in *1984* the party of Ingsoc aims to implement Newspeak by 2050 which is 66 years farther from the era Orwell sets his fictional novel in. Accordingly, the major Project of Newspeak may be resisted or ultimately fail, as it requires full submission from the outer members of the party to succeed. In order to discuss further, this paper discovered possible avenues for resistance relying on an analysis of various paths characters of *1984* take to deal with oppression of the party. It was found that most of Oceania submitted completely after the revolution, meanwhile a minority represented by Winston and Julia in the novel kept resisting mostly through attempts to preserve their old cognitive capabilities only who were later broken under torture to adopt the new reality of Ingsoc and becoming vulnerable to Newspeak. Therefore, Newspeak success depends on to the effectiveness of Ingsoc repressive measures.

The failure of Newspeak as a project due to linguistic challenges or human factors was another aspect to consider. The second chapter discovered that Newspeak as language contradicts many of the foundational linguistic principles such as Saussure semiotics theory, however it is important to shed light on the dystopian altered nature of *1984*'s setting and human psychology. The party to a

greater extent manipulates reality to the point where citizens of Oceania accept concepts the modern human cannot comprehend; accordingly, such challenges would not exist to the level that would threaten Newspeak emergence. On the other hand, failure due to human factors would occur, mainly because of the incompetency which was the norm under the party rule. This notion is strengthened by Syme's vaporization, one of the masterminds of Newspeak as a result of his intelligence that the party does not appreciate.

Moreover, The Proles and the Brotherhood can resist the program of Newspeak. The proles through their sheer number and the limited freedom they have, and the Brotherhood as their leader Goldstein knows everything about the party.

Finally, this research endorses the notion that Newspeak is an effective tool as an oppressive totalitarian attempt to control thought once it consolidates its status as the common tongue. However, as a long-term project for the party that is planned to be achieved by 2050, Newspeak realization is susceptible to failure due to human incompetence of overseeing the project, or resistance embodied in the success of Oceania's citizens in overcoming the party's repressive and manipulative measures protecting the realization of Newspeak project.

This research provides a humble attempt to delve deep into what Orwell intended to highlight with the decay of English language in the post war era especially the

language within the political speech. The limitation of this dissertation comes from the modern debate about the viability of some theories used, such as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which its stronger version (linguistic determinism) is heavily criticized. However, this criticism is directed towards its real-world use, not its fictional application.

Newspeak as a constructed language is still an obscure topic that requires more research to delve into, especially from the linguistic standpoint.

BILBIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* 79 6 *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation) The State Ideological Apparatuses*. 1971.

Chen, M Keith. “The Effect of Language on Economic Behavior: Evidence from Savings Rates, Health Behaviors, and Retirement Assets.” *The American Economic Review*, vol. 103, no. 2, 2013, pp. 690–731, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23469680>.

Chilton, Paul. “Metaphor, Euphemism And The Militarization Of Language.” *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1987, pp. 7–19, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40725053>.

Ellis, Nick. “Patriotic War Through the Lens of Soviet Propaganda.” *Series II Journal of History, Series II*, vol. 24, 2019.

Finch, Lynette. “Psychological Propaganda: The War of Ideas on Ideas During the First Half of the Twentieth Century.” *Armed Forces & Society*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2000, pp. 367–86, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45346379>.

Hall, Stuart. “Foucault: Power, Knowledge And¢.” *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, vol. 72, 2001.

Howell, Thomas. "The Writers' War Board: U.S. Domestic Propaganda in World War II." *The Historian*, vol. 59, no. 4, 1997, pp. 795–813,

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/24451817>.

Hussein, Al-Sheikh. "The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis Today Basel." 2017,

<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:27124930>.

Karlberg, Michael. "The Power Of Discourse And The Discourse Of Power:

Pursuing Peace Through Discourse Intervention." *International Journal of Peace Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–25,

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41852070>.

Lasswell, Harold D. *Propaganda Technique in World War I*. M.I.T. Press, 1971.

MIT Studies in Comparative Politics.

Lears, T J Jackson. "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and

Possibilities." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, no. 3, 1985, pp. 567–93, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1860957>.

Loponen, Mika. *The Use of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in Science Fiction*.

Orwell, George. *APPENDIX* *The Principles of Newspeak*. 1949.

———. 1984. 1949.

———. *Politics and the English Language*.

———. “The Prevention of Literature.” *Polemic*, (1946).

Phillips, Matthew J. “Towards a Social Constructionist, Criticalist, Foucauldian-Informed Qualitative Research Approach: Opportunities and Challenges.” *SN Social Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 10, 2023, p. 175, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-023-00774-9>.

Pitsoe, Victor, and Moeketsi Letseka. “Foucault’s Discourse and Power: Implications for Instructionist Classroom Management.” *Open Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 03, no. 01, 2013, pp. 23–28, <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2013.31005>.

Regier, Terry, and Yang Xu. *The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and Inference under Uncertainty*.

Sapir, E. “The Status of Linguistics as a Science.” *Language*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1929, pp. 207–14, <https://doi.org/10.2307/409588>.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. *Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Edited by John B Carroll et al., The MIT Press, 2012, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhbx2>.