



**SECULARISATION IN SELECTED NOVELS BY
DON DELILLO AND GEORGE ORWELL**

**2021
MASTER'S THESIS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

Abbas CHNANI

**Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL- JAMANI**

**SECULARISATION IN SELECTED NOVELS BY DON DELILLO AND GEORGE
ORWELL**

Abbas CHNANI

SUPERVISED BY

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL- JAMANI

T.C.

Karabuk University

Institute of Graduate Programs

Department of English Language and literature

Prepared as Master's Thesis

KARABUK

January 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	3
DECLARATION	4
DEDICATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
ÖZ.....	7
ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION	8
ARŞIV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ.....	9
ABBREVIATIONS.....	10
SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH	11
PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH	11
METHOD OF THE RESEARCH.....	11
HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH / RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	11
SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES	11
INTRODUCTION	13
CHAPTER ONE	14
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	14
1.1. Secularisation: an Indispensable Core.....	14
1.2. Dimensions of Secularisation	17
1.3. Secularism in Context and Content.....	19
1.4. Marx’s Secularism	23
1.5. Marxism and Secular Humanism	30
CHAPTER TWO	36
IN SEARCH OF DELILLO’S	36
<i>LIBRA, MAO II, AND UNDERWORLD</i>	36
2.1. Gnosticism in <i>Libra</i> :.....	36
2.2. Media Framing Secular- Religious Conflict in <i>Mao II</i>	49
2.3. DeLillo’s <i>Underworld</i> : Postsecular Reading	57
CHAPTER THREE:.....	68
TRACING RELIGION IN GEORGE ORWELL'S WRITING	68

3.1. Secularisation and Control in <i>Animal Farm</i>.....	68
3.2. Secularism as a Religion in Orwell's <i>1984</i>.....	72
3.3. Secularism, Religion and Class in the <i>A Clergyman's Daughter</i>.....	85
CONCLUSION	100
REFERENCES.....	105
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	110

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that in my opinion the thesis submitted by Abbas CHNANI titled “SECULARISATION IN SELECTED NOVELS BY DON DELILLO AND GEORGE ORWELL” is fully adequate in scope and in quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL-JAMANI

Thesis Advisor, Department of English Language and Literature

This thesis is accepted by the examining committee with a unanimous vote in the Department of English Language and Literature as a Master’s thesis. January 25, 2021

Examining Committee Members (Institutions)

Signature

Chairman : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL-JAMANI (KBU).....

Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Nazila HEIDARADEGAN (KBU)

Member : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kerem NAYEBPOUR (AIÇÜ)

The degree of Master of Arts by the thesis submitted is approved by the Administrative Board of the Institute of Graduate Programs, Karabuk University.

Prof. Dr. Hasan SOLMAZ

Director of the Institute of Graduate Programs

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work and all information included has been obtained and expounded in accordance with the academic rules and ethical policy specified by the institute. Besides, I declare that all the statements, results, materials, not original to this thesis have been cited and referenced literally.

Without being bound by a particular time, I accept all moral and legal consequences of any detection contrary to the aforementioned statement.

Name Surname : Abbas CHNANI

Signature :

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to give my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Muayad AL-Jamani, for his invaluable and positive guidance as well as his precious ideas and comments during the entire writing process of my thesis as well as my study. The present work would not have come true without his continuous instructions.

I also would love to thank all the academic staff, in particular those who taught me at the Faculty of Arts of Karabuk, especially Prof. Harith who imbued us with the love of research. Thanks are also extended to the Head of English Department, Prof. Dr. Abdul Serdar and Prof. Nazila, who taught me during the Drama course for their support and encouragement. I am also grateful to Dr. Ozkan, for his constructive feedback on my research methods and writing skills.

My final thanks go to my brother, Dr. Mohammed, who supported me with American references during the course of my research as well as Dr. Wisam from the University of Essex in England, who encouraged and helped me during my BA and MA.

Last but not the least, my sincere gratitude and love go to family members, especially my mother and my son Kinan, who increased my fluency. I extend my gratitude to my best friends as well for their encouragement and motivation.

ABSTRACT

Though it has been vigorously discussed in the social sciences recently, the subject of secularisation has seldom been inspected in modern literature. Modern literary writers are believed to be straightforwardly secular – the attention to religion is either entirely absent or personal. Modern writers engage secularisation and secularism following a reliable set of demonstrative strategies, in spite of their dissimilar experiences of religion as well as the ethno-cultural and linguistic alterations one finds among the modern literary writers. However, This study aims to analyse three of Don DeLillo's novels, namely: *Libra* (1988) which is the first one to be discussed in chapter two, and *Mao II* (1991) will be the second, besides the third which is *Underworld* (1997), and three of Orwell's novels: *Animal Farm* (1945), *1984* (1949), and *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) studied in the third chapter. The analysis will be based on the notion of secularisation. In the first chapter of the current study, the research explains the historical origins of secularisation, the dimensions of the term, and its relationship with the theory of Marxism. The second chapter will be devoted to discussing DeLillo's abovementioned novel. In the case of *Libra*, the study will seek the religious motivation behind the assassination of President Kennedy. *Mao II* will be discussed in light of the clash between religious and secular media. Finally, *Underworld* will be discussed as a postsecular work that witnesses the shift or turn of societies and individuals to something after secularism. In the third chapter, the study will focus on Orwell's novels. In discussing Orwell's abovementioned novels, the study will trace the relationship between religion and secularism. It will be shown that, although Orwell rarely employs religion in his writings, but when he does, he refers to it as a tool of manipulation.

Keywords: Secularisation, secularism, Marxism, religion, Postsecularism.

ÖZ

Laiklik konusu sosyal bilimler tarafından son zamanlarda kayda değer bir şekilde çalışılmış olmasına rağmen, modern edebiyat dahilinde nadiren incelenmiştir. Modern edebiyat yazarlarının alenen laik oldukları düşünülmektedir- din ile olan alaka ya mevcut değildir ya da kişisel boyuttadır. Modern yazarlar arasında sık rastlanılan dilbilimsel ve etnik-kültürel farklılıklara ek olarak farklı dini deneyimler göz ardı edilerek modern yazarlar laiklik ve laikleşme sürecine bir dizi güvenilir, belirtici nitelikte stratejiler aracılığıyla dahil olmaktadır. Bu çalışma ilk bölümde *Libra* (1988), ikinci olarak *Mao II* (1991) ve sonra *Underworld* (1997) olmak üzere Don DeLillo'nun 3 romanını ve ilaveten; *Animal Farm* (1945), *1984* (1949), *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935) olmak üzere Orwell'in 3 romanını ele almaktadır. İnceleme laiklik kavramı üzerinden yapılmaktadır. Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, araştırmalar laikliğin tarihi kökenini, terimin diğer boyutlarını ve Marksist teori ile olan ilişkilerini ortaya koymaktadır. İkinci bölüm, Don DeLillo'nun mevzubahis hikayelerinin analizine ayrılmıştır. *Libra* ele alınarak, Başkan Kennedy suikastının arkasındaki dini motivasyonlar irdelenecektir. *Mao II* ise, dini ve laik medya arasında süregelen savaş ışığında incelenecektir. Son olarak, *Underworld*, bireylerin ve toplulukların laiklik sonrası değişimlerine şahit olmuş post-seküler bir çalışma olarak mercek altına alınacaktır. Üçüncü kısımda ise çalışma Orwell'in hikayelerine odaklanmaktadır. Mevzubahis hikayelerin analizi aracılığıyla, bu çalışma, din ve laiklik arasındaki ilişkinin izini sürmektedir. En nihayet Orwell'in yazılarında dine nadiren yer verse de bunu yaptığı zamanlarda laikliğe manipülatif bir araç olarak başvurduğu gerçeği gözler önüne serilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Laiklik, Laikleşme, Marksizm, din, Post-sekülerizm (Laiklik sonrası).

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Title of the Thesis	"Secularisation in Selected Novels by Don DeLillo and George Orwell"
Author of the Thesis	Abbas CHNANI
Supervisor of the Thesis	Assoc. Pro. Dr. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL-JAMANI
Status of the Thesis	Master's Degree
Date of the Thesis	25.01.2021
Field of the Thesis	English Literature
Place of the Thesis	KBU – LEE
Total Page Number	110
Keywords	Secularisation, Secularism, Marxism, Religion, Postsecularism.

ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ

Tezin Adı	"Don DeLillo ve George Orwell'in Seçilen Romanlarında Laikleşme"
Tezin Yazarı	Abbas CHNANI
Tezin Danışmanı	Doç. Muayad Enwiya Jajo AL-JAMANI
Tezin Derecesi	Yüksek Lisans
Tezin Tarihi	25.01.2021
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tezin Yeri	KBÜ – LEE
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	110
Anahtar Kelimeler	Laiklik, Laikleşme, Marksizm, din, Post-sekülerizm (Laiklik sonrası)

ABBREVIATIONS

Etc. : Ve benzeri gibi

ed. : Baskı

Ed. by : Editör

p./pp. : Sayfa/sayfalar

Vol. : Sayı

Vs. : Karşı

SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH

This study mainly aims at exploring the reasons behind people's loss of faith and their conversion to secularism as portrayed in selected novels by Don DeLillo and George Orwell.

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons behind people's loss of faith and their conversion to secularism as portrayed in selected novels by Don DeLillo and George Orwell. The importance of this study is to give bright ideas for what reasons and why the new generations begin to convert from their religious beliefs to secular society as well as the impact of politicians' corruption and the defect of religion which create secularisation.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The secular characters in the six novels by Don DeLillo and George Orwell are analysed by Marxism theory and Secularisation Thesis. The research consequence assists the readers to understand the capacity of the influence of secularisation and Marxism theory upon these secular protagonists.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH / RESEARCH PROBLEM

The concept of the secular character it can be observed in similar and different simultaneously by both authors Don DeLillo and George Orwell. Both authors portray a secular upcoming generation because of the defect and fake faces of those irreligious people who represent religion.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES

The limitation of this thesis is on the six novels. Three of them to Don DeLillo which are: *Libra*, *Mao II* and *Underworld* and the other three novels to George Orwell which are: *Animal Farm*, *1984* and *A Clergyman's Daughter* for examining some aspects in the six novels. The difficulty was in analysing the protagonists of these

novels whether the converted to be purely secular or still clinging some religious creeds.

INTRODUCTION

Practising religious fanaticism leads people to abandon religions. During the Modern Age to the postmodern one and till now, people started questioning their beliefs, especially in Western society. As a result, some writer, such as Don DeLillo and George Orwell, utilised this social phenomenon to document the change in their world. Given this, my research attempts to find answers to the following questions; first, will secularisation last forever or not? Second, why are still some societies converting to be secular? Third, is secularisation a tentative solution to eliminate some wrong religious beliefs and religious fanaticism, or conclusive and permanent? Fourth, what are the reasons behind the conversion of some societies into secularism nowadays? Therefore, this current thesis attempts to answer the aforementioned questions and aims at exploring the reasons behind people's loss of faith and their conversion to secularism. This thesis is divided into three chapters. In the first chapter, the research is going to introduce the readers into the main theories used in the study. In chapter two, the study will tackle three novels of the American author Don DeLillo's *Libra*, *Mao II*, and *Underworld* in light of secularisation. In chapter three, the study will also discuss George Orwell's *Animal Farm, 1984*, and *A Clergyman's Daughter* in light of secularism, secularisation and Marxism's effect.

Studying six novels from two different novelists, the reader realises the reasons behind people's loss of faith in God and religion. All of the six novels demonstrate the effect of theocracy that lead societies to depart their faith in God and accept the conversion as well as affecting the lives, personal connections and characters' life structure. Therefore, in the current thesis, the motivations, causes, culture, history and even economic issues and religious beliefs are examined in all six novels to stand on the reasons behind converting people to secularisation.

CHAPTER ONE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. Secularisation: an Indispensable Core

The violence and practices of religious fanaticism in the world lead some societies to convert to secularisation and leave their religions. These reasons are the most influential motives behind people's loss of faith and their conversion to secularism. Therefore, secularisation comes as a reaction to religious fanaticism in order to liberate humanity from the authority of religion and fake religious doctrines. Originally the key method of understanding applied in the sociology of religion for explaining and describing religious alteration in the modern period, the theory of secularisation has now come in for criticism. Secularisation has advanced, it is no longer confined to the decline in the significance of religion, and it is also not exclusive for a particular culture or society. Therefore, it is not only probable to assert that religion in modern cultures has assimilated a new unrestricted countenance and is progressively instrumental in affecting people's actions. Yet, the kind of criticism that secularisation faced, is also accompanied by the statement that modernity and religion are fitting, that religion could have a powerful influence on existing courses of change, and that modern institutions and ideas are themselves religious in starting point (Pollak, 2015, p.61). Religion has started to be considered as a dependent variety revealed only in a reactive sense to the procedures of urbanisation, increased prosperity, rationalisation, and the growth of education in modern time.

For Agote (2010), the notion of the secularising society or secularisation, in general, has undergone numerous changes within different historical transformations (p.1). Secularisation, as a sociological indication, is the practice about modern cultures in which religious organisations and doctrines experience diminished social impact due to the development of technology, rationalism, and science that accompanies the course of urbanisation and industrialisation. This is a complicated process that involves many political, individual, and social dimensions within a religion (Agote, 1992, p.1). Secularisation thesis was advanced as a hypothetical argument also at the start of the ninetieth century; it was the part of modern trends and innovative thoughts regarding

traditional societies. The exploration of the process of modernisation leads to the root of the regulation of classic sociology.

In modern society, the reflection on the fall of religion is necessary to the expansion of European sociology and stayed essential to it until the last decades of the twentieth century. The notion of secularisation has not been pronounced within American sociology because of the different pattern of modernisation experienced by a nation shaped by continual migrations with various religious conventions.

Prior to that, before appearing in sociology, the word secularisation had a long history. Etymologically the term secularisation is derived from the Latin word *saeculum* that was firstly used by the early priests of the church as an alternative word for the temporal world. Later, in the middle Ages, the term was used by canon law so as to signify a monk deserting the regime of his order. In other fields, in 1948 the term entered the legal-political domain and that was through the Treaty of Westphalia that arranged the transmission of definite religious organisations from the spiritual territory to the temporal one. In the eighteenth century, The Enlightenment brought a consciousness of the progressive withdrawal of religion from culture. After that, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, sociology advanced this idea further by analysing the procedures of transformation within European societies (Agote, 2010, p.2).

According to Nisbet (1974), the Enlightenment “was never qualified to see religion as something that is more than a plot of madness, tyranny, and superstitions of the spirit; as an ideology, which we could hope will vanish over time, given the adequate effect of education and the examination of the indications of science” (p.158). For the “philosophes”, “Christianity and religion in general, was something that had to be comprehended at its origins than, their aim was not to destroy it whenever they could” (Nisbet, 1974, p.158). For that reason, almost all sociological thinkers have been expecting the disappearance of religion by the close of the 21st century.

The emergence of social sciences in the first half of the nineteenth century collaborated in the course of nation-state construction of European secular cultures. Sociologists’ contribution in this process could be considered as the main reason behind classifying secularisation as a social process, but not as a movement, or

political project or even as an ideology. Some anthropologists argue that secularism is not a disappointing political stand which entails abstract notions and that the promotion of secularisation is not a safe claim for public neutrality against the multiplicity of worldviews and beliefs. Beckford (2003) argues that many sociologists were concerned in practical and political schemes to obstruct, assist, or clarify the decline of religion's importance (p.15).

The most significant sociologists of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century prophesied the decline of religious organisations in the future but also predicted a theoretical and very significant analytical device so as people may understand the alterations in the religion's role in society. Religion played a part in concealing the awareness of the social world for Engels and Marx; for them, religion was a weapon used by the leading class to legitimise its authority and suppress the uprising of the suppressed classes. (Pollak, 2015, p.62) Therefore, if the working class had the chance to obtain political power, religion might soon come to an end; thus, the place of religion would be replaced by dialectic materialism, as a progressive and scientific substitute to the religious world view (Willaime & Hervieu-Léger, 2001, pp.10-11).

According to Durkheim (1967), the principal shape of the common spirit that holds people each other as a unified whole might be found in religion (p.79). Society is a set of feelings, notions, or beliefs of entirely sorts that advanced by people of that society (Durkheim, 1967, p.79). Durkheim (2007) examined the totemic convictions of Australia, but his search furthered beyond that. His purpose was to explore the way by which this moral accord was built in certain societies such as France, a society that had just gone through the 1905 law that finally established the separation between the State and Church. In 1920, Weber commented on the sociology of religion. Weber investigated about the concatenation of conditions that lead to definite phenomena emerging in the West which pointed an evolutionary movement on a worldwide balance. The explanation of the social behaviour appeared in the West in several spheres involving art, science, law, and economics (Weber, 1988, p.1). Religion and rationalisation had a complicated relationship. Religion might lead to irrational or rational behaviours, and that depends on social background. The calculation, foreseeing of consequences or instrumental rationality are all components of behaviour

opposing to the magical world view. Yet, According to Weber, the change that took place in the West had its consequences on the whole world; it paved the way for a universal evolutionary change (Ritzer, 1992, p.7).

Some critics warned people that a linear and simple concept of secularisation might no longer be acknowledged as an unavoidable quantitative withdrawal of religious dogmas; however, they must consider instead that secularisation is something multiple and complex and not essentially universal (Agote, 2010, p.3). Recently, critics believe that time had come to talk about the supposition that the relationship between religion and modernism is unavoidably conflictual. Some of them, such as (Stark, 1999, p.109) advocated that the notion of secularisation must be deserted definitively. For others, it remained effective although it needs some revision; in the middle of these views, there were more supporters of an appraisal of religion's relationship with the social background: "modern religion is subject and resilient to cultural impacts; it does not simply decline or survive but adapts to its setting and environment in complicated ways" (Agote, 2010, p.3).

1.2. Dimensions of Secularisation

The word 'secularisation' has been used within the area of sociology with a range of senses concerning the decline of religion; most of these meanings were less or more accurate. Shiner (1967) delineated six perspectives that have been given to secularisation by the sociologists. The first of these six consider secularisation just as 'decline in religion': before this time it accepted religious institutions, symbols, and doctrines lose prestige and influence (Shiner, 1967, p.57). There is a measurable decline in the practices and beliefs of social actors. Secondly, secularisation is seen as compliance with this realm of the world: a procedure by which previously religious importance is diverted increasingly from the supernatural sphere to the mundane realm. In this sense, it would be important to emphasise that, within the history of the West and of Europe; the Protestant Reformation characterised growing attention to the world mirrored in religion itself (Shiner, 1967, p.68). However, within Catholicism, for turning to "worldly", it was compulsory to protest against the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic tenets. In the case of the rebel against the Catholic tenets, the religious person turns to be secularised. In the case of rebelling against the Catholic hierarchy,

in order to embrace the world, one must abandon religion (Weber, 1988, Martin, 1979, Berger, 2001). The disenchantment or the “desacralization” of the world is the third perspective of secularisation: the permanent procedure of rationalisation will eventually lead to an explanatory causal model in the world (Shiner, 1967, p.68).

The conclusion of this procedure will be an entirely rational society in which mystical and supernatural phenomena do not play any part. Fourthly, secularisation is regarded as the compartmentalisation of religious perception within culture or society, forming religion as an independent reality and subsequently demoting it to the restricted sphere. The conclusion of this procedure would be: considering religion as the person’s individual experience and one without any corporate action or influence on social institutions. This perspective of secularisation achieves its fullest appearance in relation to the concept of modernisation as a progressive separation of societal purposes. Secularisation as a way of transferring determined religious established practices into the worldly demesne, and this is the fifth type (Shiner, 1967, p.77). In this regard, one may speak about transferring Protestant beliefs into the essence of capitalism, the idea of Marxist principles as a substitution to Judeo-Christian eschatology. As a final type, or the sixth type one may use the term of secularisation as a substitute for modernisation.

In 1964, Bellah formed an evolutionary typology, in which he was able to underscore the significance of a sequence of features that are embedded in the concept of religion as imagined by European sociology. Bellah’s typology is maintained by the idea of the advanced practical separation of society in general, mainly along the lines of improving symbolic distinction, depending on Voegelin’s (1956) central idea that society advances from efficiently symbolised customs into differentiated customs. Bellah mentions five important historical categories. The first two are archaic and primitive religions, matching to hardly segregated practices of society. There is no distinguished religious organisation in the primitive type: Society and Church are the same; however, in the outdated sort the religious organisation is combined together with another gregarious construction (Bellah, 1964, p.360). Cosmological monism appears in both the archaic and primitive. Through the detection of a domain of religious reality, the break of this monism is exactly the central feature of historical religion, and this is Bellah’s third type. The fourth type characterises the emergence of

rejection of the mundane of this world while depicting religious action as an indispensable to the person's salvation (Bellah, 1964, p.363). In this type religious organisation is differentiated from the governmental organisation, and also suggests that the issue of legitimising political authority has come into a new stage: the opportunity that political actions might be judged in religious expressions. The fourth type is the early modern religion: the beginning of religious modernism starts from the Protestant Reformation, in which the essential characteristic was the failing of the ranked shaping of the two worlds. This means that one must not seek salvation from the point of departure out of this world, but from its place at the heart of worldly activities. The fifth form of Bellah is a modern, generically defined religion that characterises the breakdown of dualism (Bellah, 1964, p.369).

1.3. Secularism in Context and Content

If secularisation has its significance merely in context, then it is right and natural to consider that it will emerge in various guises and forms in different contexts. Yet, it would be suitable to mention these three opening characteristics of secularism at the beginning because they look invariant among the various types that secularism can take in various contexts. First, secularism is considered as “a stance to be taken about religion” (Bilgrami, 2011, p.2). Generally speaking, it does not say something that is very precise or specific. The generality and imprecision have two sources: the first one is religion, concerning which it is believed to take a stance, is itself, not a very specific or precisely understood phenomenon. Yet, to the degree that one has an idea of religion in frequency — however inaccurately explained, secularisation would have a parasitic meaning incompletely explained as a stance concerning whatever that concept stands for. There are two crucial questions that arise from the first point: is it fair to claim that there is no viability in any specific concept of religion? Must the concept pass out of theoretical currency? Secularism also would lapse as a concept with a rationale and point (Bilgrami, 2011, p.2). The other source of vagueness is that people said nothing precise or specific about what type of stance secularisation takes towards religion. People could think that secularisation has to be “an adversarial stance” (Bilgrami, 2011, p.3). Since certainly it, in some cases, describes itself in contradiction of religion.

Second, secularism is different from secularisation and secular, and it is quite particular in another regard. Secularism is the name of a political doctrine (Bilgrami, 2011, p.4). As a name, it could not every time have ensured this limitation, yet it seems to be its existing main usage. Therefore, it takes a stance against religion, but it does that just in the domain of the polity. Unlike secular and secularisation that are marked with highly dispersed, and general cultural, social, as well as intellectual processes and phenomena (Bilgrami, 2011, p.5). Secularism differs from secularisation in the way that it is not extensive enough to contain a stance against religion, which involves the redirection of either individual conviction, or any of a range of cultural or personal and cultural habits of diet or dress. Therefore, it does not represent a stance against religion like that of agnostics and atheists could hope to take. The growth in a culture of loss of individual belief in religion or the decrease in a synagogue, mosque, or church, or the giving up of traditional religious customs of prohibitions against pork or dress, could all be marks of expanding “secularisation”. However, these habits are unrelated to the notion of secularism (Bilgrami, 2011, p.5). The cause behind this is rather obvious and straightforward. It could be probable to think that a devout Hindu, Christian, or Muslim might be dedicated to keeping some sides of the reach of his conviction out of the society, and does not mean he/she is giving up on being a Hindu, Muslim, or Christian. Moreover, today, it seems usual to state that an individual, for all his/her religious zeal, is pledged to secularism. It is also usual to say and think: such a religious person, in being devout, holds out against the movements released by the long ideational and social processes of secularisation; therefore, people may put secularism under the umbrella of secularisation (Bilgrami, 2011, p.6).

The third characteristic of secularism is that it is seen as a stance concerning religion, which is confined to society, and is not effective in itself. It searches for what is conceived so as to promote definite other political and moral goods, and these goods are planned to oppose what is conceived as potential, harms, or actual (Bilgrami, 2011, p.6). The third feature of secularism could be regarded too controversial to be considered as a significant feature; however, its point turns to be more reasonable when humans compare secularism with a more cognitive stance concerning religion, like atheism. In the atheists’ perspective, the fact of atheism is adequate to inspire one to follow it, and that truth is not built on the claim that it upholds a political, or moral good, or the claim that it is reinforced by other political or moral values humans have

(Bilgrami, 2011, p.7). On the other hand, for secularists, truth claimed on the grounds that appeal to further standards that reinforce the principle of secularism or other goods which were promoted by it. As a political doctrine, secularism arose to mend what was observed as damages that streamed from historical troubles that, in their turn, were observed as owing, in some wide sense, to religion. Therefore, for example, one may consider that secularism had as its massive cradle the internecine and prolonged religious disputes in Europe centuries ago. This normative power of correcting harms and serving goods is detectably implied.

