



**A NEW HISTORICAL READING OF TWO
POSTMODERN NOVELS: LORD OF THE FLIES
AND 1984**

**2023
MASTER'S THESIS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

Emre Can ŞENEL

**Thesis Advisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavghah Ghulam SAEED**

**A NEW HISTORICAL READING OF TWO POSTMODERN NOVELS: LORD
OF THE FLIES AND 1984**

Emre Can ŞENEL

Thesis Advisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavghah Ghulam SAEED

T.C.

Karabuk University

Institute of Graduate Programs

Department of English Language and Literature

Prepared as

Master's Thesis

KARABUK

January 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	3
DECLARATION	4
FOREWORD	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
ÖZ (ABSTRACT IN TURKISH)	7
ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION	8
ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ (in Turkish).....	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	12
INTRODUCTION	13
1. CHAPTER ONE.....	17
1.1. New Historicism as a Theory	17
1.2. Reflections of World War I and II on Literature.....	29
1.3. William Golding as a Novelist.....	41
1.4. George Orwell and His Concepts: Power and Politics	43
2. CHAPTER TWO.....	47
2.1. A General Perspective to <i>Lord of the Flies</i>	47
2.2. Symbolism of Historical Figures on Characters	49
2.2.1. Ralph as a Democratic Leader.....	49
2.2.2. The Voice of Logic and Justice: Piggy	54
2.2.3. A Tyrant on the Island: Jack	59
2.2.4. Roger and His Desire for Power	66

2.3. Other Symbols Representing Totalitarianism and Democracy According to the Theory of New Historicism	69
2.3.1. The Facemask of Hunters	70
2.3.2. The Black Uniform	71
2.3.3. The Secret Enemy on the Island	72
2.3.4. Signs of Hope	74
2.4. An Examination of Other New Historicist Elements in <i>Lord of the Flies</i> .	75
3. CHAPTER THREE.....	82
3.1. An Overview of <i>1984</i> and George Orwell’s Political Notions	82
3.2. The Shadow of Historical Figures on Characters	84
3.2.1. Winston’s Different Identities from Distinctive Perspectives.....	84
3.2.2. A Rosy Future for Winston with Julia.....	87
3.2.3. The Combination of Hitler and Stalin: Big Brother.....	89
3.2.4. The Little Brother and Ingsoc	93
3.2.5. The Agent Disguised Behind a Picture.....	97
3.3. The Representation of Totalitarianism and Power Structures in <i>1984</i>	99
3.3.1. Antagonists of Oceania	99
3.3.2. The Ingsoc Mask	102
3.4. A Study of Further New Historicist Features in <i>1984</i>	104
CONCLUSION	111
REFERENCES.....	115
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	121

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that in my opinion the thesis submitted by Emre Can ŞENEL titled “A NEW HISTORICAL READING OF TWO POSTMODERN NOVELS: LORD OF THE FLIES AND 1984” is fully adequate in scope and in quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavghah Ghulam SAEED

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 of Arts thesis. January 19, 2023

Examining Committee Members (Institutions)

Signature

Chairman : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavghah Ghulam SAEED (KBU)

Member : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Harith Ismail TURKI (KBU)

Member : Assist. Prof. Dr. Elvan KARAMAN MEZ (ITU)

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. Müslüm KUZU

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: Emre Can ŞENEL

Signature :

FOREWORD

First, I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavghah Ghulam SAEED for her academic support and guidance. She helped me a lot throughout the completion of this study.

I want to express my eternal gratitude to my family, Badegül ŞENEL, Necati ŞENEL, and Fatih Cihan ŞENEL, who encouraged me to complete this project.

I owe special thanks to my friend, my colleague, and my sister Tuba ŞENEL İNCE for her assistance and optimism.

Lastly, I am grateful to my friends who believed in me and boosted my energy during this long journey.

All your love and support were the most precious motivation for me.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and George Orwell's *1984* from a new historical point of view. These two postmodern novels, which were formed in the 20th century, include similar historical events, and they share common concerns about the future of states due to the conditions of the post-war period. In the first chapter, the birth of new historicism is studied together with notions and theories of prominent scholars such as Stephen Greenblatt and Michel Foucault. Also, the social and political effects of World War I and II, dictators from history, and writers' background are mentioned in this chapter to make a better comparison between the novels and historical events. The second chapter deals with the parallelism between the characters, events, and symbols in *Lord of the Flies* and history; it mainly focuses the images of totalitarianism and hope. The third chapter presents an example of dictatorship and its influences on citizens in *1984*. Finally, it is concluded that historical events of the same period can be represented in different literary works, and they can be examined in the light of new historicism to reveal the importance of literary sources for history.

Keywords: New historicism; totalitarianism; dictatorship; power; fear; discourse; history.

ÖZ (ABSTRACT IN TURKISH)

Bu tezin amacı, William Golding'ın *Sineklerin Tanrısı* ve George Orwell'ın *1984* adlı romanlarını yeni tarihselci bir bakış açısıyla analiz etmektir. 20. Yüzyılda oluşturulan bu iki post modern roman, benzer tarihi olaylar içerir ve savaş sonrası dönemin koşullarından dolayı, gelecekteki devlet yapıları hakkında ortak endişelere sahiptir. İlk bölümde, alanın önde gelen isimlerinden Stephen Greenblatt ve Michel Foucault'un fikirleri ve teorileri ile yeni tarihselciliğin ortaya çıkışı üzerinde çalışılmıştır. Aynı zamanda, 1.ve 2. Dünya Savaşlarının sosyal ve politik etkileri, tarihten diktatör örnekleri ve yazarların geçmiş yaşantılarıyla ilgili bilgiler, romanlar ve tarihi olaylar arasında daha iyi bir kıyas yapmak için ele alınmıştır. 2. Bölüm *Sineklerin Tanrısı* romanındaki karakterlerin, olayların ve sembollerin tarihle olan paralelliğini sunar; temelde totaliterlik ve umut figürlerine dikkat çeker. 3. Bölüm diktatörlük yönetimini ve bu yönetimin *1984*'te bulunan vatandaşlara etkilerini yansıtır. Son olarak, aynı döneme ait tarihsel olayların farklı edebi eserlerde yer alabileceği ve edebi kaynakların tarih için öneminin yeni tarihselcilik ışığında incelenebileceği sonuçlandırılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler (Keywords in Turkish): Yeni tarihselcilik; totalitarizm; diktatörlük; güç; korku; söylem; tarih.

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Title of the Thesis	A New Historical Reading of Two Postmodern Novels: Lord of the Flies and 1984
Author of the Thesis	Emre Can ŞENEL
Supervisor of the Thesis	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tavguh Ghulam SAEED
Status of the Thesis	Master's Degree
Date of the Thesis	19.01.2023
Field of the Thesis	English Language and Literature
Place of the Thesis	UNIKA/IGP
Total Page Number	121
Keywords	New historicism; totalitarianism; dictatorship; power; fear; discourse; history.

ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ (in Turkish)

Tezin Adı	Postmodern İki Romanın Yeni Tarihselciliğe Göre Okunması: Sineklerin Tanrısı ve 1984
Tezin Yazarı	Emre Can ŞENEL
Tezin Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. Tavgah Ghulam SAEED
Tezin Derecesi	Yüksek Lisans
Tezin Tarihi	19.01.2023
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Tezin Yeri	KBU/LEE
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	121
Anahtar Kelimeler	Yeni tarihselcilik; totalitarizm; diktatörlük; güç; korku; söylem; tarih.

ABBREVIATIONS

Etc. : Ve benzeri gibi

ed. : Baskı

Ed. By: Editör

p./pp. : Sayfa/sayfalar

Vol. : Sayı

Vs. : Karşı

SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH

This thesis examines the historical events in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and George Orwell's *1984*, in which power structures of the post-war era are represented.

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this project is to reveal reflections of historical events in the 20th century in *Lord of the Flies* and *1984*. States' control over societies, political and social effects of the post-war period, and people's conditions in both novels are analysed. The importance of this thesis is that it displays how different literary works reflect past events of the same period in a similar way by applying various methods.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

Lord of the Flies and *1984* present totalitarian regimes which appear together with their executions and influences on society members. The two novels are studied from a new historical perspective to analyse the historical representations and figures in the 20th century. How power structures shape social and political affairs of states constitute the main part of this thesis together with interpretations of the post-war era. By applying new historicism to these works, historical events from the period are highlighted, and literature is displayed as a source of history.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH / RESEARCH PROBLEM

Historical events that shaped the 20th century and dictators of the period from different countries such as Benito Mussolini, Adolph Hitler, and Joseph Stalin are demonstrated in the thesis. Additionally, the ideas, beliefs and lives of William Golding and George Orwell are examined to comprehend reflections about the history in the novels. Finally, characters, events, and symbols are analysed by the same method.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES

This study mainly deals with the representations of historical events of the 20th century. Nonetheless, collecting information about different states and comparing them with novels from two different novelists were challenging in some parts. Also, there are many studies about *Lord of the Flies* and *1984*, so examining them from a different perspective required attention.

INTRODUCTION

When we began to try to impose some order on the tangled effects that new historicism has had on the practice of literary history, we designated four specific transformations that it helped to bring about: (1) the recasting of discussions about “art” into discussions of “representations”; (2) the shift from materialist explanations of historical phenomena to investigations of the history of the human body and the human subject; (3) the discovery of unexpected discursive contexts for literary works by pursuing their “supplements” rather than their overt thematics; and (4) the gradual replacement of “ideology critique” with discourse analysis (Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000, p. 17).

According to Stephen Greenblatt and Catherine Gallagher, new historicism aims to grasp history and literature from a divergent perspective, so while defining new historicism as a literary theory, they mainly attribute it to these four principles. At the first phase of the new historicist practice, any work of art is considered as an image of what is thought by the artist, and this work is the reflection of history no matter what it includes. Also, new historicism endeavours to discover the cases on the background rather than dealing with the actions that can be analysed by anybody since they are present and evident at first glance. By doing so, Greenblatt and Gallagher believe that discourses which are on the basis of any kind of idea and thus, behaviour will be revealed, and in that way, it will be possible to uncover the reality instead of finding evidence for the existence of an ideology in a period.

To deduce main principles of new historicism, it is required to make a comparison among several other literary theories. New historicism first appears as a reaction against new criticism for the perception of literature, and traditional historicism for the comprehension of past. Instead of concerning with only literal texts, which is the main method of new criticism for literature, new historicism examines non-literary works as quantitatively identical with literary ones. “The greatest challenge lay not simply in exploring these other texts-an agreeably imperial expansion of literary criticism beyond its borders-but in making the literary and the nonliterary seem to be each other's thick description” (Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000, p. 31). Likewise, traditional historicism treats history as an objective, stationary, and confidential source as it advocates that the past is the production of reality, which can only be found in historical texts. In other words, literature is not a source or figuration of history. On the other hand, new historicism introduces history and literature are intermingled, so a new way of using these is essential. Gallagher and Greenblatt (2000) argue:

We almost always receive works whose boundaries have already been defined by the technology and generic assumptions of the original makers and readers. But new historicism

undertakes to call these assumptions into question and treat them as part of the history that needs to be interpreted (pp. 16-17).

In addition to Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, there are other significant names whose ideas and practises shape new historicism. Clifford Geertz affects the theory with its thick description while Michel Foucault's notions about history, power, knowledge, discourse, episteme, and panopticon form extensive elements of new historicism. "More precisely, it suggests a mode of examination of the general signification of the history of particular forms of rationality and scientificity. This would consist in the exact opposite of the rationalist historicism (...)" (Foucault, 1980, p. 242). Consequently, this literary theory reforms under the influences of these people and keeps developing till today.

For the appearance of new historicism, social and political effects have a part as well. Even if the occurrence of the theory does not correspond with World War I and II, these wars and their outcomes compel writers to make their works by mentioning them, on which new historicists remark. For that reason, one of the factors that directs this theory is the mental and physical conditions of writers in the second half of the 20th century. As new historicism examines the veiled historical clues in the works of the mentioned period, implications and representations are also wanted to be interpreted by comparing literature with what is known as history.

In this thesis, it is analysed how William Golding and George Orwell have depicted the circulation of power and its structures in *Lord of the Flies* and *1984*. These two postmodern novels will be examined in the light of new historicism. Under the head of this theory, the victims in society, especially the left-out children and working-class people will be the subject matter by drawing a parallelism with the 20th century and these two works of art whose main concerns are to demonstrate the danger of totalitarianism. The totalitarian regimes Adolf Hitler implemented in Germany and Joseph Stalin administered in Russia are compared with the contents of novels. Reflections of important historical events that shape the period like World War I and II together with the Cold War in terms of their effects on governing and judging the community; recreation and representation of history in both works by considering politics and people's inner thoughts against norms of the reflected eras consist of the major subjects of the thesis. Also, deconstruction of nationalism together with people who surrender themselves to the authority willingly are studied by looking at these two novels. Stephen Greenblatt's point

of view to culture, history, literary foreground, and political background of a literal work will be mingled with Michel Foucault's ideas about power, knowledge, truth, and normal. New historicism will be implemented to both novels with these basic ideologies. Thus, reproduction of reality and the circulation of power in society will be noticed with examples from the novels.

In the first chapter of this study, the birth and development of new historicism are explained by mentioning all these names and their contributions to the theory in a detailed way. Results of both World War I and World War II constitute the second part of the chapter to make a correlation between the period and the novels. In addition, totalitarian regimes with their rulers such as Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and Joseph Stalin are mentioned with the depictions of dystopias for victims of these ruling systems. In the last part of Chapter I, William Golding and George Orwell with their styles, concerns, and messages in their works are discussed. This examination will be based on the experiences of these novelists.

In Chapter II, *Lord of the Flies* is studied from a new historicist perspective. Characters, events, symbols, and motifs of the work are uncovered, and they are compared with the past by means of this literary theory. The first part of the chapter analyses the relationship of characters and people from the 20th century in terms of politics because different regimes are practiced throughout the novel. Ralph represents democratic aspects whereas Jack is the figure of a dictator on the island. Similarly, Piggy and Roger are reflections of other political and social elements of the period, so they are studied in consideration of relevant people and organizations. Symbols of the totalitarian regime, democracy, and hope involve in this chapter, and they are compared with tools and institutions from history. As the last step, other new historicist factors are mingled with important concepts of the theory since *Lord of the Flies* covers Michel Foucault's power perception; it includes the transformation of characters revealing the darkness which is present in every person's nature, and it shows an example dystopic world for people living in the 20th century in consequence of all stated factors.

1984 is the second novel of this project, and it will be analysed in Chapter III. Like the previous work, this piece of art will be mingled with new historicism. After mentioning George Orwell's political notions and the general concepts of the novel, the study proceeds with characters and their reflections of people in the 20th century. Different

identities Winston has, Julia's role for him, Big Brother's dictatorship, O'Brien's and Mr. Charrington's contributions to the totalitarian authority are viewed with the consideration of the post-war era. In the following part of the chapter, the reflection of power structures and totalitarian executions are studied from the point of new historicism. Lastly, other factors related to the theory that include character choice, representation of people's hard living conditions, discourses and epistemes formed in such an environment, the place of logic in Oceania, and how citizens are limited to live in this dystopia will be the subjects of this chapter. While doing so, the major purpose is to enlighten the dark sides of the novel which show parallelism with dictatorships from the 20th century in all possible aspects with the help of new historicism.

Lord of the Flies and *1984* are chosen for the practice of new historicism as these novels are prominent samples of the second half of the 20th century. Also, they involve similar issues about the period, but these are represented in different ways. Golding and Orwell strongly illustrate the condition of societies, and inner sides of individuals. Readers feel the atmosphere inside both works, which enables them to realize the dangers of the totalitarian system. At the same time, they witness the historical events from diversified perspectives as characters and issues are represented differently from history books. Therefore, all these features allow for the practice of new historicism on these pieces of works.

1. CHAPTER ONE

1.1. New Historicism as a Theory

As a new viewpoint to history and literature, new historicism was presented in 1980s, and by starting from these years, it has been practiced and applied to literary texts mainly for comprehending the past with a more explicit approach. In his work called *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Stephen Greenblatt mentioned and named this concept for the first time. At the early stage, new historicism was asserted and accepted as a practice by him. In *Towards a Poetics of Culture*, he states, “So I shall try if not to define the new historicism, at least to situate it as a practice—a practice rather than a doctrine” (Greenblatt, 2013, p. 1). After its emergence, many critics and anthropologists affected and shaped this theory. Louis Montrose, Clifford Geertz, Catherina Gallagher, and Michel Foucault are important names for the new doctrine.

This approach, as it can be understood from the name of it, advocates a new consideration to not only literature, but also history. However, an exact definition of new historicism is burdensome, so a comparison of this theory with former ones presents a better perceptive for the mentality of this concept. New historicism has appeared as a reaction against formalism, structuralism, and mainly, new criticism. For all these theories, literary texts are the main source of interpretation without adding or considering other elements of the writing process. However, the first and the most essential theory to be mentioned is new criticism since new historicism is a strong reaction against the new critical understanding. Basically, new criticism considers texts as the merely source for the evaluation and analysis of literary works since its appearance on the literature stage in 1940s. For new critics, no other disciplines and issues from outside of the text such as social, economic, political, cultural, and religious conditions of the author can have an influence on literature. Similarly, neither are the correlation of society, country, and historical events significant for the assessment and understanding of the literary works. One study by Tyson (2006) shows “the *text* itself became the battle cry of the New Critical effort to focus our attention on the literary work as the sole source of evidence for interpreting it” (p. 136). Ways of close reading, which mean to consider written elements of a text such as its choice of words and syntax will be enough to recognize the work and find the secret keys of locked gates under the texts. Literature has its own preciousness

which should not be affected from readers' reflexions, too. In short, new criticism discusses literature in an isolated environment that nobody and nothing can affect or change the text. This comprehension way is also named as autonomous. What the text says reflects the truth for every literary critic and reader without the other criteria.

For this strict and definite theory, new historicism, on the other hand, suggests the importance of other factors for the judgement of literature. These other factors include many concerns and affairs because the major purpose of new historicists is to understand and clarify history as much as they can. As White (1989) states "the relation between literary works and their socio-cultural context" (p. 294) is significant for new historicists. For that reason, one of the most fundamental considerations is the author of a literary work. According to new historicism, any kind of literary genre needs to be interpreted with its creator as it is impossible to generate it without carrying the owner's ideas, beliefs, emotions, concerns, and perspectives. In his *Towards a Poetics of Culture*, Greenblatt (2013) notes "... we were individual subjects but not individuals, we had no psychology distinct from the shared life of society; politics and poetry were one" (p.3). Willingly or unwillingly, writers carry their personal beliefs and put them forward, which new historicists utilize as they assess the work, notions of the writer, and mentality of the society in the year when the work has been generated.

New historicism advocates another way instead of "close reading," which is the established form of new critics to discuss "only" literary works. According to new historicists, "parallel reading" is the prominent practice that must be applied to the texts. This method is used to define new historicism by Peter Barry (2009); "A simple definition of the new historicism is that it is a method based on the parallel reading of literary and non-literary texts, usually of the same historical period" (p. 150). Basically, new historicism attempts to give equal importance to literary and non-literary works since the main goal of new historicism is to explain the past and the background of literature in a more detailed way, so critics endeavour to demolish eligibility of literary texts. Barry (2009) claims:

That is to say new historicism refuses (at least ostensibly) to 'privilege' the literary text: instead of a literary 'foreground' and a historical 'background' it envisages and practises a mode of study in which literary and non-literary texts are given equal weight and constantly inform or interrogate each other (p. 150).

New historicism does not see literary works on a higher level than other ones. Instead, a correlation between these two types of written forms is established and it is

regarded as the most correct way to understand the past. This interrelationship can be found by putting ideas and information in both literary and non-literary texts in front of the critics; not by placing the ones in non-literary works at the background or neglecting the essence of these texts. In other words, assessing texts equally is the method that should be pursued by new historicists. About this point, Barry (2009) quotes Greenblatt by saying “an intensified willingness to read all of the textual traces of the past with the attention traditionally conferred only on literary texts” (p. 150). That means it is probable to discover historical facts in literary and non-literary texts, and literary works do not only carry an aesthetic apprehension. Therefore, these facts will have a more comprehensive meaning when they are mingled with non-literary texts with the principle of parallel reading. According to Greenblatt, critics and readers must be aware of the opportunities which they are able to utilize thanks to this combination. By considering all of these, it is claimed that close reading is not enough to get essential data from literary texts for new historicism.

Stephen Greenblatt does not also accept that the evaluation of primary subjects in literary works is enough for a pure analysis. The importance of secondary points and topics are valuable, and they are required to be judged by literary critics. To point out that, he emphasizes philosophies are formed by a communal spirit which is found in each piece of work. Correspondingly, literary works show the reflection of these philosophies under the hands of authors, and these writers are exposed to the ideologies by their society. For that reason, not only the author, but also the community, culture, and the writing process under the effects of periodical conditions must be inside the arguments of literary critics because otherwise, the work of a literary critic will not be different from the life story of a writer. “We are trying, in other words, to deepen our sense of both the invisible cohesion and the half-realized conflicts in specific cultures by broadening our view of their significant artifacts” (Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000, p. 14). In short, Greenblatt argues that literary texts are more comprehensible and coherent as they are analysed with alternative parallel contexts, so new historicism denies the privacy that new criticism supports for literary works.

As a result of this approach, new historicism shares some common ideas with other theories, approaches, and practises. The argument of treating works equally results in negotiation and exchange with different principles (Greenblatt, 2013, p. 1), and it puts

new historicism a different place from the theories applying strict methods like new criticism.

