

UNIVERSIDADE TECNOLÓGICA FEDERAL DO PARANÁ  
DEPARTAMENTO ACADÊMICO DE LETRAS  
CURSO DE LICENCIATURA EM LETRAS PORTUGUÊS – INGLÊS

LUANA KRAMIN MARTINS

**LANGUAGE AS A FORM OF REPRESSION IN *1984* IN CONTRAST  
WITH LANGUAGE AS A FORM OF REVOLUTION  
IN A *CLOCKWORK ORANGE***

TRABALHO DE CONCLUSÃO DE CURSO

PATO BRANCO

2016

LUANA KRAMIN MARTINS

**LANGUAGE AS A FORM OF REPRESSION IN *1984* IN CONTRAST  
WITH LANGUAGE AS A FORM OF REVOLUTION  
IN A *CLOCKWORK ORANGE***

Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso apresentado ao curso de Licenciatura em Letras Português – Inglês, da Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná como requisito parcial para obtenção do grau de licenciado em Letras.

Orientador: Prof. Me. Leandro Zago.

PATO BRANCO

2016



DEFESA PÚBLICA DO TRABALHO DE CONCLUSÃO DE CURSO  
LETRAS – PORTUGUÊS/INGLÊS

FOLHA DE APROVAÇÃO

Autor (a): **Luana Kramin Martins**

Título: **Language as a form of repression in 1984 in contrast with language as a form of revolution in A Clockwork Orange**

Trabalho de conclusão de curso defendido e aprovado em 22/11/2014, pela comissão julgadora:

**Prof. Me. Leandro Zago – UTFPR Pato Branco**  
Orientador(a) e Presidente da Banca

**Prof.ª Dra. Mirian Ruffini – UTFPR Pato Branco**  
Parecerista e Membro da Banca Examinadora

**Prof.ª Dra. Mariese Ribas Stankiewicz – UTFPR Pato Branco**  
Membro da Banca Examinadora

VISTO E DE ACORDO:

**Prof.ª Dra. Claudia Marchese Winfield**  
Coordenadora do Curso de Letras Português/Inglês

**Prof.ª Ma. Rosângela Aparecida Marquezi**  
Responsável pelo Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso  
Portaria n.º 295 de 01/09/2015

A Folha de Aprovação assinada encontra-se na Coordenação do Curso.

“The important thing is moral choice. Evil has to exist along with good, in order that moral choice may operate. Life is sustained by the grinding opposition of moral entities.”

— Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange*

## ABSTRACT

Language can be considered one of the most important ways of communication. Through language it is possible not only to transmit information, but also intention and emotion. People who are aware of those possibilities can perceive a lot more from a conversation than those who cannot see the peculiarities on the speech. Therefore, this thesis analyzes two novels, *1984* (George Orwell) and *A Clockwork Orange* (Anthony Burgess) mainly because of their specific language, *Newspeak* and *Nadsat*, respectively. By analyzing those novels it is possible to make a comparison between languages, speeches, language reduction, among other peculiarities, with the use of language in the current society, not only about slangs and reductions, but above all, about manipulation and the use guided by intention. Far more than just that, by basing reality on the books it is possible to analyze society in other levels as well, such as violence and social identity. Therefore this thesis is an attempt to make people aware of the importance of being conscious about speeches, about the speaker's intention, and the (potential) power of language.

**Keywords:** Language; communication; intention; speech; *Newspeak*; *Nadsat*; violence; social identity.

## RESUMO

Linguagem pode ser considerada um dos meios de comunicação mais importantes. Através da linguagem é possível não apenas transmitir informação, mas também intenção e emoção. Aqueles conscientes dessas possibilidades podem perceber muito mais a partir de uma conversa do que aqueles que não veem as particularidades do discurso. Portanto, este trabalho analisa dois romances, *1984* (George Orwell) e *Laranja Mecânica* (Anthony Burgess) principalmente por causa de suas linguagens, *Novilíngua* e *Nadsat*, respectivamente. Analisando esses romances é possível fazer uma comparação entre linguagens, discursos, redução de linguagem entre outras peculiaridades, com o uso da linguagem na sociedade atual, não apenas sobre gírias e reduções, mas acima de tudo sobre manipulação e o uso guiado pela intenção. Além disso, ao basear a realidade nos livros também é possível analisar a sociedade em outros níveis com violência e identidade social. Assim sendo, este trabalho é uma tentativa de conscientizar as pessoas da importância de ser consciente a cerca dos discursos, da intenção do falante, e do poder (potencial) da linguagem.

**Palavras-chave:** Linguagem; comunicação; intenção, discurso; *Novilíngua*; *Nadsat*; violência, identidade social.

## SUMMARY

<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 A <i>CLOCKWORK ORANGE</i> AND 1984: AN ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1 A <i>CLOCKWORK ORANGE</i>.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1.1 THE LANGUAGE .....	9
2.1.2 THE LANGUAGE ADAPTATION TO DIFFERENT SITUATIONS.....	10
2.1.3 DIFFERENCES OF LANGUAGE BETWEEN ADULTS AND ADOLESCENTS.....	16
2.1.4 THE VARIETY OF SPEECH THAT COMES FROM SPEAKING MORE THAN ONE LANGUAGE.....	17
2.1.5 THE VIOLENCE IN THE BOOK.....	17
<b>2.2 1984.....</b>	<b>19</b>
2.2.1 THE LANGUAGE.....	20
2.2.1.1 <i>DOUBLETHINK</i> .....	21
2.2.2 THE MANIPULATION OF LANGUAGE, INFORMATION AND EMOTIONS.....	25
2.2.2.1 LANGUAGE AND INFORMATION MANIPULATION.....	25
2.2.2.2 EMOTIONS MANIPULATION.....	26
<b>2.2.3 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INNER AND OUTER PARTY IN CONTRAST WITH THE PROLES.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2.2.4 THE VIOLENCE ON THE BOOK .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3. A <i>CLOCKWORK ORANGE</i> AND 1984: A COMPARISON.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>3.1 LANGUAGE.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>3.2 THE VIOLENCE.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>35</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

By studying literary works it is possible to study language and its use in society. This study intends to critically analyze the language presented in two differing literary works: *1984*, by George Orwell and *A Clockwork Orange*, by Anthony Burgess, categorized in here as a way of repression and a way of rebelliousness, respectively, comparing them and putting them together into social and cultural reality.

Both works are from a fictitious origin. However, both of them apprehend themes such as repression, rebelliousness, masses control, violence, the desire of freedom and others, which are vividly present in the real world. Therefore, it is possible to build a bridge linking reality and the imaginary, since literature (although not intentionally) seems to allow it to do so. On account of that, the general objective of this research study is to analyze how the modification of a language can increase (*A Clockwork Orange*) or decrease (*1984*) the development of social identity, delimit organizational structures of contemporaneity, as well as foster new political conjunctures.

Since language has always been a very captivating subject in this researcher's life, it is now also the motif of this thesis. Through an innocent, or even naïve, analysis of language in any literary work it is possible to realize its importance and strength according to its application on the most variable situations. By the same token, by being more aware of the language, I could notice that many people are led by their emotions, by the spur of the moment, instead of rationalizing before externalizing their thoughts, while others, on the other hand, feel pleasure speaking in a certain way on purpose to manipulate (or intentionally hurt) whoever is listening.

Under those circumstances the motive was chosen, considering that speech is not the only weapon used to hurt or to heal, but also the given importance to what was said and by whom. Therefore, this analysis intends to bring about such comparisons and questionings concerning the role of language in the emancipation of the individual civil entity, acknowledging, at the same time, our human collectiveness in certain social conditions.

The general theme of language study is here limited to the critical analysis of two literary works. Thereupon, they can be related to the reality and converge to a more specific matter, which, in this case, is the language as a way of repression or rebelliousness in two opposite scenarios. Noticing how language is dealt with in each novel helps (or, at least, it is an attempt to) clarify how it is also worked with in reality. Thus it is worth asking: 1) whether the intention of someone influences, not only the speech for whichever purpose, but also, and



mainly, the common speech that can happen in a classroom or even in a family talk. 2) Are people compelled, consciously or unconsciously, to adapt their utterance to a given situation? How does this change in their discourse interfere with the way the speaker is perceived? 3) Can society, as a major influence on people's lives, be considered responsible for the need that is created with time of speech adaptation, depending on the situation. This research aims at bringing some awareness to people about the necessity of giving the due importance to the spoken or written word. Usually one's attention is directed to *what* is being said, instead of *how* it is being said, however the intention of the speaker is not always clear on what one is saying, yet on how one is saying.

In Brazil's current situation, for example, where many people are giving voice to their thoughts and ideas, while trying to protect oneself from accusations or trying to accuse, it is important to focus not only on what someone is charging another for or on what someone is being charged for, but it is also important to focus on the way one is using language to express one's thoughts in certain situation. George Orwell's *1984* raises this question explicitly by presenting the ideology of *doublethink* (see analysis, p.15). The presence of such ideology can be noticed in the ministries' names where the Ministry of Peace deals with war matters, for example. The artifices, or speech stratagems used by Alex, the main character in *A Clockwork Orange*, are other points to note, for he uses them to manipulate those from whom he wants something. Thus, those artifices are the language adaptation, the use or nonuse of slang, the use of formal or informal speech, always depending on the situation, and the attitude he adopts according to the way he wants to be perceived.