Some critics have argued that secularism did not make a plea to substantive values, which indicates that values might be embraced by some and not observed by others (Bilgrami, 2011, p.8). It was not acceptable on purely rational lands that anyone could find convincing, does not matter what functional values they embraced. People may invoke Bernard Williams's notion of "internal reasons" so as to define these types of grounds on which its explanation is given. These internal reasons rely on specific values and motives in addition to obligations in the moral psychologies of groups or individuals. Internal reasons are opposed to "external reasons", the last deal with someone who is supposed to have relatively independent of his/her substantive commitments and values, which means independent of features in the psychologies which stimulate people (Bilgrami, 2011, p.8). Bernard Williams referred to the forms of universalism and those of externalist rationality, and lastly, he made his claim that there are no "external reasons" that would participate in the establishment of secularism (Bilgrami, 2011, p.9). If humans to that secularism to carry a belief, then one would claim that it must have happened on the grounds that convinced individuals by appealing to the substantive and specific values which are found in their particular moral, psychological economy. Such a view could evoke an alarm within those who wish for secularism to have a universal basis. By their nature, internal reasons do not provide such a basis. Internal reasons might not convince everyone, since those some individuals might not embrace the specific substantive values to which such reasons plea, and on which such reasons depend. On the other hand, external reasons might convince everybody, since all they need is minimal rationality controlled by all (adult, undamaged) human minds (Bilgrami, 2011, p.9).

Charles Taylor argues that in a religious society, secularism has to be adopted on the foundation of what Rawls named an overlapping consensus (Tylor, 1998, p.11). Rawls's term represents a consensus on some policy which was achieved by individuals with very different religious, political, and moral commitments, these individuals have a different point of views, and thus they may belong to very different backgrounds. So what is the relation between the idea of secularism as grounded on overlapping consensus and internal reasons, as they were considered as the only way to justify secularism? The answer is that the latter idea lies behind the former (Tylor, 1998, p.11).

Charles Taylor argues that individuals need to redefine the concept of secularism (Bilgrami, 2011, p.15). For Tylor there have been two features to secularism, the first one is the idea of the separation of state and church, while the second idea indicates that the state upholds a neutral equidistance from various convictions within a plural society. In modern societies, people seek three things that stay significant to secular aspirations: the equality of various faiths, the liberty of worship, and finally, and most importantly, giving each faith a voice in establishing the form of the society (Bilgrami, 2011, p.15). Therefore, because the first feature stresses on the parting of state and church were too concentrated on religion, while the second one stresses on religious variety must be improved and expanded to contain the point that in recent modernity, the variety of pluralist societies includes not only a diversity of religious individuals but non-religious ones as well. Their different point of views has to be incorporated into the mix. Now, all this is the rope in the ideal and idea of a redefined secularism.

Therefore, to sum up, Tylor's explicit purposes for looking for this capacious explanation of secularism are three crucial things to be mentioned here: the significance of the state upholding an equal and neutral distance from each religion. Second, the significance of a society permitting the democratic contribution of all beliefs in determining its polity's obligations. Thirdly, there is an essential need to turn the attention away from religion to respecting and acknowledging wider structures of cultural variety and a diversity of intellectual situations, containing non-religious ones (Bilgrami, 2011, p.15).

1.4. Marx's Secularism

Researchers who engaged within the criticism of secularism have struggled for a variety of connotations of the secular and their cognates, such as secularity, secularisation and secularism. In their quest for consistency in the semantic surplus, these scholars often eluded characteristics between these connotations or looked for a simpler notion of the layman which includes all its senses (Weir 2015; Asad 2003; Taylor 2007). For other scholars, there are obvious strong similarities between Protestantism and secularism (McCrary and Wheatley 2017; Yelle 2013; Fessenden 2007; Modern 2011), at times reflecting a Christian dogmatic tradition which has long been anti-secular (Reynolds 2016; Taylor 2007; Gregory 2011). Unlike this anti-secular convention, the clearest form of the critique of secularism is that of the situations that generate a distinction between religious and secular and a critique of the traditions that empire profits from such distinction. Defeating a neat separation between religion and secularism involves reassembling them and fracturing both new ways that permit disordered life to exceed supremacy (Hurd, 2015, pp.122-127). Considering Karl Marx's secularisation provides a chance to restore the alterations within secularisation and its divergence from Christianity, but also its peculiar resemblances with religion. That progress can help to improve the secularisation critiques and uphold other significant devices for improving the economic structure.

Remembering Marx's secularisation denotes to evoke his critique of religion, his thoroughgoing empiricism, and his avowed atheism, also to admit the anti-religious atheism of Marxists, who involved in statecraft, like Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong, and Vladimir Lenin. Referring to Marx's secularisation also indicates remembering the nature of his materialism that proceeds from irreligious materialism not just because it varies with its conclusions, but due to the fact that it reflects ontological supposition a distraction from a most essential demanding emphasis on economic structure. However, some of the Marxism forms are theological or otherwise explicitly Christian, Marxian secularists used to have a massive effect on the secularisation of states and people around the globe, and Marx's naturalism presents a contest for those involved in postcolonial critique (Brown, 2014, p.122). In fact, critique's obligation to Marx does not mean that is essentially secular, yet the shadow of his secularism must not be ignored.

Marx's secularisation is a subject of the dispute and for that, it deserves consideration if people are willing to continue to consider Marx's views while taking account of secularisation seriously. Carl Marx considered himself an atheist (Marx, Foner, Lander & Marx, 1972, p.15). Those who are committed to ontological materialism and epistemological empiricism have been described as atheists, and that claim was widely spread in the late eighteenth-century, or more precisely before Marx's avowal (Kors 1992). Centuries before, the word "atheist" used in Christian societies, and it was used as a nickname for heretics (Kors 1990). Though first published under a pseudonym, Paul Henri in (1770) was the first one to articulate modern, systematic atheism, which means that, comprehensible thinking of ontological materialism (Kors, 1976, p.13). Jacques-André Naigeon, along with his contemporaries D'Holbach, Denis Diderot, Claude Adrien Helvétius, and Offray de la Mettrie, made a group of authors which was identified as the French materialists. These writers claimed that a naturalist and materialist ontology resulted from rough sensationalist empiricism, which these writers confirmed systematically in a sequence of writings that drew from the ancient traditions of the Greek and Roman empires (Kors, 2016, p.1671).

Marx is the heir of both the French materialism and ancient atomist tradition, which he referred to in his early works. However, Marx's materialism varies from that of the French materialists' writers, Marx's materialism turned away from the abstract assumption of ontology to the subjective interest of man's life. In his dissertation in 1840, Marx makes this variance clear. His dissertation was a comparative study about the normal viewpoints of two of the earliest Greek atomists, Epicurus and Democritus (Marx, 1975, pp.25-105). Other critics saw Epicurus as just a version of the earlier Democritus (Marx, 1975, pp.37-38). In the case of Marx, he differentiates between their philosophies so as to prove Epicurean innovation. In the case of Democritus, Marx discovers empiricism which tells about the world inductively by collecting manifestations into objective philosophies. In the case of Epicurus, Marx discovers the objective world existing in subjective individual consciousness; human mind and the universe mirror each other (Marx, 1975, p.73).

Marx claimed that Epicurus solved the issue of separating "phenomena" and "noumena" that Wilhelm Hegel borrowed of Immanuel Kant, he as well tried to solve

it. Marx depended, in his study on Hegel's dialectical method. However, he believed that thought is matter literally; he avoided Hegel's idealism (Marx, 1975, p.75). Thought does not represent an inductive calculation of an eventually inconceivable reality; it is co-extensive with the reality and follows the laws of reality. The reason, on the other hand, is the logic existing in both the world and the mind; and human thought is nature's concrete, and maybe self-consciousness by itself. Science, on the other hand, must always be subjective, and thus takes the side of a reasoning subject. Science must never be objective because if it is not, it will leave an immense gap between subjective thought and the world (Marx, 1975, p.78). Marx's Epicurus ties rationalist and empiricist epistemologies and affirms the importance of matter while concentrating on the human subject. The results of Marx's study early 1841 mirrors the whole scheme of his later writings: bringing individual's life into a self-conscious perception of its nature and into a suitable relationship with its material situations that are the same.

From the discussion above, it appeared that Carl Marx placed himself as a successor to the materialist tradition, Marx does not deny atheistic materialism, but he moves its attention to subjective man's life, and this leads as to ask a question: is Marx Secular? Before answering this question, it must be mentioned some points regarding secularism. Nietzsche inscribed that precisely apprehending the development and origin of morality in the West was restrained by the "democratic prejudice" of moderns (Parl, 2014, p.2). When one refracts the past throughout the progressive and egalitarian historiographical pride of the present, Nietzsche assumed, he or she fails to comprehend other tables of standards and miss the possibility to reflect and understand on one's self through them (Parl, 2014, p.110). "Democratic prejudice" sacrifices the possibility of genealogy to light up the mechanisms of power in people own moral organisation of things.

Today, much Western thought undergoes a variation on Nietzsche's charge; specifically, a "secular prejudice" comes to terms of humans' determinations to capture the play of religion in the world and thought, in past and present (Parl, 2014, p.111). Functioning from a layer of expectations about the secular and the religious, beginning with a faith in their putative opposition, humans misunderstand how they were

otherwise perceived even in modernity, and therefore lose a chance for insight into present-day predicaments of religion, secularism, and globalisation.

In some aspects of Western academic life, secular prejudice is separation under examination by a collection of scholars, including, William Connolly, Talal Asad, Charles Taylor, Saba Mahmood, Peter Danchin Winnifred Sullivan, Hent de Vries, and Tomoko Masuzawa (Parl, 2014, p.113). These scholars have shown to the universe that the modern Western secularism as involving more than the order of thinking and the religious public sphere, or a church-state distinction. Rather, secularism in modern West takes form like a figure of subject and governmentality production from which numerous associations follow.

The first point is that secularism never just includes religion. Rather it produces a particular definition and model of religion and develops specific types of religious practices and topics, such as the Protestant Reformation–formed West, restricted adherents whose worship and values are hived off from the daily public and economic life. Unique ways of creating, specifying, and arranging religion are a way of clearly distinguishing secularism. In other words, more than only separating state and church, politics and religion, private and public, secularism generates practices and meanings on both sides of these divisions and their relation.

The second point is related to the first one, in which, rather than just driving out religion from the public domain, secularism disseminates and converts religious modalities and imaginaries of consciousness through the society it rules. This dissemination extends of the essence for modern sovereignty (Schmitt) to the core of the state–public culture relation (Marx), to the normative ethos and orientation of the subject (Foucault and Weber) (Parl, 2014, p.113)

Third, many supposedly secular formulations and concepts, without forgetting about the secular thinkers, are covered with religious narratives, ordinances, and temporalities. If, for instance, Nietzsche exposed the self-satisfaction of a god’s-eye opinion in all ambitions to objectivity, he is also captive to Christianity in variety of ways, from Nietzsche’s direct reversals and rejections of Christian principles to his own self-position as the Antichrist. One may also consider Schmitt, who repeats this religious investiture in articulating sovereignty as fundamentally eternal, timeless,

absolute, above the law, impersonal, capable of deciding and making truth. Alternatively, people may consider Marx's materialist historiography (which was highlighted above), which structures a narrative that starts with an innovative fall from grace and finishes with heaven and redemption on earth. Therefore, religious consciousness does not die or fade with a secular obligation to its official expungement from practices or spheres, containing and above all thinking (Parl, 2014, p.113).

All these claims have a backstory, including a great deal of historical and theoretical detail. In the case of Marx, a secular prejudice is dominant in readings of his works that put him either as a social scientist replacing mystery with science, a hater of religion, a thinker of capital's secularising power, relentlessly secular, "or as a messianic philosopher whose Liberator was communism" (Parl, 2014, p.115). These descriptions gloss over Marx's intense intellectual construction through his involvement with criticisms of religion. Such accounts also avoid the extent to which his initial rethinking of Feuerbach, Hegel, and the Young Hegelians on the connection of religion to consciousness, history, sensuous experience, and the state creates frames and heuristics that continue across his work, sometimes in an overt form and sometimes shadowy.

While Marx was no specialist of religion, he considered religion as bunk and was persuaded by his lessons of the English working class that development of urbanisation could be the death knell of strict religious devotion. Marx did not believe the idea which says religion is necessarily displaced by science and reason, or the idea that says capitalism fundamentally abolishes religious belief. However, Marx expands the "Feuerbachian" vision that religion is a manifestation of man's alienation, a prediction of human abilities onto an unreal Other, a prediction that itself indicates people unfreedom, yet also limns their unconscious or inchoate awareness of its solution (Feuerbach, 2004, p.124). Marx goes further; he combines Feuerbach's vision into religion's common source with a Hegelian understanding of the evolving historical logic of religions, therefore seeking to identify the relation between religious form and human life form.

It is significant to point out that for Marx, the desacralizing power of capital (the power he portrays at the beginning of the Manifesto) might neither bring religious

modalities of awareness to an end to nor eliminate the situations for religion itself. Therefore, events and powers of desacralization are not equal to the end of religion, or secularism, and desacralization itself is not a unidirectional or a linear historical process. The desacralization of processes or relations in a particular place and time could be cross-cut or rejoined by sacralisation of something different. Therefore, if desacralization does not represent a one-way process for Marx, and as was stated, not equal to overcoming religion, there is no motive for religious consciousness and religion in general, to vanish in capitalist societies. Furthermore, Marx's Feuerbachian reading of the origin of religion is contrasting to the idea that it is remaining power hinge on a trick of the exploiters. Marx adopted Feuerbach's important belief that religion is an essential emanation of all unfree and alienated social circumstances. This emanation varies in its sustenance and source from ideology. On the contrary, religious consciousness or awareness articulates the disconnection of humans and the impacts of their own generative capabilities and the relegation of humans by forces (whether in modes or nature of production) bigger than their combined selves (Feuerbach, 2004, p.124).

Here, it could refer to the way in which Marx made his turn to the question of fetishism in Capital: A product is as readily understood, at first sight, something very trivial. His review reveals that in fact, it is very weird, full of religious niceties and metaphysical subtleties (Marx, 1975, p.319). The ironic twist through which this claim offered makes it simple to lose sight of the unexpected content of it. Commodities seem direct enough— secular, empirical as it were, yet their actual nature is religious, metaphysical. This is an inversion of critical theory's normal reality/appearance method: Rather than raising a religious cover in pursuit of a material substratum, people must look for the religious bases of an apparently material object.

Carl Marx argues that individuals convert nature into things valuable to them. Therefore, wood's shape is changed when a table is made from it (Marx, 1975, p.320). This idea, without forgetting labour, produces something valuable—from wood, a table. However, Marx says:

Usefulness is utterly beside the point of commodities. Rather, as soon as it steps forth as a commodity, it is changed into something transcendent. It does not only stand with its feet on the ground but in relation to all other commodities, it stands on its head and evolves out of its wooden

brain grotesque ideas, far more wonderful than “table-turning” ever was. (p.320)

Therefore, the commodity system is both active in which religious deities are—able of world-making and idea-generation and transcendent in status. Through this discussion, Marx is depicting Feuerbach’s method directly for religion: humans make God, who then makes humans. Likewise, the table, although shaped by humans from wood, as a commodity converts transcendent, develops thoughts from its wooden brain, and stands actuality on its head. In this respect, Commodities are entirely religious in nature (Parl, 2014, p.115).

Marx contends that a commodity is the matter of a definite separation of labour generative of associations among producers and between owners and producers (Parl, 2014, p.115). A commodity includes the social practice of labour at any particular place and time. Its value is regulated by the necessary labour time needed to bring into being it within that specific social shape. However, the process of commodities in the market naturally hides this relation in prefer of the relative swap cost importance amid merchandises. Therefore, it is in desertion from the field of production to the field of exchange in which the religious “exchange” happens. Marx continues:

[A] commodity is, therefore, a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men’s labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour; because the relation of the producers to their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. (Marx, 1975, p.320)

These issues provoke the general question of whether “items in the world” are what they appear, whether one could ever evade misinterpreting our optic nerve's subjective excitement for an “objective form of something out of the eye” (Parl, 2014, p.113). For Marx, it constructs the more precise enquiry of how to comprehend “a social relation between men that adopts the shape of a relation between things” (Parl, 2014, p.113). Marx’s response to such question is truly shocking he states “people should have the alternative to the mist- enveloped areas of the religious world” (Parl, 2014, pp.113-114). It means that, the world where “the inventions of the human brain seem as self-regulating beings entering into relation and endowed with life, both with the human race and with one another” (Marx, 1975, p.321). In fact, Marx does not say that commodity fetishism and religion are equivalent because both are false. What he claims instead that the production of capitalist commodity naturally produces a

distinctively religious mystification of object, powers, relations, and things. Furthermore, commodities are neither accidentally nor contingently, but necessarily fetishized; a religious demonstration of capitalist social relations is essential in capitalist production. To say it in another way, “mystical veil” according to Marx is over “the life course of society” might not be shed till there is “production by liberally associated men, deliberately controlled by them in accordance with an established plan” (Marx, 1975, p.327).

The statement that says commodity fetishism needs an alternative to the nebulous religious areas does not mean a move to analogy or metaphor. Instead, the commodity is certainly one of the two forms of modernity, in which the systematic division of individuals from their capacities happens making commodity fetishism an essentially religious component of secular society (Parl, 2014, p.113).

1.5. Marxism and Secular Humanism

Whitehead (1996), attempted to discuss the Marxists paradox and how might be so effective in evolving the scientific theory of history and society, nevertheless face so much complexity in evolving a similar religion theory. “The main subtext that this question is raising here: this issue relates to overall incapability to overcome religion as a procedure within a scientific society” (Whitehead, 1996, p.135). Although some scholars do not see it like that, they think if one is able to clarify a phenomenon, he or she would be able to overcome it, even with the further aspects of desire, the need to do so, and it is still unmanageable to defeat something that has been weakly misunderstood or explained (Whitehead, 1996, p.179).

Having this in perspective, for any scientific viewpoint such as Marxism that seeks to resolve historical and social contradictions, it is important to confront anomalies like the one to which Whitehead uses, and then overcome it. One would as well specify that such criticism has not to be restricted to religion, but has to contain a conjoined theory to clarify the persistence of the whole shapes of pseudoscientific, irrational, belief and antiscientific thinking. Whitehead (1996) cites Schumaker and Guthrie’s investigations as probable places where Marxists could begin to construct a more complicated understanding of religion; however, both works concentrated on a fundamentally psychological notion of religion. The notion that religion is

fundamentally related either to “anthromorphy” (which means, projection of personal drive, or need to supernatural conviction) or dissociation is therapeutically positioned to be used in the Marxist theory of religion (Whitehead, 1996, p.147).

In his book *Transcendental Temptation* (1991), Paul Kurtz attempts to unify a critique of both the paranormal and religion. Kurtz deals with an impressive variety of subjects from both philosophical and historical perspectives. His book contains critiques of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism, besides such phenomena as astrology extrasensory perception, spiritualism, reincarnation, and UFOs. Kurtz believes that human tendency for delusion demonstrated in a double process in which phoney prophets and conjurers first try to deceive an already naïve public into admitting their allegation to have appointed into the authorities of some otherworldly demesne (Kurtz, 1991, pp.5-23). Such claims are effective for Kurtz, because of the humans need to accept customs of “magical thinking” that offer transcendence from normal reality. The purpose of this procedure is to weaken people’s capability to use and develop critical reasoning skills.

Kurtz provides proof driven from both religious and historical sources suggesting that the prophets of the three main religions behaved in a way akin to magicians, or to put it in the modern view, they behaved as showmen or filmmakers (Kurt, 1991, p.211). He argues that the demagogic nature and highly irrational messages that religion brought have exerted an influential appeal on their supporters. The work of Kurtz in this area is very important as a logical and historical refutation of paranormal beliefs. Nonetheless, Roberts (1999) states that Kurtz views are of importance to improve the Marxist direction (p.180). Educating people in a mixture of the scientific method, critical intelligence, and scepticism could help them to confront the transcendental temptation. Still, some believe that assuming that by intensifying quantitatively people’s abilities and thinking skills would change the qualitative sources and content of their information is a mistake (Reberts, 1999, p.180).

The modern Marxist approach presents a formation of the scientific approach that goes beyond the imperfections ingrained in both the positivist or historicist opinions of science. This approach is called “dialectical critical realism,” it was presented in 1989 by a Marxist philosopher whose name is Roy Bhaskar. The concept

of “transcendental realism” that Bhaskar uses in his study might help to illuminate Kurtz’s notion of “transcendental temptation”, but also might refer to answers not considered in Kurtz’s own analysis.

For Bhaskar (1989), it is still part of reality in which people use their cleverness to overpower (transcend) it. Human’s most restricted tries to understand happenings reveal how “transfactual tendencies” occur within comparatively enduring structures (Bhaskar, 1989, pp.91–92). It does not matter how stable or normal things appear once one reflects on them; they will eventually change. In fact, they change all the time. Still, all of the people’s understanding is established on the authenticity of incidents being as they presently perceive them. Therefore, it is in the overpowering of the oppositions between what their ideology, and their criticism (Bhaskar, 1989, p.184).

This sort of dialectical viewpoint indicates that there are two forms of mystification function in human thought. These two forms are irrationalism and positivism. The first accepts a lot of what it sees, at that point uncovers excessively little on what it accepts, while the second one gives a little attention to what it perceives, and too much attention to what is believable. Hence, the comprehension of the dialectic between the reception of a fabricated belief and the actuality that inspires this belief is missing in both perspectives.

People have constantly wanted to transcend to a new reality; this new reality has to be entrenched in the actual potential of humans to restructure their concrete lives in the world. When their understanding or imagination is restricted by perspectives that explain to them that such transcendence is itself an illogical desire (the purpose of all prevailing ideologies), it inspires the searching of transcendence in otherworldly methods. It is a critical methodology concentrated on changing reality after understanding it.

In Marxist theory, almost from the beginning, the critical investigation of religion has played a great part within all tendencies. For instance, one of the most influential and extensively read works of Marxism was *Kautsky’s Foundations of Christianity* (1953). An ambitious and useful indication of this topic is David McLellan’s book *Marxism and Religion* (1987). McLellan’s book is an endeavour to assess and summarise almost every main Marxist theory about religion. The work

offers enlightening accurate summaries of the works of specific schools and figures of thought. In his attempt to construct links between Christianity and Marxism, McLellan tackles some of the questionable statements pointed at demoting the qualitative rudiments of Marxism's theoretical and historical critique of religion. Like these assertions cannot stand up to critical scrutiny.

Marxists' readings of religion have commonly taken two formulas: descriptive, which means religion is reviewed as a mutable within a leading method of production; and second, assess: religion is viewed as an alienation practice that is conquered by a new kind of society that has overcome itself the roots of religious alienation (McLellan, 1987, p.166). Religion evaluative critique in Marxism is dubitable, most of descriptive Marxists studies about religion are out of date at worst, and tentative at best. McLellan obviously objects to the opinion that considers religion as a deceptive phenomenon entrenched in human alienation and therefore fated to pass away in the change to an alienated culture. McLellan claims that no adequate social or political theory may eliminate a part for religion in its sight of the future of humanity, because in one way or another beliefs have been an enduring and deep facet of human activity (Reoberts, 1999, p.182).

Having this argument in perspective, people might reply that there have existed many enduring fundamentals of human behaviour, as well as negative ones, like cruelty, murder, and self-delusion. This does not mean humans should either embrace them as natural or resign themselves to others as endless aspects of the human condition. For example, if it were possible to prove that a particular mode of political or social life is more beneficial to the distribution of practice like cruelty, then it would be entirely reasonable for claiming that the refutation of such practice of politics, or society could also negate the duration or the strength of that practice. This represents the logical principle of the Marxist assumption regarding the possible extinction of faith in an unalienated civilisation, and McLellan's assertion does not negate that.

The criticisms of McLellan are focused on the illustrative component of Marxist theories of religion. Yet, he claims that Marxists have disregarded the positive part of religion in the history of human precisely as a shaper of people communities. Regarding this topic, McLellan claims that if Marxists adopt the perceptions of

classical sociologists, they possibly learn much about religious nature; these Marxists include Weber or Durkheim. Both of these figures saw religion as an essential feature of human consciousness, and that because first: it helps to stimulate social solidarity, and second: it vindicates approaches of social legitimacy (McLellan, 1987, p.162). In spite of this, the defence McLellan offers for this allegation is evasive and weak in that he tries to maintain that both the Weberian and Durkheimian theories of religion are similar to historical materialism while offering evidence that this could not be needed. For instance, in considering the features of Marxist historical researches of religion, McLellan states that the empirical proof is sufficient, and refers to two Marxist studies of Methodism and Calvinism that give “significant support to the overall Marxist thesis about the function and nature of religion politically and historically” (McLellan, 1987, pp.167–68). Actually, McLellan’s strong accusation of Marxists is that they faced difficulty in the explanation of millennialist Christianity (p.168).