These theories in new historicism are based on Greenblatt's works about the Renaissance culture. According to him, in England, the relationships between writers and events of the sixteenth century are intermingled. Social, cultural, historical, political, religious, economic, literary, and sexual traces are present in each part of life, and consequently, in literary texts. Greenblatt (2013) argues "not politics alone but the whole structure of production and consumption" is found in works as a result of "circulation" (p. 8). Also, he points out that these elements are formed under the effect of official power. For that reason, social incidents, controlling mechanisms, and writers are in the same cluster where literary works are formed. There is no distinct area for literature to be performed with an absolute loneliness.

Furthermore, he uses a new historicist approach instead of close reading to evaluate Shakespeare's works. With the application of this method, he can illustrate "the great crisis and uncertainty over fundamental issues such as religion, political power and gender" (Bressler, 2003, p. 141) in Elizabethan England which vitalizes the "extraordinary crisis" in Shakespeare's plays. Again, Stephen Greenblatt shows the mutual relationship between diversified kinds of elements in literature and its historical sides. He chooses Shakespeare as he believes that the observation of the society and expressing it effectively and in detail are the most powerful sides of Shakespeare's works:

Shakespeare's work is great because of his singular ability to draw on the energies generated by the conflicts in his contemporary society. (...) Shakespeare's works have a special energy precisely because they are so firmly embedded in their own historical context and because that context was a time of conflict, crisis and fragmentation (Booker, 1996, p. 142).

With the consideration of all these concepts, it is possible to state that Stephen Greenblatt shapes the main methods and ways of evaluating literary works for new historicist "practice". For him, literary and non-literary texts must be practiced together with the main and subordinate topics. Differently from close reading, which is the factor of new critical point of view, parallel reading enables the connection of new historicism and other practises. To prove his theories, he studies about the Renaissance period in England and Shakespeare's plays.

Other than new criticism, the consideration of other several approaches and theories are necessary while defining and comprehending new historicism. As its name suggests, traditional historicism is one of these terms. Till the emerge of new historicism,

it has been accepted that an objective assessment and reflection of past events is possible since traditional historicism has defended and has been in favour of this belief. It is not acquired that creators of history are ordinary human beings too. The conception of previous historicism is monological; it is not thought as the production of writers' comments (Greenblatt, 1982, p. 2251). In addition, what happened in the past is seen as a collection of chronological events, and it is claimed that there are some historical facts which are linked to one another in the cause-and-effect chain by historians. Shortly, after the consideration of the previous event, the latter is counted as the outcome which will be the reason of the next according to the traditional historicism.

At this point, the first difference between historicism and new historicism is clearly seen because new historicism does not accept history as a circle of chronological and connected events that can be represented in literary works. By Tyson (2006), history is manifested like that: "It is like an unplanned dance containing an infinite diversity of steps, following any new direction at any specified moment, and having no specific destination or goal" (p. 245). Therefore, traditional point of view to history does not represent a clear and absolute truth just because several books or resources say that since new historicism protests this stereotype and advocates a fresh judgement to interpret the past.

For that reason, new historicists propound that the past cannot be evaluated as an unbreakable or unchangeable concept as the creator of history is exposed to the cultural, social, and psychological norms of society. "The notion of authenticity seemed and continues to seem misplaced, for new historicism is not a coherent, close-knit school in which one might be enrolled, or from which one might be expelled." (Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000, p.3). Instead of advocating the absolute truth and credibility of history, new historicists see the past as a complex fact which is full of subjective and changeable events from person to person. For that reason, connotations must be reassessed by new historicism in a different historical viewpoint (Montrose, 1997, p. 241) since traditional historicism does not serve the past with a holistic approach.

To support this thought, new historicists affirm literature is not noticeable without human activity, and it is a definite perception of history. Gallagher (1989) acclaims, "the connection among texts, discourse, power, and constitution of subjectivity" (p. 37) constitutes any kind of texts. Therefore, there must be a connection between authors of

literature and history as common human nature is not a matter of question. Each individual consists of the social structure specifically, and as a result, history cannot be attributed to an objective background. Similarly, Brannigan (1998) states history is a subjective concept which cannot clarify a literary work (p. 3). In sum, to reform the past ideology, cultural elements of people, which mean authors in new historicism, must be taken into consideration.

In addition, and as it has been stated before, non-literary works are counted as a significant factor while it is time to evaluate the historical events. In this sense, a kind of bridge must be built to comprehensively understand the past according to this theory (Leitch, 2001). Hence, it is true to say that new historicism judges the same events from both the side of literature and the point of other written works, which is also different from traditional historical approach.

New historicists embrace the notion which states “history is written by the winners.” When it is considered by this viewpoint, history is just writings passing from different gradual processes until it reaches to the latest form, and it is under the effect of writers, who are in the side of victors. In this regard, the belief of “the textuality of history and historicity of texts” (p. 20) is asserted by an American critic Louis Montrose (1989). He explains this conception by saying:

By the historicity of texts, I mean to suggest the cultural specificity, the social embedment, of all modes of writing—not only the texts that critics study but also the texts in which we study them. By the textuality of history, I mean to suggest, firstly, that we can have no access to full and authentic past, a lived material existence, unmediated by the surviving textual traces of the society in question—traces whose survival we cannot assume to be merely contingent but must rather presume to be at least partially consequent upon complex and sub the social processes of preservation and effacement; and secondly, that those textual traces are themselves subject to subsequent textual mediations when they are construed as the ‘documents’ upon which historians ground their own texts, called ‘histories’ (Montrose, 1989, p. 20).

New historicism strongly advocates this belief to stand against the objectivity of history. Any kind of context, including historical context, is the product of a subjective creation, which is the author and the sociocultural features. Also, other written texts contribute to the formation process of historical documents, so there is more than one factor that prevents the absolute trueness of history. This reciprocal interaction does not end. On the contrary, it changes and evolves in different times and places, diversified conditions and cultures. For that reason, history is textual, and texts carry historicity, which occurs particularly on the basis of external circumstances. As a result, “new historicists suggested that all the critics have to admit their own subjectivities and biases”

(Bressler, 2003, p. 183). Similar to other fictional creations, history is also a product of fiction, and it is open to be examined how much historical works and approaches are true in fictional worlds of writers. In this sense, new historicism detects history as a text, and except for that, historical events are lost. Because of the same reason, new historicism is not “historical”, but a “historicist” involvement (Barry, 2009, p. 152).

By considering these judgements and interpretations, it will be true to state that these two theories also assess history and literature differently in terms of the place of them in a literary work. For advocates of traditional historicism, literary works present the past inside works and mainly, they try to answer this question: “What does this work say about a specific event?” If the answer is correct according to the historical texts, critics and readers sense the related work as a true source of history. And as the next step, they place characters, events, and time expressions accordingly to infer more data, but in the limited number. New historicism, on the other hand, approaches the same concept from a particular and reformist point of view. According to new historicist theory, literature and history have a “mutual” relationship. What is wanted to say with the word mutual is that literature both affects and is affected from history. At the same time, history serves exactly the identical way to literature. For that reason, new historicists do not put history at the background of literary works. Instead, it is one of the main elements of history with its all parts. New historicism comprehends history “as a social science like anthropology and sociology, whereas old historicists tended to view history as literature’s background” (Murfin, 1998, p. 35). The essential demand of new historicism is “how has the event been interpreted?” and “what do the interpretations tell us about the interpreters?” (Tyson, 2006, p. 23). Representation and recreation are crucial terms for this theory since they are different from one writer to another who create the past and call their works as historical. As the application, new historicists both try to fill in empty parts with actions of the past, and they endeavour to see the events from the perspective of writers and how they get involved in the replacement process. In brief, a traditional historian says, but a new historicist comments about the same events.

Main subjects with which historicism and new historicism deal are diverse. Traditional historians believe that their working field must be limited with their own philosophy which includes wars, policy, bureaucracy, affairs of states; in short, relationships of upper class and general concepts of a nation. “Historicism telling the story of great leaders and wars while neglecting other areas of human life” (Thomas, 1989, p.

94). They do not condescend to remark about domestic issues. On the other hand, new historicism brings areas that are perceived as “others” such as psychology, sociology, science, and art. Plus, plenty of topics that are neglected by authors and critics; not questioned by societies are valued by new historicists. Environment, pollution, illnesses, death, oppression, punishment, sexuality, corruption, poverty, and childhood consist of these marginal points. In this way, new historicists try to take both common and exceptional arguments to its keystone while they express the reflections of the past.

Like the subjects, characters of these two concepts which they interest show differences. Old historicism is interested in people belonging to the high status such as leaders, kings, queens, princes, princesses, diplomats, churchmen, commanders, and statesmen whereas there are ordinary people, workers, children, and oppressed society members in the centre of new historicist theory. Therefore, it is true to report that what is called as minimal or negligible by traditional historicism find a prominent standing in new historicism as a fundamental factor.

Under these character choices, there are certain reasons. According to new historicism, “man” is not a universal term that can be utilized in every work of art, or its presence does not represent the same thing for every text. It means that this approach interprets man as the man of the era when the literary work is created. As it is previously stated, the attempt to comment the past from all possible aspects is crucial for new historicism, so the evaluation of characters must be done accordingly. At this point, it will be true to mention the American anthropologist, Clifford Geertz. He is a significant figure for new historicism, especially for its cultural dimension. According to Geertz, a prototype human being is not a matter of fact because people exposed different cultures and cultural circumstances become diverse entities. For that reason, details are vital since people are the products of their own culture.

These details constitute a bigger picture for a deeper analysis of a culture. Geertz advocates to use a method to dig, and eventually discover, a better analysis about the linguistic, cultural, and social structure of a specific period (Brannigan, 1998, p. 34). This practice is called “thick description” by him. The term defined as “re-read [an event or anecdote] in such a way to reveal through the analysis of tiny particulars the behavioral codes, logics, and motive forces controlling a whole society” (Veese, 1989, p. 11). This “re-reading” must be performed in a particular environment. A specific family, society,

region, or a country with its orders, behaviours, feelings, ideas, and interpretations are parts of the environment in which thick description can be performed. When the lack of these, “thin description” becomes the subject, which is not explanatory for new historicism. In other words, any kind of behaviour is meaningful and understandable in its own context. New historicists deal with the elements of definite periods and places with the notion of thick description because in that way, they can focus on the ignored subjects such as ceremonies, gamble culture, religious beliefs, and slave-trade substituting the traditional historical topics in new historicism (Çavuş, 2002, p. 126). This substitution depicts superior glance to the past when it is combined with other non-literary, mainly cultural factors (details), and thus, the examination introduces more comprehensive understanding, and narratives are used more efficiently to be get informed about a particular past time.

Like Clifford Geertz, Michel Foucault is another prominent figure who has influenced the new historicist theory in a great deal with more than one aspect. The French philosopher, anthropologist, and psychologist attracts attention with his studies about madness, discipline, and sexuality, which direct new historicists to re-evaluate the historical research (Çavuş, 2002, p. 128). Also, he shares the same notion about history with Friedrich Nietzsche, both of whom perceive the history as a non-developing and evolving process from the past to the present. According to Nietzsche’s term of “real history”, history is not an abstract concept which has a specific starting and ending point. Similarly, Foucault disagrees with the traditional notion of history since for him, discontinuity is the determinant figure of history. (Urhan, 2000, p. 63). He believes that history is not linear, and not a collection of causes and effects.

For Foucault, history must be studied with the consideration of power and its systems. According to him, power is a sophisticated phenomenon which is determined by external practises. It is not monopolized by the owner, but rather, power circulates among society members. He states, “power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere” (Brannigan, 1998, p. 49). In each layer of the community, it is present, and its presence is felt by all people. Even in the smallest layers, like a family, power is divided into categories. For example, parents and siblings share it appropriately for the family structure. However, Foucault believes that power is not regulated and ruled by the owner. Even the power holder cannot determine how to acquire and use it on communities. Because for each state, a different kind of power is constituted

and applied according to the needs and expectations. It is also named as a “strategy.” For that reason, in *Discipline and Punish*, he notes that the power is exercised rather than possessed (Julie & Ryan, 2004, p. 550). Certain techniques, tactics, and operating mechanisms are required to implement power. In these ways, it is transmitted among people who do not have it, and on their behaviours, ideas, feelings, shortly; in every single part of life, its effects are observable.

Knowledge is the indispensable ingredient to execute power for Foucault’s doctrine since it forms and organizes individuals. Control and management systems are enabled in particular time and place thanks to knowledge as it gets its domination from relationships of power and authority. “So two important kinds of power were put into effect here, the power of knowledge of the truth and the power to disseminate this knowledge” (Foucault, 1980, p. 34). As a result, both body and soul are exposed to the implementation of power not only physically but also mentally. In the end, power and knowledge are necessary for each other to capitalize the benefits of both.

Discourse is the critical factor to understand the perception of power and knowledge, and how it works in Foucault’s conception because they are distributed to discourses before their implementation. Basically, discourse is the language of specific time and place. It has the ability to manage and keep relationships of a society. In *The Archaeology and Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) defines discourse as “the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a certain number of statements” (p. 80). Forms of experiencing and comprehending the world which are determined previously are components of discourse. It is also stated as a “mental set” carrying the notions of community members (Barry, 2009, p. 154). Nevertheless, it is not possible to assess discourse as monolithically remarkable. For different individuals in a society and for disparate states, unique discourses (tools of power) are practiced as structures of power are arranged accordingly. By doing so, discourses become the ultimate tool of authority and power structures because they have the strength to determine the qualifications of individuals in a society by judging whether their actions are good or bad, normal or abnormal, acceptable or unacceptable, innocent or criminal. At this point, Foucault advocates that discourses are determiners of conscience and good behaviours which keep the soul of an era under the control of power and discipline without performing any physical force or torture. It becomes possible with the combination of power and

knowledge which circulate their existence in discourses of different cultures and states. New historicism has been so affected from the conception discourse that both literary and non-literary texts are studied with the light of power and knowledge and how these elements are presented.

Michel Foucault's themes of power, knowledge, and discourse cause new historicists to study on their impacts on history and historical representations. As it has been stated before, new historicism does not see history as a linear order of actions. About this concept, Foucault advocates that "a deep analysis" is required to discover the real history. This analysis must be applied to the layers of discourses called "epistemes" by Foucault. Mainly, an episteme can be defined as a form of regulations and restraints that limit a society's every piece of action. Apart from these restrictions, community members are not able to think, speak, or act because this violation will be punished. This punishment may result in being excluded or silenced from the society as an episteme is a merging fundamental or notion for a community. For each state, there are tolerable beliefs which form correct actions and eventually, the "truth". These standard ideas, attitudes, and veracity constitute the epitome of episteme which is the one that must be inspected deeply to reveal real history (Urhan, 2000, p. 92). According to Foucault, new historicists' major goal is to bring different parts of epistemes together to obtain more acceptable concept of history because it definitely carries some traces from its author and the time that it has been written. In other words, epistemes play a huge role for the creation and formation of history (Çavuş, 2002, p. 128). Therefore, new historicists concern about the episteme of a society in a specific period to conduct a detailed examination of the past.

With the consideration of these concepts, it will be true to note that literary texts are also examples of discourses for Foucault. They carry the notions, feelings, concepts, culture, biases, and viewpoints of both writers and the societies. At the same time, literary works contribute to the development and prevalence of discourses, and as a result, epistemes. These language and culture related principles include policy instruments since new historicism, under the influence of Foucault, defends that most pieces of works have political purposes and politics is visible every part of life, so the concepts of power, knowledge, and discourses need to be assessed under this perception. Rather than physical force, "discursive practises (to use Foucault's terminology-'discursive' is the adjective derived from the noun 'discourse')" (Barry, 2009, p. 154) are used by the authority in many regimes. To show the power of the language, Foucault uses the example design of

a “panopticon.” In addition to prisons, he asserts that states have used the same method to govern citizens. With discourses and epistemes, the reigning mechanism easily controls even the thoughts (already created by discourses) of people, and it is not permitted to go beyond these “normal” patterns. Because Foucault asserts that in a culture, interpretations and definitions are formed by these power tools. Therefore, new historicists must extend their studies to find different forms of power since they are significant and symbolic marks to connect one period in the past with another.

In summary, new historicism grasps history and literature in an innovative comprehensive way. Authors are important elements to be considered with literary works. Instead of close reading of only literary texts, a parallel reading of literary and non-literary ones must be the method in the way of studying the works of art. Literary texts should not be counted as a better and more important form of writing, and they must be categorized in the same way with non-literary texts. An equal evaluation of these two types and the correlation between them are the guides for an efficient analysis. Principles of Stephen Greenblatt, one of the founders of new historicism, must be taken into consideration since he believes the significance of secondary subjects in texts, and the influences of not only authors but also society members to literary works are crucial. He certifies his assumptions with his studies about the Renaissance period and Shakespeare’s plays. Overall, he argues that new historicism has common aspects with other disciplines and theories.

In these theories, traditional historical approach finds a place for itself, but new historicism differs from traditional historicism in several ways. For instance, new historicists do not see a chronological order for the events of the past. They also claim that history is not objective as the writers of historical texts carry subjective thoughts which are visible in the pages of history. About this issue, Louis Montrose’s concept of historicity of texts and textuality of history is applied by new historicism. For this approach, representation is critical because for every different subject, there will be a diversified representation, and this varies from one place to another. In addition, main subjects and characters of new historicism are different from traditional historians since new historicists want to point out marginalized characters and their experiences as a major subject.

In addition to them, several important names and their theories are interiorized by new historicism. For example, on the purpose of resolving undisclosed cases, Geertz' thick description is applied. Likewise, Michel Foucault's principles such as power, discourse, and episteme become advisors to discover and show political marks in literary and non-literary texts. Lastly, the influences of panopticon system and its appliance by states are studied in new historicism because it is believed that these concepts will mirror more actual events of the past, which is the main goal of new historicists.

1.2. Reflections of World War I and II on Literature

The First and the Second World War show their effects on people in all parts of life. Mostly because of their disastrous results, economy, science, politics, art, and literature are reshaped, which bring new mentalities to overcome the hardships of related subjects. Not only physical, but also mental changes of people have created new ways of thinking and living, in other words, surviving under challenging conditions. These psychological alterations have found a place for themselves especially in art and literature because artists and writers are able to reflect their pure notions in their works. Even if they do not show their ideas directly, associated words and some indications are present in post-war works. "Most of the writers were against the war. Instead of mentioning the war to the reader directly, they preferred to give clues, use words which remind readers the war and thus, they made them realize that there was a war outside" (Sarsılmaz & Yiğiter, 2012, p. 54). While doing so, writers leave traces about lots of topics and concepts; artists produce images and signs which can be used to go back to those days and get perspectives to discover the past.

One of the most significant influences of both World Wars is on states and politics. As millions of people lost their lives, fear was the common feeling along with terror among every member of society at that period. As a result of these emotions, people tended to be oppressed and ruled by the control of power. In such a circumstance, it is inevitable to abuse the power by the owners of it. Therefore, several prominent figures like Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and Joseph Stalin together with fascist and totalitarian executions become the examples of dictator abusers.

The impact of totalitarianism was so strong that it was a prominent form of ruling embraced by several different tyrannies in different countries after the First World War. Basically, totalitarianism can be defined as a regime which forbids individual

freedom and puts government with its authority in the primary position by oppressing entire aspects of individual's life (Saxena, 2015, p. 118). For a totalitarian state, discipline, domination, obedience, control, punishment, and restraint are important elements because it is encouraged thanks to the implementation of these. In other words, totalitarianism means an unlimited tyranny that imposes its owners' beliefs to other people who do not have any other choices to regard or support with their own willingness. The purpose of this system is to make individuals accept that society members are alive and healthy thanks to the government, so this debt necessitates them to exist with their whole selves for the ruling mechanism. In that way, people learn, work, sleep, eat, spend their time, in short; "behave", according to established norms. For that reason, it is not seen a difference between individuals because the society is for the regime in this system. Plenty of people are stayed together for nonstop implementations and they are expected to be the same by the ruling class. Any kind of distinctions will not be tolerated as they are able to ruin the working mechanism. In short, totalitarianism considers individuals as the identical cogs which make the system run without any pauses. This exertion is not praised or awarded by the totalitarian; instead, it is viewed as the "normal and usual" one.

For this kind of regime, there are some features and conditions which must be present. First, an ideology must be interiorized, and it must be practiced perfectly. This perfection requires a person or a party that can hold the power and control it accordingly. In addition, some operation tools which consist of social, cultural, political, economic, and religious mechanisms are necessary, and the ruler is in charge of the supervision for the operational process. Furthermore, private worlds of individuals are also under the observation of the totalitarian. Correspondingly, a set of rules must be formed, and severe punishments need to be executed, otherwise the operation will be impractical. Police and other governance structures play an important role in this part since they are authorized in the field of penalty and discipline. To strengthen this administration, all possible ways such as radio, press, or television must be used to communicate with society and dictate the ideology while the force detect and punish the abnormal and unusual people. In that way, the norms and the system will be unquestionable for individuals since they assume that they believe and do the right thing even if there are some question marks in their minds. Thus, the regime has a chance to create ardent supporters for its wellbeing. About the elements of a totalitarian regime, Carl Joachim Friedrich (1968) notes:

(1) A totalist ideology, (2) a single party committed to this ideology and usually led by one man, the dictator, (3) a fully developed secret police and three kinds of monopoly or more precisely monopolistic control; namely, that of (a) mass communications, (b) operational weapons, and (c) all organisations including economic ones, thus involving a centrally planned economy (...) (pp. 249-254).

These factors are the initial necessities for this kind of ruling system. Without the presence of them, the operation will be impossible since for totalitarianism, mentioned concepts must be tied together to form a perfect circle, from which individuals cannot escape. For that reason, they must be connected to one another without a missing component.