All in all, this paperwork intends to analyze the novels and to relate them to the point of allowing those interested ones to perceive language as more than just a communication device, yet also as a device of repression, refractoriness and manipulation, depending on the interlocutor's intention, and also to make them sensible to any possible intention that speeches and dialogues may be filled with depending on who says it, and finally what one's aim is with the specific usage of words. Awareness, nevertheless, does not change things. This study's goal, as stated before, aims to find points of contact between two literary works, by verifying the use of language to repress and to rebel.

The specific objectives of this research frame on both types of fictional language within the novels: *Nadsat* and *Newspeak*, those being the languages used in the books *A Clockwork Orange* and *1984*, respectively. Therefore, this paperwork intends to verify how the use and nonuse of such languages can be related to the interlocutor's intention; also to testify if the *ultraviolence* (term created by Burgess), in *A Clockwork Orange*, represents all

the rage amplified in adolescence – after all, it is common sense that young people in such phase are a lot more likely to moments of irritability, which interferes directly on the way they relate to things and people around them, being language the externalization's tool. Likewise, to realize why, in *1984*, *crimethink* – as a type of violence – is a way of resistance (in its linguistic, ideological, identity, political, and social freedom aspects) against the repression imposed by the government.

Some research was made looking for other studies which could have the same approach as this paperwork, either in its integrity or by parts. However, no academic work was found so far that encompasses the analysis of *A Clockwork Orange* and *1984*. Nevertheless, some studies were found approaching the point of issue in a different aspect, or just as a complementation of another theme. For example, there is “Language as the Ultimate Weapon in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*” by Jem Berkes. His essay mentions George Orwell and the reasons why the author is interested in the use of the English language: “He realises that language has the power in politics to mask the truth and mislead the public, and he wishes to increase public awareness of this power” (BERKES, 2000). Hereupon, one realizes the study of the invented language on the novel as a manner of warning people about the manipulation made with the language(s) with the purpose of manipulating listeners through it.

Another paper containing the study of *Newspeak*, in *1984*, is “Language and history: the manipulation of the past through the word in 1984 by George Orwell” by Anderson Soares Gomes. His research has captioned parts such as “1984: The (de)construction of the reality through the language” and “Newspeak: the manipulation as news,” in which one can find the analysis of the novel and its language, as well as, on the first part, one can notice the mentioning of the theory by the linguists Benjamin Whorf and Edward Sapir claiming that: “According to this theory, the language we use strongly influences the way we perceive reality [...]” (GOMES). This part makes distinction between the reference and the influence of language on the way reality is perceived. It can also be said that the way reality is perceived influences how people behave and speak in different situations. For example, when someone needs a favor from a friend, but they do not want to ask directly due to the possibility of a negative response, people can just expose their situation in a way that seems hopeless to find a solution.

By behaving and speaking with that intention in mind, there are equal chances for positive and negative responses. Either way, the attempt was made with a purpose: trying to influence the friend favorably to one's implied request. Therefore, even if the help is not offered, there will be no negative answer since no favor was asked.

About the usage of language as a tool for trying to achieve goals through influence, it is worth noting an excerpt from the book *Philosophical Investigations*, by Ludwig Wittgenstein (2005, p. 185) “Not: “without language we could not understand each other” – but yes: without language we cannot influence other people this or that way, [...]” In the previous comment there is the reinforcement of the importance of language on the daily life as a device to influence other subjects.

In addition to the research studies mentioned before on the same topics, there are others which make a more psychological analysis, primarily of *A Clockwork Orange*. However, although there are not so many sources that make straight reference to the study of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* as proposed in the books which are part of this corpus, there are justifications for the theme. For example, the ideologies of the Party in *1984*: “War is peace, Freedom is slavery, Ignorance is strength.” Those statements are clearly showing a game with words where the language is being used as a way of repression and manipulation of people (to be explained in the analysis).

Another example on the same novel (*1984*) is the development of *Newspeak*, whose intention is to reduce the vocabulary to consequently reduce the need of thinking. The very concept of *Newspeak* certainly ensures the theme of this research. The same happens in *A Clockwork Orange* where the slang itself already represents the young’s rebelliousness against the traditional way of speaking, or, in other words, against those who precede them, against those who stipulated the rules of the proper way to speak. Besides that, language rebelliousness also proves, with Alex’s adaptation to the most varied dialogues, how the assimilation of another dialect enables him to smoothly transmute from one reality to another, in the same way that it allows him to adapt to both slang as well as to standardized language, depending on the situation he is involved.

This research is based on theoretical background and it is grounded on comparative, bibliographical, deductive, and dissertative studies. After reading the novels (and the context in which they appear), sources of book reviews will be researched to reaffirm what the novel already has explicit and critically within itself. By attempting to discuss the theme in a simple and clear way, keeping constantly the contact with the literary works and aiming to give them a highlighted importance by using their own excerpts as a way of explaining and proving arguments along this research, the task will be to demonstrate that such lack of external texts will not prove to make the books less meaningful nor of hard understanding.

## 2. A *CLOCKWORK ORANGE* AND *1984*: AN ANALYSIS

First of all it is necessary to contextualize both books by providing some information about them. Anthony Burgess, for instance, started writing *A Clockwork Orange* in early 1961, after moving back to England. At that time, he noticed how his country had changed while he was gone, mostly what concerns the youth culture, which, similarly to his book, was also filled with milk bars, drugs and a type of violence. Therefore, it can be said that some of Burgess' influence for this novel came from his own reality. Although that was not the only inspiration, since the author also had some insight from literary sources being those *1984* (the second book here analyzed), *Brave New World Revisited* (Aldous Huxley), *The Unsleep* (Diana and Meir Gillon) and *We* (Yevgeny Zamyatin). Burgess not only appropriated the values of his own reality but also from other books concerning a dystopian world, along with some psychological knowledge, making a solid foundation for *A Clockwork Orange*.

George Orwell started writing *1984* after some personal experience, when he witnessed fascist political regimes committing barbarities on the Spanish Civil War. However, his hatred to totalitarianism is what really made him devote his time to writing books that would display truthfully totalitarianism and political authority, also bringing forth *Animal Farm* (1945) and then *1984* (1949).

After contextualizing *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, it is mandatory to say that they have many aspects in common as well as many differences. Before all else the similarities: they are both dystopian novels; they both have a fictional, created language; both of them are surrounded by angry feelings, dissatisfaction, violence, as well as higher powers trying to control people's lives, and so on. On the other hand, there are the differences, in which they appear on the objective for having a new language, as in *1984* the language is created to reduce vocabulary and, therefore, thinking, and also to standardize everyone's speech. However, in *A Clockwork Orange* the slang is created to increase vocabulary and also to differ some from others.

Both works also differ on their narrative course, that is, in *1984* the main character is changing from a submissive subject to a rebellious one until he becomes submissive again under the government's pressure. While, on the other hand, *A Clockwork Orange*'s main character is changing from a rebellious subject to a submissive one under the government's treatment, to a rebellious one again until he finally settles down by his own will.

There are other differences and similarities which will be only mentioned through this study. In the following section, the books will be analyzed separately with the purpose of

working the details of each one until they converge into the point of comparison, when all the target ideas are clear and specified.

## 2.1 A CLOCKWORK ORANGE

Although this book has been mainly acclaimed thanks to Stanley Kubrick's film adaptation, it does not appear that the novel is a great piece only because of the film. *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) covers many themes that can be related to nowadays society, such as human nature, morality, the existence of good and evil, free will and also the slow path towards maturity.

The original book has 21 chapters, however, when the book was released in North America its last chapter was removed from the final version. According to Burgess himself, the number of chapters has a specific meaning, being 21 "the symbol for human maturity". Therefore, the book published in the United States of America was incomplete, and it was this incomplete version that was adapted into a movie by Kubrick.

Later on, an introduction entitled: *A Clockwork Orange Resucked* (BURGESS, 1986) was added to the book where Anthony Burgess explains why the last chapter of the book was not on the American version. In the same introduction he also explains why the last chapter is a crucial part of the book:

Briefly, my young thuggish protagonist grows up. He grows bored with violence and recognizes that human energy is better expended on creation than destruction. Senseless violence is a prerogative of youth, which has much energy but little talent for the constructive. Its dynamism has to find an outlet in smashing telephone kiosks, derailing trains, stealing cars and smashing them and, of course, in the much more satisfactory activity of destroying human beings. There comes a time, however, when violence is seen as juvenile and boring. It is the repartee of the stupid and ignorant. My young hoodlum comes to the revelation of the need to get something done in life-to marry, to beget children, to keep the orange of the world turning in the Rookers of Bog, or hands of God, and perhaps even create something-music, say (p. 5).

For that reason he considered that Kubrick's adaptation ended too prematurely without the recording of the last chapter. For this research study, the twenty-first chapter is imperative to the analysis of the book, but before this conclusion, it is necessary to discuss some aspects of the book, starting with the language.