Marxism speaks to the winners and victors of history, while Christianity concentrates “on the dead, the maimed, and the defeated” (p.171). This claim, although questionable, but it seems to verify the core of one of Marx’s too celebrated observations. For a viewpoint, whose key purpose is to console the defeated and the dead of history is obviously exposed to be the opium of the people (p.182). McLellan could reply that if he tries to construct links between religion and Marxism and are questionable, and then what could be revealed by concentrating on the conflict between the two? If people and researchers are concerned with the historical integrity and logical accuracy of their philosophies, then Marxism must forge fruitful links with secular humanists rather than with advocates of any sort of theism (p.185).

Harold Bloom, the leading figure of Gnostic literary tradition, asserts that ancient Gnosticism was a religion of the elite only (Bloom, 1982, p.22). Gnosticism is a series of religious beliefs and structures that started with early Christian and Jewish sects in the first century AD (Quispel, 2005). Gnosticism and Secularism are interrelated in terms of the interpretation of different religious texts. Consequently, the majority of the critics in this chapter seek to lay a bridge between secular society and the religious one, state and religion, and future that bears historical nature. Thus, the secular scholars attempt to create a novel open-minded society that accepts the others’ ideas, beliefs, history and views. The next two chapters will demonstrate how Don

DeLillo and George Orwell both agree in terms of secularism, and promote their related beliefs in their eminent literary works. Both authors emphasise the belief that the new secular generation would be the future of life where neither racism nor religious fanaticism do exist.

CHAPTER TWO

IN SEARCH OF DELILLO'S LIBRA, MAO II, AND UNDERWORLD

2.1. Gnosticism in *Libra*

Don DeLillo (1936) is a novelist, playwright, and essayist. At first, he is known as a well-regarded cult writer. His language has its influence upon his readers; it has the ability to secularise and cause conversion in minds and beliefs. Don DeLillo identified as an American atheist writer in almost all his novels he attempts to secularise his readers and that is clear in his novels *Libra*, *Mao II* and *Underworld*. In *White Noise*, the German nun mocks of the central character Jack Gladney's humble thoughts to ask about religion. In *Libra* Marquerite Oswald's begging Christian absolution for her child. In *Mao II* (1991) the father becomes a new convert questioning about God "when the Old God leaves the world" (DeLillo, 1988, p.7), and he asks what occurs to wholly self-confidence in religion and where is the trust in religious people? In *Underworld*, the narrator contemplates the doubting faith in religion and unreality that replaces God and lost faith, the intensity of important elements and every single meaningful framework that convert them, the infinite adjusted connections. Thus, like these anxieties do not concede any unambiguous clarification or allusion any metanarrative in a postmodern universe of culturally developed selves in societies layered in simulacra. (Valetta, 1998, p. 403) DeLillo Investigations like the following fight, habit homicide and political murders. DeLillo usually reiterates the same themes religion, political issues, death, and he uses the ironical style in his fiction.

Don DeLillo's *Libra* (1988) is considered by many critics as a significant historical novel among the others in the twentieth century, or to use Linda Hutcheon's apt term, it is regarded as a work of historiographic metafiction (Hutcheon, 1989, p.3). DeLillo, in this novel relies upon Gnosticism's redoubled cautioning against fake creation. Gnosticism is a series of religious ideas and structures that started with early Christian and Jewish sects in the first century AD (Quispel, 2005). Yet; DeLillo's historical impulse is determinedly mitigated by an opposing desire toward enigma, an

elusive search of some indescribable force that could transcend the substantial situations of history. The link between spiritual transcendence and historical basis animates the most athletic fictional Don DeLillo has. DeLillo argues that fiction, at its origin level, is a type of religious fanaticism, with components of awe, obsession, and superstition; sooner or later, such qualities will state their confrontational relationship with history (Herren, 2016, p.2). However, this does not mean that DeLillo foreswears historical events in favour of ecstatic surrender. The American novelist lays bare the way through which he shapes conflict in his historiographic metafiction, portraying a counterforce to the “wound of history” through the resolution of religion (Duvall, 2003, p.3). Don DeLillo’s fiction is remarkably bound in *Libra* by immutable and familiar details of character and plot ancestral from the historical documentation; however, he estranges and revives the Kennedy assassination by re-forming history in the course of religious fanaticism.

Some critics who have discussed DeLillo’s fiction emphasised on the deep religious side in the story. One of these critics is Mark Osteen (2000) who argues that the assassination of Kennedy could be regarded as “America’s Mysterium Magnum”; the incident is no different from any religious mystery that is heavily shrouded and radiantly overdetermined (p.153). Osteen refers to the cultic characteristics of the CIA’s secret institute of conspirators. *Libra* presents both a critique of secret histories and parodies such as mythmaking, presenting a plausible secret history. That is to say. *Libra* is two aspects at the same a theory of conspiracies, and a conspiracy theory; at once broadcasting “the animation of a secret”, and critically examining the depression that stimulates the belief in such worlds (Osteen, 2000, p.154). David Cowart stated that, As Dante allowed political and historical to enrich or complicate his Dante’s Inferno, DeLillo permits curious religious elements to appear in his fundamentally political and historical novel (Osteen, 2000, p.153).

Cowart distinguishes some allusions linking the demise of Coward, the protagonist of the novel to the Passion of Christ. DeLillo specifically asks for a religious comparison, but at the same time, he takes the rug out of his own analogy. Cowart observes, in his inchoate or fractured account of the Passion, then, DeLillo stridently notes the emerging incoherence or collapse of myths that in many respects, manifest themselves first and foremost in Kennedy's assassination. In secular societies

religion loses cultural and social significance; in modern societies (as well as modern works of literature) religion becomes restricted, faith lacks cultural authority, and life continues without the orientation to the supernatural (Agote, 2014, p.3). Cowart and Osteen both advance strong arguments that, in his novel, DeLillo as a well-informed apostate draws upon religion; hence, DeLillo does not present himself as a Christian apostle. That is to say, he employs religious metanarratives for artistic needs but eventually resists their appearance, trying them on before sending them to the rack.

As a dedicated scholar of pre-modernist theology and philosophy, DeLillo recognises that postmodernists do not embrace the private patent on a worldview bordered in terms of discontinuity, crisis, disharmony, alienation and hostility, nor are postmodernists were the only ones to reject metanarratives which portray an orderly and benign cosmos. Besides, postmodernism was not the only movement to adopt foundational teachings and texts only to revise, subvert, transpose, critique, and parody these very sources. Those transgressive strategies and radical principles were utilised in Gnosticism, an ambiguous expression for several religious sects. While the Church could have officially rejected Gnosticism, literary writers have found motivation in using its tenets.

The leading figure of a Gnostic literary tradition, Harold Bloom asserts that ancient Gnosticism was a religion, almost a literary religion of the elite only (Bloom, 1982, p.22). Among the modernist writers who were influenced by Gnosticism are James Joyce, Herman Melville, William Faulkner, Franz Kafka, Vladimir Nabokov, Jorge Luis Borges, William Gaddis, Cormac McCarthy, and Samuel Beckett; DeLillo's richest contribution to Gnosticism is his *Libra*. Inside evidence proposes that DeLillo changed to Gnosticism for beneficial prototypes in his illusory portrayal of the "religious fanatics" who conspired to murder President Kennedy (Herren, 2016, p.7).

DeLillo, in his *Libra* draws upon Gnosticism's redoubled warning against fake creation, its construction of domains within spheres, and its archetype of inside rebellion, where authority against corruption is raised from within. The latter example merges most efficiently with DeLillo's fictionalised conspiracy of CIA members against their own Commander-in-Chief. The historical circumstances which led to the appearance of Gnosticism were also encouraging to DeLillo's reasons in *Libra*. Hans

Jonas argues, in “The Gnostic Religion the gnostic test was one demonstration of the crisis which the over-all philosophy experienced” (Hans, 1958, p.13). Hans adds that the change from a metaphysics based on spirit and matter to one based on value and matter is because of the incorporation Gnosticism into secularisation.

Gnosticism and Secularism are interrelated in terms of the interpretation of different religious texts. The influence of Gnosticism and Secularism lead the characters of *Libra* novel to assassinate the President Kennedy. On the other hand, in both, nonfiction and his fiction, DeLillo discusses Kennedy assassination which influenced, changed the American century, “the seven seconds” which broke its back; as a crucial moment for the postmodern situation and in the history of America as a turning point triggering a collective existential disaster (DeLillo, 1988, p.7). DeLillo stated that what has turned to be unknown since the incident in Dallas is not the conspiracy, and it is not necessarily how much the mass of events and characters there are, instead of that the awareness of the coherent reality the majority of them shared; from that instant, they have gone into the world of ambiguity and randomness (DeLillo, 1983, pp.21-22). In his *Libra*, DeLillo pursued a technique for reimagining the historical event of Kennedy assassination which was accurate enough to the acknowledged evidence to be believable, and yet also real to the spirit of ambiguity, randomness, and incoherence that Kennedy’s assassination ushered in. Nothing mainly original in his choice to consider a CIA conspiracy relating to anti-Castro rebels with secondary assistance from systematised crime. However, what is extremely innovative is the crisis method of “religious fanaticism” that DeLillo hires as means for that conspiracy. His fascination in religious forms must not be misinterpreted as an ahistorical escapist imagination. DeLillo, by changing to Gnostic patterns lands his fiction in a metaphysical drama which responds and reflects the historical catastrophe of a world gone wrong.

DeLillo and Gnostic paradigms share the same outlook toward the modern world with secularisation. For secularisation, the world is lost within the tenets of religious beliefs; however, for Finke and Stark (Agote, 2014, p.5), religion should not be entirely ignored, rather there must be a theory to explain its variation. Though that theory is secularisation, which is based on existential safety breaks on two simple

premises or axioms that prove tremendously powerful in accounting for most of the differences in religious manners originated around the world.

DeLillo appeals freely but selectively to Gnosticism. His CIA traitors, in many respects, resemble rebellious members as considered by Manichaeism; however, in other cases the devotees of the Organisation look like the Gnostics themselves, a chosen group of recruits guided by an unshakeable conviction that they have privileged visions into the greatest cosmic secrets. This paradox can be traced in of DeLillo's characters in *Libra*, Larry Parmenter, one of the CIA agents who betrayed and conspired against Kennedy. Parmenter, like his fellow revolutionaries, felt betrayed by the president's rejection to support the Cuban revolution against Castro. While his anger towards the government is unlimited on this score, his ill desire does not spread in the CIA. He admires the CIA for offering him a second opportunity after the Bay of Pigs, and he trusts that his participation in the murder plot, though apparently treasonous, is essentially a deed of loyalty to the Agency's true spirit. Parmenter confides to his wife: "Cuba is a fixed idea. It is prickly in a way Russia is not. More unresolved. More damaging to the psyche. And this is our job, to remove the psychic threat" (DeLillo, 1988, p.16). Whether assassinating to the president of Cuba or targeting any other important individual in the world, Parmenter is willing to do whatever needed for the Agency's benefit:

The Agency understands. It's amazing really how deeply they understand. This is the nature of the business. There are shadows, there are new lights. The deeper the ambiguity, the more we believe, the more we trust, the more we band together (DeLillo, 1988, p.16).

Parmenter's idolization smacks of religious zealotry; Beryl, Larry Parmenter's wife, recognises his religious fanaticism. She observes that Larry's obsession with the Agency; it is the only subject in his life. Beryl sees the Central Intelligence as the best-structured church in the world, a mission to store and collect everything that everybody has ever reduce and then said it to a microdot and called it God (DeLillo, 1988, p.16). If the agency functions as a religion for Larry and his fellow co-conspirators, this religion is a heretical one, instituted by fringe figures who regard themselves the true purists, involved in a secret revolution against a government perceived as illegal.

In secularisation theory, in general, people experience stress, and thus, they have a need for predictable, rigid rules. The theory admits that people need to be sure of what is will occur because they have the feeling that they are in danger, their margin for error is slim, they are in need to supreme predictability (Agote, 2014, p.7). Those who are raised under circumstances of relative security may handle more ambiguity and have less need for the rigidly and absolute expectable rules that religious authorizations offer. Individuals with comparatively high stages of existential security could more willingly accept deviations from acquainted models than those who feel anxiety regarding their elementary existential needs.

DeLillo sated that, the paranoia in his characters functions as a type of religious awe; it is like a “forgotten part of the soul” (Adam, 1982, p.106). For DeLillo, the intelligence agencies that service and create this paranoia are not important to him as a master of espionage or spy handlers; they represent fascinations and old mysteries, they are similar to churches that embrace the final secrets (Adam, 1982, p.106). However, one must put in consideration that DeLillo invokes these subjects without violating them.

In *Libra*, the most substantial caution against the CIA’s organisation of privacy is expressed by Nicholas Branch. After years in shifting through the maze of artefacts, misinformation, and artefacts regarding the assassination of Kennedy, Branch does not make sharp assumptions about the fake religious premises on which the organisation is constructed. He thought they had formed an official, coded body of information that was fundamentally secret-keeping, play material, one of the deeper conflicts and pleasures of childhood. Branch thinks the CIA is defending its own identity, protecting its theology of secrets. He blames the origination for creating an intricate labyrinth to hide the truth about withholding and making secrets is its fundamental truth.

In the case of Oswald “There is a world inside the world” (DeLillo, 1988, p.14). For him, this doubt hints at driving force and a hidden order, just outside the scopes of awareness, propelling him forward to his fate. DeLillo’s formal structure of *Libra* giving credibility to this intuition, changing chapters between the private world of Oswald and the agent’s secret world in which Oswald eventually recruited. The

fundamental standard of a world inside the world is coherent with the intertwining domains of Gnosticism, jailing and trapping people in the material world. Jonas Hans in his *Gnostic Religion* states, the domain of the Archons, the universe is like a huge jail whose deepest dungeon is the scene of man's life, the earth; above and around it the cosmic domains are ranged like concentric closed shells (Hans, 1958, p.27). The religious importance of this cosmic construction deceits in the indication that everything that mediates here and the beyond helps to separate God from man, not just by spatial distance, but also by black, demonic power. Therefore, the multiplicity and vastness of the cosmic structure express the grade to which human is detached from God. Gnosticism pictures a world intended to deceive and trap humans, excluding us from understanding the nature of supreme God and the godly remnant concealed in the spirit of every person.

In his *Libra*, DeLillo portrays a whole government designed to suppress knowledge. Win Everett, the first author of the conspiracy around Kennedy's assassination, reveals, "Ignorance was cherished asset, knowledge was a danger". The suppression of knowledge included isolating every layer in the command's chain from definite consciousness of incriminating actions being performed at secondary stages. DeLillo displays the absurdity of an "intelligence" society sunk in ignorance of its own operations and information, where awareness is reckoned a liability and its absence a cultivated and cherished virtue. The president and his staff are at the top of this suppressed intelligence: "the White House is the summited of the unknowing. The truth is redeemed, and the others are obliged to admire this truth only in the abstract" (DeLillo, 1988, p.2).

The Gnostic perspectives of the previous passage are most marked. The world is so complicated that lies prevail against the truth, knowledge recedes, and ignorance prevails, and a fake myth reigns. The cruellest irony in *Libra* lies in the fact that the president's knowledge is suppressed, he ends up unaware of the plot against his life. In comparison with secularisation, Gnosticism portrays the cosmos as an evil prison. Everything in the earth and the earth itself is regarded as a base-born product, even the stars above considered as complicit in man's captivity dawn below. Moreover, Gnosticism maintains much of the Egyptian and Hellenic curiosity in the stars, augury

and astrology, sharing the conviction that collective and individual destiny is readable in the celestial domains.

Frequently, DeLillo's novels feature creative characters such as musicians, writers, filmmakers, and artists, and he usually draws self-conscious consideration to their innovative procedures and by extension to his own. DeLillo's investigations never adopt a self-congratulatory attitude admiring the noble calling of art. In fact, he scrutinizes dangerous consequences, pathological obsessions, and the dark motives of art. *Libra* does not feature any artists as such, and it functions as historiographic metafiction; *Libra* also operates as self-referential religious fanaticism.

Jonas Hans stated that this figure of a blind, evil and imperfect creator is a Gnostic representation of the initial order; in his over-all conception, he mirrors the gnostic scorn for the world; in the concrete description he makes, he is often a distinguishable caricature of the God in the Old Testament (Hans, 1958, p.269). The creator, by preserving this corrupt world, forming a whole fallen one inhabited with creatures on his own image, he exemplifies the phenomenon of the wrong imitation criticised by the Gnostics. Therefore, in the perspectives of Gnostics, being shaped in the false image of this unbalanced creator is an ontological curse. Humans extend further this curse through their desire to reproduce their own images, receiving the poisoned inheritance of the Demiurge and bestowing it to their own progeny. The Gnostic representation of the innovative impulse as an inherited illness of counterfeiting deeply informs DeLillo's representation of creatures and creators in *Libra*.

In *Libra*, Win Everett is the first god-like figure recognised as the first architect of Kennedy's assassination. Everett is a dissatisfied agency man who was burned by Bay of Pigs disappointment. He is confident in an idea that anti-Castro militaries need a stimulating occurrence to strengthen their cause and to derail the normalisation with Cuba that Kennedy's was drifting toward. Everett's strategy is to create a *failed* murder event in Miami, a pseudo-attempt on the life of Kennedy, and to pin it on Castro. Win imagines that the American people going to be shocked; they will welcome any retaliatory attempt to eliminate Castro. When making his plan for the false assassination, Everett invoked the same self-realisation and rhetoric of destiny

that Ferrie in the future hires to employ Lee Oswald for the actual operation of Kennedy's assassination.

Win states that, people spend lifetime waiting things yet they do not know that. Then it happens and they know who they are and how they can continue at once. He adds this is the notion he has always desired. He believes people feel it is true. This is their high risk. A thrilling event is required and people waited as long as he did every bit (DeLillo, 1988, p.2). The reader's understanding of Win's speech is painted by our previous knowledge of how tragically it will collapse. It is not a secret that the reader knows that the counterfeit attempt of the assassination eventually fails to fail. Thus, Everett's initial confidence in the correctness of his plan and his conceited belief of control over the conspiracy is cancelled from the start.

Win's main task is to generate a shooter from scratch. He does the entire plan with paper. He wanted his team of the shooter to escape after the plan is done, but leave a trail behind them, "change-of-address cards, photographs, or mail-order forms" (DeLillo, 1988, p.34). According to Harren (2006), the language that Win uses in describing his creative plan goes beyond the mere creation of a profile to deceive investigators and gullible reporters; he is devising an over-all shape, a life. Win aimed at finding a suitable gunman to proceed with his plan (p.11). Parmenter's mission is to get into the Records Branch and obtain a document blank; Mackey is the one who is responsible for finding a model for the character Win was in the procedure of creating. The group wanted a name, a bodily frame, a face they could use to spread their story to the world. Everett acts like Dr. Frankenstein creating a creature from humans' scrap parts; he is similar to Kabbalist rabbi who creates a golem to do his aims; all kindred variations connected to the Gnostic Demiurge.

Most significantly, by appropriating the role of god to form his character, Everett regularly undergoes a metafictional epiphany, Everett himself feels like a character created by another person. As he believed that, without numinous and compression sheen, they are just characters in conspiracies (DeLillo, 1988, p.4). Mark Osteen (2000) noted, Win's secret life requires imagination that allows him to be character and author at once; therefore, his conspiracy produces private history, identity and a community of fellows (p.158). However, these fellows have demiurgic

drives that soon send the plot careening deathward out of Win's control. In line with this Gnostic mood, each misguided act of recreation or creation leads to more confusion, chaos, evil, and violence that boil over on the day of the assassination.

Oswald is the most elusive figure among other demiurgic characters involved in the conspiracy. In his "American Blood", DeLillo (1983) states that Lee seems to be a secret design made by figures that will never surface; yet Oswald himself was the self-authored character, creation inside a creation, a metafictional self-reflection (p.22). In *Libra*, the plotters identify Oswald as the perfect person for taking the role of the shooter. However, the more they investigate him, the more anxious Everett becomes. Oswald wanted independence, and this poses troublesome distraction from Everett's ideal structure. When Mackey goes to Oswald's apartment, he finds weapons, forged documents, Marxist literature, and aliases, and these findings made Win displaced. Before the incident of the assassination, Lee hides in a sequence of claustrophobic places, making new identities. After the crime, in Dallas prison, Oswald shifted his focus to self-reinvention, managing his legacy, studying his case, adding the metafictional feature of a reporter to his roles as a character and an author (Herren, 2016, p.17). The language that Lee uses to define his condition in prison is again notable for its Gnostic articulations. DeLillo, as many crucial moments in the novel, he bends the shadows and light of Gnosticism so as to cope with his own aims. This situation DeLillo portrays Lee as both as an ascetic explorer of self-knowledge, and a deluded Demiurge.

Nicholas Branch is another main character in *Libra*, who is unlike other central characters, does not participate directly in the assassination. Branch investigates the incidents from historical hindsight. His access to the CIA's classified information gives him the privilege to know more than any other main figures who participated in the assassination. He also could appreciate the national and the individual outcomes of their actions. Although he is not involved in the conspiracy, but he is closely implicated in the conspiracy to restructure the description of those actions. Boxall (2006) stated that Branch is the character that holds the whole narrative together, among all characters in the novel Branch appeared to be the most powerful; he functions as the story's uber-narrator, retrospectively creating the development both of

Lee's complicated career, and of the Parmenter, Mackey, and Everett conspiracy to involve Oswald in the shooting event (p.34).

Branch is the man behind the curtains who shape the story readers read. The first description of him he is in the room of dreams and ideas is Ban sitting in. it is full of books (Boxall, 2006, p.35). Within the story's logic of cosmological and historiographic metafiction, Branch looks like a Demiurge reflecting his own condition, and forming simulacra modelled in his own shape, indicating his own situation. Hence, from the description about Branch. There seem to be some uncanny similarities between Oswald in the jail after shooting the president and Branch. Oswald in his prison will be given books and writing papers; he will write about his case, and he will learn about criminal law, acoustics, ballistics, and photography. "He will consume and examine whatever pertains to the case. People will come to have a look at him, lawyers first, historians, biographers, and psychologists" (DeLillo, 1988, p.2).

DeLillo intentionally implants two stages of creation in his *Libra*, and these plot frames within frames are instilled with characteristic Gnostic concern toward the creative procedure. He is not outside the sequence of inventions he portrays. Moreover, DeLillo is not exempt from the novel's Gnostic account. At the end of the book in "Author's Note", DeLillo explains that any piece of literature about a main unresolved incident will aim to fill somewhat of the empty spaces in the identified record; to do that, DeLillo embellished and changed reality, extended actual individuals into imagined time and space, invented dialogues, events, and characters (DeLillo, 1988, p.43).

DeLillo creates the authorial avatar similar to his own identity, Branch, who is operated by similar faces and obsessions, but who varies from his inventor in that, he is a CIA agent on a mission, Branch has advantaged entrance to (fictionalized) data concerning Kennedy's assassination. He accomplishes a required narrative function for DeLillo, and Everett shares an essential role as Branch. Everett functions as an author of the assassination, and he mirrors many of Branch's fears and doubts as the conspiracy spirals out of control. Everett basically generates the protagonist of the dim plot, "The Shooter". As argued above, Oswald rebellions against the authorial boundaries that his creators imposed upon him; yet for all his evasions, volatile

unpredictability, and self-reinventions, Lee ends up less or more devotedly playing his appointed part of fall man just as scripted, reflecting the images and fulfilling the needs of the different demiurges who had a hand in his formation.

According to DeCurtis (1988), possibly the obsession with creators in *Libra* is partly attributable to DeLillo's feeling that his creative genesis was perceived from the incident of the death of Oswald and Kennedy; DeLillo's self-creation myth, resulted from the brutal actions that produced in a time of chaos, again demonstrates entirely compatible with the catastrophic creations myths and pessimistic cosmos of Gnosticism (p.56).