To administer a totalitarian regime thoroughly, another essential element is the belief of the “secret enemy.” In each totalitarian system, this secret enemy is created according to the necessities and circumstances of the regime. Therefore, it can be inside or outside of the country, and its type, influence, and power are adjusted particularly. At the same time, a major problem for a state can replace the mentioned concept since its essence makes citizens unhappy, and they want a solution for the issue. Rather than its exact description, its presence is vital as this existence unveils a key factor for totalitarianism: fear. Fear is directed easily, but very effectively, when there is a thread of a hidden power. This makes people believe that they live in a happy, peaceful, healthy, normal, equal, and most importantly, secure world thanks to the authority and its system. By this way, society members perceive the totalitarian system as the protector, and they consent to accept all restrictions, oppressions, and implementations without questioning them. They also believe that the condition they live in is the most secure one and the authority carries out everything for the benefits of individuals.

Even if the totalitarian system is constructed perfectly in the theory, certain problems for the mechanism are unavoidable. Since this system is against freedom and individuality, it requires to ban any kind of actions which highlight personal privilege or pleasure. For that reason, necessary arrangements are formed to make people who do not obey the regime lawbreakers and show their behaviours as criminal. Additionally, totalitarian states are likely to modify the existing rules and laws when they do not meet the necessities of the countries. Furthermore, they can abolish the previous legislation to replace it with new principles. In this way, it becomes more feasible to punish rebels and keep them quiet. These punishments mostly affect writers and artist because as it has been stated before, they are the ones who present their beliefs and feelings more apparently than any other society members. “... not only the painters but also the authors of the

period could not stay impotent to the destructive and negative effects of the war and reflected them to their works” (Sarsılmaz & Yiğiter, 2012, p. 57). Several punishments include signaling the previous works as a kind of betrayal, preventing them from creating and publishing new works, obliging writers and artists to leave the country, torturing them physically and mentally, and lastly, executing them. The arranged system can also show that these writers or artists are in the same side with the secret enemy and their works aim to praise the hidden power. Thus, instead of realizing what happens around themselves, other citizens develop a contrary attitude towards these people, which make the penalties simpler and reinforce the established organisation with every new incident. At the same time, these implementations spread fear not only among the society members, but also to other artists and writers.

To comprehend the abuse of power with the hands of totalitarian and fascist executions in dystopias, it will be appropriate to mention some instances from history. The first example of a totalitarian ruler is Benito Mussolini, who used totalitarianism together with a state authority for the first time in the 20th century. Mussolini was born in 1883, and he continued to govern Italy with totalitarian and fascist perspectives till 1943, when he died. In his early ages, he was a member of the Socialist Party as he was under the effect of this concept: equality for every human being. However, he laid the foundations of the Fascist Party by aiming to create a national group at the time of World War I (Macdonald, 1999, p. 6). He wanted a national operation to unify Italy and his ultimate goal was to rule the country by a single party. The totalitarian system started at that point because he had to ignore individual independence and needs of people to follow his desires, which were also accompanied by some organizations. The number of these organised groups increased thanks to his impressive speeches and ensured him to become the prime minister. At that point, he began to use police according to his system as well and severe penalties and punishments were executed under his tyranny. The police were not only responsible from discipline, but also several spies were present among other people to inform the authority about the current news and possible threads. By the time of progress, Mussolini succeeded to keep public buildings under control, and this caused the exploitation followed by terror and violence. It was not surprising that only partisan journalism was permitted and factories for weapons and other tools for war were founded. Mussolini even forced people to marry to increase the number of children who would

constitute his dream nation and fight against non-followers both inside and outside of Italy.

In short, Benito Mussolini was a notorious leader whose implementations harmed lots of individuals both physically and mentally. His ambition to turn Italy into a national based country did not last long, but it left plenty of debris behind his regime. By this way, it has been witnessed the totalitarian and fascist authority which could not endure for a long time.

Even Benito Mussolini was a powerful totalitarian and fascist controller, he was not as strong as the infamous dictator in the history: Adolph Hitler. He was born in Austria in 1889, and he was a soldier during the time of the First World War. At first, the actions regarded as the foundations of his fascist mentality started with some attempts to set a political party. By doing so, he was aiming to have the control of the country by uniting the German people. After that, it would be possible for him to subjugate the whole Europe, which was one of Hitler's utmost purposes. With these ideas, the Nazi Party was founded, but it did not become the representative of government till 1933 when Hitler was delegated as the Chancellor of Germany. Thanks to his position and the impacts of economic depression in 1929, he was able to make himself a prominent figure. While lots of people were unemployed and demoralized, Adolf Hitler was giving hearting speeches about the future. Therefore, he met the expectations of a wanted leader from the society. In a short period of time, the Nazi Party got plenty of followers, which enabled Hitler to start creating the atmosphere that he wanted. Also, the base of the Nazi government was set since the media, military and police were under the control of him thanks to his status (Sauvain, 1996, p. 80). After Hitler's ministerial cabinet became the owner of legislative power in Germany, by demolishing personal rights and changing the existing democratic laws and rules, no other political parties except for the Nazi Party left in the country. In only one year, Hitler's tyranny managed to have the control over the community and several bigotry incidents especially for the members of the Communist Party and Jews were witnessed.

Hitler owned the tyranny, which was formed in a short period of time, and yet influenced not only German history but also the whole past to his ability to make excellent public speeches. By starting the years that he was not in the authority, he was able to affect and change opinions of people by his forceful language. He admitted that he learned

the importance and skills of giving a speech, which was also called as “propaganda” by him from other countries. These countries were their enemies according to Hitler, and in Germany, there was a deficiency about this concept. To show the importance of public speeches, he made a comparison between a poster and propaganda. Hitler alleged that they were similar in terms of how they were exhibited. The importance of a poster lied behind on the producer’s hands who used colours and shapes to attract the society. Similarly, the impact of a propaganda depended on the performer and how words, sentences, and intonation were used. Furthermore, Hitler declared that both forms must be arranged skilfully so that most of the people could understand what lied behind those by using their judgement and perception. In other words, they should not be so academic or scientific. Hitler (1924) states:

The art of the poster lies in the designer's ability to attract the attention of the crowd by form and color. A poster advertising an art exhibit must direct the attention of the public to the art being exhibited; the better it succeeds in this, the greater is the art of the poster itself. (...) A similar situation prevails with what we today call propaganda. The function of propaganda does not lie in the scientific training of the individual, but in calling the masses' attention to certain facts, processes, necessities, etc., whose significance is thus for the first time placed within their field of vision. The whole art consists in doing this so skillfully that everyone will be convinced that the fact is real, the process necessary, the necessity correct, etc (p. 182).

It can be seen that Hitler was aware of the importance of addressing to people and he practiced those methods greatly. For that reason, it was not extraordinary that he made so many people believe himself and gain lots of supporters for his party.

At the first step, his tyranny put emphasis on building new factories and roads. In most of the constructions, poor and unemployed people affected from the crisis worked and by doing so, he gained more respect and loyalty from these people since he had pledged to deal with the economic issues for them before he was authorized. Not surprisingly, many of these structures were about weapons because what Hitler wanted to achieve was first gaining the military power for the nation inside Germany, and next recapturing the fields and lands that the country had lost due to the Versailles Treaty. It was a known fact that Germans were unpleased because of the unfair conditions of Versailles (Arslanoğlu & Kayabalı, 1983, pp. 89-92). Therefore, Hitler cleverly manipulated the citizens both physically and mentally, and he was successful in the field of making the country and also himself powerful again. However, it was not possible to talk about equality among society members because even if the economy and living conditions of some people started to rise a bit, members of Nazi Party were becoming richer and in fact stronger by taking possessions of Jewish people. Also, hard working

conditions were a burden to poor people as unions of labour were closed by Hitler, so there were no syndicates to defend those workers. With these executions, Hitler and his supporters strengthened themselves while other ones had no choice but to obey and accept the established norms and rules. Therefore, the totalitarian system was finally established perfectly by Adolf Hitler.

As time passed, the implementations of Hitler and the Nazi Party began to be witnessed in every part of social life. Not only in political fields, but also in many other areas such as other public buildings, schools, and stations, it was possible to be exposed the propaganda of the controller thanks to the installed speakers to these positions. In this way, Hitler had the ability to advertise himself to members of society anytime and anywhere. In addition, he effectively used signs and symbols to indicate his presence because he believed that to reach large mass of people, emotions were significant as they control and direct people (Hitler, 1924, p. 109). He used several figures to stimulate several impulses of society members such as killing and attacking. In every possible place, Nazi flags were displayed with some motifs. On these flags, “swastika” is the most well-known figure associated with Hitler and the Nazi group, who used the blood of Nazi martyries on these as an implantation tool. In this way, people were subjected to see and act according to the ruling mechanism as they knew there were not any other choices to live in different, better, or more equal conditions than those.

In addition to the swastika, which was a visible proof of Hitler’s totalitarianism, the other sign of his power and propaganda was the way that people greet one another. By extending their right arms to the front, people needed to say “Heil Hitler!” when they met anywhere. Even if it started among the Nazis at first, soon after it expanded to other people as well. Thus, not only visible but also actional activities ensured Hitler’s hegemony everywhere.

As well as regaining the territories which were lost in World War I, the other primary ambition of Adolf Hitler was to form a perfect German nation. He strongly believed that to reach that goal, all obstacles and barriers must be eliminated. For him, those problems included people with mental or physical disabilities, non-Germans, and most importantly, Jews. Instead of them, he dreamt about the “Aryan Society” which can be called the superior or master class. If only he managed to create this type of community, he would occupy the other countries with these people, so he performed

many fascist and racist executions for that purpose. Initially, Jewish people were sent away from universities, military, and media. Next, those people were tortured by the Hitler's police force. However, he did not content himself with those actions. As the last way, millions of Jews were mercilessly exposed to death in the camps that the Nazis constituted, which is still one of the cruellest practises of a totalitarian leader. After gaining power and implementing those kinds of operations, the final movement of Hitler, the Nazi people, and the master class was to start invading other countries, which was the starter of the Second World War and the beginning of the end for them.

As it can be seen from the ideas, feelings, and actions of Adolf Hitler, it will be appropriate to say that he has been a notorious figure in history. At first, he had been seen a saviour for the German nation thanks to his oration skills. However, it did not take long to understand his fascist beliefs. In addition, he has been an excellent example of how totalitarianism can be practiced and what results can be expected from this kind of system for a country and for the whole world. As a result, he became a corrupted leader after he gained the political and social power, and eventually, Adolf Hitler killed himself in a shelter at the end of his journey.

After Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany, there was another example of a totalitarian who caused similar consequences for innocent people in the Soviet Union. Iosif Vissarionovich Stalin, usually known as only Stalin, was born in 1879. He was not a fascist leader, but his actions were the same as a totalitarian controller. To comprehend Stalin's image, mentioning the Russian Revolution is essential. One of the main reasons of this revolution was the governmental system in the country. Before that, most of the authority was monopolized by Tsar Nicholas II. Several changes to moderate the ruling mechanism were applied, but they were not rewarding since Tsar did not welcome any ideas which could be called reforms. Also, people were working in harsh conditions for not enough money to live. It was given a great importance to industrialization since it was accepted as the way of modernization, but low payment, unsafe, and hard working conditions were the real sides of industries (Wade, 2005, p. 5). In such an environment, it was inevitable to attempt riots, so several incidents happened before World War I. Among these, the February Revolution was an important one because the operation and the war occurred at the same time. As a result, Tsar Nicholas II was displaced, and a new government was founded in the Soviet Union.

The new government did not last long, like its subsequent ones due to the conditions of the First World War. In 1917, a new era for the country began with the triumph of the Bolshevik Revolution. To make a peace with Germany, the new authority agreed to abandon its lands, which caused a civil war among supporters of the new and the old ruling systems. Nevertheless, the main goal of Lenin, who was the leader of the latest system at that time, was to implement communism for the Soviet Union. For that reason, the property of Tsar was dispersed among the society, and it was also endeavoured to give acceptable rights to workers. These resolutions were followed by some other alterations that made it possible for Lenin to gain more power for his authority. At the same time, democratic practises and criticisms about the government were not welcomed by him, so the foundations of a totalitarian system were formed before Stalin.

After Lenin's death, there were two candidates to become the leader: Trotsky, the Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Soviet Union, and Stalin, the secretary of the Communist party. Even if Stalin was in a worse position than his rival, what he did to win this battle was that he did not announce the health condition of Lenin before he died while he was making false news about Trotsky because he knew that Trotsky was the main character to replace Lenin. Also, Stalin mostly used Lenin's propagandas, and he made the society believe the trueness of his theories by relying upon the claims of previous leaders (Suvorov, 2009, p. 70). By doing so, Stalin weakened Trotsky as he was obtaining the power of his contender. With his strategies, Stalin managed to prevent Trotsky's future as a leader, and started to show himself as the best option for the controller of the communist system.

Consequently, Stalin became the leader of the country. As it has been stated before, he was not a fascist leader like Mussolini or Hitler, but still, he gradually established a totalitarian regime. Different from his forerunners, he embraced communism for the future of the Soviet Union. His major goal was gaining economic freedom of the country by not getting any financial assistance from other countries. To achieve that purpose by communism, industries and farms were taken under the control of government because all sources must be in the hands of the ruling mechanism so that they could be distributed to the society equally. This strategy became more prominent with the help of the propaganda. According to the message, workers of capitalist system were hopeless while high living standards and quality working conditions were provided to people in the Soviet Union (Davies, 1997, p. 5). In terms of economy, this system

worked successfully, but the problem was on the side of people's welfare. As the Soviet Union reached a satisfying profit-making level, the citizens got poorer, and they were required to comply with the legislations which made them more desperate. Especially, farm owners and workers left their lands to migrate to work in factories as it was not permitted to any kind of private industries. Additionally, farming laws were determined by the government and even the extra goods were needed to be delivered to the state because they would be dispersed to industry workers. That incident bothered especially individual farmers who owned many properties which they could not use, so they began to utter their dissatisfaction about the system. Thus, an action was required to suppress those people like expelling them from their villages, sending them to prisons, or executing them. Therefore, a totalitarian system was formed with its leader, victims, and punishment mechanisms.

Soon after, those applications caused a civil war in the country. Rebels, villagers in other words, started to kill farm animals, eradicate machines and gadgets used in agriculture, and burn lands. As a result, they were displaced to distant fields to be punished. Those territories included labour camps which were called Gulags. In Gulags, victims were employed in harsh conditions, tortured, and murdered. In that way, a similar system that Hitler formed was created by Stalin as well since those places were guarded by police the government was appointed. Also, those regions were far away from the centres and a lot of railroads, dams, and canals were built there (Magstadt, 2009, p. 128). Furthermore, not only farmers who rioted against the established rules, but also people who criticized Stalin's system were also brought those Gulags and they had the same horrible experiences. Eventually, Gulags turned into prisons where dissenting citizens were tortured and executed by the authority. By this way, Stalin put the final and the most essential parts of a totalitarian into the practice, which were fear and punishment.

As a result of his system, millions of people expelled, imprisoned, or killed when he reached the control of absolute power. As a totalitarian leader would do, Stalin abused it in a way that the society was harmed. In addition, he was in a false belief that any kind of opposition against him was a plan to overthrow him. Therefore, he started another method of punishment. At the first step, this way was practiced to the old communist party members who resigned from the party as they witnessed that Stalin was becoming a dictator. Those people were announced as "wreckers, spies, diversionists, and murderers sheltering behind the party card and disguised as Bolsheviks" (Ostrow, 2012, p. 28). The

second point of this practice was to silence the other people who were scientists, military officers, media organs, and writers who were on the other side of Stalin. In this way, it became impossible to freely talk, write, or express opinions in any kind of way as all forms were observed. Moreover, those people were tortured to confess on the public trials that they were enemies of government. Similar to the Gulag practice, plenty of people were tormented, exiled, sent into jails, and killed as a consequence of the dictator.

As it can be understood from the examples, totalitarian ruling mechanism includes some key points that should be present according to the situation of a country. For the first of these, the nation must face with difficulties which necessitate them to seek for a leader. This figure must be a saviour and protector for people, so the controller becomes the head of the country with the support and willingness of the society. To achieve this purpose, commitments, strategies, and actions of the leader are significant since by using these, he gets the power. Next, the practices are started to be applied one by one. For each of these actions, rules and laws are put forward under the shadow of controlling citizens for their welfare. As time passes, these elements become norms that cannot be questioned or objected. To hold people inside the regulated circle, the police are used by the government and those who dare to exist the system are punished. The level of punishments and penalties increases day by day, which enables the dictator to hold power in his hands. Also, the media tools are abused according to the benefits of the leader, so the controller, the party, the system, and the norms are illustrated as the normal and essential ones. In the last phase of this ruling mechanism, the whole system cannot endure the oppositions and finally, it collapses by leaving millions of people behind who are discriminated, tortured, and killed.

The outcomes of both wars created such an environment that multiple countries were ruled by totalitarianism with its dictators. As it has been mentioned, the main reason of choice was fear that every individual felt no matter where he was. It was a well-known fact that the war between countries finished, but the one inside a nation was still present. With the execution of totalitarianism, many changes in social, political, and economic sides of life were witnessed. The most radical adjustments happened in the judgement mechanism as it was a lifesaver for the dictator. Therefore, necessary elements were arranged accordingly for the tyranny of the leader without considering individual freedom and welfare. Gradually, the whole system with its rules, rulers, laws, penalties, executions, and oppressions created the most undesired conditions for citizens. In

addition to rebellious individuals who realized what was going to happen in the future, other people in the society also recognized the deprivations, harms, and inequality in each piece of action. As time passed, all people became the witness of the restricting system, and they began to question the veracity of this mechanism. As a result, individuals acknowledged that they lived in a horrible, cruel, and unpleased way along with the place, which is called dystopia as a whole. Like the secret enemy concept, dystopia is singular and special for individuals in the society as circumstances, events, constraints, and the totalitarian structures are different for each state. Moreover, every person lives in his own dystopic world because of the diverse characteristics, feelings, types, and experiences that shape the personality. For this concept, fear is the significant factor, which is also true even for dystopian novels because people face with their fears when they read dystopian works even if these worries do not reflect the truth or they are not really serious (Gordin et al., 2010, p.2).

Dystopia is a term that is used not only in literature, but also in other working fields such as art, architecture, and philosophy. Nevertheless, it is mostly considered as a type of novel. In a dystopian novel, it is possible to see totalitarianism with the usage of evil, oppressive, and dictatorial figures. Writers cleverly include define terms and figures to indicate the circumstance or the problem causing dystopic world of the literary work. For example, after World War II, many authors go towards satires to remark that the war and its consequences are present, and it is endeavoured to be shared with readers so that they can notice the conditions more completely.

Dystopian works illustrate a dark, depressive, and pessimist world both for the characters and readers. The goodness, beauty, perfectness, and optimism which are existing elements in utopias are rejected because in dystopian works of art, the present and future are depicted as hopeless. Also, a dystopia for many individuals can be a utopia for specific people. Gordin et al. (2010) states:

A true opposite of utopia would be a society that is either completely unplanned or is planned to be deliberately terrifying and awful. Dystopia, typically invoked, is neither of these things; rather, it is a utopia that has gone wrong, or a utopia that functions only for a particular segment of society (p. 2).

This kind of relationship between a dystopia and a utopia is clear in a totalitarian system. While citizens suffer from terrible conditions of living, a dictator with his group and organization has everything for his benefits. For that reason, writers want to point out the inequality of this system in their works. In that way, the goal of authors is to warn

humanity. Cruelty, disorder, and terror are factors that threaten mankind. Furthermore, it is not probable to escape from these elements because every individual carries the same and even more matters with his inner self. The age, gender, nation, country, culture, or religion do not matter as in dystopic works, characters are designed accordingly from the writers. For instance, Herbert George Wells' *The Time Machine*, Aldous Housley's *Brave New World*, George Orwell's *Animal Farm and 1984*, and William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* are prominent examples of this issue.

Influences of World War I and II have created unforgettable memories for writers. They cannot escape from the disastrous consequences, and it becomes a necessity for them to share their emotions, ideas, perceptions, and interpretations with readers. While authors are under the effects of the subjects, they endeavour to depict these for other people. Even if purposes of writers can be different from one another, the way which they discuss and approach the concepts is comparable. For that reason, it is possible to see dystopian novels with totalitarian regimes in most of the post-war works. In this way, authors aim to comment ongoing matters in a country or around the world, and also, they seek to show their dissatisfaction about the wars by including historical characters, incidents, and figures in their literary works.

1.3. William Golding as a Novelist

A novelist, poet, and play writer, William Golding was born in 1911. In the first part of his career, he worked as a teacher at different schools. At the same time, he published several poems during that time. Nevertheless, he has been mostly known with his great work, *Lord of the Flies*, which made it possible for him to win the Nobel prize in 1983 as a novelist. This masterpiece includes precious reflections about the post-war period and the style of Golding, so this novel is the most significant source to comprehend him as a novel writer.

By a lot of different critics, William Golding has been perceived and commented as a pessimist novelist. Besides his own words for this issue, the topics, concepts, messages, and symbols of his works have evidential values for this perception. At the same time, his life experiences direct and shape his way of formation. Even if he was only 7 years old at the end of the First World War, his following career and beliefs about humanity were deeply affected due to the politics of England and the conflicts among other European countries. However, the major change of his life and the primary focus of

his works formed during the World War II. At that time, he was a member of Royal Navy and Golding played an active role in the destruction of lands and killing of many people, so he became aware of his capabilities as a soldier. According to Kastan (2006):

William Golding was deeply affected by World War II and its various atrocities, not least the Jewish Holocaust. In 1940, joined the Royal Navy and served in Atlantic as an ordinary seaman on missions that included chasing the German warship Bismarck, before being recruited for a position with a Ministry of Defence established that developed and tested weapons in 1940 at the age of twenty-nine. (...) Goldings naval experience is woven into his fiction, as are surface details of the war (p. 428).