Throughout the analysis, the words "good" and "bad" will not be used to imply any kind of connotation towards one specific side, because, a good or a bad act is defined by a

person's own moral and ideology, which consequently implies more than just opinion. An example for it is that while some think that drinking alcoholic beverage is a sin others think is a perfect way to refresh the mind... Therefore, if the act is good or bad, it depends on someone's ideology.

[...] it is possible to say that the meaning does not exist on itself, but it is determined by ideological positions put into play in the socio-historical process, in which the words are produced. Words change their meaning according to the position of those who use them (ORLANDIN, 2013, p. 42-43).<sup>1</sup> (Our translation).

### 2.1.1 THE LANGUAGE

Since the beginning of *A Clockwork Orange* there is a noticeable slang that is going to be used throughout the book. This language, created by Anthony Burgess, was made intentionally to cause a feeling of estrangement to the reader. The author mixed up English and Russian to give birth to *Nadsat*.

The readers find themselves being involved by Alex's world; he is the one that guides the readers through his reality by showing his points of views and impressions of everything that surrounds him. Consequently, in his speech he uses a mixture of English and *Nadsat*, in this way speaking directly to his readers. There are some words in *Nadsat* whose meaning he explains, such as *rooker* (hand) and *litso* (face), while there are others that he just uses without explanation, such as *viddy* (to see) and *veck* (person/man), but, after a while, the reader can perceive the meaning of the words just because of the context they are being used.

In addition, it can be said that Alex's purposes directly influence his speech accordingly to his intentions. This fact can not only be noticed by the readers as well as being also a fact admitted by Alex in some circumstances. While talking to *charlie* of the Wing Chapel with a different speech Alex points out to his readers his true intentions: "Sir, I have done my best, have I not?" I always used my very polite gentleman's *goloss govoreeting* with those at the top. 'I've tried, sir, haven't I?" (BURGESS, 1995. p. 48).

Alex may change his speech towards others along the story line, however, he has always been faithful to his readers about how he is really feeling in each situation, showing how he has his "brothers" (as he calls his readers throughout the book) on a high esteem.

---

<sup>1</sup> [...] podemos dizer que o sentido não existe em si mas é determinado pelas posições ideológicas colocadas em jogo no processo sócio-histórico em que as palavras são produzidas. As palavras mudam de sentido segundo as posições daqueles que as empregam.

On the previous excerpt the situation is that Alex is trying to conquer *charlie*'s trust by showing him how he is a nice boy. Still, he is just playing *charlie* into getting his trust so he can somehow get out of prison sooner than expected. In contrast to his words, however, his thoughts scream his true feeling, which he does not try to hide from his readers. In the next subsection, there is a different subject to analyze, which is the language *adaptation* to different situations.

### 2.1.2 THE LANGUAGE ADAPTATION TO DIFFERENT SITUATIONS

As the plot develops it is possible to notice the obvious changes of speech, according to the speaker's intention with its use. In Alex's case, the possibilities of language adaptation are immense, since he does not only operate with one language, but also with slang, which provides him a huge amount of words from English and *Nadsat*. For this reason, some of his ways of adaptation include decreasing considerably the use of slang when talking to "those at the top," for example, while if he was exclusively in possession of (or fluent in) the English language, the possible adjustment would be to speak in a more conventional manner.

The first example, previously analyzed, and mentioned before, represents the main character's intention towards "those at the top." For such topic there is another example: when Alex directs himself to the Minister of the Interior:

[...] So I said, bold: "With respect, sir, I object very strongly to what you said then. I am not a common criminal, sir, and I am not unsavoury. The others may be unsavoury but I am not" (BURGESS, p. 53).

In both situations it can be ensured that Alex increases his speech into a more formal manner, because he is aware of the person's position, as he mentions by describing the Minister as a "big veck," which means he has influence and, if he has influence, he may be directly related to what happens to him from that point on. That Alex does as much as he can wherever he is, in behalf of his comfort, considering that he also fancies to be in control of everyone around him, as it can be seen on the next excerpt, where Alex's droogs started having some thoughts of how things should be dealt with and so on:

But I played with care, with great care, the greatest, saying, smiling: "Good. Real horrorshow. Initiative comes to them as wait. I have taught you much, little droogie. Now tell me what you have in mind, Georgieboy" (BURGESS, p. 31)

Therefore, as formerly said, Alex enhances his speech by using more formal register, as a way of raising himself into an equal standard with “those at the top.” Alex is not only delighted by being in control, but he also likes to prove that he is capable of subsisting at the same level as those with a higher power.

Similar actions can be seen in the real world, when educated people try to be more formal, with a well structured dialogue when they are speaking with people from a higher echelon than themselves. In such situations, people avoid using slang and use the best of their language, as Alex does in the book. However, while people from present society do that as an illustration of their respect, Alex does to prove a point, as explained above. According to Gnerre (2009, p.5): “People speak to be “listened” to, sometimes to be respected, and also to exert an influence on the environment in which they realize the linguistic acts.”

Another change is clear when Alex is trying to provoke another gang, whose situation he says:

I said, smiling very wide and droogie: “Well, if it isn’t fat stinking billygoat Billyboy in poison. How art thou, thou globby bottle of cheap stinking chip-oil? Come and get one in the yarbles, if you have any yarbles, you eunuch jelly, thou.” And then we started (BURGESS, p. 13).

The amount of slang used in this phrase is distinct. That happens because they are among “equals,” they are both in a gang, they both practice *ultraviolence* and they both have knowledge of the slang. For this reason the use of slang is enhanced. Differently than this there is another perfect example in which Alex is pretending to be a gentleman in order to seem trustworthy and to be allowed inside the house to practice some “old *ultraviolence*”:

[...], so I said in a very refined manner of speech, a real gentleman’s goloss: ‘Pardon, madam, most sorry to disturb you, but my friend and me were out for a walk, and my friend has taken bad all of a sudden with a very troublesome turn, and he is out there on the road dead out and groaning. Would you have the goodness to let me use your telephone to telephone for an ambulance?’ (BURGESS, p. 15).

Alex himself points out the change on his speech for this situation because he knows that his normal way of talking will not be well received and that is not just because he knows himself, but also because he can understand how others perceive their environment, and how it is mandatory to be noted as a gentleman to be more trustworthy. On account of that, he ensures to adapt his speech to a more “acceptable” language, otherwise, there would be no possibilities of the door to be opened to him as his true self. Even though this is the analysis



of a fictional book, it is still possible to account that this phenomenon of adapting language to the given situation also happens in real life, as stated in the book “Análise de discurso” (Speech analysis):

[...] according to the anticipation mechanism, all humans have the ability [...] to put themselves into the place where the interlocutor “hears” their words. He/she anticipates their interlocutor about the meaning that his/her words have. This mechanism regulates the argumentation in such a way that the subject will reply in a manner or another, according to the effect he/she thinks to produce on his/her listener (ORLANDI, 2013, p.39).<sup>2</sup> (Our translation).

Wherefore, the acknowledgement made by Alex can be considered as a confirmation that people do change their speech consciously — not only those people that are aware of the effect caused by what they say to people, but mostly, those who know how. However, the changes made on the dialogue are also an influence that comes from society as well, due to the fact that everyone knows that it is necessary to speak in a more formal way with professors, for example, the same way everyone knows that there are not so much pressure from society when talking with acquaintances. This fact is confirmed by Meillet:

The only variable to which we can turn to account for linguistic change is social change, of which linguistic variations are only consequences [. . .] We must determine which social structure corresponds to a given linguistic structure, and how, in a general manner, changes in social structure are translated into changes in linguistic structure (MEILLET, 1921, quoted by LABOV, 2010, p. 185).

Considering that language adaptation not only happens in formal social situations, where the conversation happens with professors, politicians, bosses and other institutionalized positions, but also and mainly on a family basis, the next will be an example of Alex’s portray of the “good son,” in which his speech is clearly directed to his parents:

I put on my over-gown and looked out, in guise of loving only son, to say: ‘Hi hi hi, there. A lot better after the day’s rest. Ready now for evening work to earn that little bit.’ For that’s what they said they believed I did these days. ‘Yum, yum, mum. Any of that for me?’ It was like some frozen pie that she’d unfrozen and then warmed up and it looked not so very appetitish, but I had to say what I said” (BURGESS, p. 29).

Again Alex admits he is playing a part when he says “I had to say what I said” and he also admits that what he says is what needs to be said in that situation. In general, he lies

---

<sup>2</sup> [...] segundo o mecanismo da antecipação, todo sujeito tem a capacidade [...] de colocar-se no lugar em que o seu interlocutor “ouve” suas palavras. Ele antecipa-se assim a seu interlocutor quanto ao sentido que suas palavras produzem. Esse mecanismo regula a argumentação, de tal forma que o sujeito dirá de um modo, ou de outro, segundo o efeito que pensa produzir em seu ouvinte.

when he makes the sound “Yum, yum,” since this is supposed to mean that the pie seems good, but despite of that he confesses to the reader “it looked not so very appetitish”. Anyhow, all he does is because he knows his parents and what will please them or not, that is why he says in the end of the excerpt “I had to say what I said”. Alex is conscious that the more he pleases his parents the less they will be concerned about him, and if they are not so concerned they will not try to know for certain what Alex does. Thus, he does not need to worry about his parents getting in the way between him and his practices. The idea of saying this instead of that is explained by Fiorin (1998, p.18):

The speaker organizes his/her discursive strategy in function of an image game: the image he/she makes of the interlocutor, the one he/she thinks the interlocutor has of him/her, the one he/she desires to transmit to the interlocutor, etc. It is because of this complex image game that the speaker uses certain argumentative procedures and not others.<sup>3</sup> (Our translation).