The most powerful distillation of the Gnostic mood and the Demiurge myth in *Libra* could be observed in the short parable Win Everett's daughter, the six-year-old, Suzanne. She has two treasured figurines: "a clay woman" and a "clay man", which are her best friend. Most readers may assume that clay figurines are likely to suggest God's creation of humans from mud as the scripts suggest. Still, Suzanne's behaviour with regard to her clay woman and man resembles the Gnostic Demiurge. She remains wide-awake at nights so as to hide her clay puppets in a safer place. On the literal level, the child's action is disturbing because it indicates that she has adopted the paranoid essence of the era. On a cosmological level, Suzanne's desirous effort to keep her creatures out of sight, protecting them from being found lest they are kidnapped, functions as the relationship between Demiurge and his mortal creatures sheltering the divine spark. The child basically creates her own little universe around two "Little Figures," a microcosmic "world inside the world" that echoes the narrative's macro cosmos. The two clay figures are not toys at all; Suzanne never plays with them. She only keeps them to the time when she might need them. "She had to keep them safe and near in case those who call themselves her father and mother were actually someone else" (DeLillo, 1988, p.32).

Win Everett trusts that he is protecting his daughter from hazardous knowledge, just like when he endeavours to protect his managers in the government from implicating information. In fact, Suzanne performs in miniature the same delusions, paranoia, and anxieties cloaking her clay woman and man in secrecy, darkness, and

ignorance. She truly represents the child of her age, and Gnosticism gives DeLillo the motif, crisis, and ethos modes he requires to depict that dark spirit best.

DeLillo allows man's need to default to a "master plan" that clarifies everything; in fact, DeLillo likes such conspiracy philosophies himself. According to William Goldstein (2005), for DeLillo, the belief in the existence of a conspiracy comforts him, and there is a tale in a conspiracy to speak to each other to avert the fear of spontaneous and terror actions (p.51). Conspiracy presents consistency, the purpose of Gnosticism in *Libra* is to supply the structure for a universal conspiracy of the Light versus Dark, where arch-villains maintain and design the world as a huge severe colony to keep people away from godly knowledge. Moreover, DeLillo indulges metaphysical and historical plot philosophies just to cancel them in the end. Indeed, as soon as he starts dragging threads from the conspiracy of assassination, the coherent material of plot begins to unravel, exposing a leaderless plan surrounded with blind spots, mistakes, miscommunications, betrayal, cross purposes, and dumb luck.

DeLillo argues that, when one idealises conspiracy, he/she misrepresents it, he invests it with possibilities and powers it does not have (Goldstein, 2005, p.106). Those possibilities and powers, precisely clarified by McClure (1991), "suggest a world alive with divine and demonic forces, and an inner world also intense and profound" (p.106). Although McClure does not mention it by the term, Gnosticism worth specific concern within this context as Don DeLillo's tropological archetype for the demonic desires stimulating the conspiracy story of *Libra*. DeLillo's approaches in his novel are ultimately deconstructive, applying Gnosticism as his scheme for restructuring the assassination of Kennedy on an epic scale, just to pull to pieces his own grand cosmological and historical structures over the sequence of the *Libra*. Gnosticism, inadvertently have helped to secularise the society because of the religious fanaticism that is practised by them. Therefore, due to religious and political zealotry and violence, people will continue to convert to secularisation and lose their faith in religion. Then secularisation will last forever in this world as a substitute for religion. Besides, for some people, secularisation will not be a tentative solution to eliminate some wrong religious beliefs, religious fanaticism, but they will adopt secularisation as conclusive, permanent and obligatory.

2.2. Media Framing Secular- Religious Conflict in *Mao II*

The sorts of information that flourish in America are both verbal and visual, including political, cultural, and commercial messages from various categories of media. A great focus in *Mao II* is given to the impact of information that carries messages about tragic and dark events. DeLillo stated that news is fictions, the news represents the new narrative, specifically, the tragic, dark news; from such kinds of news people discover a sort of narrative with a tragic stamp, which in another time they found in the literature (Thomas, 2005, p.43). In *Mao II*, DeLillo hires Bill Gray to remark on the issue of media: “News of catastrophe is what the only narrative that the people need. The darker the news, the grander the narrative” (DeLillo, 1991, p.42). *Mao II* foregrounds reports on incidents that impact a great number of people in tragic and violent situations.

Throughout the novel, the reader is introduced to various turbulent situations around the world, for instance, the Tiananmen massacre in China, activities of an Asian religious cult, conflicts in the Middle East, and a sporting tragedy in a football pitch in Sheffield, Britain. Such disturbing incidents establish the fictional environment of media-saturated United States in 1989. So as to comprehend what lies behind DeLillo and Bill’s observations on the news, it would be better to consider Bill’s assistant, Scott Martineau’s speech: “The novel used to feed our pursuit for meaning. . . . It was the great secular transcendence. The Latin mass of language, character, occasional new truth. But our desperation has led us toward something larger and darker. So we turn to the news, which provides an unremitting mood of disaster” (DeLillo, 1991, p.5). In the violent, troubled world the writer depicts, a strong sense of desolation triggers the characters’ awareness. Their effort to comprehend the meaning of the world incidents is blocked by the accumulation of information about meaningless deaths, catastrophes, and extreme violence. In *Mao II*, the reader recognises that characters are overwhelmed by desolation and desperation; however, they progressively cope with these troubles, wishing for more catastrophes and darkness.

Such tragedies and darkness resulting from military and ideological conflicts, and unbridled technological and economic developments are apparent in DeLillo’s

other works. *White Noise*, for instance, tackles the subject of a derailed train car leaks lethal chemicals that expand into a cloud and its outcome in a peaceful suburban zone. DeLillo focuses on risks and catastrophes resulted from the advancement of machinery. *Libra* presents an imaginative reinterpretation of history surrounding the Kennedy assassination, delving into the complicated powers that conclude into the national, traumatic event. His masterpiece *Underworld* discusses the social and economic circumstances in American after the Great War, driven by its rivalry with the Soviet Union. In DeLillo's mentioned works, technological, ideological, and military threats and possible catastrophes trouble the characters, and such tragic, dark incidents are constitutive of his thoughts and ideas of the modern world. However, in *Mao II* DeLillo presents a society that is driven by tragic, dark as a new, dominant narrative. DeLillo pits Bill's literary works against media so as to react to the challenges created by it and to discover the novel's probability.

The media, Matt Evans (2011) states, is the key actor in the advancement of a country's political, economic culture, it also does an important part about people socialisation; an ability of media to spread in a whole society has made it an important instrument in bridging social gaps, forging national identities, and sparking political change (p.235). Recent technological enhancements lowered the cost of generating news and enlarged entrees to a wider variety of media.

In *Mao II*, Bill Gray plays the role of the author figure. He stresses on the significance of the novelist's position in shaping human culture and human consciousness. For Bill, as a novelist, not the other novelists, but terrorists are his major competitors. Bill believes that, in previous times, "the job of the novelist was to alter the inner life of society"; nowadays, the gunmen and the bomb –makers have taken that territory; they gradually make raids on human awareness (DeLillo, 1991, p.3). Gray is a solitary insurgent, he purposely separates himself out of the dominant ideological and economic powers. Gray's fictional ability originates from the capability to raid a blow against culture from the outside. The loss of such an ideal disturbs him, as novelists he finds himself "incorporated" in media-driven, a capitalist society. His half-ironic statement that admires bombers' power to "make raids on human consciousness" submits a powerful feeling of frustration imbedded in the loss of writers' ability to fight against the normative and originate the essence of culture.

Gray's hyperbolic stress on the contemporary crisis of literature seems to push his own literary career to the edge until it margins onto terrorism and to empower his fictional creativity. In one of his interviews DeLillo comments, "There seems to be a deep narrative construction to terrorist acts, they alter and infiltrate consciousness in manners that authors used to aspire to" (Passaro 84). However, in spite of their shared desire, DeLillo and Bill refer to the issue in various ways. In *Mao II*, DeLillo lets Charles Everson, another character in the novel, to criticise Gray's methods in writing: "You have a twisted sense of the writer's place in society. You think the writer belongs at the far margin, doing dangerous things" (DeLillo, 1991, p.97).

News concerning a terrorist action guides Bill directly to the domain outside the artistic domain and therefore directs him into international politics. The news is about a hostage situation kidnapped by a terrorist group headed by someone called Abu Rashid. According to the American media, a Swiss UN worker was abducted by Abu Rashid's group, and the group says the hostage is a poet-to publicize UN and spread the Swiss political agenda. In reaction to the threat, the Committee on Freedom of Expression that Everson works for asks Bill for support, the committee intent on taking advantage of Bill's fame as a notable novelist. As the chairman of the committee, Charles Everson comments, "I want the famous novelist to address the suffering of the unknown poet. I want the English-language writer to read in French and the older man to speak across the night to his young colleague in letters". (DeLillo, 1991, p.98)

For Charles Everson, the significance of the incident deceits in the simple act of reading in the general sphere and its demand to international audiences. The immediate distribution of the news regarding this action could exert an influential impact on viewers. The saving of the Swiss poet is less significant than restricting the influence of the media and increasing the committee's agenda. Bill quits writing, goes to Beirut so as to meet with Abu Rashid. The news about terrorism drives Bill toward Rashid, on his journey to Beirut he gets hurt, yet Bill refuses to be nursed. The purpose behind Gray Bill's rejection for being treated, to be cured, Douglas Keesey (1993) comments, is because his injury makes him feel connected in a particular way to those who have been injured by terrorists (p.192). As much he dramatizes his connection with the

terrorist victims, the more he distances himself from any actual association with them, considering himself as one of them.

What Gray actually creates is a false, fabricated narrative of heroism so as to give meaning to his illogical act, which eventually leads to his worthless death. DeLillo treats Gray's assiduous act of writing with respect, although it exhausts him and forces him to abandon writing. For Bill literature has lost its power due to the dominance of commercial, political messages that is why Gray was driven to play a political role in an unfamiliar situation that he does not even understand. He finds himself in a complicated conflict of forces-a struggle involving terrorism, Maoism and geopolitics in the U.N.A, and the Middle East. As a consequence, Gray fails in both in politics, and in his attempts at writing, not just that, his involvement in such cases lead him to his meaningless death (Caporale, 1995, p.2).

The main reason behind Bill's motivation to take his journey to Lebanon was the media in his own country. He knows nothing about what actually happens there, but media has framed his knowledge about the circumstances in the Middle East. Evans (2011) stated that media frames emphasise specific features of incidents and shape a central arranging theme, relating and connecting individual actions or occurrences (p.236). The manner in which media structures an event has a significant result on where it will be rated on the society's agenda. Framing theories stress the media's influence in agenda-setting and its "capacity to mentally organize and order the place we live in" (DeLillo, 1991, p.5). The media, through framing, consolidates complicated subjects in a coherent manner for the public; however, the choice to make an image, or a subject more prominent in the production of a news report makes it "a distinguishable slant" (DeLillo, 1991, p.7). The decision of which items to highlight will verify whether the public comprehends the information negatively or positively (Evans, 2011, p.236). In Bill's case, he received the news negatively, he decides to go to the terrorist country, and this leads to his meaningless death.

The incorporation of the tragic, dark news into the narrative is obvious in DeLillo's novel. As it was stated earlier, when DeLillo speaks about the profound narrative construction to terrorist deeds, he emphasises their ability to alter and infiltrate consciousness. The terrorists were portrayed as having the power to form the

subjectivity and the views of the people, which comparable to Gray's statement that the novelist's power lies in his ability to change the inner life of the culture. DeLillo's notions about culture seem to be more complicated than Gray's since the latter does not delve to the traditions of culture. Miller's (2002) statement clarifies the idea of culture: A culture could be described as a social crowd all admitting similar assumptions around behaviour, judgment, and value (p.90). These conventions are the constitutive components of society, of culture, yet the manners of cultural transmission and formation are varied and complexly interlocked, as demonstrated by media. Furthermore, narratives from different regions of the world penetrate into those media and impact the course of cultural formation (Miller, 2002, p.90).

Correspondingly, the extent to which an audience categorises traditionally with, or feels negatively or favourably toward, a specific society or group is impacted by the media framing to which they have been exposed. Media, in some cultures, could govern how a particular group is viewed in society in comparison with other groups in the same society. Framing of a group could happen in the mainstream media, and sometimes it could occur in media catering to either the other rival groups or to the group itself. In *Mao II*, terrorism in the Middle East, and religious ceremony in Muslim Iran are spread through the media networks. Of course, this news spread in America where Bill Gray lives. Thus, these groups are viewed as extremely dangerous. In secular media, religious leaders are regularly related to corruption, and scandals, the influential leaders of religious, political parties usually appear in the front-page headlines (Evans, 2015, p.142).

Brita Nilsson is another main character in the novel. She goes travelling around the world to take pictures of famous writers. Brita ponders on the construction of culture casually from a viewpoint obviously different from Gray's: "Brita thought that everything came into her mind lately and became a perception appeared at once to enter the culture, to become a painting or photograph or slogan or hairstyle" (DeLillo, 1991, p.165). Brita, as a photographer, understands the logic of image, popular culture in which views become circulated, and commodified through the media. Nilsson's notion of culture is an excess of modish, aesthetic, discourses and political images where there is no vivid differentiation between media-generated ones and images created by individual fantasies (DeLillo, 1991, p.41).

The conflict between the disturbing forces of information and literary practices is furthered in the conflict between Karen Janney and Bill Gray. The runaway girl, Karen, was brought to Gray's place after she ran away from her a religious cult group. Once a follower of a dictatorial religious leader, Karen signifies the loss of individuality in the masses age that Bill abhors. Karen joined the terrorist group because of the news that the group broadcasted. Through the 1990s, the religious media witnessed a rapid advancement that puts them upon an equal stage with the mainstream media, in terms that both power and sales form a particular political agenda (turkey). Nowadays, the media in secular countries with religious society such as Turkey are characterized by an obvious divide between the Islamist pro-government media, and the mainstream media (Kaya and Çakmur, 2010, p.533). While both sides are intensely imbedded in the current economic system, they regularly clash over topics portraying Turkey's sociopolitical order. In *Mao II*, the conflict between the two camps of media depicted in Bill Gray and Karen Janney, the first takes a journey to the Middle East because he wanted to free the Swiss worker who was abducted by a terrorist group according to the mainstream media; while Karen joined a terrorist group, believing in their case just because the fake religious news that the group broadcasted.

The mission assigned to Gray is located in a region of linguistic practice completely different than his own. Discourse and Information sometimes involve various practices for their mastery. Bill's position shed more light on this matter, he is an isolated rebel, and for him, this position is fundamental to his own identity as he is a novelist one. Gray faces a fierce interference of information in such shapes as political and capitalist messages into his subjectivity. The crucial point here is that the political and economic that Bill faces is programmed in fragments of information, not essentially in a united discourse. Scott Lash argues that this form of power takes an informational shape rather than that of a coherent, linear discourse; for Lash, "it does not lie in discourse anymore, but it lies in the more transient, and the much shorter fragments and bits of information" (Lash, 2002, p. 189).

A similar view is shown by Mark Edmundson when he remarks on images of media in DeLillo's novels: "The sort of power DeLillo renders occurs nowhere and everywhere. It is impossible to confront" (Edmundson, 1995, p.116). For other writers,

power lies in the discourse of the work, while according to Gray, power is increasingly scattered in little units of written, visual, and auditory information. Due to its fragmentariness, it is hard to challenge news, and therefore, it may alter and infiltrate one's subjectivity.

In some instances, DeLillo depicted Karen as submitted to the persuasion of a religious cult, and she uncritically attracts to the political and capitalist messages from the media. Furthermore, she appears to be fascinated with news about tragic, dark incidents that happen in the troubled areas of the world. The amount of prominence and news space is given to religious items, in addition to their usage of graphics and framing, distinguish the secular and religious media, for instance, the more religious papers will include Islamic indications, like religious scenes (of praying communities, and mosques) the crescent, prayer times, and the Islamic calendar. Depending on the grade of the convention of a specific paper, females will either be displayed only in veiled shape or not at all. Additionally, the papers' prioritization and selection of news objects obviously indicate a favoured political agenda (Evans, 2015, p.144). Karen, at a definite level of her life, realised the significance to increase her sympathy and imagination toward distant, cultural others, this feeling resulted from the way she absorbed their media images, and eventually lead her to her dilemma with a terrorist group caused the death for many innocent people.

DeLillo's explanation of the crowds on television points toward aesthetic and ideological conflicts between Karen and Bill. Karen's attraction to anonymous masses and Bill's obsession with seclusion signify the two ideological points of collectivity and individualism. Gray's individualism is the core of the independence of his art; however, this directs him to his self-enclosed isolation. Jenny's desire for collectivity directs her to attach, but it could make her submit to anonymity and even dictatorial control. In Karen's description that appears at the beginning of the novel, she seems to be happy with the terrorists' attack on the innocent people. For instance, News from Britain appears on television concerning a sporting disaster at Hillsborough. In an overfull stadium, supporters- many of them are children and teenagers, are crushed to death: "She sees boys and men at first, a crowded maleness, a thickness of pressed-together bodies. Then a crowd, thousands, filling the screen. It looks like slow motion, but she knows it isn't" (DeLillo, 1991, p.32). In spite of seeing these images, Karen is

a passive receptor, observer and absorber of these images; although she feels sad over innocent people for a moment.

What calls the reader's attention in DeLillo's description of the stadium incident is the repeated phrase "she sees". This shows Karen's absorptive role of watching TV images that are repeated throughout the novel, combined with the signal-"they show"-that directs toward the continuous flow of images: "They show men standing off to the side somewhere, watching kind of half interested. She sees a great straining knot of people pressed to a fence, forced massively forward. They show the metal fence and bodies crushed against it, arms upflung" (DeLillo, 1991, p.33). Through the scheme of intensification and accumulation, new wreckages of images of crowded bodies are inserted after each indication, and the reader becomes absorbed in the details of such images. According to Ahmed and Ittefaq (2018), religious people such as Muslims turned to be a hot topic for the mainstream media and its journalists; these media have portrayed a negative image of Muslims around the world by viewing their contribution in various terrorist events such as skyscraper terrorism, aeroplane hijacking, the assassination of unbelievers and suicide bombers (p.41).

DeLillo stages a conflict between that of a "mass-produced" foreign consciousness and the individual Western identity, a battle creating equal amounts of paranoia and xenophobia. For most of the story's characters and isolating mass, identity is emblematised by images of political and religious leaders like Mao, and images of non-Western languages. For DeLillo, the apparently foreign "cult of Mao" becomes a product of American consumer society, which means, An American assumption of the commerce of mechanical reproduction and that of mass terrorism. This paranoia and xenophobia among American citizens have resulted from the mainstream media. For Evans (2011), Battles between secular and religious societies have been waged in two main venues: media and politics; thus, media is equal to politics in the term of influence (p.237).

For DeLillo's *Mao II* characters, xenophobia appears as a demonstration of anxiety over mass production and mass identity; images that replace the "original" object; group identities of consumer culture; multicultural or hybridized languages and text. The American concept of terrorism is then generated from a severe dread of

collective identity built in an extended Western fictional custom of fetishizing the individual. DeLillo creates an opposition between the Eastern/mass terrorist and the Western writer/individual only to collapse it. The old-fashioned white novelist's individual writings are cast against hybridized, foreign "mass" languages of politics, terrorism, and advertising. Throughout the novel, DeLillo portrays the speciousness of the opposition between the foreign and the domestic, both of which appeared to be outcomes of the same Western creativity. More noticeably, for the American writer, the foreign terrorist turns out to be his alter ego. In this context, the character of Mao designates not a foreigner alternative economic or social, but the very process of capitalist construction in DeLillo's America. Therefore, one only perceives *Mao II* as an effect of Mao.

2.3. DeLillo's *Underworld*: Postsecular Reading

The term "Postsecular" has remained somehow obscure. For some critics, the term concerns with some specific strain of words within contemporary fiction. In this sense, John McClure inspects some literary works written by contemporary writers who engage "a mode of seeing and being that is at once critical of reality, dogmatic religiosity, and of secular constructions" (McClure, 2007, p.21). For other researchers, the postsecular is a sort of theoretical perspective, a criticism from which one could inspect, examine works from any genre and any period. In this sense, the postsecular tendency lies in readings that question the very concept of the religious.

The term "postsecular" includes the implication that this perception follows a secular one. However, with such a construal, two main problems arise. First, there is no specific time, or single object could be classified as "secular" due to the idea that what people believe to be as the sacred and the secular are interwoven. The second issue is that such a view involves a secularisation account that many philosophers have effectively challenged. Charles Taylor, in his recent book *Secular Age* (2007), comments on the contemporary secularity, for him it involves not in the desertion of the religious, but in the "change from a culture where belief in God is unproblematic and indeed unchallenged" to another one in which belief in God is one "embattled option" among many (p.3). Generally, one could assume that the postsecular follows an era that many define (d) as secular, in spite of the inescapable influence of

assumptions and attitudes which arise from religious traditions. If we have managed to acknowledge the secular accounts of modernity till now, therefore, the postsecular is the taking away, or elimination of such accounts and conventions, in favour of the awareness of its own connection with the religious.

Don DeLillo's *Underworld* (1997) is a salient instance of how a literary work contributes to the structure of this postsecular moment. This novel is a half-century backdated of life following the Cold War. The plot of the story centres on two main blasts or shots, which happened on the same day in 1951: the check outburst of a nuclear bomb by the U.S.S.R and a game-winning homerun in the Dodgers-Giants pennant game, these two incidents mark as a crucial date in the record of the Cold War (Ludwig, 2009, p.84). What remains of the story follows a young man whose name is Nick Shay in near swap chronology from his maturity as a waste administration expert, back to his previous life as a gangster in the Bronx who unintentionally murdered a young man who was a mentor and a friend. Shay is the last owner of the ball, and the hunt for the homerun ball's sources resembles Nick's attempts to cope with his own life into a reliable story. The novel ends with Shay's efforts to tidy up the waste of his past flops; Nick experiences a turning, a comprehensive reversal from the nihilistic, buffered persona he has shaped for himself, in his way to a life of relation.

Both Martin Buber and McClure refer to "turning" as a person's experience of religious reorientation (Ludwig, 2009, p.83). These experiences are a recognising characteristic of postsecular fictions. In the case of the characters in DeLillo's *Underworld*, a nun named Sister Edgar and Nick Shay's turning resides in the movement from endeavours at "buffering" to the recognition of "porousness". In DeLillo's novel, the postsecular features appear as the identification that we are and continuously have been absorbent, in spite of our demands to modern autonomy (Ludwig, 2009, p.83).

In his book *A Secular Age* (2007), Charles Taylor clarifies that the line between external forces and the people was porous in the pre-modern consideration of the cosmos; however, in the modern identification of cosmos, the mind is the locus of meaning and power. So, a man in modern times is "buffered," which means that modern man is the opposite to his grandfather in the medieval age, who felt himself as

a subject to spirits and the holy powers outside his control, the modern man feels that he is capable of drawing his limits and boundaries without the intervention of the outside powers because the awareness of modern man has advanced during the time (Taylor, 2007, p.32).

Nick Shay, who is the central character in the *Underworld*, appears to be the crucial instance of the buffered, protected self. Nick tries to avoid what seems to be meaningful to him; he avoids connections with his wife, his neighbours, and strange people. He is a worker in waste management, constructing landfills at work and fanatically sorting out the trash at home. His attempts to include the ever-increasing danger of waste, along with efforts to control the danger of his previous life by keeping his mother in a cold room, feeding her with organic food, depriving her of the outside life are procedures evocative of America's Cold War strategy of restraint (Ludwig, 2009, p.84).

Likewise, the nun, Sister Edgar, generates further limitations for herself. "She is a habit wearing, germ-phobic nun", she teaches at a Catholic school in 1951 in Nick's Bronx neighbourhood (Ludwig, 2009, p.86). However, by the year 1992, Sister Edgar works with the "city's unbelieving poor", yearning for the construction of the grammar and catechism. Throughout the most of the story's events, she is depicted as wearing battles germs and latex gloves with "infinite regression", segregating herself from people whom she thinks as ill (Ludwig, 2009, p.86).

Yet, Taylor's outline of a disillusioned age seems to be that to which Sister Edgar, Nick, and many other characters in novel struggle with slight, real success. As was stated above, if the societies in medieval Christendom were exposed to demons, spirits and other mysterious powers, characters in DeLillo's novel feel threatened by foreign enemies, growing landfills, germs, they are even threatened by their pasts. DeLillo's characters lack the capability that Taylor sees functioning in modernity to undo from everything beyond the mind, so they invent artificial limitations for themselves. The consequence is a world in which people attempt to find ways to protect and separate themselves from one another.

When Sister Edgar and Nick experience turnings, their reorientations allow them to enjoy another type of porousness, these two characters are not just vulnerable

to insidious powers, but they also willing to have connections with other people in their society in positive relations. When facing his past life, Nick symbolically replaces his work in waste containment with a new job in which he works as a "waste analyst"; he manages to stand in a new position, in the course of his relation to the people in his life. In such position, Nick is willing to share his life secrets with his wife. Therefore, these two characters are abandoning their old conventions about life within their society.