As a result of these experiences, Golding banishes the notion of goodness of humanity from his mind. Therefore, he focuses on the depressive and sinister sides of people from all ages, and because of this, he uses children as the main characters of the mentioned novel. For him, every individual carries the instinct of harming others.

Another important element that influences his perception is the totalitarian system used in Germany and other countries. During his life, it is hard for him to understand and justify the actions of dictators like Hitler and Mussolini because it is not possible for him to explain the actions of these people words. About this concept, Golding (1966) says:

Before the Second World War I believed in the perfectibility of social man; that a correct structure of society produced goodwill; and that therefore you could remove all social ills by a reorganisation of society. It is possible that I believe something of the same again; but after the war I did not because I was unable to. I had discovered what one man could do to another. I'm not talking of one man killing another with a gun, or dropping a bomb on him or blowing him up or torpedoing him. I am thinking of the vileness beyond all words that went on, year after year, in the totalitarian states (pp. 86-87).

With all these incidents, William Golding pens *Lord of the Flies*. In the work, he enlightens inner sides of characters which cause them to act in particular ways. Golding cleverly puts data from history on incidents and makes them vivid for readers. He tries to show the evil side of people and dangers of the totalitarian ruling system with the hands of dictators by placing them on appropriate parts of the novel. By using lots of symbols, the writer shows the presence of history and historical figures in his literary work. In doing so, he points out that literature is a source of history with its all elements.

Another substantial aspect of Golding is that he adopts the dynamic environment around himself. That means William Golding invariably searches the new for his current times since he endeavours to produce disparate pieces of works. Gindin (2016) reports: "As he often says, he sees no point in writing the same novel twice" (p. 6). Though there are some common subjects among his fictions, all of them are considerably different from

one another. This attempt contributes to his idiosyncratic style and makes his works distinguishable, but exclusive.

To conclude, the First and the Second World War mould Golding's feelings and ideas about humanity. Since he is an eyewitness of both, his personality is shaped by the wars and their outcomes. Also, he stays under the effects of totalitarian and fascist executions from different countries. During his life, Golding endeavours to prove that every human being is capable of harming others no matter how old he is; where he is from, and what his occupation is. To support his ideas, he writes novels which show him as pessimistic but realistic. In his works, he mentions significant information belonging to the past and it is possible to encounter with plenty of indications about historical facts. Similarly, Golding exhibits striking fictions which have particular aspects and purposes. Through his abilities to incorporate the reality and fiction in a distinctive way, William Golding is regarded as one of the greatest novelists in English literature.

1.4. George Orwell and His Concepts: Power and Politics

As a son of a civil servant in India, Eric Arthur Blair was born in Bengal in 1903. Even if his real name is Eric, all over the world, he is mostly known with his pen name, George Orwell. By starting from his early ages, Orwell was interested in literature, and he started his writing career with some poems when he came to England. Several of these were published in local newspapers, and even at that time, he got some reputation in the field of poetry. Different from his peers, he could not continue to his education for a long time due to poverty and at the end of his educational life which he maintained with some scholarships, he found himself as a member of Indian Imperial Police Force in Burma.

During his term of office, Orwell witnessed executions of the British colonial system, so it took 5 years for him to sustain his job there. These implementations formed the first step of his view towards politics of states because he understood that he was in the incorrect side of this conflict. As a result of these practises, his ideas about force, equality, bigotry, and life developed. George Orwell (1986) concludes:

I was conscious of an immense weight of guilt that I had to expiate (...) I felt that I had got to escape not merely from imperialism but from every form of man's dominion over man. I wanted to submerge myself, to get right down among the oppressed, to be one of them and on their side against their tyrants (p. 129-130).

Under the effect of these feelings and beliefs, he resigned from his job and left India. When he returned to England, he worked at different jobs to maintain his life before

becoming a writer. His awareness about imperialism was carried by him till the rest of his life even if he was wounded and almost killed in the Spanish Civil War. Nevertheless, he did not abandon his notions and continued to stay against any kind of totalitarianism. Another example of his perseverance occurred during World War II. Through the first period of the war, he worked at BBC, but he did not want to be the advocator of British propaganda. For that reason, he also quitted from this job and followed his own values.

Even if Orwell does not accept to attend the Second World War, he asserts that people must endeavour to get what they deserve, and if necessary, war can be the way of fighting against tyrannies. The technical sides, tools, and methods of wars are not primary for him. Rather, George Orwell cares the link between war and politics because he tries to show that the practice of will and oppression are found on the base of politics, and violence is an unavoidable situation for countries in that condition (Stone, 2016, p. 222). For that reason, he supports that risks must be taken to resolve totalitarian states, like Germany, and their owners, like the Nazi group. About this concept, Stone (2016) also points out: “Those who rejected this necessary evil were, he maintained, guilty of allowing their squeamishness about violence to distort their reasoning, or dangerously naïve about the threat posed by Hitler” (p. 222). In other words, Orwell believes that to demolish a tyranny, its defence mechanisms must be destroyed and by directing force it becomes achievable. Therefore, the implementation of force directly affects the condition of a country as well as its citizens’ well-being.

It will be true to say that George Orwell’s life is formed by political and historical facts. In addition to his experiences in Burma and Spain, conditions of totalitarian states such as Germany and Russia direct his perceptions. As Bounds (2009) argues: “Orwell framed his account of modern dictatorship with a portrait of the role of intellectuals in totalitarian societies” (p. 151). Therefore, it is possible to find traces of past in his works since reflections of these events are mingled with Orwell’s ideas, and they are presented together to readers inside fictions. *Animal Farm* and *1984* are distinguished novels which carry the mentioned elements of his style. In these pieces of works, readers find themselves in an environment where they can see, hear, and touch; in other words, feel the narrative since it is depicted as an alternative form of reality with characters, events, symbols, and motifs. This parallelism is the preeminent feature of Orwell’s novels as in that way, he strongly founds a correlation between the real world and the inner selves of readers. It can be also added that the portrait of history and historical facts are presented

so impressively that every individual finds matters about himself, and also, about the external world.

George Orwell embraces the characteristics of a political writer. In his works, he talks about both his own times and future. He mainly deals with how power and politics are intertwined, which enables the execution of a totalitarian regime. According to Stone: (2016), “He maintained an intimate link between politics and force such that one is not possible without the other” (p. 223). For that reason, he alleges that if a ruling mechanism does not use power effectively, it is vulnerable and is ready to collapse. Similarly, Orwell believes that the relationship between countries is similar since force is the ultimate source of states both for their citizens and for their presence against others. For that reason, every individual accepts to live in a condition which power feels itself. This acceptance also involves the risk of war between countries too, otherwise the regime will not be long-lasting. As it has been mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the critical matter behind war is significant for Orwell, so it is stated that: “Whatever he personally felt about war, the logic of its necessity was the compelling point for Orwell” (Stone, 2016, p. 223).

Despite these specified matters about George Orwell’s political and social views, it is not feasible to identify his theories by an exact approach. He embraces several features of communism, but he cannot be only considered as a communist. Likewise, it is an accepted case that he is against most of the governmental structure. Nonetheless, he is not a total anarchist. One of the fundamental causes of this uncertainty is that he does not feel that he is an individual of his own class in the society. In addition, he correlates a strong bond with the culture of working people. Commenting on Orwell, Bounds (2009) states: “Whatever else he might have been, the author of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was never a good party man” (p. 15). Therefore, he is not a strict follower of a perspective, but rather, he carries a combination of many.

In the view of all that has been mentioned so far, it can be concluded that George Orwell is impressed by the social, political, and historical incidents since his childhood. Because of his experiences which lead to a major change in his viewpoint, he opposes to any kind of totalitarian, dictatorial, or imperialist regimes. He does not also accept the class system in a society. Although his conceptions cannot be ordered under a specific angle, it is acknowledged that he stands against inequality and injustice. In some

situations, Orwell suggests war because power is the controller of a state, and it can be captured by the society. In that way, it becomes possible for individuals to take their freedom back from dictators. For his notions, Orwell faces with challenging conditions, yet he does not yield against them. In most of his works, connections between history and fiction are present. These relationships make the real world more explicit as Orwell manages to show it much better thanks to his writing abilities. For that reason, his works are like fictional sources of history which can be sensed by each individual in a different way.

2. CHAPTER TWO

2.1. A General Perspective to *Lord of the Flies*

Lord of the Flies is a distinguished work which combines both William Golding's creativity and historical circumstances of the written period. In the novel, political and social conditions of countries after the Second World War are examined. This piece of art was written in 1954 by William Golding and even in the first part of the novel, which depicts children escaping from a war zone, there are considerable incidents that can relate to the historical background of the period. "Ralph danced out into the hot air of the beach and then returned as a fighter-plane, with wings swept back, and machine-gunned Piggy. 'Sche-aa-ow!'" (Golding, 1954, pp. 12-13).

William Golding does not affirm that he pens *Lord of the Flies* as a historical book. Nonetheless, it contains lots of elements which can be associated with what happens in the period of post-war. Generally, the novel illustrates how opposite sides stay together such as "Christianity and paganism, innocence and guilt, childhood and adulthood, civilization and anarchy, collectivism and individuality, and democratic values as opposed to tyranny" (Ireland, 2017, p. 27). For that reason, it is possible to state that the novel is a representation of the battle between the dogmas of East and West as this is the current incident after the Second World War and during the Cold War.

The themes, motifs, and symbolism in the novel are also reflections of these contrary ideologies and, they are handled in the direction of historical references. The conch is one of the notable figures which is designed as a representation of democracy because of the way that it is used. Since each child has a right to express himself, the way children do it is to have the conch when he speaks. "That's what this shell's called. I'll give the conch to the next person to speak. He can hold it when he's speaking" (Golding, 1954, p. 45). On the other hand, spears that Jack's group utilizes to hunt not only animals, but also children in the other crowd are showed as a tool of tyranny. After Jack takes the control of the island, wherever he goes, he takes his spear with him, and he uses it effectively while giving speeches to other children. "Jack ignored him, lifted his spear and began to shout. 'Listen all of you. Me and my hunters, we're living along the beach by a flat rock. We hunt and feast and have fun. If you want to join my tribe come and see us. Perhaps I'll let you join. Perhaps not'" (Golding, 1954, p. 201). In that way, Jack

shows who has the physical and mental power since he pledges others a better life. In other words, he uses his spear as a sceptre.

Like the conch and spear, there are other symbols for representations of various conceptions. Piggy's glasses, black cloaks that Jack's tribe wear, the death body of the pilot, Jack's mask on his face, and the fire which children try to keep are all indications of several concepts. Therefore, their analysis helps to enlighten the novel, and the historical events of the era.

In *Lord of the Flies*, all the main characters are children not only because this novel tries to depict the hardships of them far from civilization, but William Golding craves to prove what any individual can do to obtain power and control when it is necessary. It is claimed by the writer that instincts of individuals can direct them in difficult conditions. He believes every human being is capable of harming others because both they want it, and it is in their nature. He reaches this consciousness as a result of his experiences in World War II. "Golding was shocked by his own capacity to harm his fellow humans" (Deyab, 2016, p. 76). According to him, the most hazardous object in the world is mankind. Similarly, human beings are the major reasons for continuing conflicts and rivalry. Furthermore, they do it at the cost of harming their own kinds. For that reason, he believes that the biggest reason of the war and its consequences is the ambition of people due to their hunger for power.

During his life, William Golding is included in politics with his ideas and actions. Since he is aware of the fact that the world is in danger of dictatorship during the period of World War II, he endeavours to show its dreadful effects to humanity. By starting from Chapter 10 of the novel, he sets the totalitarian regime on the island. Before doing so, first, he positions an enemy for the children; the beast, and then, two groups of parties are formed to represent and follow particular methods for the annihilation of the antagonist. Next, leaders of these groups explain their goals and ways, but Jack gains the authority thanks to his abilities to hunt; he affects others with his physical abilities and psychological superiority. Also, his effective speeches help him to become the tyrant of the system which is dictatorship. When the creation of these steps is examined in a detailed way, it can be observed that Golding depicts the social and political environment which dictatorship requires.

In *Lord of the Flies*, he introduces two different leaders with their distinctive ruling methods. Ralph and Jack have similar features of a democratic and dictatorial ruler respectively. William Golding suggests there are distinct characteristics for dictatorship which are present at the systems of most dictators (Deyab, 2016, p. 78). By placing the plot around these representative characters, the writer depicts the exercises of their systems and shows their influences on other characters of the novel, which can be seen as the society of a country that is ruled by a dictator. Therefore, new historicism can be applied to *Lord of the Flies* by grasping its characters, plot, symbols, and other significant details which connect literature with the 20th century under the hands of William Golding.

2.2. Symbolism of Historical Figures on Characters

In the novel, characters are designed as the main representations of historical background of the period. Therefore, a new historicist approach will be applied to characters first. By making a comparison among opposed figures such as Ralph, Jack, Piggy, and Roger, their roles will be studied to reveal their positions in the history.

2.2.1. Ralph as a Democratic Leader

At the first part of the novel, Ralph is chosen as the leader of the boys on the island without overwhelming other children, so it can be said that he is an “elected” leader. “Every hand outside the choir except Piggy’s was raised immediately. Then Piggy, too, raised his hand grudgingly into the air” (Golding, 1954, p. 29). There are several reasons why he is chosen by the group of children. Firstly, his physical features enable him to carry some leadership qualifications. He looks fit and strong: “You could see now that he might make a boxer, as far as width and heaviness of shoulders went” (Golding, 1954, p. 11). At the same time, his kindness and sensibility are clear in his eyes since they “proclaimed no devil” (Golding, 1954, p. 11). Secondly, Ralph is the son of a commander in Navy, so he is the person who carries the hopes of others to be saved. Lastly and most importantly, he has the conch showing that he has the power to speak and at the same time, others must listen to him unless they have it. In other words, the conch makes it possible to express his ideas for the speaker and maintain silence among other children at the time of speaking. In his analysis of *Lord of the Flies*, Deyab (2016) identifies the

importance of the conch by saying: “Finally, Ralph has the conch shell, which represents something from the adult world, a megaphone from the airport” (p. 7). In this way, a democratic environment is set on the island with the presence of the conch and Ralph becomes the leader of the boys because he has it.

After Ralph gets the authority on the island, the first thing that he does is that he establishes several rules. These regulations are put for the sake of everyone’s welfare as it is performed in all democratic regimes. For example, the usage of the conch is one of the first principles that must be obeyed. Similarly, Ralph declares that the place of the conch determines the location of the meeting, and all children must gather for it. “We ought to have more rules. Where the conch is, that’s a meeting. The same up here as down there” (Golding, 1954, p. 58). Also, the rules comprise Ralph himself, so he must obey the orders since he believes that there must be no discrepancy between the leader and the other members of the group. For that reason, Ralph acts like a representative of the group who is responsible from making the organization among children and creating an equal atmosphere on the island in the light of rules and regulations (Basirat & Farhoud, 2015, p. 193).

Next, Ralph charges all children according to their physical capacities and abilities. Mainly, he reminds others that they will be rescued sooner or later, but to provide it as soon as possible, they need to work. He thinks each child must have a task on the island. Thus, he starts to appoint children for suitable tasks. Ralph believes that the most important task of children is to make a fire since in that way they can be noticed by a ship. “So we must make smoke on top of the mountain. We must make a fire” (Golding, 1954, p. 51). Ralph even nominates Jack and his group by making them responsible from hunting by declaring “Jack’s in charge of the choir” (Golding, 1954, p. 30). What Ralph attempts to do is the division of labour since he is in the notion that if all children act and work as a group, it will be achievable for them to overcome the hardships that they can face on the island and eventually, all are able to be saved with minimum damage. Therefore, in each meeting, Ralph mentions that they need to work together for that ambition, which also shows the presence of democracy in his authority.

Another characteristic of Ralph that makes him a democratic leader is he pays attention to everyone’s ideas. He supports the littluns to express their notions during the meetings. Even if others’ beliefs or ideas are against his actions or his authority, Ralph

welcomes them with empathy. He concentrates on the feelings, especially fear of children, and criticism about himself (Deyab, 2016, p. 81-82). Additionally, he is aware of the fact that Jack feels humiliated because he is not chosen as the leader of the children, so Ralph allows him to stay as the head of his own group to moderate his feelings. In that way also, he intends to create a sense of wholeness for all children on the island.

From the beginning of the novel till the end of his authority, it is witnessed that Ralph is an accountable leader. Setting some rules for the children on the island as the first action is an evident proof of his sense of responsibility. He also endeavours to discover the place to make sure that it is an island. "We ought to draw a map" (Golding, 1954, p. 35). Another reason for this wish of exploration is that he tries to comfort young ones about the beast by proving that it is not actually present on the island. "Ralph exerts all possible efforts to reassure them that there is no beast on the island" (Deyab, 2016, p. 80). Therefore, Ralph aims both to keep the possible dangers away from his group and ensure the unity with safeness for all children from the youngest to the oldest ones.

Thinking before acting is a significant characteristic which every democratic leader must have. In *Lord of the Flies*, Ralph is the example of this kind of ruler since he arranges his language appropriately. Before he decides about the subjects that concern everybody, he remarks that he needs time to think. "Listen, everybody. I've got to have time to think things out. I can't decide what to do straight off" (Golding, 1954, p.30). By doing so, Ralph endeavours to adhere to the most logical and advantageous method. Additionally, he tries to dispel fear from little children's minds. As for him, fear prevents reasoning (Deyab, 2016, p. 80). Thus, it can be concluded that another reason why he relieves the littluns is to put consciousness and logic in front of their feelings.

To strengthen this clear thinking and sensibility among children, Ralph's honesty plays an important part. He is a frank and reliable person for children as he expresses his ideas and feelings directly. He tries to be understood by everybody on the island since he thinks children must behave by considering the organization and its needs. Therefore, Ralph searches for the most accurate words and phrases in his speeches to be understood by his community. "He was searching his mind for simple words so that even the littluns would understand what the assembly was about" (Golding, 1954, p 111). This characteristic of Ralph also shows that he arranges his manners equally for everyone, which is the essential quality that a democratic leader needs to have.

The analysis of Ralph demonstrates that he carries the fundamental features of a democratic leader. Right after he becomes the leader of the children, he sets rules, and he holds himself responsible from them too. His sense of responsibility ensures that he works with his group for the same purpose: to be rescued from the island. To manage that goal, each child is charged by him suitably because he believes that everyone must work and must be a part of the system to sustain the dynamism on the island. Also, Ralph approaches towards other children's feelings and notions with empathy. By doing so, he aims to behave equally to all children. Basirat & Farhoud (2015) points out:

Rather than assuming the role of a 'leader,' [Ralph] turns to an organizing and law enforcing 'member' whose assignments are designated by law. His efforts are aimed at safeguarding the children against the possible dangers of the outside nature, exploring its resources for their benefit, and finally saving them from the island ... Ralph's group prioritizes the members' common interests over the personal interests of any single individual, and as a result, there appears to be a cooperative atmosphere in which there is no room for any great discrimination between the leadership and the main body of the group (p. 193).

The mentioned features of Ralph show parallelism between the characteristics of some democratic leaders from the history. Among these, Winston Churchill is the most preeminent one as there are a lot of common traits between him and Ralph. First, he is in the notion that the collapse of dictatorship is possible with the implementation of democracy. Because he believes "the survival of civilization and the well-being of mankind" (Wilson, 2012, p.1) depend on the application of democracy, and "understanding of human nature" (Wilson, 2012, p.1) is combined with the feature of Churchill's attitudes towards society. In such an environment that dictators and their actions from different countries can be witnessed, he becomes the pioneer of a new challenge against tyranny which is democracy. As Quinault (2001) notes: "He played a leading role in the ideological battles between democracy and dictatorship in the first half of the twentieth century and he was one of the principal architects of the modern democratic order" (p. 201).

These attitudes also provide him to be an elected leader. During his regime, he clearly states that war is not a solution of the quarrels between people. For that reason, he is an advocator of peace in the world and one of his main approaches for the politics is to find another way instead of the endless battles between countries. "To give security to these countless homes, they must be shielded from the two giant marauders, war and tyranny" (Churchill, 1946 p. 3). Likewise, in *Lord of the Flies*, during the conflict between Ralph and Jack for the authority, Ralph rejects to fight against him since he knows that this will not solve the problem. "Take another example; when Jack, for the first time,

challenges Ralph's authority, Ralph is reluctant to fight him, not out of cowardice or physical weakness but rather, because his noble nature is loath to use his physical strength against weaker boys" (Deyab, 2016, p. 83). By looking at these examples, it can be concluded that both Churchill and Ralph consider war as an unnecessary way of acting even if they have enough power to emerge victorious. The main reason behind their notions is that they care for the others, in other words, the weak ones in the society who suffer from conditions of war more than themselves. For that reason, these two leaders set the welfare of communities before their ambitions.

One of the other similarities between Winston Churchill and Ralph is that they both believe the importance of freedom and democracy. According to Churchill, every individual has a right to live independently in a democratic environment. He points out the importance of "the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, (...) freedom of speech and thought should reign" (Churchill, 1946, p. 4) in a state. To ensure that it is possible, he empathises with people and attempts to govern the country accordingly. In addition, he is careful about his language like Ralph since he also thinks that communication between him and society is crucial for the future of the country. Thus, he is known with his open and direct expressions. As Wilson (2012) points out: "Churchill communicated what he thought and felt to those he believed would benefit from his message. He was open and clear, as opposed to sending hidden messages. He offered his honest thoughts, ideas, and feelings" (p. 1). For that reason, he enhances the reliance of the society members on him as Ralph does during his regime.