Therefore, Alex keeps using his speech in a specific way to please his parents, although what he says to them is not always true. For this example there is Georgie’s speech, in which he is careful about his word choices because he wants the context to be understood, but he does not want to be so direct, trying to be smooth with it. For not saying it directly he only implies that, maybe, Alex should stop being a leader for a while because he is not handling the position so well:

‘Sorry about the pain,’ said Georgie, like very concerned. ‘Using the Gulliver too much like, maybe. Giving orders and discipline and such, perhaps. Sure the pain is gone? Sure you’ll not be happier going back to bed?’ And they all had a bit of a malenky grin. [...] I said ‘[...] This sarcasm, if I may call it such, does not become you, O my little friends [...]’ (BURGESS, p. 30-31).

Georgie does not say exactly what he wants to say. For that he uses sarcasm, in a way he is trying to be tough at the others, proving that he is courageous enough to stand out in front of Alex. However, Alex is alert enough to realize the true meanings of his inference and he makes that clear right away making a statement and affirming himself as their leader. Alex is always trying to be alert on the details that are close to his life and he has a characteristic pointed by Maria Lúcia Santaella Braga on her book “Produção de Linguagem e Ideologia” (Production of language and ideology):

---

<sup>3</sup> O falante organiza sua estratégia discursiva em função de um jogo de imagens: a imagem que ele faz do interlocutor, a que ele pensa que o interlocutor tem dele, a que ele deseja transmitir ao interlocutor etc. É em razão desse complexo jogo de imagens que o falante usa certos procedimentos argumentativos e não outros.

Accordingly to Pierce, the sign is not a simple triadic relation, but a complex of triadic relations, and only entrancing these relations we can capture the dynamic radically dialectic between a sign and the interpreting mind. At the same time that the sign is a mediator between the man and the world, man is a mediator between a sign and another sign (BRAGA, 1980, p 13-14).<sup>4</sup> (Our translation).

Meaning that only signs little can give on information, signs must be interpreted by man in order to give them a proper meaning. Alex is always interpreting signs and trying to perceive the world on his own way, his interpretation grant him to see the world in a different way, in a way that provides him with a confidence to influence on it the way it pleases him.

There are also two situations where Alex is desperate, and for this reason he does not really mind his language, showing his real side for those around him. The first one is when his droogs betray him and leave him behind to be caught by the police:

‘It was all their fault,’ I cheeched, blinking my smarting glaz-zies. ‘The bastards will be peeting away n the Duke of New York. Pick them up blast you, you vonny sods.’ And then there was more smecking and another malenky tolchock, O my brothers, on my poor smarting rot (BURGESS, p.40).

Here Alex was still dizzy by what happened, since he was hit by Dim, and for this reason he was just realizing everything; consequently, he spoke his mind without previous thinking. The same happens when he is already being treated with the Ludovico’s Technique: “Stop it, stop it, stop it,” I kept on creeching out. “Turn it off you grahzny bastards, for I can stand no more.” It was the next day, brothers, [...]. “Oh, I’ve had enough” I cried. “It’s not fair, you vonny sods,” [...] (BURGESS, p.64). In this passage Alex was watching the films and feeling the effects of the technique, which were really bad. Alex could not care about his speech and its consequence on others, for he was too busy feeling terrible and trying to get out of that situation. Those are examples that show that the mind is not always in control of what people say, there are certain circumstances that can lead people to say something they wish they had not said, being those moments when one can perceive the true self of someone.

To finish this topic there is another type of language that can also be manipulated: the unspoken language. It is the same situation exposed before, when he tries to seem trustworthy, before speaking with the lady he knocks at the door: “I knocked nice and gentle and nobody came, so I knocked a bit more and this time I could slooshy somebody coming, [...]” (BURGESS, p.15). Alex considers important to make note of even the way he knocks. Many

---

<sup>4</sup> Segundo Pierce, o signo não é uma relação triádica simples, mas um complexo de relações triádicas e só entranhando essas relações podemos captar a dinâmica radicalmente dialética entre o signo e a mente interpretadora. Ao mesmo tempo que o signo é um mediador entre o homem e o mundo, o homem é um mediador entre um signo e outro signo.

times it is not just what people say, but how they act, move, and so on. There are details that need to be taken into account in order to have a full image of a person's intention.

After having discussed about speech in the novels it is possible to say that people have total control under the way they are perceived if, of course, they are conscious that they are being perceived somehow, unless when they are exposed to a situation that they were not expecting or even when their emotions are stronger than their thoughts. Thus, if someone is conscious of what they are saying, they are also conscious of some rules for speaking, some of those rules were quoted by Gnerre (2009, p.6):

Every human being has to verbally act according to such rules, this is, he/she has to "know": a) when they can and when cannot speak; b) what type of referential contents are allowed, c) what kind of linguistic variety is advisable to be used [...] The presence of those rules are relevant not only to the speaker, but also to the listener, who, based in such rules, can have some expectation relating to the linguistic production of the speaker.<sup>5</sup> (Our translation).

When people are conscious of their surroundings, and how they can influence others or even be influenced by others, they have a tool on their hands, with which they may develop the ability of analyzing circumstances and making their own mind about it without the help of others to interpret a speech or an attitude. These people are usually called or respected as "leaders."

Furthermore about this topic, after analyzing and placing into light some situations of speech adaptations, it is important to affirm that society *is* responsible for the need created with time of speech adaptation depending on the situation. Considering some examples, such as people being aware of the need to speak more formally with a boss or a professor; or even the consciousness of the importance to treat elders with respect, this knowledge came from early age taught at home, at school, at church, or at whichever social circle the person may had been a part of.

Consequently, it can be stated that people's reason to change their speech involve intention, situation, emotional (if the person is in a comfortable situation or if he/she was caught by surprise for some reason), hierarchy, and also society influence. There probably are other reasons which are not listed above or that were not mentioned on this study, however, in the present moment those are enough to prove the previous settled purpose of this thesis.

---

<sup>5</sup> Todo ser humano tem que agir verbalmente de acordo com tais regras, isto é, tem que "saber": a) quando pode falar e quando não pode, b) que tipo de conteúdos referenciais lhe são consentidos, c) que tipo de variedade linguística é oportuno que seja usada. [...] A presença de tais regras é relevante não só para o falante, mas também para o ouvinte, que, com base em tais regras, poder ter alguma expectativa em relação a produção linguística do falante.

### 2.1.3 DIFFERENCES OF LANGUAGE BETWEEN ADULTS AND ADOLESCENTS

When talking about differences between adult and adolescents there is a number of things that can be pointed out: age, knowledge, behavior, maturity, and so on. However, in this specific topic the difference that is going to be analyzed is present on their language, making it possible to be more detailed about their variation. In Alex's world and in nowadays society, the differences of the language between adults and adolescents are clear, considering that adolescents, in both worlds, use slang as a way of conversation in several situations (talking with parents, friends, teachers, and so on). The slang adolescents use on the book is not known by all the adults, as it can be proven with the stretch from the book:

‘These grahzny soding veshches that come out of my Gulliver and my plot,’ I said, ‘that’s what it is.’ ‘Quaint,’ said Dr. Brodsky, like smiling, ‘the dialect of the tribe. Do you know anything of its provenance, Branom?’ ‘Odd bits of old rhyming slang,’ said Branom, [...]. ‘A bit of gipsy talk, too. But most of the roots are Slav. Propaganda (BURGESS, p.66) (‘Subliminal penetration’).

Dr. Branom has some knowledge of the origin of the slang, but this does not mean that he can master the slang, but he knows something, while Dr. Brodsky has no knowledge of it. This detachment of the language influences each one in a different level. This fact can also be seen in the present society, since there are adults who know some of the slang, although, they cannot use it the same way as the young ones.

The adults live inside their own bubble unaware of the varied use of language that can be reached by the young ones, while, on the other hand, adolescents have the advantage of being aware of both worlds (adults and their own).

For slang and jargon it is relevant to consider a conceptual and referential universe in relation to what they exist. Of course it is not enough “to know” the lexicon to understand a message in slang or jargon. It is necessary to be somehow “internal” to the referential contents in order to understand something from the messages (GNERRE, p. 24).<sup>6</sup> (Our Translation).

Therefore, their created language allows them to be part of an exclusive world of their own without having to be ignorant of the “adult’s world”, since they are somehow part of both worlds. This is also an advantage provided by the acquaintance of a second language. When abroad, people that can speak another language, besides their own, have more possibilities of

---

<sup>6</sup> Para as gírias e os jargões é também relevante considerar o universo conceitual e referencial em relação ao qual existem. É claro que não é suficiente “conhecer” o léxico para entender uma mensagem em gíria ou um jargão. É necessário ser de alguma forma “interno” aos conteúdos referenciais para entender algo das mensagens.

interaction and relation with others, while the group of people that only speaks their mother tongue are destitute of such privilege.