The protagonist of the novel, Nick, feels that he needs to be close to his mother, who always realised about his transgression. After his mother's death, Nick thinks or feels that she has penetrated his "animating entity, if anything, the thing, that will survive my own last breath" (DeLillo, 1997, p.80). Moreover, in the novel, Sister Edgar's turning is portrayed as "a mystical apparition on an orange juice billboard": the illustration of a massacred orphan, whom Sister Edgar had wished to save, surreptitiously emerges when the train passes. Sister Edgar's vision is not clearly validated by the text, but at that moment, she feels in "An angelus of clearest joy" (DeLillo, 1997, p.82). After seeing the orphan's apparition, she immediately removes her latex gloves, (which could be considered as a highly symbolic gesture), then she starts to shake hands with those who have grouped to see the image. She even hugs a man whom she has been suspecting as having an AIDS and has been trying to avoid; she "wraps him in her cleaned cloth, and breathes the air he breathes" (DeLillo, 1997, p.82). There is a deep faith in her behaviours and reactions that her lifespan of service to the God house has never prompted, and now she is ready to connect his faith with the communication with people whom she has been trying to avoid for almost fifty years.

What is more significant than these character's turnings are the altered worlds that resulted from them, without forgetting the reasons behind them. In postsecular novel, as it could have seen in DeLillo's *Underworld*, the secular often displaces or substitutes for religion. Characters of DeLillo's *Underworld* cling to paranoia as a means for arranging chaos as a replacement for the security of religious tradition (O'Donnell, 2000, p.8). An apparently supernatural visualisation emerges on a commercial poster. For Nick Shay, "a religious thing" is a waste with which he works, and for him, it "demands" dread and reverence (DeLillo, 1997, p.88). Therefore, the

real origins of the religious trends in the *Underworld* are not conventionally sacred sources, but the individuals, and the material world they live in, and what actually acquired from that world shape their personality.

A case in point is when both Sister Edgar and Nick Shay are transported to the exact time of crisis that comes before their turnings, and that is what Martin Buber describes as "holy terror" by a conflict with a victim (Martin, 1982, p.177). Shay goes to a nuclear test location in Kazakh and watches preys of Soviet nuclear effect. These "Misshapens" or "down winders" contain fetuses in pickle jars, a cyclops and two-headed specimen (DeLillo, 1997, p.45). For Nick, confronting with such misshapens or down winders is a moment of existential desolation. On the other hand, the turning that Sister Edgar faces results simply in part from the commercial image. Her turnings begin when she attaches with the orphan child, Esmeralda. What she really sees in Esmeralda is "a grace and radiance...a cancellation from the Wall's ceaseless distress, even a source of personal hope, a stimulus to the old strong faith" (DeLillo, 1997, p.81). The orphan child is the first person to touch the unapproachable Sister, and when Esmeralda dies, the nun falls into crisis.

The impact of these events on Sister Edgar and Nick can be described through the view of Emmanuel Levinas; for the latter "the face of the other is a failure of the sacrificial instruction" (as cited in Ludwig, p.87). Yet, for Ren Girard, the substance of civilised cultures depends on the scapegoat; opposing parties direct and unite their anger at an innocent, random victim, or a scapegoat (Rene, 1997, p.11). In DeLillo's *Underworld*, however, it is the collapse of the scapegoat machinery (throughout the uncovering of the victim) that Triggers Sister Edgar and Nick's turnings.

In the case of Esmeralda, the orphan child, the nun (and the people gathering at billboard vision) watch an orphan girl who was murdered after being raped, which is one of society's excluded or forgotten subjects. In the case of the misshapens, Brain (another character in DeLillo's novel) and Nick look at the situations of the victims of nuclear effect, these victims are forgotten categorised in small groups, and they are mainly found in both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. these individuals lost their lives due to the radiation of secret weapons. In each case, social outsiders are a classified situation that everybody knows about. When Sister Edgar and Nick see these innocent victims,

they choose to desert the foundational accounts of their own lives accepting the openness and vulnerability of transformation over the fake security of consistency or the sameness provided by their individual paranoid accounts that they experience for a long period of time (Ludwig, 2009, p.86).

Of course, seeing such horrible things and images can be frightening. DeLillo's novel presents a crucial question: what would happen when one breaks things open and looks inside? In DeLillo's *Underworld* Bronzini is a science teacher who spectacles at the accord of the atom: "The entity of matter considered as the basis of nuclear energy. In the fifth century, the Greeks of suggested the notion of the atom. .Small, small, small. Something inside something else inside something else. Down, down, down. Under, under, under" (DeLillo, 1997, p.73). From its context, *Underworld* is about the split of the atom and discovers what could be inside it. The explosion of the bomb offers a metaphor for the horror at that age (Ludwig, 2009, p.86). The Cold War had drawn humanity into an era in which it is possible to generate such a powerful weapon. The era that follows the Cold War is possibly even more frightening than the war itself. As Nick comments "when the rivalry and tension come to its end, that's when our worst nightmares start. All the intimidation and power of the nation will leak of our bloodstream" (DeLillo, 1997, p.170). What DeLillo does here is presenting a visual image for porousness, and the possibility that humanity will face a worse than these catastrophes when moving forward in industry fields.

The idea of moving forward seems very postsecular. For both Sister Edgar and Nick is the movement forward after their turnings do not consider as a release into something happier or safer, but it is to be regarded as a movement into something more complicated. The nun's experience is more radical than Nick's. Sister Edgar dies immediately after her turning, and she enters cyberspace instead of heaven. Her experience is somewhat frightening; on an internet site containing information about the bomb, Sister Edgar experiences a hallucination of a mushroom cloud, which the nun believed to be a manifestation of God. Later the mushroom cloud turned to be a Soviet bomb, being shown repetitively on an internet site. The nun sees the explosion, "senses the supremacy of fabricated faith, the faith of paranoia" (DeLillo, 1997, p.82). She senses how interconnecting systems aid to pull us apart, presenting half beliefs and easy retreats. As McClure comments, "The whole thing is connected in cyberspace.

However, all connections are cold, and the only light comes from sources that have nothing to do with the divine" (McClure, 2007, p.96). Pairing this vision with the orphan child vision, readers can see the possible conflict of opposites, the potential for both fear and hope in spiritual visions the risks included in seeing. On an internet site, the nun joins to J. Edgar Hoover, "the other Edgar". However, this union does not last. The uniting of opposites (female and male) goes too far. Sister Edgar experiences a "settling of alterations... all conflict, all argument programmed out" (DeLillo, 1997, p.82). According to Girard Rene (1997), when connection causes the closure of difference, we jeopardy repeating the aggressive system that lies at the core of the sacred; in other words, if splitting the atom causes the generating of the bomb, compulsorily blending atoms leads to the fusion bomb (as cited in Ludwig, p.87).

The current postsecular reading of DeLillo's *Underworld* proposes that the embodiment within the course of depicting connections is both the risk of paranoia, violence and the hope of true relation (between divine and humans and between humans themselves). Possibly, DeLillo's novel also presents a model for steering that terrain. Patrick O'Donnell argues that, in DeLillo's *Underworld*, the assignment of histories and times in relation to one another in "partial linkages" (O'Donnell, 2000, p.34). O'Donnell adds that DeLillo tackles the writing of history as "a procedure that is tangled, but not complete, narratable but not a whole, and completely reliant on the complicity, and the adjacency of its opposing, completing sacred versions" (O'Donnell, 2000, p.34).

Some postsecular researchers are presently considering the transformation of the description of the sacred as shifting from a signifier of the existence of holiness (within a top-down construction), toward a more atheistic, communal ontology (Secord, 2015, p.19). Particularly, for scholars like René Girard, Maurice Blanchot, Georges Bataille, and Jean-Luc Nancy, society is central to the postmodern identification of the sacred. The reason behind that, as Martin Buber claims, a humanist account of enchantment discovers the sacred in relations among humans; moreover, Buber observes "religion is not a dogma, it is a relation", the sacred occurs between people, and not between God and his creatures (Buber, 1958, p.13).

Religion has long presented humans a link to others, whether on a local scale (through the gathering of church members) or on a global one (as religions are customs of imagined societies). People may assume that a movement to secularism, where traditions of the congregation, for instance, stop to take place, could cause a vacuum in the person's need to be part of or to belong to a community. It can be said, however, that humour has this ability on both a practical and imaginative scale insofar as we assemble locally to contribute in comedy (films, television shows, stand-up shows.). People can also communicate, interact with other people through using senses of humour, and that is mainly depending on our shared experiences (Secord, 2015, p.22).

Humour might also be considered as a cure to one result of the movement to secularism, which Taylor describes as 'self-buffering'. For Charles Taylor (2007), the "porousness" of our descendants was a consequence of their conviction that the world was "entranced", and the disillusionment of the modern world produced "a closing-up of these pores" (p.35). This framework has been used above to discuss postsecularism in *Underworld*; the characters in the DeLillo's novel accomplish porousness and hold the other into themselves. Moreover, DeLillo's depiction of the new sacred is the reopening of the self as the in Sister Edgar and Nick to the other. The modern world is preoccupied with the sacred relations people make with each other. It is a condition that demands pores "for the purpose of permitting in the other" (Secord, 2015, p.19). Their capability to feel the humour to sense it is fundamentally based on their capacity to attach with other people. Even though people "buffer" themselves, this process disappears spontaneously when people laugh. "A world occupied only by buffered selves" (for instance, people with impervious, stable, sturdy identifies) would mostly be a world shorn of wonder and humour" (Paolo Costa, 2011, p.151).

Therefore, identifying community is instinctive in sensing humour. However, the very expression of the laugh or giggle is universal. Every human laugh before she/he is separated by the languages they acquire, meaning that laughter is innate and pre-linguistic (Martin, 2007, p.3). However, it is a post-linguistic as it is "border of human behavior" (Plessner, 1970, p.138). The laughter is like the cry, and the expression used when other utterances conclude to be enough. The laugh, in this sense, is a practice of interaction that is both beyond and before the inventions of language: separating inventions such as religions, nations, and cultures (Secord, 2015, p.19). The

laugh then ties them after and before they individuate themselves that is why it takes the role that religion used to occupy in their world without the negative behaviours and ideologies which derived with developments of language. The sensing of humour includes imagining a community, and its mechanisms lie somewhere between unconsciousness and consciousness. The reason behind considering the sense of humour as culturally subjective and specific is that it based on common experiences and generated out of them, it expresses a feeling it works as a turning in one's mood.

On the other hand, the relationship between DeLillo and religion is amicable; just like his protagonist in *Underworld*, Nick Shay, DeLillo was raised Catholic, in the Bronx; he remembers himself going to church, and these events are his "warmest childhood memories" (LeClair 26, Duvall 10). However, DeLillo saw a conflation between art and religious ritual; DeLillo himself stated that "religious ritual has components of art to it and it provoked thoughts that art occasionally draws out of us. I believe I responded to it as I react now to drama" (Secord, 2015, p.43). The homology that DeLillo shows between religion and art, it indicates features of religion, to him, may occur outside the houses of God, and therefore, art could be a technique of experiencing it just as forcefully or purely. Therefore, it is sensible to suppose that, for DeLillo, the ontology of the holy is not monolithic, and the evidence for that is his treatment of laughter in *Underworld*.

Ira Nadel (2002) emphasised the function of comedy in DeLillo's *Underworld*; for Nadel, the novel is political. He claims that "comedy is confrontation in DeLillo's novel; it is a means of striking back at the uniformity, conformity, and mediocrity of American life that is recurrently appeared to be tricky, duplicitous, and questionable" (p.177). For him, comedy is a way through which these issues might be neutralised. Nadel (2002) divides comedy in *Underworld* into two opposites through a sequence of comparative chiasmic arguments that uncover his theory on the cosmic stability, and he demands comedy withstands: "Bruce demolishes the admitted; Gleason confirms it;" "Bruce is impulsive, Gleason prepared;" Bruce "'the diamond cutter'," Gleason "the cut-up" (p.179). The American public requires these two types of comedy. Nick Shay asserts "Gleason is the one we needed at the end of the day, he gave us the sure laugh" (DeLillo, 1997, p.106). On the other hand, Nadel (2002) argues, "Bruce is like conventional Juvenalian satirists, wanted to offend so as to correct the wrongs of the

period” (p.181). Both practical roles of these two comedies might be understood as postsecular in nature because one offers stability and comfort, while the other promotes scepticism of dogma. Therefore, Nadel’s notions comprise the early stages of postsecular ideas, though they regularly stay within the secular discourse.

Critics who have talked about DeLillo’s *Underworld* share the opinion that the pivotal movement is toward togetherness. However, Secord (2015) claims that, as a replacement for “porous” body, that is a body experiencing humour or “humoured body”, instructs this communal force (p.45). The expression of the laugh is the main signifier of wrongdoing to DeLillo’s position of the sacred. Secord (2015) reading is similar to Daniel Born’s who locates the sacred in “the connection between violent sacrifice, linguistic utterance, and communal bonding” in his interpretation of some of the cult-like incidents in other works of DeLillo’s such as *The Names* and *White Noise* (Born, 1999, p.213). Born’s recognition of the linguistic expression as complicit in holy shared ritual is prefatory to Secord’s claim insofar as a sense of humour is handled as sacred in the *Underworld*, even though it is not an entirely linguistic utterance.

Another component of postsecular discourse that according to Secord (2015) that the critics missed in the analysis of the novel of DeLillo is how wonder and humour are conflated in *Underworld* (p.48). The secular lack of enchantment in the novel is conveyed by Klara Sax’s statement that “humans weren’t saying Oh Wow any longer. They were uttering No way in its place, and she questioned if there was something she could learn from this” (DeLillo, 1997, p.382). Despite this, however, *Underworld* definitely includes many instances of experiences of awe and wonder. One instance of laughter that is either intrinsically linked to it in some way, or produces an experience of wonder. For Paolo Costa (2011), experiences of humour and wonder are much related in nature (p.139). According to Paolo Costa’s statement that “a world occupied just by buffered selves (i.e. individuals with impervious, stable, and sturdy identities) would fundamentally be a world shaved of wonder and humour” (Costa, 2011, p.151). DeLillo’s novel proposes that society is both a product and a prerequisite of the (often fascinated) experience of humour. Therefore, DeLillo’s notion of the sacred is a phenomenally shared bond that overcomes the buffering that jails the self.

In the opening scene of the novel, Nick Shay speaks with Klara Sax. However, the importance of this prologue is that throughout the conversation, their laughter is depicted as the means for Nick's later development. Nick says: "We laughed once again and I felt better. Laughing with her was wonderful. I wanted her to see me. I wanted her to know I was out of there, whatever crazy mistakes I'd made--I'd come out okay" (DeLillo, 1997, p.73). The accidental killing of George Manza was Nick's "crazy [mistake]", and it was due to that incident Nick served time in a juvenile improvement facility (DeLillo, 1997, p.19). Its consequence was strongly segregating insofar as it literally demoted him to the margins of the community. The declaration that Nick "felt better" immediately after this laughter suggests that the process of laughing is the start to fill the need that provoked his "turnings"-- his requirement for connection.

DeLillo appears to outmodedly complete the postsecular method set out in Foster's *Infinite Jest*, whose characters strive to exceed their own limits, let alone connect with each other. However, it is clear that both novels display not only an appeal for movement towards forming relationships with others but also a belief in the significance of it; both specify this assembly as sacred in a secular world. Moreover, it is, most significantly, an outcome of the capacity to sense and experience humour.

The three novels, *Libra*, *Mao II* and *Underworld*, share similar points of view in terms of the rejection of religious fanaticism and political corruption, and the establishment of a novel society where secularism prevails. Whereas *Libra* explores the religious motivation behind the assassination of President Kennedy, *Mao II* sheds the light on the prevailing clash between religious media and its secular counterpart, and emphasises the influence of media on individuals' behaviours and decisions. On the other hand, *Underworld* examines the postsecular period in which massive shifts take place in society, and secularism does not outcast religion. Instead, that period witnesses a state of co-existence named as a secular-religious society.

CHAPTER THREE

TRACING RELIGION IN GEORGE ORWELL'S WRITING

3.1. Secularisation and Control in *Animal Farm*

George Orwell (1903) his real name is Eric Arthur Blair. Orwell is best known as an atheist and abhors Catholic Church. In all his novels and essays he declares about his aversion to religion especially Christianity. He wrote novels and essays and his famous novels are *Animal Farm* and *1984*. In his novels, he attempts to secularise his readers by revealing the negative practices to uncover the real face of the Catholic Church. Therefore, in the mid-ninetieth century, a social movement began featuring European intellectuals and gained traction as well. During that period, secular, humanitarian, liberal and iconoclastic writers who were not part of either party or ideology came up against theological, progressive and social systems. The corruption and inequality of the capitalists' states were revealed by George Orwell. They even asked for the common man, more rights, advantages and privileges. G.B. Shaw, like Orwell, was a humanitarian person whose aims were to rescue people from capitalism, corruption. For socialism's sake, he never was a socialist. Shaw's socialism is a source of his creative development philosophy. Like other socialists, the technical details of the matter are not discussed. He protested a few evils for the sake of humanity. He was an anti-capitalistic, anti-drinkers, anti-royals, anti-democrats, etc. However, Orwell saw that there was a totalitarian tendency without the joy of salvation in the modern state.

Orwell has a humanitarian view towards men, thus he reflects his humanistic perspective in his novels. In *Animal Farm*, Orwell depicted the pigs the most explosive members of the farm. The pigs are physically and morally filthy. It is Orwell's treatment for lack of morality and loyalty made *Animal Farm* a representation of the totalitarian system.

Orwell objected to communism and Catholicism. He thought that both are the reasons for the downfall of societies. For the social groups, Orwell had never said that he belongs to some social entity. He never has identified himself as socialist or

capitalist. Orwell was always on the side with oppressed. His novels, especially *Animal Farm* and *1984* are the clear representations of the inhuman systems.

George Orwell is best distinguished for his two fictional political theorists, *Animal Farm* and *1984*. Because of the success of these two books, Orwell is almost solely taught in the educational sector as a dystopian fiction novelist. He has since become associated with authoritarian regimes and repressive societies. And in contemporary history, 68 years since the first publishing of his last book in *1984*, the word "Orwellian" is used to classify political governments or foreign states. He has made a lavish criticism for the Catholic Church to show it was part of the corruption.

George Orwell is raised as an Anglican. A child with faith and conservative beliefs. Yet at a later stage in his life, he became an atheist. He became the critical eye of the Catholic Church. His goal became the criticism of organised Christianity. One of the professors at Texas University and Virginia University named John Robin wrote many papers concerning Orwell and his religious critique. In his paper "Orwell on Religion: The Catholic and Jewish Questions," he said that Orwell has a constant subscription to catholic magazine because he was eager to know- in Orwell's words- what the enemy was doing (Rodden, p.44). Orwell also has written articles concerning Catholicism. In his a critical "Such, Such Were the Joys," Orwell said that "till the age of about fourteen I believed in God, and believed that the accounts given of him were true. But I was well aware that I did not love him. On the contrary, I hated him, just as I hated Jesus..." (Orwell, p.1323) Orwell developed a sense of hatred toward Christianity when he was ten years old. During his time in the catholic school, St. Cyprian, he lived a miserable life. Yet, Orwell doped his lavish critique for Christianity during the Spanish war. He believed that the church is the sources of corruption. During the Spanish war, the church sided with the Fascist against the socialist. In other words, the church took side against Spain and vitality. The church was against the democratic ideology. He inaugurated to present the Church as its own dictatorial regime (Hill, p.1274). Orwell believed that no one ever worshipped the church for the sake of humanity, but they do so for the sake of power and to gain control over the middle and low-class people (Rodden, p.47).

In this chapter, the analysis is going to be centred around the idea of religion and secularism in *Animal Farm* and *1984*. Since Orwell hated religion, he made his novel without the existence of any. Yet, Orwell argues that despite the absence of religion, the corrupted political system turned them to replace religions in society. Communism became the religion in the novels of Orwell.

Orwell's political opinion has an aversion to Catholicism. Because the Catholic Church supported fascism, Orwell considered it impossible to associated religion with socialism. Orwell translates this view of the religious critic in his novel *Animal Farm*. By creating a character such as Moses the raven, Orwell wanted to show the false promises that the breaches are given to middle and low classes. In the novel, Moses always preaches the animals the way to enter the Sugarcandy Mountain. The Sugarcandy Mountain is the representation of heaven. Moses says that the animals will not enter unless they worked hard. Beside preaches, it can be noticed that Orwell has given the raven a biblical name. In addition, Orwell wanted to construct the image of the church in function. In the novel, Moses disappeared in the time of the revolution. After the revolution, he returns to the farm and shared no works with other animals. Orwell described by saying that “unchanged, still did no work, and talked in the same strain as ever about Sugarcandy Mountain” (Orwell, p.70). Orwell made Moses be the controlling religious factor. Moses tells the animals on the farm that Sugarcandy Mountain is “that happy country where we poor animals shall rest forever from our labours!” (Orwell, p.70). He convinced the animals that the afterlife is better, just like the church telling the poor that they will be rewarded in the afterlife.

The use of a character like Moses is to symbolically refer to the church as a means to control the low class. The statements used by the raven are the ones that made the poor morally contempt. It is one of the ways that the church uses to keep the poor in constant slavery with low wages. The thing that made the low class believe in them is the divine reward. Politically speaking, Orwell also showed the standpoint of the government toward the behaviours of the church. In the novel, the pigs were their representation of the government in *Animal Farm*. As a socialist, the pigs did not believe what Moses said. The pigs believed in a secular system of society. Yet the Pigs did not kick the raven out of the farm. The pigs “declared contemptuously that his stories about Sugarcandy Mountain were lies, and yet they allowed him to remain on

the farm, not working, with an allowance of a gill of beer a day” (Orwell, p.70). The role of the church was to maintain social classes. To keep the poor from unifying together and keep them repressed. It is because of religion that the low class find a reason to stay in their position.

It is interesting that the authoritarian control of the Catholic Church was so prominently in Orwell’s mind as he completed *Animal Farm* since its fictional narrative contains few religious or sectarian references. The only direct mention of God comes when the cynical donkey Benjamin remarks that if ‘God had given him a tail to keep the flies off’ he would prefer to have ‘no tail and no flies’ (VIII.2). The satiric character of Moses the raven perhaps parodies earnest Christian evangelists who promise the faithful a delightful heaven in the form of Sugarcandy Mountain where all animals supposedly go after they die. Like a saccharine version of the Christian heaven, it is imagined to be situated somewhere in the sky beyond the clouds where it is ‘Sunday seven days a week’, with clover, sugar and linseed cake permanently available for all animals. Old Major’s teachings are categorised into the secular creed of ‘Animalism’ (VIII.10) and the regular Sunday meetings of the animals may be equated not only to hectoring Communist assemblies but also to the coming together of a new Nonconformist sect. The animals have imposed upon them ‘The Seven Commandments’, obvious Biblical travesties, which are tacitly emended and corrupted by the devilish pigs. But other than these few superficial references, *Animal Farm* seems to concentrate primarily upon political parody rather than offering any religious, sectarian or spiritual commentary. On one level, this is understandable since Orwell himself had categorised this 30,000-word novella as a ‘fairy story, really a fable with a political meaning’ (XVI.126). However, there are also moments in the narrative when Orwell’s authorial persona seems more of a satiric Jeremiah than a secular political commentator. The renowned axiom ‘All animals are equal but some are more equal than others’ (VIII.90) seems to echo the self-deceiving thoughts of Milton’s Eve in *Paradise Lost* when she wonders whether to tell Adam of her newly attained knowledge, thinking that withholding it might ‘render me more equal, and perhaps, / A thing not undesirable, sometime / Superior’ (IX.823–5).

The two false demigod-like of *Animal Farm*, Farmer Jones and Napoleon, are equally unsatisfactory replacements for an ordered Deo-centric society, with only the

deceptive prophet Moses the raven offering brief nostalgic glimpses of the possibility of trust in ‘individual immortality’ which provides, as Orwell argued in *The Lion and the Unicorn*, the basis of distinguishing between good and evil. In his review of Harold Laski’s *Faith, Reason and Civilisation* (13 March 1944) Orwell emphasises how Christianity had remained an essentially unchanging doctrine through the centuries, thereby providing a sense of continuity and clarity of conviction necessary to all flourishing societies. But, in contrast, the Communist doctrine (as evidenced in its most extreme form in Soviet Russia) was constantly evolving and intrinsically deceptive towards its own citizens. As he noted in this review, if a dictatorship is established, there is no way of guaranteeing that a dictator will act as he has ‘promised to do’. Hence, in *Animal Farm*, The Seven Commandments are readily corruptible to suit the elite regime’s personal preferences and comforts. Just as the rousing egalitarian anthem ‘Beasts of England’ (VIII.8) is suddenly replaced by an anodyne ‘Animal Farm, Animal Farm, / Never through me shalt thou come to harm’ (VIII.60), so the fourth commandment, ‘No animal shall sleep in a bed’ (VIII.15) can be surreptitiously emended by Squealer to ‘sleep in a bed with sheets’ (VIII.45). The replacement anthem, ‘Animal Farm, Animal Farm’, is composed by Minimus, the regime’s poet-propagandist pig, who also writes a quasi-religious panegyric poem in praise of Napoleon which he orders to be inscribed on the wall of the barn at the opposite end to the Commandments, surmounted by a grandiose portrait of himself. The poem celebrates Napoleon as a pagan deity and venerates him as the ‘giver of / All that thy creatures love’ (VIII.63). The novella concludes with the animals gazing through the farmhouse windows as the pigs and neighbouring farmers play a drunken game of cards in a tragi-comic reworking of the pagan myth of Circe since it is now impossible to differentiate between the greed and self-interest of the Stalinist pigs and the capitalist humans.