Winston Churchill and Ralph carry similar characteristics to become an influential leader. To begin with, they are aware of their position as a leader. "Ralph moved impatiently. The trouble was, if you were a chief you had to think, you had to be wise" (Golding, 1954, p. 110). Similarly, both see the circumstances of people who are in need of their appeal. For that reason, Ralph endeavours to ease the feelings of littluns. Additionally, Churchill and Ralph behave strategically for the issues and problems with which they encounter. Since they are cognizant of others in their community, they look for solutions corresponding to the troubles. Also, both leaders decide their approaches and follow methods by considering future. Lastly, they have the control of language, so the usage of it is a significant element of their ruling system. As Lord (2001) argues:

In order to perform effectively, leaders (especially, though not only, political leaders) arguably need four qualities: an understanding of their country and its history; an understanding of the

strategic environment they face, and of their actual and potential adversaries; a vision of the future; and an ability to communicate. Churchill's possession of all four qualities explains why he was the great leader that he was (p. 142).

The evidence presented in this section suggests that Ralph is a representation of a democratic leader in *Lord of the Flies* with his ideas, feelings, actions, and methods of ruling the island. He has a lot of common points with Winston Churchill, who is a remarkable figure in the history of democracy. Both are the kinds of leaders that try to implement the necessities of a democratic state in hard conditions. They believe the importance of freedom, so the support of equality is a not coincidence for their regimes. These elected rulers utilize all possible sources for the benefit of others, and they see themselves as a member of their communities. Mindfulness about their language and being farsighted contribute their characteristics required to be an effective leader. Plus, their honesty towards other people enables them to be understood clearly, so they maintain the operation of ruling smoothly. This maintenance combines with the empathy that they show towards every individual, which contribute to the unity and integrity of not only the supporters of them, but also every member of society. With these ways, they attempt to set the foundations of a well-being community and sustain peace both inside and outside of the state in logical ways.

2.2.2. The Voice of Logic and Justice: Piggy

After Ralph, the second examined character will be Piggy who is the other crucial person for the implementation of democracy in the novel. Like Ralph, he endeavours to maintain the democratic regime on the island despite hardships. He is both a friend of Ralph and a reflection of many concepts of democracy, so his character analysis also enlightens the democratic examples and procedures from the 20th century in the novel.

One of the essential components of Ralph rule is Piggy because without him, it is impossible for Ralph to maintain his administration. "He is absorbed in himself in the beginning until Piggy helps awaken his social consciousness" (Chavan, 2013, p. 1519). In Ralph's democratic system, Piggy mainly represents logic both physically thanks to his glasses, and practically with the help of his clever and efficient ideas for different circumstances. By starting from the first chapter of the novel, Piggy shows his intelligence by emphasizing the significant points to survive on the island. Firstly, he realizes the conch and he believes that it possible to use the conch as a kind of microphone

which announces the sound of democracy on the island. At the same time, he teaches Ralph how to use it effectively. “‘No. A shell.’ Suddenly Piggy was a-bubble with decorous excitement. (...) ‘A conch he called it. He used to blow it and then his mum would come. It’s ever so valuable’—” (Golding, 1954, p. 18) Second, he mentions the importance of building shelters because he knows that they need to be covered from rain and also other dangers during the time that they will spend on the island. “‘The first thing we ought to have made was shelters down there by the beach. It wasn’t half cold down there in the night’” (Golding, 1954, p. 62). In addition, Piggy is always aware of the feelings that Jack has towards Ralph, so he warns Ralph to be careful about his approach to Jack. When Ralph underestimates Jack and his hunters, Piggy states: “‘Now you done it. You been rude about his hunters’” (Golding, 1954, p. 179). Piggy knows the relationship between Ralph and Jack is getting worse because Jack’s disaffection with Ralph’s authority is obvious. Therefore, he warns Ralph and tries to make him notice that his democratic system and executions are under Jack’s thread.

Justice is the other element that Piggy symbolizes in the novel. He believes that each boy on the island is equal and there must be no room for privilege. Primarily, all ideas are valuable for him since they share the same environment and there must be a correlation among the boys. As it happens in a democratic system, this unity can be provided with justice and equality. For that reason, Piggy suggests that everyone has a right to speak when they have the conch. “‘Let him have the conch!’” shouted Piggy. ‘Let him have it!’” (Golding, 1954, p. 48). This characteristic combines with freedom of speech, which is one more indispensable item for democracy. Even if Piggy doubts whether he should say what he thinks in certain situations too, he performs necessities of the democratic environment on the island by expressing his opinions. Although Piggy is mocked by some at this point, he continues to state the truth for himself, and he encourages others to do so. In addition, he endeavours to play a part to discover the island, which also shows the struggle for existence of logic in a circumstance which requires physical capability and courage. “‘Piggy stirred. ‘I’ll come.’ (...) Jack and the others paid no attention. There was a general dispersal’” (Golding, 1954, p. 31). Again, he thinks that it is the right of everyone to perform the action which they want despite their defects.

The importance of logic and justice is vital for the implementation of democracy since these are the methods of demolishing physical power and savagery that other authorities such as dictatorship embrace. Both physical and psychological situations of

Piggy demonstrate that he does not carry either bodily superiority or selfish notions that end up with brutality. By looking at these points, it is possible to assert that Piggy represents the features of democracy. If Ralph is the implementation of the democratic system, Piggy is the necessities of it. Therefore, it has been argued that without Piggy, Ralph cannot achieve his established structure on the island. “Only, decided Ralph as he faced the chief’s seat, I can’t think. Not like Piggy” (Golding, 1954, p. 110). Similarly, without Ralph, Piggy is not effective as he is the voice of ideas, not actions. In other words, he is only present in terms of notions and thoughts because he does not take actions according to them. “Piggy could think. He could go step by step inside that fat head of his, only Piggy was no chief” (Golding, 1954, p. 110). Instead, Piggy makes other people behave and live in consideration of his suggestions and opinions. In sum, Ralph and Piggy constitute the democracy on the island together because one needs another for the implementation of the system.

When it is considered from that point, it is true to deduce that Piggy mirrors a society which interiorize the grandness of wisdom over bullying. Hence, Piggy is not only a portrayal of logic and equality, but also, he is the model of a community that acts according to the rational ways. Though he is exposed to cruel exercises by Jack, Roger, and other boys, he does not change his side and his ideas because he accepts the credibility of science and reasoning.

Another important characteristic Piggy has is that he acts not according to his instincts. Even in the most compelling circumstances, he manages to behave wisely since he perceives the method of solving problems which entails a scientific aspect. For that reason, he does not believe that there is a beast on the island. “‘Life,’ said Piggy expansively, ‘is scientific, that’s what it is. (...) I know there isn’t no beast—not with claws and all that, I mean—but I know there isn’t no fear, either.’” (Golding, 1954, pp. 118-119). Additionally, he shows no acts of worship to the lord of the flies contrary to other boys because he is not afraid of it. Instead, Piggy asserts that any kind of concern causes from people because this is the actual feeling. “Unless we get frightened of people” (Golding, 1954, p. 119). Thus, he endures the savagery of the totalitarian regime till his death and does not abandon his beliefs although he is frightened of Jack and his tyranny.

In addition to Piggy’s roles as the figure of logic and symbol of society, it is appropriate to present him as a party member. Presence of several parties is a need for

democracy because having different views in politics and choosing the one that is considered as the superior by voting freely set the democratic environment. Similarly, there are two different parties in the novel which are led by Ralph and Jack. From the very beginning of the novel, Piggy does not leave Ralph and he follows his regime despite all difficulties and struggles. “Piggy’s glasses flashed. ‘I was with him when he found the conch. I was with him before anyone else was’” (Golding, 1954, p. 31). They face with these challenges together and Piggy informs Ralph about the conceivable strategies to maintain his administration. Furthermore, he does not show any desire to be the chief of the island. The only thing Piggy tries to do is to support Ralph and his rule while he also displays propaganda for the sake of him. As a political party member does to the leader, Piggy adheres to Ralph by reminding him “You’re still chief” (Golding, 1954, p. 223). From these points, Piggy’s trust in Ralph is clearly seen since he stands together with Ralph not for his own interest, but he regards him as the true leader of the boys. For that reason, Piggy is also the figure of a political party member who supports the exercises of democracy for everyone’s benefits.

With all these, it is accurate to say that Piggy is the key element of democracy. He is a friend and the helper of Ralph, who is the reflection of the democratic leader, and he is the implementor of democracy on the island. Because of that reason, Piggy died and “the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist” (Golding, 1954, p. 260) at the same time. In other words, the end of democracy comes with the death of Piggy and the destruction of the conch. Additionally, Ralph feels all alone and is too away from practicing any form of democratic implementations since he does not have enough source for them. “There was no Piggy to talk sense. There was no solemn assembly for debate nor dignity of the conch” (Golding, 1954, p. 282). Therefore, there is no way to resist the dictatorship without Piggy.

In politics, there are several elements that democracy requires for its practice. For democracy and democratic leaders, the environment that is created by the society is significant as it is the ultimate foundation of the system. The essential element of this atmosphere is trust, which brings law, justice, equality, and freedom together. “It is not enough to itemize the essential features of democracy when there is no trust in those who govern the state (Olatunji, 2013, pp. 76-77).” In an environment on which reliance on a democratic leader is missing, it is not possible to talk about the presence of democracy.

Therefore, for each democratic system, it is necessary to ensure the trust in citizens, party members, and the leader as it happens in the novel thanks to Ralph and Piggy.

Equality and justice are constant components of democracy, and they are present in Ralph's ruling mechanism thanks to Piggy. As it has been mentioned so far, Piggy is the key figure for these features. Additionally, they provide an independent legislative power on the island, which is a prerequisite for the success of democracy. As Olatunji (2003) states: "The rule of law is an effective valuable in democracy because it promotes the following: responsibility, reciprocity and trust because these values basically embody what good governance and democracy stand for" (p. 75). Therefore, it is witnessed one more time that Piggy ensures the operation of democracy in more than one aspect.

Theoretically, democracy stands against any kinds of quarrels both inside the country and with other states since they cause a massive deterioration in lots of individual rights. Winston Churchill (1946) mentions the importance of making and maintaining peace by saying:

I spoke earlier of the Temple of Peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. (...) Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved again unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released (p. 6).

Churchill thinks that there is a possibility for the third war to be the most devastating one. Therefore, it must be avoided with the practice of peace in every state. Similarly, Piggy has the same attitude as supporters of democracy because he does not want Ralph and Jack to fight against each other. He says: "The thing is: we need an assembly" (Golding, 1954, p. 111). Piggy also believes that any kind of argument results in harm to all children, which makes it more difficult to survive on the island. For that reason, he shares similar concerns with people who embrace democracy and its requirements for a state.

Both Churchill and Piggy are against wars, and they believe reasoning is the approach to prevent disagreements and battles. Winston Churchill emphasizes the value of logic, and he makes an effort to use it as a precaution against wars. "There is the path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure" (Churchill, 1946, p. 6). From that point, it is true to infer that he and Piggy attempts to utilize judgment as a way of solving problems since this method is the correct form of limiting the number of conflicts.

In brief, Piggy is one of the most essential democratic figures in *Lord of the Flies* with Ralph since both form and apply democracy on the island. Piggy is the representation of more than one concept, but in all of these, he principally aims to perform this ruling system. In one part, he is seen as a party member while in the other, he is the reflection of logic and equality. To signalize the efficiency of his wisdom, he is depicted as an adult rather than a boy, and because of the same reason, he seeks for the answer for “What’s grown-ups going to think?” (Golding, 1954, p. 129) as he tries to determine the most logical way for each circumstance. All these have parallels with democratic executions and characters from the history like Winston Churchill. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that Piggy is present in the novel to represent the other foot of democracy applied in the 20th century by standing on the same side with Ralph.

2.2.3. A Tyrant on the Island: Jack

William Golding effectively portrays a leader who stands against tyranny by trying to practice democracy despite the hardships of the place and people. Before mentioning the regime of dictatorship, he illustrates the sort of life in an equal and free world. In the second phase of the regime, Jack takes over the leadership of the island, which makes it possible to show how a dictator appears, rules, and manipulates all the suitable sources. For that reason, the third character who will be studied is Jack that creates the flawless system of tyranny.

As the antagonist of Ralph, Jack reveals his hunger for leadership and power from the very beginning of the novel. His first appearance as the leader of the choir, the difference in his dress from other choir members, and the presence of his authority over them are distinguished foreshadowing about what is going to happen in the future. Furthermore, his cruel way of leading and controlling the group is also demonstrated to clearly indicate that under his regime, there is no room for weakness and objection since the group is “wearily obedient” (Golding, 1954, p. 26) even after the faint of one of the boys.

It is no surprise that this kind of character is present in the work since it is a well-known fact that William Golding is against dictatorship during his life. His main goal is to illustrate two different political systems emerging in the 20th century. For the dictatorial

regime, he distinguishes Jack and makes him like the shadow of dictators of his own time. Commenting on Jack, Chavan (2013) points out:

Jack is a combination of the western dictators of the 20th century. His red hairs symbolize communist dictator Stalin. His "crumpled and freckled" face matches that of Mussolini. His blue eyes remind us of Hitler. Jack is a combination of communism, fascism and Nazism (p. 1521).

Apart from these physical similarities, there are many features of Jack which can show the parallelism between him and dictators from the history. To begin with, he has desperate desire to be the chief on the island, so he follows deceptive and sneaky ways to overwhelm Ralph and his regime. In every possible situation, he shows himself as a better leader to the other boys. Even if he agrees with Ralph for the setting of some rules for the future of the island at first, he vetoes them since he wants to put and implement his own laws rather than obeying the present ones. "Why should choosing make any difference? Just giving orders that don't make any sense— (...) But Jack was shouting against him. 'Bollocks to the rules! We're strong—we hunt! If there's a beast, we'll hunt it down!'" (Golding, 1954, pp. 129-130). Secretly, Jack undermines his rival by emphasizing a critical point about the island and children, because most of them do not welcome these rules. Since they want to spend their time by playing and having fun instead of performing the duties that Ralph charges on them, Jack tries to win other children over his side with his strategies. This incident is one of the decisive characteristics of dictators like Hitler because Jack bluffs Ralph while he is planning to defy him and his orders (Deyab, 2016, p. 88).

In addition to his apparent actions that can be inferred as evidence of his dissatisfaction about the leadership of Ralph and his own ambition to be the chief, Jack uses his language skilfully to gain more respect and support from the boys. When they lose the chance of being noticed by a passing ship because Jack and his group do not fulfil their responsibility of making the fire, Jack's two words both save him from being guilty and show Ralph's accusations unfair: "I apologize" (Golding, 1954, p. 101). By doing so, Jack shows that he protects his group, and he does it in an honourable way: "The buzz from the hunters was one of admiration at this handsome behavior. Clearly, they were of the opinion that Jack had done the decent thing, had put himself in the right by his generous apology and Ralph, obscurely, in the wrong" (Golding, 1954, pp. 101-102).

As Ralph is aware of this "verbal trick" (Golding, 1954, p. 102), he struggles to prevent Jack's conspiracy against himself. Nonetheless, his efforts are evaded by Jack

thanks to his ability to change the direction of arrows from his own to Ralph. First, he causes Ralph to claim him and his hunters as “boys armed with sticks” (Golding, 1954, p. 179), and then, he provokes his hunters by saying “Ralph thinks you’re cowards, running away from the boar and the beast” (Golding, 1954, p. 181). In this way, he successfully creates the background which he needs to defeat Ralph by showing him as troublesome, his actions as useless, and altogether, he claims that he is not a proper leader. Furthermore, Jack inflames the feelings of his hunters by reminding that Ralph is not able to serve them food and his only practice is to give orders and expect obedience. “He’s not a hunter. He’d never have got us meat. He isn’t a prefect and we don’t know anything about him. He just gives orders and expects people to obey for nothing” (Golding, 1954, p. 182).

The other way which Jack adheres is to favour his group by giving them more meat. Since he is known with his pledges for food and protection, they are used as a propaganda by him to humiliate Ralph. As Deyab (2016) states: “In a very cunning move, Jack invites Ralph, Piggy and other boys to eat meat in a ceremony (...). In this invitation Jack intentionally humiliates Ralph and asserts his own leadership over the hunters and all the other boys” (p. 89). This incident brings not only Ralph physical presence, but also his position as a leader towards Jack as he is degraded by the position that he finds himself: desperately eating the meat that Jack and his hunters provide. Jack’s strategies are other confirmations of his dictatorship because “right from the very beginning of the novel, he employs what is called in politics ‘dictators’ tricks’ to fool other boys into believing that he would be a better and more successful leader than Ralph” (Deyab, 2016, p. 88). For that reason, it can be concluded that the way of Jack behaves is as devious as a dictator from the history, and it is also effective because he reaches his desired wish thank to these kinds of manners.

For most of the dictators, arrogance, narcissism, and pride are common emotions. Many ideas and behaviours of them can be explained as a result of these feelings because their whole selves are determined and shaped accordingly. They are also obstacles for these people to see beyond of their notions. Likewise, they cannot evaluate events from another’s person’s point of view (Deyab, 2016, p. 85). With a glance to history, it is possible to see that Adolf Hitler is one of the notable examples of this kind of leader as he carries the stated main features. As Glad (2002) observes: “But unlike Stalin, his grandiosity was more personalized, and he (Hitler) had no modesty about proclaiming his

own superiority as a *sui generis* genius” (p. 5). Similar characteristics are present in Jack who assumes himself better in every aspect from others. Also, his narcissist personality does not allow him to love and respect other children on the island, so he makes his decisions, and he lives according to his own desires, wishes, and ambitions without considering others. For that reason, he is not able to create an emotional or psychological connection with any of the boys. He also does not accept to be one of the members of the group, which is shown in his reaction after hailed by his first name: “‘Why should I be Jack? I’m Merridew.’” (Golding, 1954, p. 27). Therefore, it is true to state that he is different from other boys even with the way which he introduces himself to everyone.

Putting himself another place than where others stand is also a common characteristic for him and Hitler. Deyab (2016) notes: “‘Typical of Hitler, Jack thinks that he is greater than anyone else” (p. 86). Because of that, as it has been stated, he never cares about the ideas of others when he decides how to act. In addition, he believes that he is the one who can determine what it is the best in all areas. No matter what happens on the island, Jack has something to say even before he becomes the chief. “‘I ought to be chief,’ said Jack with simple arrogance, ‘because I’m chapter chorister and head boy. I can sing C sharp’” (Golding, 1954, p. 28). He categorizes himself a person who deserves to be the leader of the island just because his ability to sing a note. In that part, it seems that Jack tries to use what he has to obtain a completely another concept. Likewise, in another incident, he does not accept that Ralph tells the truth unless he witnesses it:

‘But there isn’t a snake!’

‘We’ll make sure when we go hunting.’

Ralph was annoyed and, for the moment, defeated. He felt himself facing something ungraspable. The eyes that looked so intently at him were without humor.

‘But there isn’t a beast!’

Something he had not known was there rose in him and compelled him to make the point, loudly and again.

‘But I tell you there isn’t a beast!’

The assembly was silent (Golding, 1954, p. 50).

Jack’s obstinacy and egotism are visible in many incidents, and they are essential parts of being a dictator. Most of the dictators of the 20th century and he are alike in terms of this way. Mentioning Hitler, Glad (2002) states: “‘Not only did Hitler see himself as one of the greatest political leaders of all time, he considered himself an intellectual and

creative giant, an expert in virtually every field of endeavor” (p. 6). Therefore, Hitler does not evaluate circumstances with anybody. Rather, he only fulfils his intentions no matter what the results can be, since nothing and nobody are important except for his own desires. Because of the same reason, he does not feel guilty about the loss of lives of people. Stalin’s notions and behaviours are not so different from his predecessor. “In addition, Stalin presented himself as the found of wisdom” (Glad, 2002, p. 5). Correspondingly, the only credible and correct source for him is himself. He even does not care about the people who are experts in their fields of works for the issues that concern every individual in society. Again Glad (2002) notes:

In 1941 Stalin rejected all messages from Soviet intelligence, his military commanders, Winston Churchill, and even the German ambassador in Moscow, suggesting that Hitler was planning to attack Russia. For him, the warnings were just ‘dis-information’ or ‘clumsy fabrications’ (p. 8).

Aggression is another common characteristic of dictators from the history and Jack because “a dictator is an aggressive personality with an unusual amount of sadism” (Bychowski & Bychowski, 1943, p. 456). The first evidence of Jack’s aggressive side is definite in the colour of his cloak as “black is often used to signify evil and death in various cultures around the world” (Deyab, 2016 p. 91). For that reason, Golding associates him and also his group with this colour, and he illustrates his first appearance in an aggressive tone: “The boy himself came forward, vaulted on to the platform with his cloak flying, and peered into what to him was almost complete darkness” (Golding, 1954, p. 25). Henceforth, in most of his actions, it is possible to observe aggression that derives from his personality. Other instance that shows how his aggression is beyond his logic is witnessed when the boys are arguing about snakes on the island. Whereas Ralph tries to explain others that it is not possible to see huge snakes there since this place is an island, Jack’s solution is to kill them if they face with any snakes. “Ralph’s right of course. There isn’t a snake-thing. But if there was a snake we’d hunt it and kill it” (Golding, 1954, p. 50). Similarly, Hitler has similar features that cause him to be remembered as one of the cruellest tyrants. “The name Adolf Hitler is associated with an image of madman in command; a man of incomprehensible ‘evil’ who was directly responsible for the unimaginable suffering and death of millions upon millions of innocent people” (Hyland et al., 2011, p. 58).