There is another advantage for those able to speak more than one language, which will be discussed on the next topic.

#### **2.1.4 THE VARIETY OF SPEECH THAT COMES FROM SPEAKING MORE THAN ONE LANGUAGE**

While many people are stuck with only their mother tongue, there are others that go further and apprehend another language, which increases their vocabulary as well as their speech. While some are limited by their languages others have expended their knowledge to others, giving them the ability of expressing themselves in varied ways.

In *A Clockwork Orange* Alex speaks slang alongside with standard English, showing that, even though his speech is varied and can be adapted to many situations, he has more advantages than those in the book that can only speak in English. Therefore, he can adapt more easily to situations than the majority. Alex and his *droogs* are different because of it, they do not use their slang only for communication, they also use it as a way of rebelliousness. Because people are supposed to speak standardized English in a proper way, that is the “rule” and everyone does that, there come the *droogs* (in other words, the adolescents) to make it different and to prove that they are not following orders that the society applies, they are not ready to bow down to the government and its statements.

#### **2.1.5 THE VIOLENCE IN THE BOOK**

Violence is called *ultraviolence*. Alex and his *droogs* would go around town looking for someone to practice it on. At the beginning of the book they attack an old man that was like a teacher. They destroyed his books as well as hurt the man, just because of the fun of it.

In another situation they invade a house, rape the woman and make the man in the house watch it. They would do anything that goes against the rules of society, as a proof: the first man looked like a teacher, and teachers are supposed to be respected. On the second case they invaded a house with respectable people, even a man who was a writer.

Through this analysis it can be said that all the rage and desire to go against society and everyone who impose power over them are a boost that comes with the young age, when they are not children anymore, as well as when they have not reached full maturity yet. According to the site Psychology Campus:

Adolescence (12 - 18 years old) is a particularly hard time for children. They are experiencing all kinds of new changes in their bodies and in their feelings. As well, they often feel misunderstood as they are struggling to leave behind their childhood and become adults. Adolescence has commonly been characterized by issues such as rebellious behaviour, lying, cheating, school performance problems, negative attitudes, disobedience and disrespect, sibling rivalry, drug and alcohol abuse, pressures from peers, depression, and issues of sexuality.<sup>7</sup>

Therefore, they are lost in their own desires, not knowing yet who they are or who they want to be, choosing destruction as an easier path than construction.

However, there is another type of violence practiced on the book, the violence imposed to Alex in order to make him a “better” person. There is a question that *charlie* makes and leaves it unanswered: “Is a man who chooses the bad perhaps in some ways better than a man who has the good imposed upon him?” (BURGESS, p.55). That is a question that might have no right or wrong answer, but it certainly instigates a deep point for reflection.

---

<sup>7</sup> Retrieved from: <<http://www.psychologycampus.com/adolescent-psychology/>>.

## 2.2 1984

This book was published in 1949, therefore, thirty-five years away from its despotic reality, and now thirty-two years apart from nowadays society. Nevertheless, it could not be more present now than it was before. As well as *A Clockwork Orange*, *1984* also explores many themes that can be related to current society, such as human nature, morality, information manipulation, free will and also a constant feeling of being watched. Accordingly to Isaac Asimov on his “Review of 1984”, the book came to stand just for government:

1984 [...] came to stand not for Stalinism, or even for dictatorship in general - but merely for government. Even governmental paternalism seemed '1984ish' and the catch phrase 'Big Brother is watching you' came to mean everything that was too big for the individual to control. It was not only big government and big business that was a symptom of 1984 but big science, big labour, big anything. (In: <http://www.newworker.org/ncptrory/1984.htm>)

Therefore it is a way of warning people about the government in its many types, although the totalitarian one is more clearly perceived. When Asimov wrote his review being watched almost all the time was not a problem yet, but it is something that people can worry about now.

Even though there is no *telescreen* in each person's house, there are a lot of cameras everywhere (supermarket, theater, streets, etc.) and people own a camera that comes with their Smartphone. Therefore, anybody can be filming someone or something at any moment, which increases the *Big Brother* kind of feeling. It is as much that there is a show named after it, where people stay in a house and they are filmed 24/7 and there are those who entertain themselves by watching other people living their lives. Of course that is not what the book is about, but it surrounds the idea of people being watched.

However, watching the citizens' every move and reactions is not the main tool for the power of totalitarian government, for its power lies on the use of language. They do not just use opposites ideas and make people believe in that as a true (being that the conception of *doublethink*), they are trying to reduce the language as much as possible. Therefore there are two languages spoken throughout the book: the *Oldspeak* and the *Newspeak*. The first is standardized English, while the last one is a reduced form of *Oldspeak*. The main goal with the new language is to stop thinking itself, the less words there is to think about, the less will be necessary to think and language can finally be used only for necessary communication.

That being said, the next topic will get a little further on such subject.



### 2.2.1 THE LANGUAGE

In *1984* the main idea is to prevent people from thinking unnecessary things; that is why they create *Newspeak*, to turn communication into a controlled system where you only transmit exact and precise things without the whole thinking and feeling that they might be considered dangerous acts. Therefore, the inner Party also tries to control emotions, but this last point will be analyzed further on. The power of language is an obvious matter pointed out by Orwell in his novel, and such a thing was also duly noted by Jean-Jacques Courtine and Laura Willett on their study *A Brave New Language: Orwell's Invention of "Newspeak" in 1984* (1986, p.70):

Power must thus become master of language since language is the living memory of man and offers him a space for inner resistance. Language constitutes a screen between the totalitarian gaze and the human body, it offers the shelter of its shadow, it veils the harsh light needed to read bodies. Language threatens the totalitarian enterprise. It is in fact the zone of obscurity where the gaze is lost. People must therefore be cured of their language: old and obscure terms must be eliminated, areas that escape definition, and zones of indetermination-ambiguity, equivocation, polysemy wiped out. Signs must be purged and purified of their meaning and bodies of their substance.

On account of that, it is clear that the Inner Party needed to control language in order to control the Outer Party, and in order to control language it is necessary to break down the old one in order to build a new one, which will be framed according to their desire. To that end they came up with the *Newspeak*.

The words of *Newspeak* were divided into three parts: A vocabulary, B vocabulary (also known as compound words) and C vocabulary. According to "The Principles of *Newspeak*" (ORWELL, 1949):

The A vocabulary consisted of the words needed for the business of everyday life. [...] It was composed almost entirely of words that we already possess words like *hit, run, dog, tree, sugar, house, field* – but in comparison with the present-day English vocabulary their number was extremely small, while their meanings were far more rigidly defined.

The B vocabulary consisted of words which had been deliberately constructed for political purposes: [...]. The B words were a sort of verbal shorthand, often packing whole ranges of ideas into a few syllables, and at the same time more accurate and forcible than ordinary language.

The C vocabulary was supplementary to the others and consisted entirely of scientific and technical terms. [...] Very few of the C words had any currency either in everyday speech or in political speech.

Some words that could be found on the A vocabulary were, for example, *uncold*, which means “warm”, *pluscold*, which means “very cold” and *doublepluscold*, which can be translated as “superlatively cold”, according to Orwell. What can be noted on those three words is that the adjective “warm” was excluded from the *Newspeak* vocabulary, keeping only “cold” and using it to describe two opposite ideas with the same word, adding just a couple of affixes.

*Crimethink* and *thinkpol* are words founded on the B vocabulary. The first is a crime committed when the citizens dare to think, while the second is the Thought Police, or, in other words, those responsible for finding who might practice *crimethink*. The C vocabulary is not needed to be shown here, since its words are not very commonly used by the Parties. By creating that language a new way of repression is also created. Thinking is not an allowed activity, and, as a consequence, it is necessary to eliminate as many unnecessary words as possible. This way there is no reason why to think about a word meaning in contrast with its antonymous, because there will not be such a thing anymore. And as well as reducing the language it is necessary to create an ideology to spread around.

There are many words and many ideologies that can be found in *1984*, but there is one that surrounds everything from the name of the ministries and the slogans of the Party to the way people would live their lives, and that is *doublethink*.

### **2.2.1.1 DOUBLETHINK**

Ideology is present in every society, real or fictional, however its presence is not always known by the citizens of this or that society, although many of their attitudes are based on it. In *1984* the ideology has a specific name: *doublethink*, and in this case the majority of people from that reality know the meaning of the word and they live their lives according to its principles. *Doublethink* is what keeps a sort of order in the reality of the book, for it is everywhere and it is the basis to keep it the way it is. The concept of *doublethink* was created by those in power; since “[...] in a class society, ideology is always of the dominant class, because it is this one that through power usufruct gives name and sense to things” (BRAGA, 1980, p. 51)<sup>8</sup> (Our translation). Therefore its use and its enforcement in that reality can prove that it is a strong and present ideology, and the concept of it is explained on the book:

---

<sup>8</sup> [...] numa sociedade de classes, a ideologia é sempre a da classe dominante, pois é essa, através do usufruto do poder, que dá nome e sentido às coisas.