3.2. Secularism as a Religion in Orwell’s *1984*.

George Orwell, born and educated into the Anglican faith, grew up to become an agnostic. In an essay written some years before the composition of *1984*, he remarked that “few thinking people now believe in life after death The real problem is how to restore the religious attitude while accepting death as final” (Crick, 1980, p.322). Both Orwell's rejection of supernaturalism and his quest for moral significance

in its absence is evident in his last novel *1984*. As his statement suggests, Orwell stands in the tradition of Victorian religious scepticism and moral earnestness typified by writers like George Eliot and Matthew Arnold, but with this difference: he is defied with a world, which far more than theirs challenges not only religious belief but the mere potentiality of moral meaning. In response to that realm, and through an imaginative rendering of its darkest possibilities, he creates in *1984* one of the most influential secular myths of modern times—his own attempt, perhaps, to "restore the religious attitude" which has been lost in the decay of religious faith in the Western countries. The bleakness of his vision is a summons to believer and nonbeliever alike to take up his search for the grounds of goodness in an apparently morally indifferent world, but Orwell also asserts that both have to concede that neither faith nor mind may be sufficient for the task.

Conventional religious faith as a spring of meaning and regulation is rejected from the onset; concerning the twentieth century, as represented in the novel, is certainly Post-Christian, the hereditary faith of Western civilisation no longer in evidence, even among the proles. The absence of religious reference in the accomplished totalitarian state of the novel's present is not unexpected: there is room to only one god in Oceania, and his name is Big Brother. What is noteworthy, however, is that Christianity is not a part of the historical fabric of the pre-revolutionary period which the Inner Party is still striving to eradicate. Amongst the plentiful impediments to the absolute control of the society that have been overcome, religious belief is noticeably absent. The only suggestion that religion may have been important to the presence of an earlier generation is a triad of images of the Church in the novel: the old churches of London, either in ruins or converted to secular functions; the engraving of St. Clement's Dane Church which Winston Smith finds in the junk shop; and the nursery rhyme catalogue of church bells with its prophetically grim ending. The church or temple is the most unique and the least perishable image of religious faith and culture. This image or symbol, now emptied of all religious meaning, is all that remains of a once vital spirituality: a physically ruined sign and reduced metaphorically to esthetic realms (the engraving) and anthropology (the rhyme). Taken together, the images of the church indicate that religious belief is no longer feasible in today's world and that it is not thus a force that forms Western people's mind, heart and imagination. Since those images convey to the readers the

inevitable impressions in which Christianity had died a normal death well before the revolution, and so neither bombs nor boots were required to finish the job.

Ironically, while giving the Christian creed an arguably premature burial, Orwell's *1984* keeps and expands the discipline and practices of Christianity's largest denomination. Most Roman Catholic readers over thirty will recognise that *1984* is, among other things, a corrosive satire of their institutional church. Oceania's Ministry of Love invites comparison with the Inquisition; and the Inquisition's later counterpart, the Holy. The office is parodied in the Ministry of Truth. The Church's Augustinian puritanism is echoed in the Anti-Sex League, as well as the Inner Party's either/or reduction of the sex act into the procreative mechanism or sordid animalism. The Inner Party's manipulation of symbol and ritual is a grotesque parallel to Catholic use of iconography and liturgy. For instance, Hate Week is Oceania's version of Holy Week; and the Two-Minute Hate, like the Catholic Mass, is a condensed ritualisation of the larger feast. The ubiquitous telescreen functions as an audio-visual catechism, recurrently issuing forth its messages of utter truth with reliable authority. Lastly, O'Brien, in the last section of the novel, functions as a spiritual director-cum-confessor to Winston. The latter is not merely brainwashed into the mysteries of the true faith, he is led by O'Brien through a process alike to the traditional. This sacramental experience of penance: confession, mortification, repentance, and restoration to the faith community.

Although the institutional reforms initiated by Vatican II make Orwell's implicit criticism of the Roman Church something of a dead issue today, in 1948 his anti-Catholicism was understandable and very much in vogue (Winter, 1984, p.44). One reason for the hostility towards Rome among Leftist intellectuals of the middle decades was the Church's rigid opposition to liberal and democratic principles and to all forms of socialism in general, a hostility which resulted in its collaboration with fascist governments in Spain and Italy. So in the great struggle between democratic socialism and totalitarianism, Rome took the wrong side, blindly rejecting to see, as Orwell saw, that fascism and Soviet communism were at the bottom the same thing. Further, by refusing to relax its own authoritarian grip over its subjects, the Church betrayed, to liberal eyes, its kinship to the secular fascists themselves. Two years after

1984's appearance, an American journalist, Paul Blanchard, published a point-by-point comparison of the Vatican and Kremlin as totalitarian regimes (Blanchard, 1951, p.12).

Nevertheless, his assault is against not so much a certain belief-system as the repression of democracy and lack of personal choice. Whether by threatening or conditioning of the adherents of any scheme, religious or democratic. Oceania has still not had a religious faith and has all the traps of a theocracy: a goddess, a high priesthood, and a State religion's discipline and ritual. It has a kind of orthodoxy, expressed in the slogans of the three parties. It even has a dogma of sorts, reflected in the three Party slogans. But Oceania lacks a scripture expressive of a genuine mythos: it has no salvation history, no teleological vision which explains the past, interprets the present, and predicts the future. For its citizens, history has ceased to exist, and the present is the future. Without history, that is, an oral or written record of objectively real events occurring in an objectively real universe, "reality" itself becomes whatever the state dictates it to be. Myth does not replace experiential reality as such; it rather transforms it into something meaningful by providing a context of importance into which individual human lives can be fit as part of a larger process, either transcendental or historical in scope. The ritualistic reenactment of mythic events actualises myth in history, affirms the continuity of meaning, and bonds the participants of the present with those of the past and future. By depriving its citizens of history, Oceania's rulers also deprive them of authentic myth. Instead, Oceania functions with arbitrary models of both, created and imposed by the Inner Party. "History" is being continuously rewritten within the cubicles of Minitrue per the self-generated and self-serving messianic "myth" embodied in Big Brother.

Not only has the state constructed an artificial mythology which both affects and justifies its absolute power, but it has also fabricated, as a major part of the mythic scheme, an anti-myth, the rebellion, which acts as a negative image to the state religion: Goldstein is its godhead, his book its scripture, the Brotherhood its cultic priesthood, in opposition to Big Brother, the products of Minitrue, and the Inner Party. And paradoxically, because its model is an authentic modern myth, Marxism, this anti-myth has more body and consistency than its antithesis. Its perpetration serves the Inner Party as effectively as does the cult of Big Brother, despite its subversive potential; for it creates for the Outer Party members the illusion of engagement in a

cosmic struggle between the forces of light and darkness, making them participants in the larger pseudo-mythology generated by the Inner Party's manipulation of history, media, and ritual. Conditioned into zealous worship of Big Brother against the anti-Christ Goldstein, Oceania's citizens readily partake in the nationalistic idolatry demanded by Oceania's shifting warfare with Eurasia and Eastasia. Quite simply, they transfer the intense emotions aroused by the domestic anti-myth (which has been cleverly given at least the semblance of meaning and form by its creators) onto a confusing, contradictory, and purposeless international struggle mythic only in its proportions. In their frenzied response to their "enemies," both at home and abroad, they—excepting Winston and Julia—fail to observe that there is no actual protomyth from which these "enemies" receive definition. There is no actual antithesis between the rival deities, any more than between Eurasia and Eastasia (or the designated opponent state and Oceania).

The fictional Brotherhood likewise acts as a medium to capture heretically-inclined thought-criminals into frank apostasy. Those who have a vestigial reminiscence of the pre-revolutionary past are most susceptible; for that yore, changed by temporal distance into a Paradise Lost, may give rise to a vision of Paradise Regained. Therefore an authentic protomyth still lies nascent in that perspective of history which the Ministry of Truth has not yet been capable to deconstruct completely: the personal memory. Winston, whose few conscious memories are increased by dreams, and out of which memories he forms a vague, unarticulated desire for something better, is easily seduced by O'Brien's sleight-of-hand transformation of the anti-myth into protomyth, anti-Christ into Messiah. The Brotherhood offers to Winston meaning and purpose, the heroic action essential to achieve them, and the grounds for hope—all of which myth has traditionally implemented. What Winston and the careless reader ultimately discover, however, is that the Brotherhood is Big Brother; and that both are puppets, means with which the Inner Party achieves a self-perpetrating, completely directionless (hence a-mythical) exercise of sadistic power. At the heart of things, there is no myth at all, solely the mechanical beast.

1984, then, takes its readers inferentially through a process of demythologisation. The Church images—relics of the transcendental mythos of

Christianity—recall an earlier age when belief in a God Incarnate infused sacramental meaning into every aspect of temporal reality. The parody of institutional religion, Catholicism, in particular, suggests the overwhelming of spiritual authority by temporal power as a logical outcome, perhaps, of the Constantinian conversion of Christianity into a state religion, with the accompanying shift of eschatological vision from the supernatural to the historical sphere. The rise of reason and science during the last several centuries completed the process of secularisation and gave birth to a new set of mythologies, Utopian rather than celestial in their thrust. In its satire of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, *1984* warns people of the ease with which a modern myth, racial or economic, can be institutionalised into a state religion more powerful and oppressive than any church of previous eras. The Goldstein book is the clearest reminder of Ingsoc's secular myths and a Trotskyite view of history and a criticism of the modern past. Marxism, Orwell suggests, lost its importance as the liberating vision of mankind as its leaders took the power machinery, immensely strengthened by modern communication, development and war technology, much like Christianity centuries ago. So the most chilling aspect of Oceania's relationship to the historical models of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia is that its affinity with them is mainly in its totalitarian apparatus, not its ideology. Oceania has moved beyond even secular, nationalistic mythology: there is no millennium towards which its citizens are striving; there is only the distortion of yesterday's facts into today's schema and the perpetuation of today into tomorrow. No ideological myth inspires the machine, for the means to effect the Utopian end has become the end itself. O'Brien tells Winston: "The object of Power is Power." As stated by Goldstein's book, "the earthly paradise had been discarded at exactly the moment when it became realizable" (p.168); and humanity sank back into the Darwinian jungle that both Nazism and Communism wished to change into gardens of earthly gladness, through conquest or historically inevitable revolution.

The prominent deconstructionist of mythologies both religious and rationalistic in the British philosophical tradition is Thomas Hobbes. If Goldstein's book explains how the totalitarian global state emerged, Hobbes's *Leviathan* offers a hypothetical answer for why it so developed. In the seventeenth century, Hobbes (1960) devised a purely secular, naturalistic rationale for an absolutist government which could supplant the traditional supernaturalistic doctrine of divine right, and which was based on his

understanding of the natural condition of mankind, war: "Continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" (p.100). What Hobbes apparently did not foresee was that the very power he defends as necessary to the amelioration of this condition could become the instrument of its perpetuation. Hobbes argued that "the Right of Nature ... is the liberty each man hath, to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own nature" (p.101). Besides, in a state or circumstance of war, "every man has a right to everything, even to one another's body" (p.104). The Inner Party has used its collective power, not to establish peace (which Hobbes says is "the first and fundamental law of nature"), but to maintain a permanent state of war, the condition of which justifies its continued and unrestrained exercise of that same power over the masses (Hobbes, 1960, p.103). The Hobbesian ethic of "might makes right" has degenerated into its *1984* doublethink version, "War is Peace". Also, by reducing human nature to its atomistic level, man to a corporeal body merely, subject in his entirety to the laws of motion, Hobbes inadvertently sanctioned not only the licentiousness of Restoration rakes but the sadism of O'Brien and his colleagues in the Inner Party; inadvertently because his sense of natural law could not accommodate totally purposeless brutality. In his definition of Cruelty, he comments: "For, that any man should take pleasure in other men's great harms, without another end of his own, I do not conceive it possible" (Hobbes, 1960, p.104). In short, Hobbes anticipated the myth of the Newtonian universe, in which the cosmic machine itself, if not the consciously human part of it, functioned according to an absolute law reflective of rational order. But the Newtonian universe has been displaced, along with the ascription of it to a First and Final Cause; and the physical laws of motion have been restructured into the predatory laws of the jungle. Not even nature itself provides any longer a check on mankind's appetite for pleasure in its most gratifying form: power. O'Brien warns Winston: "We shall squeeze you empty, and then we shall fill you with ourselves" (Orwell, 1949, p.211).

That very image, constructively serpentine and parasitic, is archetypal, evocative of lamias and demon-possession; and points to the fact that this novel, which concerns itself with the historical trend towards demythologisation, is itself essentially mythic. Furthermore, one of the great protomyths of which it is expressive is that most ancient of Judeo-Christian stories, man's fall from Edenic perfection. Adam's and Eve's

consumption of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge to turn out to be god-like is, in the Christian tradition, the archetypal sin, a prideful lust for transcendent power. Eventually, the sin became charged with satanic overtones with the development of the mythic story of Lucifer's rebellion in heaven and fall into hell, which served as an a-historical prototype for Adam's fall. Also, the originally anonymous serpent of Genesis was subsequently identified as Lucifer/Satan, who sought to win the new creation over to his fallen kingdom. The two fall stories are most eloquently intertwined into one great myth by Milton. But earlier Faustian stories serve to confirm the idea that aspirants to divinity become demoniacs, and their momentary flight up the Chain of Being is in effect a descent into hell. The modern demoniacs in *1984* are, of course, O'Brien and his colleagues in the Inner Party. But instead of suffering the torments of the damned as victims of Satan in hell, they have created their own hell on earth, assuming satanic mastery over their temporal kingdom's inhabitants.

That portion of the novel which provides the strongest basis for the presence of the Fall protomyth is the interpretive history of Ingsoc's rise, as provided by Goldstein's book—ironically the work of the demoniacs themselves if O'Brien can be believed. The author of it states that "the new doctrines arose partly because of the accumulation of historical knowledge, and the growth of the historical sense" (Orwell, 1949, p.168). An understanding of historic cycles gave modern man control over history: "if it was intelligible, then it was alterable" (Orwell, 1949, p.168). This mastery of historical process along with the rise of technology made possible the realisation of the Utopian vision of universal equality. In mythic terms, the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge gave humanity the god-like powers to create an "earthly paradise" (Orwell, 1949, p.168). However, since the acquisition of this power is by definition Satanic, its consequences are bound to be evil rather than good. The possessors and purveyors of knowledge, unwilling to relinquish the power they could retain in a hierarchical society, abandoned the Utopian dream for its antithesis. "As compared with their opposite numbers in past ages they were less avaricious, less tempted by luxury, hungrier for pure power, and above all, more conscious of what they were doing and more intent on crushing opposition" (Orwell, 1949, p.169). Power had become its own end, the exercise of power its own reward; thus arises the endless cycle of brutalisation which is the mythical vision of the inferno.

It is at this point that Orwell's novel shifts from protomyth to anti myth. If Christian salvation history originates with the fall of man through the wiles of the Serpent, it concludes with the fall of the Serpent through the redemptive act of the Son of Man. The Christian mythos, then, looks forward to the exorcism of evil from the postlapsarian world and the restoration of the earthly paradise as a transfigured, everlasting model of the celestial one. Orwell's apocalypse instead envisions the triumph of the Beast within endless time and the establishment of an earthly hell that mimes its infernal archetype (McNamara, 1882, p.46). The individual neo-Satans will enjoy their demoniacal powers for a lifetime and then disappear into the oblivion of nonbeing, to be succeeded by generations of temporal devils like themselves, creating anew their generations of zombies and slaves. If there is a prototype for this situation at all within the Judeo Christian tradition, it is the utter sense of helplessness among the remnants of the Jewish faith which heightened their expectation of divine intervention through a heaven-sent messianic figure. But by the novel's end, there is no remnant: the Last Man in Europe has been healed of his humanity, and there is no one left to save.

Orwell manipulated Part III of *1984* into some kind of brutal, if not severe, version of the Catholic Confession. In brief, Winston is pressured to confess offences that he did not conduct against a group member, O'Brien. In this case, O'Brien serves as a priest, and Winston takes on the position of part of the congregation. The aim of Winston's testimony is to absolve him of the offences he has perpetrated against the Government so that he can be hanged as a defendant of the Government's rule. The condition is reminiscent of the Catholic tradition of being absolved from guilt before death, such that an individual dies as a member of the religion and can be admitted into Heaven. Patricia Hill (1984) describes this as "a process similar to the traditional sacramental experience of penance: confession, mortification, penitence, and restoration of faith to community" (pp.274-275). In reality, Orwell's message was almost given up in O'Brien's discussion of party control during Winston's investigation. When Winston is sitting in the chair, O'Brien says to him, "we are the priests of power...God is power" (Orwell, 1949, p.339). These two brief sentences reinforce the theological undertones of the third part of the book. O'Brien's explicit parallels to morality, the mysterious nature of Big Man, and theological allegory in Orwell's representation of Oceania are proof that Winston resides in a society

dominated by radical Christian ideology. In fact, this government is close to the Catholic Church, with the Party explicitly referring to the Catholic Church and the Ingsoc faith.

Orwell's *1984* is almost as much about an authoritarian dictatorship as it is about losing confidence in a theocracy. Winston's constant questioning of the nature of Big Brother and his search for affirmation from others leads to a storyline in which a man tries to come to grips with his disappointment in religion. Winston is still on the alert for any indication from colleagues or peers that they do not necessarily believe in the party, either. For illustration, during the initial Two Minutes Hatred, Winston looks for affirmation of his disdain by covering the space before his eyes land on O'Brien. At the moment, Winston was persuaded that "an unmistakable message had passed" between himself and O'Brien. He believed O'Brien was conveying a sense of agreement towards Winston's "contempt, ... hatred, ...disgust" towards the Party (Orwell, 1949, p.103). Actually, one of the important factors between Winston and his girlfriend Julia was that both of them hated that Party and constantly criticised it. Julia was attracted to Winston once she "knew [he was] against them" (Orwell, 1949, p.203). It became evident that Julia was not true to Winston's party and reversed her original desire to destroy her for being a better member of the parties. The finding of others that believe in the same values as themselves is one of the main unifiers of faith and Orwell utilises this human characteristic to create Ingsoc's theocracy.

The Party's famous campaign term, "Big Brother is Watching You," is also an allusion to the Big Brother as Deity. The belief that God is always observing or monitoring the World is a common method of influencing the Church. This tactic is often utilised by the Party as a Big Brother to alter people's actions by promoting the impression that they are still being stared at. The picture of the Big Brother still seems to be present throughout the Two Minutes Hatred. At these cases, it is placed at the front of the room in the same way as the Catholic crosses represent Jesus at the front of the main altar. Likewise, several Catholic churches still have stone-carved depictions of Jesus or stained-glass windows recounting his biblical account. Orwell's aim was to depict Big Brother in a way that would equate him to the most influential people in Christianity.

The Big Brother as an enigmatic character is one of the main aspects in which he achieves this. Although the Big Brother posters are embossed throughout Oceania, his existence as a physical person is dubious. Winston himself is uncertain of the reality of the Big Brother. The Winston story could be told in line with this interpretation as a story of a man who lost faith in his religion and that religion tried to save him. When prompted by O'Brien, Winston asks his question directly – “Does Big Brother exist?” To which O'Brien responds, “Of course he exists. The Party exists. Big Brother is the embodiment of the Party” (Orwell, 1949, p.334). Naturally, this answer is ineffective to determine whether or not to give a direct answer to Winston's question. The questions about the Big Brother align with the current controversy about God's presence. The people of Oceania are led blindly by their party by the big brother just as members of the Christians pursue their religion on the ground of "faith". Any who do not commit themselves entirely and persuasively to the party is found guilty of "Thought Crime". These citizens, if tried, have been sentenced in Room 101 to torture and re-education. This feature of the novel is possibly influenced by, as has already been described, the Catholic Inquisition and daily practice of communion. Indeed, before O'Brien began interrogation, Winston himself called O'Brien an "inquisitor." (Orwell, 1949, p.320)

Room 101 functions loosely as a heaven and hell allegory, whereas the cell of Winston acts as a bare space similar to the purgatory. One of Winston's descriptors was his incapacities to decide the level of the building on which he was in the Ministry of Love; “He moved himself mentally from place to place, and tried to determine by the feeling of his body whether he was perched high in the air or buried deep underground” (Orwell, 1949, p.320). In Christianity, it is usual to see the paradise as a place above the world, much like Hell is a place commonly identified with grim, hidden environments. Winston's confusion inside his cell represents the same ambiguity as purgatory as a place where a person awaits judgment. In comparison, Purgatory is a Catholic structure, in which the dead are purged before they are called to Heaven. This is also O'Brien's mission in the torment of Winston in room 101 to purify his soul and make him reasonable until his imminent death for reintegration into Oceania's culture. In the eyes of the Party, a reader can conclude that Oceania is a form of Paradise due to its subsequent reintegration to society.

Hell is an iteration of room 101 itself. While Orwell does not generally stick to the damnation representation of hell, he followed an interpretation more similar to that of Dante. Dante's view of hell includes circles much as there are some aspects of Winston's torment in Room 101. Winston describes the beatings as: "Sometimes it was fists, sometimes it was truncheons, sometimes it was steel rods, sometimes it was boots" (Orwell, 1949, p.317). Even as Winston clearly suffers, however, O'Brien exacerbates his torture like that of Dante travelling through Hell's multiple circles. O'Brien then uses a device to impose some other type of pain. This, Winston says, is the feeling of "his body...being wrenched out of shape, the joints...being slowly torn apart" (Orwell, 1949, p.321). Yet, Winston's final and worst circle of Room 101 is what O'Brien describes as, "The worst thing in the world...In your case...the worst thing in the world happens to be rats" (Orwell, 1949, p.357). It is then that Winston is engulfed in Torment when O'Brien turns the rat cage against him.

A widely accepted counterpoint to that *1984* explanation surrounds the strict no-tolerance policy for the religion of the Party, prevalent in totalitarian regimes. And besides, it is incontrovertible that the Party does not endorse any specific faith and has made concerted efforts to destroy remains of religious architecture., Mr. Charrington, by looking on the picture of St. Clements, informed Winston: "There's a lot of [churches] left, really...though they've been put to other uses" (Orwell, 1949, p.179). Although the churches were transformed to other places in Oceania, the inhabitants of London were transformed to believe in Ingsoc. Orwell excludes all other sects from Oceania deliberately to suggest that Ingsoc is the faith above everyone. That is to say, he draws a parallel to the Ten Commandments. The very first commandment is to admit that there is only one God and to deny the presence of a few others. The Party will therefore preserve its people's trust, and expel those who fail.

The names of individual characters also offer additional evidence of divine allegory. Emmanuel Goldstein, for example, has two names reflective of faith. Emmanuel is, first of all, a Hebrew name which translates to "God is with us." Furthermore, Goldstein finishes with a classically Jewish suffix – "stein." The party's adversary was Goldstein in 1984. The figure of Goldstein could reflect a few difficult viewpoints. In the first instance, he may be an allusion to god because of his clearly Jewish name and his vague history. Jesus expanded his teaching and finally received a

following. John Haldane (2005) proposes there is a “parallel to the position of early Christianity in Roman Palestine” (p.265). However, this hypothesis fails since Jesus is a central figure in any aspect of Christendom. However, the interpretation of Goldstein as a representation of the Devil suits the story very carefully. This theory is outlined by Patricia Hill (1984) in describing the community was “conditioned into a zealous worship of Big Brother against the anti-Christ Goldstein...” (p.276). And like Satan was kicked out of Paradise because he did not love humanity, Goldstein was kicked from Oceania to protect the Party. Also, as the Group moves the adversary to justify the original change in their eternal warfare, Goldstein is blamed for false assertions. The Hate Week, for instance, declared that the Oceania War was simply with Eastasia and not with Eurasia. The posters with the wrong faces and the wrong flags were instantly demonstrated by the idea “the agents of Goldstein had been at work!” (Orwell, 1949, p.257).