With these ideas, Jack thinks that he must be the chief. Along with specified characteristics, tactics, and behaviours, he needs the last part of forming a tyranny on the

island for himself: A group of people that support him anytime and anywhere. Undoubtedly, this assembly is the choir. Thanks to his total control over the choir members, he gets their support so effectively that it is almost precise he will be the leader in the end. In addition to their organized way of dressing and acting, they obey his orders from the beginning. As time goes by, the group starts to make propaganda of him. To boost Jack's charisma as a leader and protector, they frighten the other boys by talking about the beast on the island: "'Perhaps that's what the beast is—a ghost.' The assembly was shaken as by a wind" (Golding, 1954, p. 128). As a solution to that problem, the only person is Jack since he is the ability to conserve the boys from the beast and other dangers. "'I gave you food,' said Jack, 'and my hunters will protect you from the beast. Who will join my tribe?'" (Golding, 1954, p. 216).

By gathering the boys together, Jack not only enhances his power and reduces the efficiency of Ralph, but also, he forms a loyal and supportive group in a better way for himself. Therefore, Jack surrounds himself with people who are the same as him in terms of thinking and acting. Dictators of the 20th century do the same for their tyrannies since in that way it becomes possible to sustain such a political entity for a long time. They manipulate their supporters, and by applying different methods, dictators make their followers believe the excellence of the system, and they become a part of it. As Bychowski & Bychowski, (1943) argues:

There exists a particular interrelationship between the dictator and the subjugated collectivity. The latter submits to the dictator not only because of fear but because it worships him and sees in him an ideal. The members of the group identify themselves with the leader whose image becomes incorporated, as it were, into the collective mind as a kind of super-ego. (...) They see him the embodiment of their own wishes and desires, particularly their desire for greatness and happiness. They believe his promises and in their misery and anxiety rely on him uncritically (p. 455).

For this manipulation, a dictator needs to make some sacrifices. It must be assured that the group of supporters is not like a typical individual from the society. For that reason, they are required to be felt precious and superior. In other words, a dictator must "buy" the loyalty of his followers. Jack does so by showing his generosity to his hunters about two significant subjects on the island: food and safety. "Like many dictators, to keep the hunters under his control, Jack assiduously pays them off. He gives them more meat and allows them much fun" (Deyab, 2016, p. 92). Similarly, it is known that Hitler distributes the property of Jewish people to the Nazis while Stalin supports farmers who are willing to obey the economic regulations of the established system. Overall, it seems

that Jack and the tyrants of the 20th century adopt the same strategy to acquire adherence and obedience of their supporters.

Jack is the embodiment of a dictator who is depicted to illustrate how power can affect the behaviours of people. Typical for a tyrant, his actions do not yield even when he gets the authority of the island. “Yet the tyrants of history, (...), are not inclined to moderate their cruelty after they have consolidated their power” (Glad, 2002, p. 12). He does not satisfy with controlling almost all the children. Rather, he looks for a new challenge for himself which can ease his desire for absolute power. In accordance with this purpose, it is started by him to harm and eventually, kill the boys along with pigs:

The rock struck Piggy a glancing blow from chin to knee; the conch exploded into a thousand white fragments and ceased to exist. Piggy, saying nothing, with no time for even a grunt, traveled through the air sideways from the rock, turning over as he went. (...) His head opened and stuff came out and turned red. Piggy’s arms and legs twitched a bit, like a pig’s after it has been killed. (...) the body of Piggy was gone. (...) Suddenly Jack bounded out from the tribe and began screaming wildly. ‘See? See? That’s what you’ll get! I meant that! There isn’t a tribe for you any more! The conch is gone—’ (Golding, 1954, pp. 260-261).

The death of Piggy is not enough for Jack to cease his savage actions, so he endeavours to slay Ralph because of the same reason. To achieve it, he runs the risk of destroying all trees on the island, which also shows the predominance of his lust for power on his logic. The other reason why Jack applies physical and psychological force to others is that he takes pleasure in killing:

Jack, his face smeared with clays, reached the top first and hailed Ralph excitedly, with lifted spear. ‘Look! We’ve killed a pig—we stole up on them—we got in a circle—’ (...) ‘I cut the pig’s throat,’ said Jack, proudly (...) ‘There was lashings of blood,’ said Jack, laughing and shuddering, ‘you should have seen it!’ (Golding, 1954, pp. 97-98).

This is noticed in his first experience of killing and continues with ululations with joy when he tries to catch Ralph to kill him. Similar satisfaction is present in the dictators of the 20th century such as Hitler and Stalin as Glad (2002) notes: “Not only did these tyrants engage in extensive cruelties, they also personally participated in and sadistically enjoyed many of the cruelties for which they are responsible” (13). It will not be incorrect to say that Joseph Stalin enjoys witnessing how people suffer due to his personal issues with them. “Stalin also personally attended some of the show trials in the 1930s (...) He laughed immoderately on seeing an imitation of the old Bolshevik leader Grigori Zinoviev being dragged to his execution, making pleas for mercy with obscenities” (Glad, 2002, p. 13). Likewise, Adolf Hitler has this narcissistic personality too because “although Hitler more than Stalin seems to have distanced himself from many of his murders, we

do have evidence that he took pleasure in some of his cruelties” (Glad, 2002, p. 14). Together, these comments outline that harming and killing other people give pleasure to dictators and Ralph due to their sadistic natures and characteristics.

In the view of all that has been examined so far, it can be stated that Ralph carries innumerable similarities with dictators, and his system has a lot in common with dictatorships. He uses sneaky and deceptive ways to obtain the authority of the island. He does so not only by using physical and psychological methods, but also with the help of some verbal tricks. As time progresses, Jack’s aggression combines with his egomania, which result in the creation of a tyrant. Characteristically, he shows no mercy and empathy towards others because he considers himself superior to the other boys in every field. He attains the power of the island thanks to his control and management over his group. By directing them with the correct method, Jack successfully gains more supporters, and he creates his own kingdom on the island with the help of them and their propaganda. During the novel, his transformation is displayed as he turns into a dictator whose satisfaction comes from murdering. He carries savagery and cruelty on all his ideas, feelings, and behaviours. “On the other hand, Jack is a totalitarian, an authoritarian man-of-power who despises assemblies and conch, and becomes an absolute ruler of his tribe in the end” (Li & Wu, 2009, p. 121).

William Golding displaces the dangers of dictatorship by implementing its major practises. He portrays Ralph and Jack respectively to reflect an accurate portrait of the conflict between democracy and dictatorship (Deyab, 2016, p. 93). Golding makes the analysis of a tyranny by starting from the characteristics of the dictator to his implementations step by step to make it explicit what kind of executions will be exposed to individuals if the system is set and performed successfully.

2.2.4. Roger and His Desire for Power

Piggy has been analysed as he is an important representative of democracy on the island. A similar analysis is required for the character who stands on the same side with Jack from the beginning of the novel since he is the reflection of the group members supporting the dictator with a devoted loyalty. For that reason, the last part of the character study contains Roger, the subsidiary force of Jack.

Roger is one of the characters who undergoes a major change throughout the novel. At first, he does not exhibit particular or distinguished behaviours that can make him a noticeable figure. Although he belongs to the group of Ralph, Piggy, and Jack in terms of his age and physique, he acts like one of the littluns of the island. "There was a slight, furtive boy whom no one knew, who kept to himself with an inner intensity of avoidance and secrecy. He muttered that his name was Roger and was silent again" (Golding, 1954, p. 27). Also, he is depicted as a hopeless boy as he does not believe that they will be noticed and rescued by somebody. "Roger took the conch and looked round at them gloomily. 'I've been watching the sea. There hasn't been the trace of a ship. Perhaps we'll never be rescued'" (Golding, 1954, p. 59). For that reason, it can be seen in the beginning of the novel that there is always a dark side and pessimism in Roger.

These characteristics drag him to form a notorious personality. Gradually, he becomes the bully boy of the island who begins to perform cruel actions especially to little boys. He destroys the sandcastles of them with his companion Maurice with joy. "Roger led the way straight through the castles, kicking them over, burying the flowers, scattering the chosen stones" (Golding, 1954, p. 84). Inwardly, Roger feels the transformation that he has been passing through because he carries "something forbidding" (Golding, 1954, p. 85) in his physical appearance. Later, he throws stones to Henry, one of the littluns of the island, even if Roger is in danger of being wounded because breeze causes nuts and lumps to fall. Nevertheless, he cannot suppress his instincts which are driven by savagery. Even Jack does not notice "a darker shadow crept beneath the swarthy skin" (Golding, 1954, p. 87).

Even if Roger is a quite boy, he is known with his courage since he is the one who joins Ralph and Jack to look for the beast. When this braveness merges with his wild side, the combination makes a perfect subsidiary for Jack. He is accompanied by Roger to the hunts. At the same time, he follows Jack, obeys his rules, and fulfils his wishes. After Jack invites children to join his tribe, Roger becomes the first one who welcomes this offer and changes his side, and he expresses his contentment: "Roger admired. 'He's a proper chief, isn't he?'" (Golding, 1954, p. 228).

Roger both respects the chief and provides the security for his regime. During Jack's and his hunters' attacks on Ralph and Piggy, Roger leads the way with Jack. At that point, he becomes the representative of Jack's force and his lust for power, so Roger

also acts by following his ideas and emotions which are similar with Jack's notions. Therefore, he acts like a guardian of Jack and his authority. In other words, Roger becomes the police force of Jack's dictatorship as he abuses power for his own benefit. Rather than applying it in correct ways, unjust and unreasonable decisions are practiced under his command. In addition, after Roger's transformation is completed, he begins to consider others as feeble and insignificant. "Roger was dropping them, his one hand still on the lever. Below him, Ralph was a shock of hair and Piggy a bag of fat" (Golding, 1954, p. 259). Clearly, Roger gets strength as a result of his alteration while Ralph and Piggy lose their power and influence on the island.

With these features and actions, Roger can be compared with elements of function and police power of the 20th century dictators. The most accurate one will be Hitler's police power which is called "Gestapo" since they execute the most violent practises of punishment. Thanks to newly adjusted laws and regulations, they are allowed to apply unproportional force especially against the opposed groups of people. As Dunnage (2006) argues:

The presidential decree of 4 February 1933 for the 'Protection of the German People', followed by the decree for the 'Protection of the People and the State' of 28 February 1933, empowered the Gestapo to apply arbitrarily preventive custody (Schutzhaft) and preventive detention (Vorbeugungshaft), as civil and legal rights were indefinitely suspended (p. 105).

A similar practice is applied by Roger when Jack tries to learn the hidden place of Ralph to punish him. Because Sam and Eric refuse to say where Jack hides, Roger makes them speak by force. "The yelling ceased, and Samneric lay looking up in quiet terror. Roger advanced upon them as one wielding a nameless authority" (Golding, 1954, p. 262). Jack's system empowers him from physical and mental aspects, which contribute to Jack and Roger because both Jack's authority and Roger's power enhance as a consequence of this implementation.

As people in Germany fear Gestapo and they try not to object to their system, children on the island do the same Roger because he is considered the cruellest character on the island. Even Jack is not compared with him at that point. To warn Ralph about the danger of Roger, Samneric state: "'You don't know Roger. He's a terror.'" (Golding, 1954, p. 272). Likewise, it is witnessed in Germany that Gestapo follow similar ways to control and punish the society. "The involvement of the Gestapo in training the police suggests, however, that they received instruction in more sophisticated methods of brutality" (Dunnage, 2006, p. 112). Though the duties of both Gestapo and the police are

the same, they receive different commands by their chiefs. Roger is also like Gestapo because he and the other hunters are responsible from maintaining the order of the island, yet he is the most brutal one due to his capabilities and his discrepancy inflicting from his malice.

Another key role that Roger plays happens after Ralph's hegemony falls because Roger destroys the debris of democracy with his thoughts and actions. He is the supporter of Jack in each condition, so any kind of objection against his regime is challenged by Roger as he is the representative of power and the guardian of the ruling system. At this point, Golding attributes to protectors of dictators through Jack. In all dictatorial regimes, defenders try to sustain the force on the hand of the tyrant. Dunnage (2006) points out: "In Italy, after Mussolini came to power at the end of 1922, the police played a key role in the outlawing of the political opposition, especially left-wing parties and union organizations, and the dismantling of the democratic framework of the Liberal state" (102). In that way, it becomes apparent that Roger is the reflection of security forces that protect their dictators at the cost of harming and killing others who challenge tyrants' authorities in a state.

In conclusion, Roger represents power, and he utilizes it for the advantage of the dictator and his tyranny. Throughout the novel, his evolution is witnessed from quietness to savagery. Under Jack's regime, he acts like the controller of public order on the island, and he attends every piece of action with Jack. Like Hitler's Gestapo, he becomes another example of how power can change an individual from all aspects. Roger shows similarities with Mussolini's police force too since both forms are designed to protect their leaders and perform necessary actions for the progression of the established regime by any means. His darkness integrates with his lust for harming others and in that way, he performs the most notorious actions, which also shows how William Golding considers the cruelty and injustice of tyrannies with their means of implementations.

2.3. Other Symbols Representing Totalitarianism and Democracy According to the Theory of New Historicism

Like the characters of the novel, other objects carry symbolic meanings, and their analysis will be presented in the light of new historicism. The importance and reflections of the conch and the spears of hunters are explained at the beginning of this chapter.

Similarly, *Lord of the Flies* includes plenty of tools of signs which cooperate with the events and characters to make the novel more explicit.

2.3.1. The Facemask of Hunters

Mostly done by Jack, his group paint their faces before they hunt to hide themselves, and this activity is displayed as a transformation ritual for Jack and his hunters. The “dazzle paint” (Golding, 1954, p. 88) is a symbol which provides a person to change his identity. In the next chapters of the novel, hunters use this painting act to distinguish themselves from the other boys. This ceremony prevents shyness and hinders guilty from the maker as he considers that his actions are not regarded with his real sense; he is guided by the mask. “He was safe from shame or self-consciousness behind the mask of his paint and could look at each of them in turn” (Golding, 1954, pp. 201-202).

Golding shows what a person can do by illustrating his insights because according to him, any kind of individual can turn into an evil character if the conditions are suitable. This transformation is mainly shown on Jack because he is one of the children who corrupts a lot after he becomes the authority. “He gets transformed into a killer who doesn't hesitate to kill other children. Jack becomes the evil incarnated” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1521). Painting also enables other hunters to feel the power that they have since they know how to use it against the children. Additionally, they show their respect and devotion to Jack with these figures. For that reason, they are started to be called as “savages (...) painted out of recognition” (Golding, 1954, p. 251) because it is not possible to recognize the individuals anymore. More importantly, they are considered as the power holders regardless of their identities and this is provided thanks to the masks that they have. In this way, Golding points out the capability of a person due to the evil side which is carried in instinctively. “Golding's thesis of "darkness of man's heart" can be interpreted as an attempt to show that human civilization has already deconstructed itself. Man, who is the centre of civilization, possesses a dark heart, the evil within himself” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1523). In fact, these masks are like a reflection of the darkness they carry in their inner selves.

The representation of these boys in an identical way thanks to their masks is similar to the Nazis' figures because they also categorize themselves identical with their symbols such as swastika and the way which they use to show their esteem to Adolph

Hitler while hailing him. They physically carry their signs like the children in the novel. They belong to their own association and during Hitler's hegemony, the Nazis use mentioned concepts both to show their loyalty to the ruler and to dictate other people their ideas without saying a word. They display swastika on their flags, tattoos, surfaces of the buildings, and even on their shirts to make the impact bigger and more effective. "To gain control of Germany, Hitler built an army very much like the old Prussian machine. (...) The Nazis were given the brown shirt instead of the 'black shirt' and the swastika became their emblem instead of 'skull and cross bones'" (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 417).

Another similarity between the hunters and the Nazis is that both groups of people try to reach an exclusive society. The ultimate way of doing so is to eliminate other people who do not belong to their system or show any kind of weakness. For that reason, hunters start to kill other boys like Piggy and almost Jack while the Nazis attempt to demolish the presence of Jews and the other political parties. "The German Republic has been transformed into a centralized state with only one party. All rival political organizations of Nazis have been dissolved" (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 418). Therefore, it is correct to say that hunters with their facemasks and the Nazis having swastika carry common features as the followers of a totalitarian.

The masks and the swastika are the same tools used by several groups of people in different ways. Nevertheless, the main focus of this usage depends on the propaganda of the ruling regime to abuse the force which is obtained by the tyrant. It is seen that they are adopted by the followers of a leader to make themselves distinguished figures among society.

2.3.2. The Black Uniform

At the beginning of the novel, Jack and his group wear a special cloth to indicate that they are the members of the same unity. These "black cloaks" (Golding, 1954, p. 24) signify their sense of association since they act obediently according to the orders of Jack. The reason of this accordance is that they have the responsibility to behave by following the rules and orders of their leader and it also shows Jack's ability to control this group of people. The other element that supports their choreography is the way they get dressed. At that point, a connection can be established between the choir and a military force because both unities must perform what is wanted from them. In that way, they can

separate themselves from others since their purposes are determined and it is not possible to consider them as typical individuals. “The uniform reflects order and discipline, and calls for subordination by displaying a variety of insignia, including badges that indicate rank and emphasize the hierarchical structure of armies. It also calls for respect and fear and symbolizes strength and power” (Pfanner, 2004, p. 94). By looking at these points, it is true to say that the black dress of the choir necessitates them to be obedient since it shows them as an image of threat to the other boys.

As it has been mentioned before, the Nazis wear the same type of shirts. This shows a similarity between them and the hunters as their way of acting is determined by their dress. They show a commitment not only to their leaders, but also themselves because there is a homogenous combination for each member of the group. “About one million men belonged to this brown-shirted force. (...) The foregoing has given a glimpse of the military organization of the National Socialists, or as they are sometimes called, the Fascists of Germany” (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 417). Therefore, in addition their masks, cloaks of the choir members contain reflections from the history of tyrannies because both are used in a similar way for the same goal.

2.3.3. The Secret Enemy on the Island

For each totalitarian regime, fear is the ultimate feeling that is present since if only there is panic in the society, the mentioned ruling mechanism can be practiced. Most of the time, this emotion is formed with the help of the secret enemy concept by the state. People tend to be afraid of the invisible things more than the present ones. Therefore, instead of stating the enemy or the rival directly, the real identity of the contrary power is not revealed by the regime.

In *Lord of the Flies*, the presence of beast is used for this purpose. At the first stage, it appears as a form of snake. Next, it is believed that “beastie came in the dark” (Golding, 1954, p. 49) or it is “a beast, some sort of animal” (Golding, 1954, p. 117). Even it is alluded by the boys that it comes from the water, and it is a type of ghost. Finally, the one falling from the air, the pilot, is considered as the last form of the beast because of his death body. However, the critical point that must be highlighted is the presence of a creature of which most of the children are frightened. Its existence is vital

rather than its exact description since it is enough to manipulate the boys due to the possibility of it.

With the help of this concept, Jack becomes the authority because he is the leader figure who can stand against the beast. At this stage, his brutal side helps him to become the chief of the island. The children are more likely to choose him since “their decision emanates from the fact that people are usually more ready to be led by a cruel but strong leader rather than by a kind but hesitant one” (Deyab, 2016, p. 84). The process of a totalitarian system is similar since without intimidation, a tyranny cannot be founded in any states. For each example of despotism, it is seen a different kind of danger, but the objective is the same: to make people dependent on a leader who can rescue them from their situation. After the Second World War, Hitler shows the unfair matters of Versailles Treaty as an obstacle for the survival of Germany, and he asserts that they will bring the end of their nation. In addition, he says “The Jews made the war” (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 415). By doing so, he forms the enemies of the country, which enables him to perform his cruel actions as he does so to rescue his nation. Against these problems, Adolf Hitler promises to destroy the reasons of war and also “Hitler demanded the abolition of the St. Germain and Versailles treaties” (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 415). Thus, it becomes achievable for him to become the leader of Germany and to exercise any kind of power on people since it is shown as an exercise to demolish the attackers. Similarly, Stalin endeavours to strengthen his power over the country by exercising merciless activities. It is alleged by him that he protects Russia against hostile organizations. Therefore, he establishes different unions for his own benefit during his regime: “Always intent upon preserving and extending his power, Stalin founded for his own use and purposes what was called the Secret Department” (Frye, 1998, p.88).

As a result of the hidden enemy concept, the tyrants attain a chance to abuse the fear of society. Like Hitler and Stalin, Jack manages to direct the individuals whom he controls thanks to the beast and alarm on the island. “The same fear, insecurity and drives construction and strengthening of Jack’s tribe and the tribe doesn’t only kill for food but for sport also” (Chavan, 2013, pp.1520-1521). For that reason, it can be ended that the probability of an enemy is enough for dictators, which shows why the antagonist is called as “secret”.

2.3.4. Signs of Hope

Together with totalitarian images, there are indications of hope in the novel such as Piggy's glasses, the fire, and the pig's head. Even if they do not serve for the same purpose, their usage methods indicate the presence of expectation for positive phenomenon on the island.

To start with, Piggy's glasses represent a civilized aspect of the work since they are cleverly used to make the fire. Contrary to barbarian behaviours of children, the existence and operation of them show a sign from civilization. From the beginning of the novel, children try to build a fire to be noticed and rescued, so the igniter of both the fire and their hopes of salvation is the glasses. This subject matter symbolizes superiority of the logic over darkness. Nevertheless, the Piggy's lenses are stolen and broken by the representations of totalitarianism because they cannot endure the existence of logic which interrupts totalitarian executions. "And breaking of his glasses symbolize the blindness of the human race" (Chavan, 2013, p. 1522). Therefore, it is correct to state that as it happens in every tyranny, hopes of society are demolished by the tyrant since he is against all kinds of possible hazards for his reign.