DOUBLETHINK means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. [...] The process has to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it also has to be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity and hence of guilt (ORWELL, p. 270).

As said before, the idea of *doublethink* surrounds every aspect of the book, and we can see it on the name of the ministries related to its function on the government:

The Ministry of Peace concerns itself with war, the Ministry of Truth with lies, the Ministry of Love with torture and the Ministry of Plenty with starvation. These contradictions are not accidental, nor do they result from ordinary hypocrisy; they are deliberate exercises in DOUBLETHINK (ORWELL, p.273).

*Doublethink* is on the slogans of the Party: “WAR IS PEACE; FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH” (ORWELL, p.6). It is, as well, on Winston's (the main character) duty at the Ministry of Truth, which is to “rectify” what was previously reported: “The messages he had received referred to articles or news items which for one reason or another it was thought necessary to alter, or, as the official phrase had it, to rectify” (ORWELL, p.49).

As it can be seen, *doublethink* is an open ideology: everyone, from inner and outer Parties, know about it; everyone practices it and nobody questions it, for if they do they are committing *crimethink*, and whoever does that will have the same fate: to be vaporized, which is the same as never have existed. “There is only ideology through subject and for subjects. In that measure ideology finds itself present in every individual act and gestures that comes to be indiscernible from your lived experiences” (BRAGA, p. 50).<sup>9</sup> (Our translation).

Although in the present reality there is nothing exactly like the events that occurred in 1984, there is a lot to relate and to make comparisons with. In the movie *Detachment*, directed by Tony Kaye, there is a peculiar scene where a high school teacher (Henry) explains to his students the meaning of *doublethink*, and, besides that, he also gives real life examples of the idea, proving that people live under the *doublethink* ideology and they are not even aware of it. That is one of the side effects of an imposed ideology, causing people to rarely be aware of its influence on their lives, also because they have a superficial idea of its concept. From the movie comes this interrelational piece:

---

<sup>9</sup> Só há ideologia através do sujeito e para sujeitos. Nessa medida a ideologia se acha a tal ponto presente em todos os atos e gestos dos indivíduos que chega a ser indiscernível de sua experiência vivida.

To deliberately believe in lies while knowing they are false. Examples of this in everyday life: oh, I need to be pretty to be happy; I need surgery to be pretty; I need to be thin; famous; fashionable. Our young men today are being told that women are whores, bitches, things to be screwed, bitten, shit on, ashamed. This is a marketing holocaust. Twenty four hours a day, for the rest of our lives, the powers that be are hard at work dumbing us to death, [...] (DETACHMENT, 2012).

Even though those examples came from a movie, it is necessary to see them as true, and to prove the likelihood of what was stated on the previous lines. There is an excerpt written by Bakhtin (2006, p.29) in which he allows the understanding that ideology is everywhere, it is present in things and also the way we see the world:

An ideological product is part of a reality (natural or social) like all physical body, tool of production or consumption product; however, unlike those, he also reflects and portrays a reality that it is from the outside. Everything that is ideological has a *meaning* and refers to something out of itself. In other words, everything that is ideological is a *sign*. *Without signs there is no ideology*. (Author's emphasis)

This means that ideology is everywhere, it is present in things and also the way we see the world. People are being given lies all their lives, since when they were too young to know any better. In school a girl can be bullied because she is not thin as she is “supposed” to be, because she is not beautiful enough, and those ideas only grow inside. People grow up to be unsatisfied or unhappy with their own body, with their own personality without even knowing why. They apprehend those ideas like their own and then it starts a pursuit for a happy life based on shallow ideals.

All of that happens because people allow it to happen. Humankind accepts lies as true and they live it every day, and most of them are not even aware of it. That is the modern *doublethink*. People might not be committing *crimethink* if they start being aware of the dominance that is upon them, but they will be considered weird if they do not aim for a beautiful body anymore, or if they stop caring about what they wear. As well as they will not be vaporized if they do so, but many people might just start excluding them for thinking differently.

What happens is that those who are aware of this manipulation are a small amount from society, and why is that if nowadays the access to information is all around, just one click away? Because what comes easy goes easy. The easy information that is at people's fingertips is mostly just to entertain and to keep them busy. To become aware is necessary to get out of the comfort zone and face the unknown. Continuing on Henry's speech to his class, where he adds a “solution” for them, he says:

[...] so to defend ourselves and fight against assimilating this dullness into our thought process, we must learn to read to stimulate our own imaginations, to cultivate our own consciousness, our own belief systems. We all need these skills to defend, to preserve our own minds (DETACHMENT, 2012).

The answer is simple: it is necessary to read. Not to read blogs, Facebook pages or whatever easy media there is, but, instead of those easy options, it is necessary to read books; books that can open minds in order to see what is really going on. To reinsure the idea presented on the movie, Braga (1980, p 21) emphasizes the previous view on the next given lines:

What we are trying to show is the need for an effort of theoretical integration that can interrupt our more and more vertiginous fall for the decoy of ideological atomization that dress itself with the clothes of scientific specializations [...] and that tapers our thoughts, blocking our investigation capacity, but, even worse than this, they feed us with the supercilious illusion of being working for the science progress, when we actually are fighting an ideological fight for the possession of the territory of knowledge for the power usufruct disguised in a knowledge above any suspicious.<sup>10</sup>. (Our translation)

Thus it is necessary substantial reading and information, although the movie used here as a reference is great, it is easy information as well. Nevertheless, there are so many good books that people just ignore, because it is not a novel or a story of some kind. Marilena Chauí is a writer and her book “O que é ideologia?” (What is ideology?), for instance, is so short that can be read in one day. Yet it seems that watching TV shows is way easier.

Therefore, since it is clear that there is information all around us, and what one has to do is just reach out to it, it can be said that there are tools used to keep them distracted from the important information, tools with one main goal: manipulation.

People interact between themselves and with the word within ideology. It is this that shapes and conforms our consciousness, attitudes, behaviors, in order to shape the conditions of our social existence. Both in a classless society and in a class society, ideology's role is to ensure a certain relationship of men between each other and with their existence condition, to adapt subjects to their tasks fixed by society. It is, therefore, ideology that provides to the subjects a given social formation, a certain homogeneity in the way to interpret the world, in their ways of feeling, desiring, judging, and to conform to their real existence conditions<sup>11</sup>. (BRAGA, 1980, p. 51). (Our Translation).

---

<sup>10</sup> O que estamos [...] tentando marcar é a necessidade de um esforço de integração teórica que possa interromper nossa queda cada vez mais vertiginosa para o engodo das atomizações ideológicas que se vestem com a roupagem das especializações científicas [...] e que afunilam nosso pensamento, bloqueando nossa capacidade indagativa, mas, pior que isso, alimentam-nos com a ilusão superciliosa de estarmos trabalhando para o progresso da ciência, quando estamos, na realidade, travando uma luta ideológica pela posse de um território do conhecimento para o usufruto do poder disfarçado em um saber acima de qualquer suspeitas.

## 2.2.2 THE MANIPULATION OF LANGUAGE, INFORMATION AND EMOTIONS.

### 2.2.2.1 LANGUAGE AND INFORMATION MANIPULATION

The language in *1984* was already previously analyzed and it can be said that the manipulation of the language was done on purpose to keep the Outer Party under control. Now over the perspective of the book it is possible to analyze society these days. As already pointed out, the access to information is getting easier and easier every day, creating a sensation that people cannot stand wasting time anymore, causing them to want to give information as fast as they can have access to it.

As a result of it many people are now reducing their written words, and, in some cases, that reduction is going to the spoken words as well. As soon as possible became faster if written ASAP, and instead of saying how something is funny you can only write LOL (laugh-out-loud). The same way that patience is being lost for writing, it is also being lost for reading. If a text has more than one page people cannot stand reading everything, another consequence of easy information: if something takes too much time and a considerably amount of concentration it is not worth doing it.

Since people are reading less and less every day, it is necessary to make good titles, to make sure to get the reader's attention through short texts only by saying the necessary, so they will not get tired of it. The manipulation of information is all around; when someone needs to sell something they will say that people need that to be happy, because everyone has one, and so on. Products are not sold because they are useful, but because "everyone has it." Information is being handled in the way that affects people the most: making them think they are out of style, making them think that they need to buy to be happy. And so it grows, people buying things to feel happy and complete, but after that is achieved they need something new, it is a never ending circle, and there are many who are trapped in it because "those with power" know how to use the language to get what they want. It seems that the suppression of words take place since youth, when parents fail to say "no" to their children, giving what they whine about, creating more consumers that will only feed the greedy system designed to make them want to have, rather than choose out of sacrifice and work.

---

<sup>11</sup> Os homens interagem entre si e com o mundo dentro da ideologia. É ela que forma e conforma nossa consciência, atitudes, comportamentos, para moldar-nos às condições de nossa existência social. Tanto em uma sociedade sem classes como em uma sociedade de classes, a ideologia tem como função assegurar uma determinada relação dos homens entre si e com suas condições de existência, adaptar os indivíduos as suas tarefas fixadas pela sociedade. É, portanto, a ideologia que fornece aos indivíduos uma dada formação social uma certa homogeneidade nos modos como interpretam o mundo, nas suas maneiras de sentir, querer, julgar, e de se conformar às suas condições reais de existência.