It is with this circumstance that George Orwell strongly connects the theological allegory with the well-established understanding of *1984* as a totalitarian authoritarian regime. In a newscast reported by the British Broadcasting Corporation in 1941, Orwell is quoted as follows on his view on totalitarianism and religion:

In medieval Europe, the Church dictated what you should believe, but at least it allowed you to retain the same beliefs from birth to death.... Now with totalitarianism, exactly the opposite is true. The peculiarity of the totalitarian state is that though it controls thought, it does not fix it. It sets up unquestionable dogmas, and it alters them from day to day. (Orwell, 1949, p.265)

Orwell refers back to politics in his description of Hate Week, and the Hate Week, despite its flaws, is the perfect instance of the Oceania people actually believing the Party's will. By establishing the totalitarian government as a theocracy, he illustrates how when there is no consistent reality, the most oppressive fascist government emerges. In particular, he utilises this moment to depict the future of an inherently totalitarian society in which a Christian theocracy takes place. It acts as a foreboding sign that theocratic regimes will inevitably turn authoritarian.

The *1984* narrative of George Orwell is also viewed as a cautionary political novel. Principles like double-mindedness appear ever more important for current problems related to "fake news," including the perpetual state of conflict and other "Orwellian" dystopias. However, although Orwell's technology and ideology were not

negated in regards to contemporaries, the allegory of the Christian theocracy in *1984* is still well illustrated. Orwell has finally brought about published work about religious dogma, in particular, that of the Catholic Church. That is, Orwell had published social critiques of everything from dirty postcards to fascism at this point in his career. It would be nonsensical to believe that Orwell did not write a piece on religion for his entire literary life. *1984* is a novel where the result of a totalitarian theocratic Christian government is predicted by George Orwell.

3.3. Secularism, Religion and Class in the *A Clergyman's Daughter*.

A Clergyman's Daughter is a kind of *Bildungsroman* in which the main character, Dorothy Hare, loses her Christian faith. It is a unique novel because one would not expect Orwell to write an entire novel about religion or, for that matter, the Church of England. In several of his essays, he examines the effects of religion, specifically Christianity, on society, arguing that as a charitable and political institution the Church is harmful. In his first novel, *Down and Out in Paris and London*, Orwell objects to the patronising missionaries who force the tramps to attend religious ceremonies before they are given tea. According to Orwell, the Church maintains the status quo (Voorhees, 1961, p.15). Despite his objections to the Church, Orwell is not preoccupied with religion. Therefore, it is strange that he would entitle his second novel *A Clergyman's Daughter*, that he would use the church and its community as part of the setting, and that he would use the loss of Christian faith as one of the main themes in the novel.

It is also a unique novel because it is one of the few novels in the English language in which the heroine has no immediate appeal. Dorothy has the self-righteous piety of Richardson's *Clarissa* but lacks her idealism. She undergoes poverty and suffering similar to Defoe's *Moll Flanders* but lacks Moll's gusto. She performs social and religious duties with a moral condescension similar to Austen's *Emma*, but she does not possess Emma's charm or self-perception. Dorothy is physically and intellectually unattractive. She is rather ordinary,

"a girl of middle height, rather thin, but strong and shapely, and her face was her weak point. It was a thin, blonde, unremarkable kind of face, with pale eyes and a nose just a shade too long; If you looked closely you could see crow's feet round the eyes, and the mouth, when it woe in repose, looked tired" (p.8).

In fact, her only qualities seem to be negative ones. She has an admirable capacity for endurance, and the ability to suffer from stoical fortitude. Yet, such qualities do not stimulate a great deal of veneration, for Borne of her sufferings are obviously avoidable. For example, "her chosen form of self-discipline, her guard against irreverence and sacrilegious thoughts" is to prick her arm with a "long glass-headed pin" (pp.12-13).

Nevertheless, Orwell does evoke some sympathy for Dorothy, despite the fact that she often appears tedious. She attracts readers because of the sufferings and distresses imposed on her by her environment, her upbringing, and her circumstances. Like all of Orwell's main characters, she is a victim of a society that oppresses her. The readers are won over by Dorothy in much the same way they are won over by Clarissa. Both struggle nobly against great obstacles. As the readers are with Clarissa, they are drawn into Dorothy's struggles. That is just as Lovelace is a balance to and a cause of some of Clarissa's problems, Mr. Warburton balances and causes some of Dorothy's problems.

Finally, *A Clergyman's Daughter* is unique because it is the least overtly political of all Orwell's novels. In *Burmese Days*, the antagonist is clearly defined as British imperialism. However, in *A Clergyman's Daughter*, the antagonist is not that clearly defined: it is not simply the capitalist system, though that is the larger structure in which the novel is placed, and Orwell implicitly attacks that structure in the novel. But his attack on capitalism is more sophisticated in later novels, particularly *Coming Up for Air*. Nor is the antagonist in *A Clergyman's Daughter* simply Christianity or the Church of England, though Orwell certainly levels part of his attack against them. As David Buckley (1962) points out in his study of the novel, there is no "assurance that the most important problems confronting the main character can be removed by the reform or overthrow" of capitalism or the Church (p.2).

Dorothy's problems cannot be neatly stamped with a political label. At first glance, she seems to be a rather drab girl in a dreary world. However, a closer examination of Dorothy exposes a more complicated character. The readers could find that Dorothy both reflects her society and stands at some critical distance from it. Like Flory, they could also find that her personal struggles are not disassociated from

various political levels in the novel. Like all of Orwell's novels, *A Clergyman's Daughter* has important political implications. Its message reflects the development of Orwell's politics, though at this stage in his development his sense of politics is not very mature.

Nevertheless, items traditionally associated with politics do exist on various levels in the novel. For example, politics exists on the level of party politics. The best instance of this level is the Blifil- Gordon campaign for parliament, a ludicrous parody of political slogans, speeches, processions, and party rigmarole reminiscent of Dickens' Eatanswill election in *Pickwick Papers*. The class structure of society suggests another political level in the novel. There are essentially four different classes represented in the novel: the middle and upper-middle-class in the village of Knype Hill in Suffolk; the lower-middle-class London suburbanites who bend their children to dingy private schools such as Ringwood House; the lower working-class labouring in the hop fields of Kent; and the class at the very bottom of the social stratum, the tramps at Trafalgar Square.

One of the most important political points of the novel has to do with this class structure. As David Buckley argues, all of the classes suffer from the same disease-impoverishment (Voorhees, 1961, p.3). Just as everyone is a victim of British imperialism in *Burmese Days*. Everyone in *A Clergyman's Daughter* suffers under the weight of bourgeois society, though the effect of such a weight becomes more important in Orwell's next two novels.

Dorothy is the focus of the novel, and insofar as she is a victim of this society and experiences each social class represented in the novel, she serves as an example of the impoverishment caused by such a class structure. Despite the fact that each class is suffering from impoverishment, there is a notable difference between lower-class and middle-class impoverishment. The middle-class suffers from spiritual impoverishment, symbolised first by the decoy of Christianity, specifically St. Athelstan's Church, and second by the shabby, authoritarian Ringwood House Academy. The impoverishment of the lower classes is material. The analysis of *A Clergyman's Daughter* will concentrate on Dorothy as both a representative victim of the spiritual and material impoverishment and as an individual character in opposition to this impoverishment.

The novel moves in a cyclical pattern, a variation of a pattern Orwell himself experienced, which he records in *Down and Out* and *Wigan_Pier*, and a pattern followed by Gordon Comstock in *Keep the Aspidistra Flying*. The main character sinks below his or her own class to a lower class and eventually returns to the original class. Furthermore, the novel moves as a kind of episodic Journey, the Journey of a prodigal daughter. It begins with a detailed account of Dorothy's life in Knype Hill as a pious and faithful servant to her father, the ill-humoured, anachronistic Rector of St. Athelstan's Church. The novel at first describes the phase of Dorothy's life, a day in the life of Dorothy Hare, from half-past five on a cold August morning to midnight that same day. By the time readers finish the first chapter, they know her well, they know her habits, her thoughts, and her environment. One of the things that are impressive about Dorothy is how much she is able to accomplish in one day but equally impressive is how monotonous all her pious thoughts and actions are. Time moves slowly in this phase while Dorothy moves rapidly. Her actions are both calculated and frantic. She lives by rules and lists, she measures out her life with duties—duties for her father, the church, and the community.

The novel marks a sudden and dramatic shift in Dorothy's life. She awakes in London after losing her memory and Joins a group of young tramps lead by Nobby on their way to the Kentish hop fields to try to earn some money by picking hops. The novel also describes the second phase of her life, a down-and-outer among the tramps of England. While a tramp, she regains her memory and appeals to her father for help.

Moreover, the third phase of her life in the novel when her father asks his rich cousin, Sir Thomas Hare, to help Dorothy out of her wretched condition. The cousin rescues her and finds her a Job at Ringwood House Academy, on ugly girls' School run by an even uglier, miserly principal, Mrs. Creevy.

Later on, Orwell shows Dorothy with the help of Mr. Warburton, returns home, which brings readers to the final phase of her life--the return of the prodigal daughter. While she loses her faith already in the novel and while she begins to accept the implications of this loss in subsequent events, however, she does not only accept this loss but understands the reasons for it as well as why she should continue serving her father and his church. Her education is complete.

Despite the rambling, loose structure of the novel, which critics are fond of attacking, (Lee, 1969, p.13) the cyclical pattern provides an essential unity, though the character Dorothy is by far the most important unifying factor in the novel. On the surface, the phases of Dorothy the tramp and Dorothy the school teacher are separate from each other and separate from the first and last phase, Dorothy the faithful servant at Knype Hill. When readers meet her in the advanced events, she is no longer the tedious, bland participant in an even more tedious and bland community. The readers do not sympathise with the Dorothy of inaugural events in the novel. Instead, they stand back and judge her, condemning her martyr complex, her methodical and exaggerated sense of duty, and her self-inflicted sufferings. The readers could be disgusted with her unhealthy commitment to her father, the church, and the community. She is drab, insecure, paranoid- a puritanical spinster afraid of God, afraid of her father, afraid of other men, afraid of herself. She is guilt-ridden and conscience-stricken. She is a stereotyped version of a clergyman's daughter. Indeed, Orwell intends her to be exactly that. The omniscient narrator sarcastically tells us that the bill from Cargill, the butcher, is "one of the chief torments of her life. At all hours of the night or day, it was waiting round the corner of her consciousness, ready to spring upon her and agonise her . . ." (p.6). Such advertent melodrama suggests that Dorothy has, as Warburton claims: "Hypertrophy of the sense of duty . . ." (p.307).

At the beginning of the novel, Orwell satirises Dorothy's piety. Her first ludicrous exhortations to get up in the morning, her self-inflicted pinpricks because she does not want to take the communion chalice after the decrepit Miss Mayfill, and her frantic attempts to make armour and Jackboots out of paper and paste for the church play, all reveal a pathetic girl whose life is even more pathetic because of her passive submission to it. The readers are meant to Judge her harshly, the same way the readers are meant to Judge the miscalculating and meddlesome Emma in Austen's novel.

The readers' attitude toward Dorothy shifts immediately in the later events when they meet her as a down-and-outer. Not only do they pity her for the wretched condition in which she lived as well as for the fact that she has lost her memory, but they also admire her for her ability to survive under such conditions. The description of the second phase of Dorothy's life contains some of the best writing in the entire

novel. It echoes Orwell's own account of his life among the tramps in *Down and Out*, and among hop-pickers in his diary account, "*Hop-Picking*."

One of the most important aspects of this phase in the novel is the strong sense of community people experience with Dorothy among the down-and-outers. The community of pickers gives Dorothy the strength to survive. They accept her as one of them, they give her food, they help her pick the hops when she gets behind, they support her when Nobby is arrested for stealing, they provide her with emotional stability, and they do not ask her questions about her past, despite the fact that her "educated accent" indicates that she is not one of them.

This phase in Dorothy's life, described in the novel, has important political implications, for the community, Dorothy experiences represent the kind of community Orwell admires- a community devoid of political institutions but full of human decency. It is a community of down-and-outer sharing what little they have with each other. Orwell makes it clear in *A Clergyman's Daughter* and in the bulk of his writing that low-class people, those who are politically and economically disenfranchised, have a community. Such people are human beings. They are the proles of *1984*. They are the real heroes and heroines of Orwell's politics, for they manage to survive despite incredible obstacles while they maintain their humanity, their ability to love and care for one another. The contrast between the strong sense of community among the hop-pickers in Kent and the tramps at Trafalgar Square and the lack of community between the middle and upper-middle classes of Knype Hill and Southbridge is intentionally dramatic and essential to readers' understanding the changes that Dorothy undergoes in the novel.

Obviously, the economic exploitation of the hop-pickers is related to the larger political setting in which the novel is placed. The hop-pickers make starvation wages and strikes are impossible. "The pickers had no union, and the foremen of the sets, instead of being paid twopence a bushel like the others, were paid a weekly wage which stopped automatically if there was a strike; so naturally they would raise Heaven and earth to prevent one" (pp.131-132). The whole system is part of an economic structure that keeps the poor poor and the rich rich. However, Orwell understands this structure well enough to realise that it is not simply a matter of the farmer's greediness;

the low price of hops was the source of the problem since it was not the farmers who were to blame. (p.132)

Despite the exploitation of the hop-pickers and, to some extent, because of it, these people have a nobility about them. This nobility is an essential part of Orwell's own political consciousness, for he is suspicious of political Institutions but confident about man's basic humanity. Part of the message of *A Clergyman's Daughter* indeed a message recurring in all of his novels, is the need for a humane community. This message is a vital aspect of the politics in Orwell's fiction.

However, *A Clergyman's Daughter* intensifies the political message Orwell make about the community of brothers and sisters among the down-and-outers. It is an obvious attempt at an experiment in the novel form. Although this experiment is not prepared for, it works effectively to make an important political point, despite most of the critical objection to it. (Woodcock, 1966, p.133) Orwell himself admits in a letter to Henry Miller in 1936: "My third book, *A Clergyman's Daughter*, which came out in England about a year ago, was published in America last week. That book is bollox, but I made some experiments in It that were useful'.to me" (CE, I, p.229). Chapter Three is one of those experiments. In Section I of that chapter, Orwell drops his omniscient narrator and shifts suddenly to a theatrical style:

(Scene: Trafalgar Square. Dimly visible through the mist, a dozen people, Dorothy among them, are grouped about one of the benches near the north parapet.)

Charlie (singing): "'Ail Mary, 'ail Mary, 'a-il Ma-ary" (BigBen strikes ten.)

Snouter (mimicking the noise): "Ding dong, ding dong! Shut your-noise, can't you? Seven more hours of it on this-square before we got the chance of a set-down and a bit of sleep! Cripes!"(p.167)

And so it goes. The effect is Jolting. Orwell removes the guiding narrator, forcing the reader to enter the scene and imposing on the reader the task of doing what the narrator has done up to this point. The distance that an omniscient narrator traditionally provides is overtaken. The meaningless drivel of London's bums is set down in raw, impressionistic realism. At first glance, it is monotonous and empty, like the cheap chatter of the British functionaries in Burma. At second glance, it represents one of the most important sections in the novel. Beneath their sleazy dialogue emerges a sense of community, a sense of sharing. They understand each other. They are

communicating, despite the fact that each lives in his own fantasy. For example, Mr. Tallboys, the defrocked minister who continues to spout religious Jargon, cares for his "flock" in a way that Dorothy's father is never able to care for his. Mr. Tallboys is one with his own kind of people. He does not despise them the way Charles Hare despises his congregation. Not only do these bums communicate through their inane drivel, but they also share what little they have. They sleep together to provide warmth from the cold nights, they pool their money so that they can buy tea in the morning, and, like the hop-pickers, they accept Dorothy without any questions. They are pathetic but touching.

This brief interlude not only intensifies the community of these bums, but it also gives to them and their community a sense of permanence. This section stands out from the rest of the novel, and it can be read as a separate unit. Further, it provides this community with a sense of timelessness. Throughout the novel, time is an important factor. At the beginning of the novel time is stretched out into a long day in which every thought, feeling, and action of Dorothy is presented. Away from home, the prodigal daughter encounters many different experiences and meets many different people. In this phase, time moves rapidly, covering almost a year of her life. The next phase in the novel summarises the ten days she spends with the bums at Trafalgar Square but the first section of this phase, which runs for some thirty-four pages of dialogue, covers only one night and part of the next morning. The importance of this section is that this is the way it is every night, every morning, every day. Their life goes on in this dreary pattern day after day after day. Orwell has captured the permanence of it by separating it from the rest of the novel.

Although the sudden stylistic shift in the novel appears abruptly with no previous indication that such a shift is coming, the functional importance of this experiment is very similar to the inaugural of the novel, which minutely details Dorothy's daily duties, thoughts, and feelings. Such details create the same sense of timelessness. In the inaugural of *A Clergyman's Daughter*, Dorothy appears trapped in a maze of mundane obligations. Later on, in the novel, the frozen permanence of the bums crystallises the cold reality of their poverty. Orwell reiterates this permanence, this tirelessness, by beginning the third phase of her life in the novel with: "And so it goes on" (p.200). The point is that these people exist continually. The structure of

society has created a class of bums like the poor that are always with us. They not only serve as a constant indictment against jetty but also as a reminder to the rest of society that, despite their material wretchedness, these people have a community that is far more humane, far more decent, than the rest of society. This is a major political message of *A Clergyman's Daughter*.

The importance of this message for Dorothy is that she learns by personal involvement the significance of such a community. She does not preach this message; she does not even articulate it. She practices it, first at Ringwood House as a teacher in private school and second as a clergyman's daughter back home at Knype Hill. This is her politics of faith, faith in people and in the necessity of serving and helping people, not out of a religious sense of duty but out of a love for her fellow human beings.

Dorothy Hare is certainly not a model of a liberated woman, but liberation, Orwell understands, is extremely difficult, if not impossible, in the world of *A Clergyman's Daughter*, nevertheless, implicit in the whole of Orwell's novels is the point that man has an obligation to struggle for liberation, both personal liberation and the liberation of society. According to Orwell, one cannot be separated from the other. As it could have been seen, Flory struggles for his liberation and loses. Dorothy struggles for hero and vino, though her victory is very limited. Regardless, it is a rather impressive victory given her environment and given the nature of her struggles.

Apart from the most immediate and obvious problems Dorothy faces in the novel—her poverty, her loss of memory—there are two major problems she struggles with, although the second one is by far more serious than the first. Her first major problem is her frigidity, which David Buckley (p.6) discusses at some length in his section on *A Clergyman's Daughter*. The second major problem is her loss of faith. Both problems are related to the socio-political world in which she lives.

Dorothy's frigidity is classic. It reflects her cold environment. As a young girl, she realises that the marriage of her father and mother "had been diabolically unhappy" (p.23). "She could remember, as clearly as though it were yesterday, certain dreadful scenes between her father and mother—scenes that she had witnessed when she was no more than nine years old" (p.93). Dorothy's father not only oppresses her mother, who dies several years after the Hare family moves to Knype Hill, but he also oppresses

Dorothy to such an extent that she grows up lacking self-confidence. She is haunted by the same insecurity that haunts Flory, and this in-security appears in the other main characters in Orwell's novels. Dorothy grows up in the prudish atmosphere of her father's home, the arid atmosphere of a decaying church, and the narrow-minded, gossipy atmosphere of a gloomy society. Furthermore, her associations with men usually lead to unpleasant, though traditional, sexual exploitation: "Dorothy was all too used to it—all too used to the fattish middle-aged men, with their fishily hopeful eyes, who slowed down their cars when you passed them on the road, or who manoeuvred an introduction and then began pinching your elbow about ten minutes afterwards" (p.92). The rakish Mr. Warburton typified such exploitation.

The sterility of Dorothy's environment and the attempts to use her sexually cause her to withdraw from sexual involvement with men. And her puritanical upbringing causes her to have a masochistic sense of duty. She compensates for her personal insecurity and her frigidity by developing religious piety, which seems to give her identity and a certain amount of sexual release. But her religious piety is fragile, easily shattered by a confrontation with a different society, a different set of values, a different kind of faith. The community Dorothy experiences in the hop- fields and at Trafalgar Square is a community of friends not hound by a sense of duty to religious dogma. They are hound by faith in each other. Dorothy's loss of religious faith is replaced by this new faith. Not only does she gain a new faith, she gains a sense of confidence in herself.

In the inaugural scenes of *A Clergyman's Daughter*, Dorothy is a stereotyped product of her environment. She can only understand the prick of a pin and the chastisement of a biblical verse: "Yes, it was discouraging work, so discouraging that at times it would have seemed altogether futile if she had not known the sense of futility for what it is—the subtlest weapon of the Devil" (p.50). The fear of Hell and the expectation of Heaven are her rationalised motivating forces. Her commitment to Christianity requires her to sell her soul and to sacrifice her individual freedom.

However, Dorothy's character undergoes a major development. Her change is sudden, but not unprepared. The opening passage of the novel portends the dramatic change that occurs later in events of the novel: "As the alarm clock on the chest of

drawers exploded like a horrid little bomb of bell metal, Dorothy, wrenched from the depths of some complex, troubling dream, awoke with a start and lay on her back looking into the darkness in extreme exhaustion" (p.5) She awakes exhausted from the futility of her duty-bound existence. This exhaustion partly explains her attack of amnesia in the novel (Voorhees, 1968, p.12).

The changes that Dorothy goes through as a hop-picker, tramp, and school teacher are described rather than analysed, neither the narrator nor Dorothy explains her loss of faith. At this stage in her life, she is not capable of intellectually comprehending this loss. It happens. She suddenly realises that prayer no longer works for her:

arrested her. Prayer—In those days it had been the very source and centre of her life. In trouble or In happiness, it was to prayer that she had turned. And she realized—the first time that it had crossed her mind—that she had not uttered a prayer since leaving home, not even since her memory had come back to her. Moreover, she was aware that she had no longer the smallest impulse to pray. Mechanically, she began a whispered prayer, and stopped almost instantly; the words were empty and futile. Prayer, which had been the mainstay of her life, had no meaning for her any longer. (p.152)

Her response to this loss is rather matter-of-fact. It is not shocking or haunting, for Dorothy had to think about her future from now on (p.152).

It is only when Warburton picks her up at Ringwood House to return her to Knype Hill that he begins to give an analysis of her loss of faith. The analysis is prompted mainly by Mr. Warburton, who forces her to look inward, to give reasons for her thoughts and actions. Her self-awareness is explained in the latest events of the novel. Nevertheless, awareness is still fairly vague and unsophisticated, and the narrator sees little need to supply a more complete explanation. The new Dorothy lives more by instinct and feelings than by a set of rules—a direct contrast to the first phase of her life. While riding on the train back to Knype Hill with Mr. Warburton, she realises the "truism that all real happenings are in the mind ..." (p.294). Of course, Warburton does not understand. Her decision to return home and to pick up where she

left off strikes him as being "downright septic." "You've a sort of mental gangrene," he exclaims, "hanging over from your Christian upbringing" (p. 299).

His analysis is correct, but he fails to take into consideration Dorothy's character. His marriage proposal further indicates his inability to understand her. However, she understands his motives as well as her own. She recognises "that all he had sold had been no more than a trick to play upon her feelings and cajole her into saying that she would marry him; and what was stranger yet, that he had sold it without seriously caring whether she married him or not. He had, in fact, merely been amusing himself" (p.306). She answers his charge of hypocrisy by saying, "I do feel that that kind of work, even if it means saying prayers that one doesn't always think are true—I do feel that in a way it's useful" (p.307).

She has learned the lesson of usefulness earlier at Ringwood House, even though she is eventually forced to give in to Mrs. Creevy's wishes and even though she is eventually fired. Now she realises that although "her faith had left her, she had not changed, could not change, did not want to change, the spiritual background of her mind; that her cosmos, though now it seemed to her empty and meaningless, was still in a sense the Christian cosmos; that the Christian way of life was still the way that must come naturally to her" (p.308). Her self-education is complete. She comes back to serve mankind in her own pitiful little way because that is what she knows how to do. She can be useful, not in some grand revolutionary way, but simply by performing small acts of kindness. She comes back to attempt to build the kind of community she experiences in phase two of her life. She gains a humanitarian faith, a faith in herself and in her fellow man.

Orwell agrees with Karl Marx that "religion is the opium of the people." In an essay on Malcolm Muggeridge's *The Thirties*. Written five years after the publication of *A Clergyman's Daughter*. Orwell writes: "Religious belief, in the form, in which we had known it, had to be abandoned." It has to be abandoned because it is "in essence a lie, a semi-cons cloud device for keeping the rich rich and the poor poor. The poor were to be contented with their poverty, because it would all be made up to them in the world beyond the grave, usually pictured as something mid-way between Kew

Gardens and a Jeweller's shop." The entire fabric of a capitalist society is covered by this lie. Orwell says, and it is "necessary to rip [it] out" (CE, II, p.15).