The fire reflects different things to children. While it is the most effective method of being rescued from the island for Ralph and Piggy, it is not given as much importance as by Jack and his group, because their main desire is to stay on the island and continue to maintain their ruling system. After Jack declares his leadership, he does not consider about making the fire as it is not necessary for him. At that point, the hopes of other children wane just like the fire on the island. Instead of utilizing it for the sake of being noticed, Jack uses it to demonstrate his power and authority on the island and for that reason, he steals Piggy's lenses. Here, it is witnessed that the same tool is used oppositely by democratic and totalitarian regimes.

In addition, Jack burns almost the whole island to eliminate his only rival, which ends up with their rescue. It can be said that he brings his own end by setting on the fire. In other words, Jack burns his own tyranny and opens an opportunity for democracy to rise from the ashes. About this notion, Chavan (2013) reports:

Ralph and Piggy feel that they won't be ever rescued from the island because Jack doesn't care about the signal fire. But ironically the fire put to the whole island by Jack and his party to hunt down Ralph brings in the rescue. The unintentional and incidental rescue of the boys from the island closely resembles the narrow escape of democracy at end of world war (p. 1521).

To survive on the island, the other thing children do is to show their respect to the beast, lord of the flies, because they consider it as the enemy. Therefore, they present a pig head to it, which is a symbol of hope not to rescue from the island but to stay alive on the island. Even if it is not that effective, it can be counted as an indicator of civilization since children try to find a logical solution for a present problem instead of considering attacking the beast is an inhuman way. “The Pig's Head on the stick is the most appropriate symbol which represents the blind civilization” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1523).

In short, there are symbols of hope in the novel which fade away due to the power of totalitarianism. Nonetheless, most children manage to survive on the island thanks to these images. The salvation of Ralph also has a reflection of democracy that remains against totalitarian executions. “Ralph's narrow escape at the end of the novel is the narrow escape of democracy” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1523). Thus, it is pointed out that there is still hope about the execution of democracy in the world.

2.4. An Examination of Other New Historicist Elements in *Lord of the Flies*

For new historicism, representation of events is crucial because it is considered that in every piece of work, it is possible to find a way of reflection from the past since writers' comments are found in literature. These authors' opinions mirror the general conceptions of a period, which is called discourse in new historicism, and these discourses build the foundations of an episteme that is the source of power affecting how people consider the reality.

As it has been argued in the first chapter, discourse comprises the jargon of a particular time and it regulates social relations. In other words, it is the determiner of truth and normal for a society since discourse necessitates to discuss and learn the mental set of an era before analysing a work. Altogether, discourses form epistemes, which must not be exceeded since people are stigmatized if they go beyond these standards. The theory suggests that to comprehend a literary work, it is essential to assess the piece of art according to existences of discourses and epistemes during its era because history is a form of power, and literary works reflect the power structures of their written period. “We can't understand a historical event, object, or person in isolation from the web of discourses in which it was represented because we can't understand it in isolation from

the meanings it carried at that time” (Tyson, 2006, p. 286). Therefore, the period when a literary work is formed is studied before the analysis of the piece of art.

In *Lord of the Flies*, there are more elements of new historicism in addition to characters and symbols. Most of these factors are present as a result of discourses and epistemes. The main circumstance determining both is the Second World War and its consequences, because the novel mainly discusses the status system in politics and social life which appear after it. As Deyab (2016) states: “Thus, according to new historicists, it is so important to take the socio-historical context of Post-world war II literature into account when studying the texts produced during this period” (p. 75).

Hierarchical order is the central subject matter of the novel and other incidents are placed around this structure. With the collusion of democracy and the rise of totalitarianism, it is depicted the potential ruling mechanisms in the post-war period. William Golding “writes *Lord of the Flies* which depicts the annihilating dangers of dictatorial rule, and which is considered as a fictional plea for people to live under democracy than under dictatorship” (Deyab, 2016, p. 76). Therefore, most parts of the novel must be evaluated from this perspective because only in that way the meanings of messages, symbols, and themes can be internalised.

Instead of mentioning the lives of people who belong to the upper class like kings, queens, generals, or diplomats, children are chosen as the main characters of the novel. This is a significant aspect of the novel which can be analysed by new historicism since it is witnessed the hardships of real people in the 20th century although there is not a single adult character. About the characters of the novel, Spitz (1970) states: “They were the carefully chosen products of an already established middle-class society. They were socialized in, and were a partial microcosm of, twentieth century English (or Western) civilization” (p. 29). In that way, it is true to say that character choice represents the importance and reflection of discourses of the 20th century in the novel.

The theory discusses issues from viewpoints of people belonging to that era and therefore, a similar social life with its structure is formed to reflect the people’s condition after the Second World War in *Lord of the Flies*. This connection is linked with the combination of children’s old life and their current situation on the island. Even if the war ends outside, there is still an ongoing battle in each individual according to the position and condition of human beings in the society. For the people of the 20th century, the

influences of war are so strong that they continue to fight against their inner thoughts as they are conducted by their instincts most of the time. These emotions force them to perform according to the necessities of the period, which are particular for every person. The same struggle is present in the novel for each character. It is witnessed that even the older children have problems in their minds, and they try to solve them. “Ralph chose the firm strip as a path because he needed to think, and only here could he allow his feet to move without having to watch them. (...) He found himself understanding the wearisomeness of this life” (Golding, 1954, p. 107). What Golding makes here by exhibiting characters’ inner thoughts is that he conveys the people’s message from the post-war period, which is not more than a vain hope.

Another evidence for the importance of discourses and epistemes is reflected by the submissive behaviours of the boys on the island. Though the children do not live according to the rules of their old lives, they still act obediently because they are directed by these obligations. For that reason, Maurice does not continue to harm littluns because “in his other life Maurice had received chastisement for filling a younger eye with sand. Now, though there was no parent to let fall a heavy hand, Maurice still felt the unease of wrongdoing” (Golding, 1954, p. 84). At the light of these examples, it is true to state that once orders of a serious condition are set in one’s mind, it is quite challenging to act differently. In other words, discourses and epistemes determine the borders and characters do not overstep them like people in the 20th century because these regulations are so effective that it is not required to execute physical power thanks to presence of them.

Both in the novel and in the post-war time, the importance of logic recedes into background since it is replaced by the power. The more powerful person, organization, society, country, or political party can declare a control over others as it is the ultimate need to correspond requirements of life. Methods of discretion are left behind as the common view turns into standing together with the stronger one. This change causes people to attach importance to physical abilities and superiority. As a result, priorities are modified in economic, social, and political fields. Due to the same reason, Piggy is not counted as one of the influential children in the work. His desires and words are not considered even if he puts forward his ideas for the sake of all children. Piggy and Ralph converse as it follows:

“We got a lot of sticks. We could have a sundial each. Then we should know what the time was.”

“A fat lot of good that would be.”

“You said you wanted things done. So as we could be rescued.”

“Oh, shut up.” (Golding, 1954, p. 91).

It is seen that both in the post-war period and in the novel, intelligence is not regarded as one of the effective tools for people. On the contrary, it is despised because judgment does not enable people to stay alive and healthy, which is the major concern of community in that era.

In the light of this priority, which is given to power, Golding shows that people have died for the sake of force. Gaining and obtaining any form of control constitute both reasons of conflicts and purposes of states in that period. To achieve these, regimes do not hesitate to risk individuals' lives because they have already ventured deaths of millions. Because of the same reason, totalitarianism becomes the preeminent ruling method in more than one country at the same time. This is another reason why he depicts the unpleasant conditions of these kinds of reigns in the novel since William Golding believes that totalitarian system “makes the world blind and brutal. It pushes the human race in primitive barbarism based on instinct. Golding rejects the thesis that dictators can lead the world to civilization” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1521).

Conditions of the 20th century and the novel openly depicts the presence of war outside in addition to the mental and psychological struggles of each individual. The evident indicator of this situation is the Cold War appeared after the Second World War in the period. “For nearly two somber and dangerous decades this antagonism dominated the fears of mankind; it may even, on occasion, have come close to blowing up the planet” (Schlesinger, 1967, p. 22). Though it mostly involves two blocs, it is inevitable for other countries to be affected by the circumstances of it. Thus, even the physical battle ends, and people think that they can return their normal lives, the Cold War prevents the occurrence of this relief. Likewise, in the end of *Lord of the Flies*, Ralph believes that the arrival of an adult to the island ensures his safety. However, the identity of the grown-up awakes all children as they realize that the end of their conflict indicates the start of a new one. As Spitz (1970) argues:

For at the very moment when Ralph thinks he is saved, when all the children are saved, by the appearance of adults on the island, we know that he and they are not really saved. For the man who heads the adults who have come to rescue them is a naval officer, also a leader of hunters; and the ship to which he will take them is a battle cruiser, which cannot carry them back to the safe shore (England), since that shore is now in ruins, but will itself soon be engaged in a hunt for the enemy -man- in the same implacable way as Jack and his deranged followers hunted Ralph. The boys move not from one evil to another evil, but from one aspect or level to another

of the same evil; they go from the Lord of the flies writ small to the Lord of the flies write large (p. 28).

Without they speak anything about return, all the boys know they will continue to fight against the same enemies in a different place. The uniform of the officer and the kind of the ship are described for a specific purpose by Golding because he tries to show that the characteristic of a person does not overwhelm his position in the society. His occupation and how much power he has are the crucial factors that must be considered since these determine the future of children. As a result of this consciousness, Ralph and other boys started to express their real emotions as they “begin to shake and sob” (Golding, 1954, p. 290).

By looking at the end of the novel, it is possible to refer to the power concept of Michel Foucault who considers it as a nonstop implementation. He argues that power needs to renew itself with a different form; it never disappears, but it turns into a new kind of structure. At the same time, he argues that power “is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation” (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). The handover of control is seen both in the post-war period and in the novel. The leaders, systems, regulations, and regimes change in countries according to the conditions in the world, but they never end. Likewise, the boys witness several alterations of the authority and the administration. Respectively, Ralph, Jack, and the naval officer takes control of the island and all practice various government types. Even though every element of power changes, the only thing remains the same is power's itself as it is impractical to live in the absence of a kind of force according to Foucault.

During all regime types, the circulation of power from the bottom to the top is witnessed together with the leaders' actions. At the first phase, it is noticeable that Ralph rules the island with Piggy, but even Piggy is affected by Ralph's authority at some points. Similarly, it becomes inevitable for them to exercise power to other children by starting from Jack to the younger ones gradually. Therefore, their union does not mean a power-free ruling mechanism for themselves and other members on the island. Likewise, during Jack's hegemony, power circulates among the children by starting mainly from himself and it reaches its ultimate impact towards the bottom. For that reason, Roger and Maurice destroy the sandcastles that littluns form while Jack is chasing Ralph and his desires. Furthermore, other hunters with their facemasks spread terror in children's hearts and

they mention the beast stories because of the same source. Lastly, the naval officer takes control of the island after his appearance, which makes all children the objects of power executions since the soldier holds the power to distribute it for the future situations accordingly. In the light of these examples, it is seen that there are different power structures in *Lord of the Flies*, and they execute it variously. More crucially, power is depicted in a never-ending cycle as the people in charge of it alters, but its presence remains stable to feel itself in each possible condition.

With the existence and circulation of power in every part of human life, people of the 20th century and children in the novel are used to living in hard conditions which are perceived as the normal. This is imposed on these individuals so effectively that they do not recognize how rough the conditions are. Naturally, human-beings are supposed to perform necessities of the period and place that they spend their lives. In other words, the term “survival of the fittest” becomes an obligation for everyone, which is visible both in 20th century and in *Lord of the Flies*.

All the above bring the most undesirable way of life for people: dystopia. Due to the exercise of totalitarianism in the hands of dictators, communities in different countries suffer from lots of unpleasant conditions if they are not in the same side with the exerciser like Gestapo in Germany, or members of the Secret Department in Russia. While people of the 20th century are hopeful about their future because the First World War ends, they experience the least wanted circumstances: dictators in their countries, the Second World War, and deaths of millions. Similarly, children’s joy that they have in the first of half of the novel thanks to the presence of “no grownups” (Golding, 1954, p. 8) turns into a nightmare after Jack becomes the dictator and starts to implement totalitarianism, which cause a battle on the island. Children who do not belong to Jack’s group on the island undergo identical sequence of events with the people of the post-war era. In the novel, William Golding “shows the terrible consequences of the disagreement discovering the roots in the human nature itself. Civilization is turned upside down” (Chavan, 2013, p. 1524). Therefore, an example of real people’s dystopic world is presented in the work with explicit similarities from the history.

The character names which are purely English like Ralph and Jack are decided to illustrate the deconstruction of nationalism in the work. The children who start their journey as the most civilized national members transform into barbarians after

experiencing the island conditions. “We’ve got to have rules and obey them. After all, we’re not savages. We’re English, and the English are best at everything” (Golding, 1954, p. 58). In this way, it is shown that the English are still thirsty for power and they can perform what it is necessary to get it. For that reason, it is possible to comprehend this novel as the deconstruction of English nationalism when it is considered from a new historical perspective.

In *Lord of the Flies*, the characters, incidents, subjects, themes, and motifs transmit particular meanings and examples from the 20th century. To attract attention for possible dangers of totalitarianism, William Golding synthesizes social and political conditions of the post-war period and presents them to readers. For that reason, the novel must be analysed with the glasses of that era because only in this way it is possible to infer truer meanings, reach hidden messages, and see a reflection the real world.

3. CHAPTER THREE

3.1. An Overview of *1984* and George Orwell's Political Notions

One of the symbolic works of the post-war period, *1984* is a prominent novel which illustrates the future of a state ruled by a totalitarian regime. It has been published by Eric Arthur Blair, who is mostly known as George Orwell, and the major concern of the work is to describe the social and political situation of a country that is under the effective control of tyranny. "Orwell may have wished it that way, for in his mind the book aimed at being a political satire (...) as well as his fear of the future" (Thorp, 1984, p. 3). In most parts of the piece of art, there are observable connections between the countries which embrace totalitarian political structures such as Germany and the Soviet Union and the setting of the work: Oceania. With these parallel cases, Orwell tries to warn humanity about the risks of totalitarianism that must be evaded by any country because "to him, the political process had gone sour, and literature could only reflect that fact" (Thorp, 1984, p. 3).

As it has been stated in the first chapter of this thesis, it is a known fact that politics and power concern George Orwell during his life. Rather than focusing the power concept as a completed figure, he regards the purpose of force implementation as he thinks people have a right to use power if the situation necessitates. For him, to demolish any kind of organization which is against personal freedom and individual independence, power with its sources is an applicable way of solution and resistance since it will not be possible to take a society's sovereignty back without it. Therefore, he majorly ponders tactics and plans about a conflict. "Orwell, it emerges, was not much interested in the technical aspects of war. (...) Orwell was, in other words, very much interested in matters of strategy and the qualities required for sound strategic decision-making" (Stone, 2016, p. 222). One of the main emotions that forms Orwell's notions about this way of struggle is fear because during his lifetime, he has his despair about future in which freedom is not present. His participation in Spanish Civil War to prevent the hegemony of Franco is a determiner for his concepts as "Orwell's morbid fears about a totalitarian future had their genesis in his experience Civil War in Spain, where he fought as a volunteer for the socialist cause in 1937" (Thorp, 1984, p. 4). Similarly, he does not continue to work as a police officer in Burma, which is followed by his resign from BBC because his

perceptions do not allow him to stay in the same side with an oppressive regime which ignores personal privilege of community members and creates the environment for a tyranny. “Orwell’s reflections on equality go back to his experience in Burma. (...) Orwell notes, imperialism in only the most blatant form of inequality” (White, 2008, p. 82).

George Orwell does not totally adopt only one social or legislative theory. Nevertheless, it is not true to place him outside of all concepts because it is seen that he mostly follows the prints of communism and socialism. “For Orwell (...) socialism is morally necessary since it is the most obvious manifestation of freedom, justice, and equality” (White, 2008, p. 74). For him, these are significant elements that must be present in a state, so his criticism of totalitarianism derives from his socialist mentality. With these ideas and experiences, it is inescapable for him to detail the totalitarian regimes and its executions in his works. His awareness of the conditions of states in the post-war era shapes his opinions and beliefs about the future world waiting for the individuals in most of the countries. After witnessing the Spanish Civil War, the Second World War and the Cold War, Orwell expresses his criticism against totalitarian power mechanisms and *1984* reflects this concept thanks to its features referring to political propaganda.

With the presence of characters carrying reflections from history, events that include historical facts, symbols showing power implementations in many parts of life, and representations of most countries’ situation in the post-war period, *1984* is like a mirror of both George Orwell’s own ideas about diplomacy and the examples of totalitarianism from history. “The book illustrates his belief that since the 1930s political behavior had become increasingly irrational” (Thorp, 1984, p. 4). Winston is displayed as an image of ordinary man during the post-war period while Big Brother is depicted as the totalitarian figure in a state by Orwell. Julia involves the concepts of hope and desire for freedom whereas O’Brien is both a party member and executor of its practises which include oppression and restriction. In this panopticon, each individual lives in their own dystopia because they need to survive despite hard living conditions. Also, the class distinction is clear in the novel due to the Inner Party, the Outer Party, and the Proles. All these make new historicism feasible to be applied in this novel since lots of aspects of the work are similar with history.

As it has been examined in Chapter 2, the similarities between the novel and historical elements are studied in this chapter. For this analysis, a comparison will be implemented on characters, events, and motifs that are present in *1984*. At the final step, other new historicist features will be analysed and their implementation ways which contribute a better examination of the work will be undertaken with specific examples from *1984*.

3.2. The Shadow of Historical Figures on Characters

In *1984*, characters bear an extensive resemblance with personalities and images from the written period of the novel. Therefore, the first analysis of Chapter 3 will be on these characters respectively: Winston, Julia, Big Brother, O'Brien, and Mr. Charrington. During their analysis, examples from different countries with their dictators, practises, and systems will be presented, and they will be compared with people in this piece of work.

3.2.1. Winston's Different Identities from Distinctive Perspectives

Winston Smith, the protagonist of the novel, carries more than one reflection of people in history. Firstly, he is like a typical society member whose qualifications are not more than a person in community. He has a job to earn money, but not freedom because he must perform only what is wanted from him, At the same time, Winston has no right to behave according to his wishes during the other times when he does not work like the remaining members of Oceania, so "before his rebellion, Winston Smith was a typical member of this group" (Thorp, 1984, p. 10). For that reason, it is true to mention he is a part of the working system that is considered as a non-stop organization which does not allow the presence of feelings.

His lack of freedom does not mean that Winston believes the propaganda of the Party and support Big Brother. Winston is aware of the corruption process of real events, and yet, he does not oppose the system. Although, he is a witness of changed history and he is the person who rewrites the history, his position does not permit him to perform what is true since he does not have enough authority to correct what has been done wrong. "He has no freedom of choice in any direction whatever" (Orwell, 2021, p. 115). In the

light of these, it is possible to say that Winston is the image of an individual in the society who realizes the problems in a system but cannot interfere with the process. In other words, he is a typical community member of the 20th century.

It is known that Orwell supports democratic implementations instead of totalitarian practises because “the best possibility for preventing the horrors of a future world carved up among three predatory regimes, he believes, is for some major area of the world -such as Europe- to establish democratic socialism on a firm footing” (Thorp, 1984, p. 7). At that point, it is appropriate to refer that Winston Smith is depicted in a way to represent democratic beliefs; he carries an anti-totalitarian approach because his desire is to prevent erroneous practises of the totalitarian regime. For that reason, “he continued to feel a peculiar uneasiness, which had fear mixed up in it as well as hostility” (Orwell, 2021, p. 6) against tools of totalitarianism since he believes the importance of truth for the welfare of community.

To deepen the presence of democratic ideas in the novel, it is beneficial to talk about the name “Winston”. It is not a random choice by George Orwell to give this name the protagonist of the novel. By naming him as Winston, it is made a reference to Winston Churchill, who is known for his antipathy towards any kind of totalitarian regimes in the world. At the same time, it is Winston Churchill who governs a democratic state during the period when tyrannies are present in more than one country. “Winston Smith is a prototype of man deliberately being remade by political and technological forces” (Feder, 1983, p. 395). He is both a symbolic member of society and his name is a reference to the policy of the post-war period. Therefore, the correlation between the protagonist and a ruler governing a state in the light of democracy can be identified in *1984*.

In this connection, it is important to remember that George Orwell is also a member of the society in Britain during the post-war era. Therefore, it is also feasible to compare Winston with Orwell in terms of their ideas, beliefs, and actions. One of the significant similarities between them is that they endeavour to do the proper action for themselves despite the dangers that they can face. The two set the truth before their welfares because the reality for society is more meaningful than their contentment. For that reason, they do not hesitate to fight if it is imperative. Both Orwell’s attempts against different kinds of unfair incidents during his life and Winston’s rebellious actions opposed to Big Brother are fitting cases for this argument. Similarly, because of their

actions, both suffer from penalties and tortures implemented to them. While Orwell has “experience of being down and out in Paris and London” (White, 2008, p. 78), Winston finds himself in “Ministry of Love with torture” (Orwell, 2021, p. 117).