There are courses that teach how to advertise properly, because it is imperative to know how to produce a good advertisement in order to sell more, not only products but ideas and ideologies as well. All of that happens in *1984*: the Inner Party makes people think that everything that happens is for a greater good, when the only benefited with it is the higher power. The selling idea is also portrayed in the book, they sell products as Victory coffee, but they essentially sell ideologies. Some examples are the slogan of the party: the posters all around written “Big Brother is watching you”; and the advertisement for “Two Minutes Hate.” The party needs people to buy those products and ideologies as easy as it is to consume them, since it is the same for everyone.

For the propaganda, it is not only required well-structured words, but also an outstanding visual appearance, considering that people are mainly visual creatures. That explains why Winston mentions the face of Big Brother everywhere alongside with the statement: “Big Brother is watching you”. Big Brother’s face is an instrument of repression itself, a higher power looking over people’s actions. Therefore, it can be seen as a method of manipulation and also to increase the mixing idea of fear and love towards the higher power.

By manipulating the language, even if it is the bigger influence on people, it is not the only way to keep them under control. Manipulating and forbidding emotions is another tool used by the Inner Party.

### **2.2.2.3 EMOTIONS MANIPULATION**

Since the idea is to decrease people’s thoughts to a minimal, it is necessary to decrease the possibility of emotions as well, because some emotions might drive people away from their obligation to the Party. Reading and thinking provide not only vocabulary enhancement, but lexicon can also increase emotions, since words and thoughts are connected. With that in mind, intercourse must be seen as an act free of love or pleasure, to become only a necessary mean towards procreation. Children must only be faithful to the Big Brother, the relation between parents and children are only a necessary mean for survival and development of the young ones.

On the other hand, however, there is an emotion that is prized when the time is right: the Two Minutes Hate. At those two minutes the outer Party is allowed to show that specific emotion in order to prove its hate towards Goldstein, or anybody that stands against the Big Brother, hence proving its loyalty to the Party. Besides the Two Minutes Hate there was also a

week dedicated for that, called Hate Week, which was an even bigger event where the citizens would put a lot of effort on it. It is possible to compare the Two Minute Hate with the idea of the movie *The Purge*, directed by James DeMonaco, where people can commit any type of crime, such as robbery, murder, rape, torture, and the use of guns are permitted for a whole 12 hours.

The development of both ideologies is divergent, but its purpose is more or less the same: to drive people's hate into a different direction, giving them something to get distracted and to take their heads out of the government or any problems that may be occurring. They change people's perspective, taking it from the reality and replacing it into something that will keep them busy and "entertained" for some time. In "The Purge" they have a whole 12 hours to purge and then the rest of the year to prepare for it and to think about the next purge. While, on the other hand, in *1984* people have two minutes of hate every day, being, therefore, a more constant "remedy" with fewer side effects.

Even if there is no Two Minutes Hate or a purge, people on modern society are still getting distracted. There is an intolerance that surrounds everyone every day, which is not only a type of manipulation but also a type of violence. More and more hate crimes are taking place everywhere and the use of freedom expression, that once was a conquest, now has given power to overspread hate and intolerance through social media with easy access. Freedom expression was a great achievement and it is used for good as well, however, the number of people that manifest their hate without limit is vaster.

[...] the simple fact of raising an opposite opinion to the offenders or to the large medias also results in threats, persecution and attacks. Internet, that should be the way of dissemination of transformative information, has been advertising device of moral, ethnic, sexual and symbolical violence. (MIRANDA, 2015) (Our translation).<sup>12</sup>

People cannot stand thoughts that they do not agree with, or that do not go in conformity with their own. There are religious, ethnic, gender and so many other types of violence around, that seems impossible to realize that we are all humankind, and whatever each one decides to do with their lives is up to them, since there is only one life for each and every one. People are distracted hating each other and trying to make others accept their true as the most pure of all. While there are those endless fights without reason, the world perishes

---

<sup>12</sup> [...] o simples ato de ser levantada opinião contrária à dos ofensores ou dos grandes meios de comunicação também acaba resultando em ameaças, perseguições e agressões. A internet, que deveria ser o caminho da disseminação das informações transformadoras, tem sido canal de propaganda da violência moral, da étnica, da sexual e da simbólica.



and the dominant do as they please with everything else, as it can be seen with Brazilian current plebiscites and senate sessions.

### **2.2.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INNER AND OUTER PARTY IN CONTRAST WITH THE PROLES**

The differences between Inner and Outer Party, and proles are clear along the story. There are those who have more privileges, those who must only follow rules, and those that have not so many concerns relating to safety or any possibilities of uprising, because they are contained by the idea of *panem et circenses* (bread and circuses), which will be better explained further on. While *Newspeak* is mandatory for the Outer and the Inner Party, the same is not required of the proles. They speak standardized English neither do they have a *telescreen* controlling every move of theirs, mainly because they are controlled in a different way.

The Inner Party has the language knowledge and also has some other privileges, such as good food and the possibility of turning off the *telescreen*. Their desire to stay in power leads them to a higher commitment to the main ideology: the *doublethink*. They also have a more profound knowledge of what is really happening, but that does not change much as said in the novel: “In general, the greater the understanding, the greater the delusion; the more intelligent, the less sane” (ORWELL, p.271). The old saying that ignorance is a blessing can be taken here as not wanting to know will keep us safer. The Outer Party has to consume Victory products. They are constantly watched and they have some idea of what is going on, but all under *doublethink*, which does not make any difference at all.

The movies made on the Ministry of Love is for proles’ consumption, they do not eat only Victory products, they have their smuggling around that allow them to have better food. This is the political strategy used by the Party, to hand down entertainment options and good food in order to maintain the prole distracted. This can be directly compared with the politics of *panem et circenses* used by Roman leaders to control the general population, as in 1984 this strategy is only used to control the proles (general population), those that are from the Party (Inner or Outer) are controlled with different methods. The proles do not work for the Inner Party, therefore the need for any kind of education is not crucial, this is why they do not have to know *Newspeak*: language control is used for those who need a preparation for their job, being those exposed to some kind of knowledge.

The control the Inner Party has over the proles is the pornography they sell to them, the music, the distorted news (what they know is what is allowed for them to know), the uncertainty of life, since a bomb can fall down out of nothing. Hence the Inner Party does not pay much attention to the proles and that is why Winston thinks that any uprising will start with them.

#### 2.2.4 THE VIOLENCE IN THE BOOK

In *1984* the violence does not have a specific name, but it is used to control those who have committed some sort of crime, in Winston's case *crimethink*. Winston is tortured in varied ways to the point he gets to love the Big Brother. There is no real point in the torture. They are not going to let Winston live anyway, but there is a reason, as O'Brien says to Winston:

We are not interested in those stupid crimes that you have committed. The Party is not interested in the overt act: the thought is all we care about. We do not merely destroy our enemies, we change them. Do you understand what I mean by that?  
(ORWELL, p.319)

They care about the way Winston thinks, not about what he did. Therefore, the only reason for the torture is to change Winston's thoughts, in which the main purpose is to make Winston truly love the Big Brother and to make him die loving him, and, despite the torture and everything, in the end he does.

### 3. A *CLOCKWORK ORANGE* AND *1984*: A COMPARISON

So far each book has been analyzed separately in order to enhance its peculiarities related with nowadays society. However, now is the time to converge them into similar topics and to highlight important and remarkable features from both, also pointing out some differences. Starting, as always, with language, since this is the orbit of the thesis.

#### 3.1 LANGUAGE

The languages are different and have completely different purposes. In *A Clockwork Orange* it works as a new way to see the world, increasing the possibilities of expression, while in *1984* it works as a way of stopping thinking and controlling the population, almost extinguishing with possibilities of expressions, leaving only words needed for communication. Hence, in the first one the language frees its speaker, whilst in the second it blocks the speaking and thinking abilities.

Furthermore, it can be considered that *Nadsat* was created as a way of finding new ways to express oneself; considering that the language was created for the use of adolescents, that are humans unsure of their desires and prospects, it can also be said that its creations is also a form of finding out the true self, as a path to self-awareness. On the other hand, *Newspeak* was created to cancel any new possibilities of expression or manifestation of thinking or self increasing. The intention was to limit the development to a determined point, where the person could still receive orders and be obliged to the Big Brother. Therefore, the possibility of speech variation is restricted by *Newspeak* while *Nadsat* allows many kinds of variations and uses.

Another point to note is that *Newspeak* is a language through the process of development, although it is possible to write full texts using it, there still are blanks to be fulfilled. The book transmits the present desire of reaching perfection, in other words, when the use of standard English will become obsolete. *Nadsat*, on the other hand, does not need to reach point of perfection or fulfillment since it works alongside with English. Therefore, there are no worries about overcoming the standard English, given that the whole essence of *Nadsat* is the possibility of permuting with English, allowing consequently an uncountable number of variations.