Orwell recognises an equally important a misconception that many of his left-wing contemporaries refuse to deal with adequately, and that is that the opium of religion has to be replaced by something better. According to Orwell, it is necessary to realise "that man does not live by bread alone, that hatred is not enough, that a world worth living in cannot be founded on realism and machine-guns" (CE, II, p.10). This is precisely the realisation Dorothy gains: "She did not reflect, consciously, that the solution to her difficulty lay in accepting the fact that there was no solution; that if one gets on with the Job that lies at hand, the ultimate purpose of the Job fades into insignificance; that faith and no faith are very much the same provided that one is doing what is customary, useful and acceptable. She could not formulate these thoughts as yet, she could only live them" (pp.318-319). Insofar as she does live them, she is the heroine of the novel.

Dorothy's new faith is a major accomplishment, although she is not able to overcome her frigidity. Of course, Warburton's final attempt to seduce her reinforces her fear of men and her understanding of sexual exploitation. Her decision to return to Knype Hill is a manifestation of her new faith. Nevertheless, Orwell's resolution in the novel is somewhat ambiguous. He creates a monotonous world, he places the drab Dorothy in that world with very little choice, and then he seems to affirm that world by having Dorothy return to it. While Orwell clearly exposes the dreary injustices of this world, he is ambivalent about what possible alternatives there are in *A Clergyman's Daughter*. Clearly, the alternative of a revolution is not yet realised by Orwell, and when this alternative is realised in *Animal Farm* and *1984* it is very grotesque.

However, Dorothy's decision to return to Knype Hill is not an indication of Orwell's affirmation of that society. Orwell condemns the sterile society of Knype Hill and its antiseptic influence on Dorothy, but he also indicates that Dorothy's decision to return home is the only viable decision she could make. In a sense, she is fated to return to a duty-bound existence, yet this existence has a touch of nobility and decency about it. The point is that the community Dorothy returns to is not a community in any meaningful sense of the term. She affirms herself and her new role in that community,

but she does not affirm that community. Dorothy's experiences away from Knype Hill have given her a new recognition of her place in that society, a new desire to work toward building a decent community. She is a positive answer to Flory's suicide. Flory could not find a community; Dorothy experiences a community, and this experience leads her to commit herself to the dull, routine, difficult work of attempting to establish a community at Knype Hill. However, Dorothy's noble decision is not the choice of a martyr. It is a choice based on a new self-awareness. Her escapades away from Knype Hill led her to the conclusion that "after all—and here lay the trouble— she was the same girl. Beliefs change, thoughts change, but there is some inner part of the soul that does not change. Faith vanishes, but the need for faith remains the same as before" (p.315). She satisfies this necessity to faith by a decision to be useful, by developing a new faith in her own ability to serve mankind: "How can anything dismay you if only there is some purpose in the world which you can serve and which, while serving it, you can understand? Your whole life is illumined by that sense of purpose" (p.315).

Orwell understands the difficulty of building a decent community, but he also understands that a revolt from one's oppressive society is equally difficult, difficult because of the nature of society and difficult because a successful revolt requires the same kind of disciplined dedication exemplified by Dorothy. In *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* and in *Animal Farm*, Orwell explores the difficulties of a successful rebellion. In *A Clergyman's Daughter*, he explores the possibilities for the usefulness of a girl who has been tyrannised by her environment.

Although Orwell becomes increasingly more concerned with political tyranny in later novels, tyranny already exists in *A Clergyman's Daughter*—a tyranny of the Rector over his daughter, the tyranny of the Church over its subjects, the tyranny of man over woman, tyranny of a class structure, and tyranny of education. Dorothy's decision is practical, but it is also necessary. She decides to help build a society in which tyranny does not exist. There is one major difference between the practicalness of the parents of the children at Ringwood House and Dorothy's practical decision—the one fosters tyranny, the other fosters a break from tyranny. She learns this difference at Ringwood House in her lives:

For she had grasped now that it is easy enough to keep children in order if you are ruthless with them from the start. Last term the girls had behaved badly, because she had started by treating them as human beings, and later on, when the lessons that interested them were discontinued, they had rebelled like human beings. But if you are obliged to teach children rubbish, you mustn't treat them as human beings. You must treat them like animals—driving, not persuading. Before all else, you must teach them that It is more painful to rebel than to obey... But she had not become cynical as yet. She still knew that these children were the victims of a dreary swindle, still longed if it had been possible, to do something better for them. (p.281).

Dorothy's ability to remain positive, not to become cynical, is a major indication of her victory. Dorothy does not become a tyrant, nor she does consciously or unconsciously revolt from the tyranny around her, though her attack of amnesia eventually causes a kind of revolt. In fact, the attack itself is a kind of revolt. There are simply no exits for Dorothy. She has two choices: to commit suicide like Flory or to return to Knype Hill and attempt to do something useful to overcome tyranny. She places her homely faith in herself, her people, and in the tasks that are before her. The politics of Dorothy's new faith is the essence of her humanness. Therefore, due to all these miserable circumstances and strict religious fanaticism which Dorothy has experienced, so she preferred to be a secular one, but not to leave her religion in all its aspects.

Consequently, Orwell objects to Communism and Catholicism because he thinks that both are the reasons for the downfall of societies. In this chapter, the analysis is centred on the ideas of religion and secularism in *Animal Farm*, *1984*, and *A Clergyman's Daughter*. Since Orwell abhors religion, his novels almost have indirect religious allusions except *A Clergyman's Daughter*. Yet, Orwell argues that despite the absence of religion, the corrupted political regimes lead people to substitute religion with secularist doctrines in society. Communism becomes the religion in Orwell's novels. Orwell rejects the fact that the church kept the destitute in constant slavery, uncivilised, uneducated, and dependent. The three novels discussed reveal how the negative side that the religious institutions practiced upon the societies have driven the characters to lose faith in religion.

CONCLUSION

Secularisation is no longer confined to the decline of religion, and it is also not restricted for a particular culture or society. The most powerful criticism that secularisation faced is that religion has started to be considered as a dependent variable entity revealed only in a reactive sense to the procedures of urbanisation, increased prosperity, rationalisation, and the growth of education in the modern age. Therefore, secularisation has undergone numerous developments as well, and these changes took different historical transformations. The emergence of social sciences and the decline of religion in the first half of the nineteenth century collaborated in the course of nation-state construction of European secular cultures. Over the course of its development, secularisation has been given six main perspectives: "as a decline in religion," as compliance with this realm of the world," "as the disenchantment of this world," "as the compartmentalisation of religious perception within culture or society," "as a way of transferring determined religious practices," and "as a substitute for modernisation."

To admit the anti-religious atheism of Marxists, Marx's secularisation has been discussed as a tool to recall his critique of religion. Referring to Marx's secularisation also indicates the quality of his materialism that proceeds from irreligious materialism not just for the reason that it varies with its inferences, but also it reflects ontological supposition a distraction from much demanding emphasis on material conditions. It appeared that secular prejudice is dominant in the readings of Marx's works, and that placed him either as a social scientist replacing mystery with science, a hater of religion, a thinker of capital's secularising power, relentlessly secular or as a messianic philosopher whose Liberator was communism. These statements gloss over Marx's intense intellectual construction through his involvement with criticisms of religion.

The modern Marxist approach presents a formation of the scientific approach that goes beyond the shortcomings that originated in both the positivist or historicist opinions of science. This formation offers the idea that it is still part of reality that people use their intelligence in an effort to overpower (transcend) it. In the theory of Marxism, almost from the beginning, the critical investigation of religion has played a great part within all tendencies. Critics have been trying to construct links between Christianity and Marxism. Marxists' interpretations of religion have commonly taken

two formulations: descriptive, this means religion is reviewed as a mutable within a leading method of production; secondly, evaluative: considering religion to be a tradition of alienation, in which to be resolved by the advent of a new model of generations that have themselves overcome the origins of religious alienation

Consequently, religious fanaticism in the worldwide leads secularise the societies and help to animate secularism and the appearance of postsecularism which combine and unify between religion and religions. Thus, with the advancement of the theories of secularisation, especially in Western countries, many literary works started to tackle the subject of science and its conflict with religious beliefs. One of those literary writers who depicted such themes in his novels is Don DeLillo. In his *Libra*, DeLillo tackles the religious side in the assassination of Kennedy. This incident, in *Libra*, is no different from any religious mystery that is heavily shrouded and radiantly overdetermined. The novel presents both a critique of secret histories and parodies such as mythmaking, presenting a plausible secret history. DeLillo, in his *Libra*, relies on Gnosticism's redoubled warning about fake creations, their construction of domains within other spheres, and their archetypes of inside rebellion, where authority against corruption is raised from inside it. DeLillo's main structure of *Libra* giving credibility to this intuition, changing chapters between the private world of Oswald and the agent's secret world in which Oswald eventually recruited. The fundamental standard of a world within the world is coherent with the intertwining domains of Gnosticism, jailing and trapping people in the material world.

In *Mao II* DeLillo focuses on risks and catastrophes resulted from the advancement of machinery. He presents media as a key factor in the advancement of a country's political, economic culture, and it also plays an important part in the socialisation of its people; the ability of media to spread in a whole society has made it an important instrument in bridging social gaps, forging national identities, and sparking political change. He also stresses on the significance of the novelist's position in shaping human culture, and human consciousness. Dark news concerning a terrorist action guides Bill directly to the domain outside the artistic domain and therefore directs him into international politics. The dark, false news lead the protagonist of the novel to his death. The terrorists were portrayed as having the control to form the personality and the opinions of people, that is similar to Gray's statement that the

novelist's power lies in his ability to change the inner life of the culture. On the other hand, DeLillo employed a female character whose name is Brita Nilsson as a foil to Bill Gray. Karen joined the terrorist group because of the news that the terrorist group broadcasted. The conflict between the secular and religious media is the central theme of *Mao II*.

Underworld is a salient instance of how a literary work contributes to the structure of this postsecular moment. Both Martin Buber and McClure refer to "turning" as a person's experience of religious reorientation. These experiences are a recognising characteristic of postsecular fictions. The postsecular features appear as the identification that people are and continuously have been absorbent, in spite of their demands to modern autonomy. In this novel, the secular often displaces or substitutes for religion. The characters of the novel cling to paranoia in the manner for arranging chaos as a replacement to the security of religious tradition. In this novel, the idea of moving forward seems very postsecular. The nun's experience is more radical than Nick's. Sister Edgar dies immediately after her turning, and she enters cyberspace instead of heaven, which is the key idea of the post-secular concept.

On the other hand, Orwell's attitude is not in line with DeLillo's. It is no surprise that Orwell despised communism and Catholicism at the same time. In his main novels, Orwell referred to the religious authority of the church as a part of the corruption of the governments. Orwell viewed the Church as its own authoritarian regime. Because the Catholic Church supported fascism, Orwell considered it impossible to associate religion with socialism. Orwell transforms this view in his novel *Animal Farm*. By giving the raven the name Moses in *Animal Farm*, Orwell wanted to show the false promises that the breaches are given to middle and low classes. Giving the raven this biblical name, Orwell wanted to construct the image of the church in function. The use of a character like Moses is to symbolically refer to the church as a mean to control the low class. The statements used by the raven are the ones that made the poor morally contempt. It is one of the ways that the church uses to keep the poor in constant slavery with low wages. The thing that made the low class believe in them is the divine reward. When the pigs took control in the farm, they act like seculars, they did not believe in the raven, but they did not kick him out as well, and that is the depiction of secularisation. The satiric character of Moses the raven

perhaps parodies earnest Christian evangelists who promise the faithful a delightful heaven in the form of Sugarcandy Mountain where all animals supposedly go after they die.

In *1984*, the Big Brother is characterised to assume a divine role. However, the old churches in the novel are either ruined or converted to secular institutes. The images of the church indicate that religious belief is no longer feasible in today's world and that it is not thus a force that forms Western people's mind, heart and imagination. However, Orwell's anti-Catholicism was understandable and very much in vogue. His assault is against not so much a certain belief-system as the repression of democracy and lack of personal choice. Whether by threatening or conditioning of the adherents of any scheme, religious or democratic. The struggle between Big Brother and the Inner Party's members creates a universal conflict between the forces of darkness versus light. The Church images—relics of the transcendental mythos of Christianity recall an earlier age when belief in a God Incarnate infused sacramental meaning into every aspect of temporal reality. The Citizens of the fictional city in the novel are occupied with the belief that Big Brother, God is always watching them. The questions about the Big Brother align with the current controversy about God's presence. The people of Oceania are led blindly by their party by the big brother just as members of the Christians pursue their religion on the ground of "faith."

In *A Clergyman's Daughter*, the novel moves as a kind of episodic Journey, the Journey of a prodigal daughter. The readers are introduced to the character of Dorothy. The readers could be disgusted with her unhealthy commitment to her father, the church, and the community. She is drab, insecure, paranoid- a puritanical spinster afraid of God, afraid of her father, afraid of other men, afraid of herself. She is guilt-ridden and conscience-stricken. She is a stereotyped version of a clergyman's daughter. The new community gives Dorothy the strength to survive. They accept her as one of them, they give her food, they help her pick the hops when she gets behind, they support her when Nobby is arrested for stealing, they provide her with emotional stability, and they do not ask her questions about her past, despite the fact that her "educated accent" indicates that she is not one of them. *A Clergyman's Daughter* is made clear by Orwell and in the bulk of his writing that low-class people, those who are politically and economically disenfranchised, have a community. At the end of the

novel, Dorothy changes she gives up her religious beliefs as soon as she realises that it was the constrain that kept controlled her life and caused her doom. Therefore, Dorothy decides to convert to secularism and to be a secular person and intends to establish a new life out of Christianity creeds.

The six novels, *Libra*, *Mao II*, *Underworld*, *Animal Farm*, *1984* and *A Clergyman's Daughter* share similar points of view in terms of the rejection of religious fanaticism and political corruption, and the establishment of a novel society where secularism prevails. They explore the religious negative practices and shed light on the prevailing religious media and its secular counterpart, and emphasise the influence of media on individuals' behaviours and decisions. On the other hand, the novels examine the postsecular period in which massive shifts take place in society, and secularism does not outcast religion. Instead, that period witnesses a state of co-existence named as a secular-religious society. The two authors Don DeLillo and George Orwell emphasise the rejection of religious fanaticism and the acceptance of modernity. Consequently, both authors attempt to bridge the gap between secular society and the religious one, state and religion, and future that bears historical nature. Thus, they attempt to create a novel open-minded society that accepts the others' ideas, beliefs, history and visions. Don DeLillo and George Orwell both agree in terms of secularism, and promote their related beliefs in their eminent literary works. Both authors emphasise the belief that the new secular generation would be the future of life where neither racism nor religious fanaticism does exist. Therefore, secularisation can be considered as a solution through which religious fanaticism can be eliminated in the long run, and the foundations of an educated and racism-free society can also be laid.

REFERENCES

- Adam, B. (1982). The Art of Fiction CXXXV: Don DeLillo. *Conversations with Don DeLillo* 3(8). 86-108.
- Agote, P. (2010). The notion of secularization: Drawing the boundaries of its contemporary scientific validity. *Current Sociology* 3(2), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114533333>
- Asad, T. (2003). *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- Beckford, J. A. (2003). *Social theory and religion*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bellah, R. N. (1964). Religious evolution. *American Sociological Review*, 29(3), 358. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091480>
- Bhaskar, R. (1989). *Reclaiming reality: A critical introduction to contemporary philosophy*. Taylor & Francis.
- Bilgrami, A. (2011). Secularism, liberalism, and relativism. *A Companion to Relativism*, 326-345. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444392494.ch17>
- Bizzini, S. C. (1995). Can the intellectual still speak? The example of Don DeLillo's *Mao II*. *Critical Quarterly*, 37(2), 104-117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8705.1995.tb01061.x>
- Blanshard, P. (1952). Communism, democracy, and Catholic power.
- Bloom, H. (1982). *Agon: Towards a theory of revisionism*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Boxall, P. (2006). *Don DeLillo: The possibility of fiction*. Routledge.
- Brown, W. (2014). Is Marx (Capital) secular? *Qui Parle*, 23(1), 109-124. <https://doi.org/10.5250/quiparle.23.1.0109>
- Buber, M. (1958). *Prophecy, apocalyptic, and historical hour. On Judaism*. Syracuse.
- Costa, P. (2015). The joy of secularism: 11 essays for how we live now. *Common Knowledge*, 21(1), 116-117. <https://doi.org/10.1215/0961754x-2818273>
- Crick, B. R. (1980). *George Orwell*. Prabhat Prakashan.
- DeCurtis, A. (1988). An outsider in this society. *Introducing Don DeLillo*, 43-66. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822381679-003>
- DeLillo, D. (1988). *Libra*. Penguin.
- DeLillo, D. (1991). *Mao II*. Penguin.

- DeLillo, D. (1997). *Underworld*. Simon and Schuster.
- Durkheim, E. (1967). *Sociologie et philosophie*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Duvall, J. N. (2003). Introduction: The power of history and the persistence of mystery. *The Cambridge Companion to Don DeLillo*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ccol9780521870658.001>
- Edmundson, M. (1995). Not Flat, Not Round, Not There: Don DeLillo's Novel Characters. *Yale Review*, 83 (2), 107-24.
- Evans, M (2011). Media framing in religious–secular conflict in Turkey and Israel. *International Political Science Review*, 36(2), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512113512147>
- Fessenden, T. (2007). *Culture and redemption: Religion, the secular, and American literature*. Princeton University Press.
- Feuerbach, J. (2004). *Post-secularism, realism and utopia: Transcendence and immanence from Hegel to Bloch*. Routledge.
- Goldstein, W. (2005). An interview with Don DeLillo. *Contemporary Literature*, 23(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1208140>
- Gregory, B. S. (2012). *The unintended Reformation: How a religious revolution secularized society*. Harvard University Press.
- Haldane, J. (2005). *Nineteen Eighty-Four, Catholicism, and the Meaning of Human Sexuality*. Princeton University Press.
- Harren, G. (2016). *Cosmological metafiction: Gnosticism in Don DeLillo's Libra* (Doctoral Thesis). http://www.exhibit.xavier.edu/english_faculty.
- Herren, G. (2016). *The self-reflexive art of Don DeLillo*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Hervieu, E. D., & Willaime, J. P. (2001) *Sociologies et religion. Approches classiques*. Presses Universitaires de France
- Hill, P. (1984). Religion and Myth in Orwell's 1984. *Social Theory and Practice*, 273-287.
- Hobbes, T. (1962). *Leviathan*, New York (Collier Books) 1962.
- Hutcheon, L. (1989). The politics of Postmodernism: Parody and history. *Cultural Critique*, (5), 179. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354361>
- Jonas, H. (2001). *The gnostic religion: The message of the alien god & the beginnings of Christianity*. Beacon Press.

- Kaya, R., & Çakmur, B. (2010). Politics and the mass media in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, 11(4), 521-537. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2010.540112>
- Keeseey, D. (1993). *Don DeLillo*. Twayne Publishers.
- Kors, Alan. (1976). *D'Holbach's Coterie: An enlightenment in Paris*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kurtz, P. (1991). *Toward a new enlightenment: Philosophy of Paul Kurtz*. Routledge.
- Lash, S. (2002). *Critique of Information. Theory, Culture & Society*. Sage Press.
- Laski, H. J. (1944). Faith, reason, and civilization.
- Lee, R. (1969). *Orwell's Fiction*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Livergood, N. D. (1967). The difference between the Democritean and epicurean philosophy of nature in general. *Activity in Marx's Philosophy*, 63-76. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-5059-2_6
- Ludwig, K. (2009). Don DeLillo's "Underworld" and the postsecular in contemporary fiction. *Religion and Literature* 41(3). 82-91
- Martin, D. (1979) *A general theory of secularization*. Harper.
- Marx, K. (1975). "Difference between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature." In *Collected Works*, 1(2). 1835-1843.
- Marx, Karl, Philip S. Foner, and R. Landor. 1972. "Two Neglected Interviews with Karl Marx." *Science & Society* 36 (1): 3-28.
- Mathewson, G. F., & Ralph, A. Winter (1984). *An Economic Theory of Vertical Restraints*, *Rand Journal of Economics*, 15, 27-38.
- McClure, A. (1991). Postmodern romance Don DeLillo and the Age of Conspiracy. *Introducing Don DeLillo*, 99-115. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822381679-006>
- McClure, J. A. (2007). *Partial faiths: Postsecular fiction in the age of Pynchon and Morrison*. University of Georgia Press.
- McCrary, C., & Wheatley, J. (2017). The protestant secular in the study of American religion: Reappraisal and suggestions. *Religion*, 47(2), 256-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0048721x.2016.1244124>
- McLellan, D. (1987). *Marxism and religion: A description and assessment of the Marxist critique of Christianity*. Springer.
- Miller, J. H. (2002). *On Literature. Thinking in Action*. Routledge
- Modern, J. L. (2011). *Secularism in Antebellum America*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nadel, I. (2002). *The Baltimore catechism; or comedy in Underworld*. Associated UP

- Nisbet, R. A. (1974). *The sociology of Emile Durkheim*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Donnell, P. (2000). *Latent destinies: Cultural paranoia and contemporary U.S. narrative*. Duke University Press.
- Orwell, G. (1981). Such, such were the joys. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children*, 2(3/4), 48-51.
- Osteen, M. (2000). *American magic and dread: Don DeLillo's dialogue with culture*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Plessner, E. (1970). Laughing and crying. A study of the limits of human behaviour, by Helmuth Plessner. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 3(2), 204-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071773.1972.11006257>
- Pollack, D. (2015). Secularization. *Oxford Bibliographies Online Datasets*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199756384-0073>
- Quispel, G. (2005). Gnosticism: From Its Origins to the Middle Ages. *The Gale Encyclopedia of Religion*, 5, 3507-3515.
- Rene, G. (1977). *Violence and the sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. John Hopkins.
- Ritzer, G. (1992). *Classical Sociological Theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Roberts, R. (1999). Marxism, structuralism and humanism. *Marxism and History*, 108-128. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4039-1379-1_7
- Rodden, J. (1984). Orwell on Religion: The Catholic and Jewish Questions. *College Literature*, 11(1), 44-58.
- Rodden, J. (1984). Orwell on Religion: The Catholic and Jewish Questions. *College Literature*, 11(1), 44-58.
- Stark, R. (1999). Secularization, rip. *Sociology of religion*, 60(3), 249-273.
- Secord, A. (2015). *Civilized Music: Postsecularism and the Humoured Body in Don DeLillo's Underworld, Thomas Pynchon's Vineland, and David Foster Wallace's Infinite Jest* (Doctoral Dissertation). Dalhousie University. <https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/bitstream/handle/10222/56306/Secord-Amanda-MA-ENGL-2015.pdf;sequence=1>
- Shiner, L. (1967). The concept of secularization in empirical research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 6(2), 207. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1384047>
- Springs, J. A. (2017). Elizabeth Shakman Hurd : Beyond religious freedom: The new global politics of religion. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University press, 2015. Pp.

- 200.). *The Review of Politics*, 79(2), 316-319. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0034670516001200>
- Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1998). *A secular age*. Harvard University Press.
- Thomas A. (2005). *Conversations with Don DeLillo*. Penguin. Voegelin, E. (1956) Order and history. Louisiana State University
- Valletta, C. (1998). A “Christian Dispersion” in Don DeLillo's *The Names*. *Christianity & Literature*, 47(4), 403-425.
- Voorhees, R. J. (1986). *The Paradox of George Orwell*. Purdue University Press.
- Weber, M. (1988). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*. JC Mohr
- Weir, T. H. (2015). Germany and the new global history of secularism: Questioning the postcolonial genealogy. *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, 90(1), 6-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00168890.2014.986431>
- Whitehead, A. N. (1996). *Religion in the making*. Cambridge University Press.
- Woodcock, G. (1984). *The crystal spirit: a study of George Orwell*. Schocken.
- Yelle, R. A. (2013). Orientalism and the language of disenchantment. *The Language of Disenchantment*, 3-32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199924998.003.0001>

CURRICULUM VITAE

Abbas Chnani was born in Kut, Iraq on May 17th, 1987. He received his BA in the English Language from Wasit University and his MA in English Language and literature from Karabuk University. He has attended several conferences on English Language and Literature. He worked as an English teacher in primary school for eleven years, but now he is working as an English teacher in AL- Jihad intermediate school. He has the intention to apply for a PhD in English literature to extend his research. His fields of interest also include English and American Literature with a specific concern upon Postmodern Literature; Mysteries and Romance Novels.