### 3.2 THE VIOLENCE

Both books show terrible scenarios where physical violence takes place. In *1984* all the violence is used to change the thoughts of the subjects, to make them think exactly the opposite that they are compelled to think, that is, they change their essence. The same happens in *A Clockwork Orange*, when Alex undergoes Ludovico's Technique. Although it is a different kind of violence, it is being considered violence here because it is something that they are doing to him against his will, and they are also causing him discomfort.

In addition, in both situations there are people trying to change the thoughts (or behavior) of someone else by causing them pain. It seems that they are not allowed to have a proper identity if that identity goes against the government ideals. That being true, they need to act and change it, before their behavior causes more damage in society than it is necessary.

There is another kind of violence in *A Clockwork Orange*, when Alex and his droogs hurt others just because it is a way of going against the rules of society. In this case, Winston does not use any kind of physical violence to manifest against the government, but instead of that he commits *crimethink*, which is the reason why he is caught, while Alex was also caught because of his acts of violence.

Nowadays, the most common type of violence is the one committed through social network, where people attack each other just because the other has an opposite idea or way of life. People's intolerance is turning into hate. And there it is, people, in real life, *trying* to control what others think and how they live.

### 3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL IDENTITY

Thinking about both books separately it is possible to realize how each character is perceived accordingly to the way he acts, his decisions, and of course the way he speaks. How do the authors portrait reality on their dystopian stories? Both make use of several social structures of society to build their world around it. Orwell, as an example, used his novel to criticize the totalitarian government and its part on people's lives. While, on the other hand, Burgess used his novel to point out that people grow up, they become mature at a certain point, and that it might come earlier for some than for others, as well as some never reach maturity.

They structured a society in order to criticize it, then, they changed the structures, by that means allowing them to portray what really happens, but is disguised so others will ignore its true features. In *1984* there is a well-structured society built on a totalitarian government intended to keep the control of its citizens. However, all this carefully designed structure changes once Winston is caught for *crimethink*. The reality of his society comes up and it is possible to understand the reason their government works so well due to the fact that they spot a possible problem for the regime and they “solve it” before it becomes more than just a possibility of a problem. Of course that their methods are neither easy or fast, but they want to ensure that the change really happens on each and everyone that dares to go against the rules.

Moreover, in *A Clockwork Orange*, although the structure of society seems disrupted, since there is free violence and crimes all around, what is more visible is the change that society structure causes on Alex. At first he is a normal adolescent doing whatever he wants to show his disrespect towards rules, but, once he is caught, put in jail and started on the Ludovico’s Technique, everything changes: Alex view of society changes. People who are supposed to be doing things in the right way are messing with someone else’s life, because they do not like his behavior.

The dismantlement of society happens in one way or another, but in both novels it is possible to perceive the effort made by the government to change things they consider inappropriate in their society. For such, it does not matter how much of people’s character they will change; it does not matter if people stop having a personal identity, since they will be living by the rules the government applies from some point onward.

While in *1984* there is an illusion that something might be done to change their situation, nothing can be done, because the Inner Party is committed to change everybody’s thoughts if necessary. The Party’s power on society is too big to be changed so easily. On the other hand, in *A Clockwork Orange* it is shown the government’s attempt to control one’s life. It is an attempt to make things the way the government considers more suitable. Anyhow, it is just an attempt, although they manage to be successful, they have to change it back again, because that society is stronger and they do extreme things to get people to live their life as they please. It does not matter if the government thinks their life style is right or wrong since they are living the life they choose.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This thesis attempted to make an analysis of two novels in three ways: the first one was to analyze each one separately on its own fictitious reality; the second one was to bring literature and reality close together, comparing and analyzing both of them guided by the novels separately; and the third was to bring the two novels into the same spotlight in order to compare them both. The main focus was language and the trial to aware readers of its power not only on fictional books, but also in reality. Because most people are not completely aware of it, they say and hear “stuff” without thinking about its meaning.

Reading two novels that can either be opposite as well as similar was an incredible way of noticing nowadays society through two divergent points of views that can be so familiar. Self awareness can be achieved from reading, watching or just analyzing everyday’s events.

For example, the reduction of the language can be seen in conversations through social media or in some informal talks; Slangs are all around, they vary depending on who is speaking (adolescents, groups of artists, teachers, older people) and they can be noted if someone is not with his/her headphones on. The manipulation of speech can be perceived if a person is aware of the speaker’s intention, if something is needed, if something was wrongly done, if there is bad news, and so on.

Every human being can manipulate speech as far as they are concerned about the effect they will cause on whoever is listening. The voice tone can be manipulated as well if the subject is delicate or bad, if there are great news or even if someone is on a bad mood. Everyone can notice those slightly changes, but sometimes many are just not so aware of the power they may have on their hands if they start paying attention.

Paying attention to what is going on around is not only a way of being aware of what others think, or how they want to be perceived, or how yourself should be saying this or that. But it is also a way of noticing how society is influencing our own identity. Are we what we want to be or we are just an extension of what others think we should be?

Just like in the novels, the present society can be capable of changing our identity. There is no torture, but with social media people start to desire what they do not have and even things they never wanted. There is also a notion that it is necessary to have as many things as possible, because that is the only path towards happiness.

In conclusion, there is a number of things that people ignore and they should not, because what happens around interferes on everyone’s lives. It is certain that being aware of

ideologies and the strings that the government has upon us is painful, but it is a choice. People can either be aware or ignorant of things, and, of course, those who know almost nothing are happier, but are they themselves or are they the government's improved version?

## REFERENCES

- ASIMOV, Isaac. **Review of 1984**. In: <<http://www.newworker.org/ncptrory/1984.htm>> Access in June 6, 2016.
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail. **Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem**. 12<sup>a</sup> ed. Hucitec, 2006.
- BERKES, Jem. **Language as the “Ultimate Weapon” in *Nineteen Eighty-Four***. 2000. Disponível em < [http://www.berkes.ca/archive/berkes\\_1984\\_language.html](http://www.berkes.ca/archive/berkes_1984_language.html)> Access in: June 6, 2016.
- BRAGA, Maria Lúcia Santaella. **Produção de Linguagem e Ideologia**. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 1980
- BURGESS, Anthony. **A Clockwork Orange**. Paperback. ed. W. W. Norton & Company, 1995.
- BURGESS, Anthony. **Laranja Mecânica – Edição Especial 50 anos**. 1. ed. São Paulo: Editora Aleph, 2012.
- COURTINE, Jean-Jacques and WILLET, Laura. **A Brave New Language: Orwell’s Invention of “Newspeak” in 1984**. University of Wisconsin Press. Vol. 15, N<sup>o</sup>2, Issue 50. 1986.
- DETACHMENT. Directed by: Tony Kaye. Produced by Adrien Brody, Marcia Gay Harden, Christina Hendricks, Willian Petersen, and seven more. 100 min. United States. Tribeca Film. 2012.
- FIORIN, José Luiz. **Linguagem e ideologia**. 6<sup>a</sup> ed. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1998
- GNERRE, Maurizio. **Linguagem, escrita e poder**. 5<sup>a</sup> ed. São Paulo: Editora WMF Martins Fontes, 2009.
- GOMES, Anderson Soares. **Linguagem e história: a manipulação do passado através da palavra em 1984 de George Orwell**. In: <<http://www.filologia.org.br/viicnlf/anais/caderno10-10.html>> Access in: June 6, 2016.
- ILARI, Rodolfo. GERALDI, João Wanderley. **Semântica**. 11<sup>a</sup> ed. São Paulo: Ática, 2006.
- KOCH, Ingedore Grunfeld Villaça. **Argumentação e linguagem**. 11<sup>a</sup> ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.



LABOV, William. **Principles of Linguistic Change: Volume 3: cognitive and cultural factors**. 1 ed. United Kingdom. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

MIRANDA, Sandro Ari Andrade de. **As máquinas de vender intolerância e preconceito**. In <<http://www.cartacapital.com.br/blogs/outras-palavras/as-maquinas-de-vender-intolerancia-e-preconceito-4823.html>> Access in: December 2, 2016.

ORLANDI, Eni P. **Análise de Discurso: princípios e procedimentos**. 11<sup>a</sup> ed. Campinas-SP. Pontes Editores, 2013.

ORWELL, George. **1984**. Lisboa: Antígona, 2012

ORWELL, George. **Nineteen Eighty-Four**. Appendix. The principals of Newspeak. In: <[http://orwell.ru/library/novels/1984/english/en\\_app](http://orwell.ru/library/novels/1984/english/en_app)> Access in: June 6, 2016.

Psychology Campus: What you need to know. Adolescent Psychology. In: <<http://www.psychologycampus.com/adolescent-psychology/>> Access in: November 24, 2016.

PURGE, The. Directed by: James DeMonaco. Produced by: Jason Blum, Sèbastien K. Lemercier, Michael Bay, Andrew Form and Bradley Fuller. United States. 85 min. Universal Pictures. 2013.

Sparknotes: In <<https://www.sparknotes.com/lit/1984/context.html>> Access in: November 24, 2016.

The International Anthony Burgess Foundation: In: <<https://www.anthonymburgess.org/a-clockwork-orange/>> Access in: November 24, 2016.

WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig. **Investigações Filosóficas**. 4. ed. Bragança Paulista: Editora Universitária São Francisco; Petrópolis: Vozes, 2005.