Another similarity between these two can be on the way that they spend their time. To rescue their souls from the problems of daily life, both need to express themselves. Orwell and Winston do it by sharing their opinions with papers. For that reason, Orwell reflects his ideas and emotions to literature; Winston does the same with a diary. In addition, both hide the fact that they are interested in writing because George Orwell does not use his real name for literal works as Winston secretly pens his notebook.

Additionally, both Orwell and Winston are against totalitarian regimes because for them, equality and freedom are the crucial elements for every individual. Even if the environments that they live are not suitable for their concepts, they have “hope” about the future and they struggle to sustain it and spread it among society. “Still, Orwell holds out at least a glimmer of hope that a cure can be found for the maladies of political culture” (Thorp, 1984, p. 7). Actually, because of that reason Orwell forms his works which are about political dangers in the future. Similarly, Winston rebels against the established system since he believes in the power of the Proles that constitute the majority of Oceania. Therefore, he states: “if there was hope, it lay in the proles!” (Orwell, 2021, p. 120).

By looking at all these, it can be said that several identities are included in Winston Smith. At the beginning of the work, he is a typical society member before his democratic side turns him into a revolutionary. Also, he carries a close resemblance to George Orwell from the point of their ideas, beliefs, and actions. One of the significant similarities between Winston and Orwell is their hope about the future because they behave on the purpose of maintaining it. Therefore, reasons providing the existence of this feeling matter to analyse the novel better.

Winston’s anticipation for a preferred future also depends on Julia, so the second character analysis will be on her who shapes Winston’s view of freedom and his way of acting.

3.2.2. A Rosy Future for Winston with Julia

Hope is the ultimate factor for optimism which makes life more meaningful for people. In *1984*, Julia is the person that instils belief and aspiration about the future into Winston. Before meeting with her, he is not able to indicate his notions apparently because there is no one to explain his true self. Not because Winston is alone like many other members in Oceania, but because he knows that his ideas are not regarded as important as he thinks. “How could you communicate with the future? It was of its nature impossible. Either the future would resemble the present, in which case it would not listen to him” (Orwell, 2021, p. 5). During Winston’s conversations with himself about the expectations which he visualizes as dark, he does not see anything different from what he has at that moment. The reason behind this thought is that there is no cause of ambition in his life to dream about a better destiny.

However, after he witnesses Julia’s actions on which she does not show any fears or hesitations from doing what she wants, Winston begins to break his taboos too. “Julia, however, seemed unable to mention the Party, and especially the Inner Party, without using the kind of words that you saw chalked up in dripping alley-ways. He did not dislike it” (Orwell, 2021, p. 66). She becomes a representer of freedom of notions and actions for both herself, and Winston because thanks to her, a new chapter starts in their lives. Although there are differences between their perceptions about the factor against which they rebel, their ultimate enemy is the system ruled by the Party. The impulse that directs Julia for her rebellious actions are about gaining her privilege since she conceptualizes freedom as personal. On the other hand, liberty must exist for every individual of society according to Winston. “Clearly, she lacked Winston’s theoretical interest in the workings of the system and his need to formulate a conception of the past, as well as to understand his own history. Her rebellion was, however, anything but mindless” (Enteen, 1984, pp. 209-210).

At this point, Julia’s role reflects its utmost relevance to new historicism as with the consideration of what she represents for herself and Winston, it is possible to make a comparison between the novel and history. Circumstances in most states are similar due to totalitarian practises in the 20th century, so society members are in pursuit of hope to rescue from tyrannies and restrictions. In other words, they try to look at the future with hope, which require responses and activities against the ruling mechanism. In the Soviet Union, the foundations of liberty are set thanks to the idea of salvation. At first, they do

it to avoid the system's force by embracing socialism: "Stalin's claim that the peasants had 'turned toward socialism' in fact reflected only the peasants' attempts to escape the waves of violence, and their hope that expressing agreement with collectivization would permit them to escape it" (Reiman, 2016, p. 77). Nevertheless, with the presence of several organizations to improve individual privileges, their main goal is to gain their rights and freedom. "The network composed of these organizations thus became an idiosyncratic replacement for a true 'civil society', (...), and bound a significant portion of the citizenry to the existing powers, making of them an organized 'backup' resource" (Reiman, 2016, p. 23). The fundamental ingredient for the community's progress in the field of privilege is their belief for a desirable future. Therefore, it is true to say that people in the Soviet Union puts their actions in the shape of liberty which is formed by hope.

The destruction of the established political system must become a reality if community's expectations will come true. Therefore, "the Stalinist terror and the consequences of Stalinism" (Reiman, 2016, p. 9) need to arrive at the conclusion in the Soviet Union. In other words, the end of totalitarianism can initiate the beginning of freedom, so it is necessary to destroy the regime for the welfare of the society in the country.

Likewise, thanks to Julia's affairs with the Inner Party members, Winston imagines the deterioration of the Party and consequently, the system. "Anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope. Who knew, perhaps the Party was rotten under the surface, its cult of strenuousness and self-denial simply a sham concealing iniquity" (Orwell, 2021 p. 68). Like people in the Soviet Union, he dreams about the collapse of Oceania's political regime together with Big Brother because this makes it possible for people to get their independence and privilege back.

The thing that Julia presents to Winston, and emotions of people in the Soviet Union in that period is alike because both bear hope and reliance on the future, which will bring equality and justice for every individual. About the comparison between the two, Enteen (1984) argues: "In Julia, Orwell depicts a range of the responses one may readily find in the Soviet Union" (p. 210). Hence, it is true to say that the existence of anticipation builds a better identity for people, together which they lay the foundation of a superior future.

Julia brings hope to Winston with her mentality and lifestyle, and they contribute his evolution as a person who seeks for not only his freedom but also the liberty of the whole community in Oceania. The desire that she represents for Winston is similar to people's wish in the Soviet Union because their dream is the same as his thoughts about the future. The reason behind this resemblance is that they struggle against the same enemy concept, which is totalitarianism. For that reason, the next analysis on characters will be on totalitarian figures who exercise it powerfully from the beginning to the end of the novel.

3.2.3. The Combination of Hitler and Stalin: Big Brother

As in each totalitarian system, there is a controller of force in *1984* that has the absolute power and total authority over Oceania. Even though its physical existence is not known, implementations and mental presence of Big Brother apply totalitarian practises throughout the novel. By placing this kind of figure in the novel, Orwell depicts a prototype country which is ruled by a political party that is like a vivid figure of dictatorship due to the excessive restrictions to the society's physical, psychological, and mental conditions. Primarily, its threats for citizens are illustrated and Orwell endeavours to alert people by showing what it can transform if dictators continue to apply totalitarianism. About this concept, Thorp (1984) says:

Far from surrendering to the mysticism of violence, Orwell acts as a voice of warning, lamenting the passing of liberal values, and decrying the totalitarian boot forever crushing a human face. By deducing what might be the next step beyond the barbarity of such masters of inhumanity as Hitler and Stalin, he confronts us with the uncertainty of the future (p. 3)

At the light of these arguments, it can be seen a parallelism between Big Brother and other dictators from the history in many aspects. The first and the most apparent resemblance is the regime which priorities its interests more than individual freedom. For this sort of ideology, the main concern is to sustain its entity in the authority regardless of the consequences. Therefore, it is not possible to accept any kind of opposition against the system, so it makes fear inevitable to be abused by the controller because only in that way the authority can prevent probable criticisms and maintain its control. In *1984*, people are so afraid of the Party and Big Brother that they cannot think about an action which will be different from what is expected by them. Naturally, nobody can share what they believe since there is no trust among even family members. "All their ferocity was turned

outwards, against the enemies of the State, against foreigners, traitors, saboteurs, thought-criminals. It was almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children” (Orwell, 2021, p. 13). Hence, it can be said that fear is implemented skilfully under the hands of Big Brother in Oceania.

A similar condition can be found in countries which are controlled by dictators following practises of totalitarianism. It is present in laws, regulations, and actions of controllers and they are applied thanks to the other members of tyranny who support the mechanism. Even though countries and circumstances in these are diversified, the method is the same because the function of totalitarianism necessitates terror. “Recent research on denunciations may have brought Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany closer together than previously imagined in their ability or willingness to ‘terrorize’” (Dunnage, 2006, pp. 21-22). Therefore, abuse of fear is a fundamental element in a totalitarian system, which is present in *1984* and different states in the world.

Power is the ultimate necessity for implication of fear in a society because without the existence of force and control over a state, people are not frightened of the totalitarian. In other words, the system becomes impracticable since a tyrant’s domination is not regarded if there is no deterrent force to terrorize people. In the novel, Big Brother clearly has the power in all senses because even the idea of him is enough for citizens to correct their behaviours because they are terrified of being exposed to implementation of force. “Big Brother seemed to tower up, an invincible, fearless protector, standing like a rock against the hordes of Asia” (Orwell, 2021, p. 8). Just his description provides that he is not only a figure of power for Oceania, but also a threat for the other countries, so his dominance in the state is unquestionable.

For dictators in history, holding power and causing society to scare of the authority are visible evidence to perceive how people are controlled by these dictators. For people in the Soviet Union, Stalin is this kind of figure who has been described like an oppressor: “But as for Stalin, he was not only a bully but also a thoroughgoing roughneck” (Frye, 1998, p. 88). In that way, he maintains his regime and abuses the fear of community for his own desires. Likewise, Adolph Hitler interiorizes a similar way of acting, and his actions towards even his supporters are not that different in some incidents as Frye (1998) argues: “Hitler imposed his own forms of tyrannical bullying upon his subordinates” (p. 90). He manipulates each member of society to sustain his reign of fear over Germany.

This comparison between Big Brother and dictators from the history shows that they employ their dominance to keep society members under control.

When fear is combined with power, they set the fundamental atmosphere for totalitarianism. For the flawless execution of this sort of regime, there are two more elements which must be integrated to the system: discipline and penalty. In fact, these are the crucial ingredients for dictatorship since they make it possible to obtain and hold power which can be used to frighten individuals in a state, that is, totalitarians reach their ultimate position thanks to punishment. In the novel, the kinds of penalties are exemplified from the beginning as they are accepted as essential parts of the ruling system. “Purges and vaporizations were a necessary part of the mechanics of government” (Orwell, 2021, p. 25). For that reason, people in Oceania cannot follow their desires, or they are not able to perform true things for themselves because they are trapped inside the rooms of laws and rules which open a door to persecutions if they are forced. People do not even carry a contrary belief against government because the result is the same for everyone: “You can’t help it. They torture you” (Orwell, 2021, p. 92).

Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin are similar to Big Brother in the way of governing since for all, punishment is the key concept for their regimes and practises. Because of that reason, citizens are terrified of objecting to them, and their power is accepted by community although their decisions with implementations are too far from being acceptable. Their dominance is so intense that they utilize particular regions to subdue the opposing with specific ways. The Nazi camps are created for this purpose and “under the control of newly appointed Fascist Party police chiefs, many were involved, directly or indirectly, in atrocities against partisans and the deportation of Jews to Nazi death camps” (Dunnage, 2006, p. 18). Similarly, Stalin leads the constitution of Gulags where he can show his strength and menace disobedient community members. As it has been mentioned in the second chapter, these camps are positioned and shaped particularly to penalize anyone trying to stand against his tyranny. “At the time of Stalin’s death, there were roughly 2.5 million prisoners in labor camps and colonies across the eleven time zones of the Soviet Union, many in Arctic regions” (Alexopoulos, 2016, pp. 363-364). The number of people and places show that Stalin’s major solution method is to send rebels to those parts of the country and “educate” them by his own methods. By looking at these, all dictators abuse power with specific methods for identical purposes.

Like the Nazi camps in Germany or Gulags in the Soviet Union, there is a special place to punish anarchistic people in *1984*. The Ministry of Love oversees discipline in Oceania and individuals considered as attackers the system are “welcomed” there to be healed. It is known by all society members that when you defy Big Brother and the Party, it is the spot where you will find yourself. “One did not know what happened inside the Ministry of Love, but it was possible to guess: tortures, drugs, delicate instruments that registered your nervous reactions, gradual wearing-down by sleeplessness and solitude and persistent questioning” (Orwell, 2021, p. 92). From this point, it is correct to say that Big Brother, Hitler, and Stalin develop similar methods to fix the problems in their states, which include both physical and mental conditions of individuals in their societies.

The whole process results in the transformation of society into a model that dictators want. After individuals experience fear, power, penalty, and discipline, they become obedient community members who seek for the welfare of the tyrant in their states, and they recognize the supremacy of the dictator willing or unwillingly, otherwise there will be no way of rescuing from their prisons. In other words, all people become like the same kind of creature whose missions are determined and they are controlled physically, emotionally, and mentally. In *1984*, Winston abandons his pursuit of truth and freedom as he becomes an exact opposite version of himself because of tortures that he is subjected. “But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother” (Orwell, 2021, p. 165). New Winston is someone who does not have any personal feelings or desires when he sees the sunlight again after going out Room 101. Similarly, Julia becomes identical with him in terms of her way of thinking after she admits her betrayal. “She gave him another quick look of dislike” (Orwell, 2021, p. 162). For both, it is possible to say that they complete their transformation process and become a stereotype whose purpose of life is to support and love Big Brother by accepting his authority and respecting his mechanism in Oceania.

The method is used throughout the novel because it is considered as the ultimate technique to punish and treat people. For that reason, it is implied in the work that more and more people will visit Room 101 since totalitarian practises continue in the future. In addition, it is repeated that in Oceania all members of the state recognize the system with its infamous part as O’Brien alludes: “You know what is in Room 101, Winston. Everyone knows what is in Room 101” (Orwell, 2021, p. 143). Therefore, it can be discerned that totalitarianism is depicted as an eternal ruling mechanism in *1984*.

By looking at this point, it is possible to see another similarity between Big Brother and dictators in the 20th century. They use the punishment for similar purposes and continue to execute what they have done to the next generations. Even if some individuals gain their rights to be free after some time, others whose actions cannot be forgiven stay in the prisons. “Like other prisoner releases in the Soviet period, Stalin’s amnesty did not extend to political prisoners or criminal recidivists, so it represented no fundamental change in the regime’s treatment of gulag prisoners” (Alexopoulos, 2016, pp. 275-276). Similar to Big Brother, Stalin’s regime proves that methods of authority have been unquestionable, and they will stay exactly the same in the future of the country.

In the light of this examination, it is seen that Big Brother is the combination of Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin. Not also their physical appearance shows similarities because all have characteristic moustaches, but also their systems formed in different countries are identical in many ways. These dictators use terror, force, and penalty on individuals to govern their states. They gain their power from discipline, and discipline gives them more power. This cycle renews itself till the ultimate organization is ensured and monopolized by the head. When it is reached to this level, society is controlled according to the wishes of the tyrants, and their escape from “rehabilitation” is next to impossible.

Dictators need several other elements to perform their totalitarian regimes in a country for long periods of time. After they become the leaders of the system, their authority must be protected by the other people who stay in the same side with them. Therefore, the next character analysis will be about O’Brien who is more than just a Party member in the novel.

3.2.4. The Little Brother and Ingsoc

As the implementor of laws and rules for the Party, O’Brien is the representative of the system and a follower of Big Brother with his body and soul. Not only he reveals Winston’s colour, but also, he plays an active role for his healing process because he is the one who transforms Winston into a party member by using his knowledge about him and expertise in the Party’s policies.

O'Brien's language ability is his predominant skill because he manages to shape Winston's ideas before he moulds them into the final design with the help of rats. He begins the curing process by pointing out crucial matters for the Party which will influence Winston as he believes in the power of words: "The Party is not interested in the overt act: the thought is all we care about. We do not merely destroy our enemies, we change them. Do you understand what I mean by that?" (Orwell, 2021, p. 139). In that way, O'Brien shows that he knows how to use Winston's weak sides for his own and the Party's benefits.

Another evidence of his effective use of language is presented together with the concepts of the Party such as Doublethink and Blackwhite. These theories are performed smoothly by O'Brien as he carries all methods of teaching and applying them with his belief to the Party and Big Brother. Therefore, he circulates among Winston's notions in Room 101. The single-sided dialogue constitutes a major part of the verbal torture, which awakes Winston to O'Brien's power and his language skills because at these moments, the inquirer travels inside his subconscious and chooses the words for him: "I told you, Winston," he said, "that metaphysics is not your strong point. The word you are trying to think of is solipsism. But you are mistaken" (Orwell, 2021, p. 147). For that reason, he has nothing to do against O'Brien's masterwork except for being silent and trying to think since he is hopeless. "As usual, the voice had battered Winston into helplessness. Moreover he was in dread that if he persisted in his disagreement O'Brien would twist the dial again" (Orwell, 2021, p. 148).

In addition to spoken execution, O'Brien uses rats of which Winston fears the most. Even though it is only mentioned once before his therapy, it is deduced that the Party records each single data about people in Oceania. "I'm sorry," he said, "it's nothing. I don't like rats, that's all." (Orwell, 2021, p. 80). For that reason, it is true to say that the Party's mechanisms are everywhere thanks to telescreens and hidden microphones, which enables O'Brien to use different methods to torture Winston who is perceived as the opponent of Ingsoc and Big Brother.

All these incidents demonstrate that O'Brien is a vigorous advocate of the Party. His ultimate duty is to detect disobedient community members in Oceania and reintegrate them as a supporter of it. He does not only sacrifice his life for Ingsoc, but also, he is like the Party and authority. He presents Big Brother's himself in Oceania: "He is Big Brother

in the flesh, hovering over Smith's every wince of pain, every reservation or capitulation, knowing all, rewarding and punishing" (Feder, 1983, p. 404). Also, O'Brien is like a physical form of a leader like him since Winston believes in "his projection of his need for a powerful leader onto O'Brien, a substitute for Big Brother, on whose presence, glances, and gestures he builds his alternate fantasy" (Feder, 1983, p. 402). For Winston, he is like a leader figure who can bring features of a state that Winston desires. Therefore, Winston plucks up his courage to share his true notions with him thanks to O'Brien and his behaviours since he secretly believes that O'Brien carries the same feelings with himself. "It is his image of O'Brien that seems to give him permission to accept the most obvious truths about external nature and the laws of the universe" (Feder, 1983, p. 402). In the light of this information, it is possible to state that O'Brien represents the Party, Big Brother, and a leader figure by all means of manipulation that he implements to society.

By considering these points, it can be said that O'Brien is similar to supporters of dictators and their systems like other Party members. In other words, if Big Brother is Hitler, O'Brien and the others are the Nazis because their roles are identical: to support the dictator in each possible way. Thus, actions causing anxiety and panic are witnessed in both states. Dunnage (2006) argues about the Nazis: "The Nazis played a key role in a terror system, as exemplified by the responsibility given to the Party militia, the SS (Schutzstaffel), for management of the concentration camps and, from 1939 onwards, for bringing to fruition Hitler's mass murder programme" (pp.12-13). Likewise, the Party members with O'Brien effectuate an identical organization that necessities the presence of distress, anger, and passion for the leader. For that reason, a member of the Party "should be a credulous and ignorant fanatic whose prevailing moods are fear, hatred, adulation, and orgiastic triumph" (Orwell, 2021, p. 106).

In addition, verbal and psychological methods which are applied to society show parallelism between the novel and states in history. In politics, language tricks are essential for the protection and progression of a regime since it is endeavoured to hold individuals' ideas stable. Therefore, words are controlled, limited, and abused by authority. For some circumstances, totalitarians apply for a production of a new language with added words because it makes oppression happen in the way of thinking and speaking. In the novel, "the destruction of words" (Orwell, 2021, p. 28) is observed by both Winston and readers due to the struggle between Oldspeak and Newspeak, which is

presented by the Party. Ingsoc does not only restrict the words, but also the mentality of individuals because it is stated that: “every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller. (...) ‘Newspeak is Ingsoc and Ingsoc is Newspeak’” (Orwell, 2021, p. 29). For that reason, it can be concluded from the work that limitation of words is a plan to force people’s ideas into a determined shape and not allow them to forsake the principles of the Party. In the Soviet Union, a similar mechanism is practiced by Stalin to achieve the same purpose: restraining the diversity of notions. Together with physical use of force, the community is oppressed by mental aspects since Stalin’s main aim is to form a society obeying his regime by accepting all the conditions that he asserted. To achieve that purpose, he attempts to halt individuals’ consideration competence. About this situation, Enteen (1984) says:

The concept of newspeak is helpful in still another context. Those of us who study Russian history cannot help but ponder Stalin’s massive terror. Over and over we ask, in different ways, about the conscious motives of the purges and the political and social impulses behind them, what some scholars call the structural predispositions. Many Russians answer these questions quite simply: Stalin was trying to make us stop thinking. The overt simplicity of the answer is deceptive; its meaning requires reflection (pp. 211-212).

From these aspects, it is correct to state that Stalin implements different limiting mechanisms during his reign. Not only Stalin, but also, other rulers during history practise similar methods to do the same because language is the channel providing relationship among people and setting their frames of mind about every incident. In other words, it is the crucial component of correlation, so it is typical to observe comparable exercises in several governments. Like Newspeak, Doublethink is practised in both *1984* and different states in the world. Feder (1983) says: “*Doublethink* is a political appropriation of psychological defences that have operated as long as human beings have been socialized. It is a denial of reality” (p. 396). This strategy is adopted for the sake of authority in states throughout the history because politics necessitates the hiding of truth in some conditions. For that reason, similar to Ingsoc, other parties interiorize language devices like Newspeak and Doublethink for the future of their managements.

In the work, the period of Two Minutes Hate is executed due to the Party’s imposition. It also has an extensive meaning when it is considered with Stalin’s speeches. During his reign, he propagandizes his policies to the Soviet society, and he is heard in every part of the country. After the announcement of “speaking are all radio stations of the Soviet Union” (Messerer, 1984, p. 131), all individuals in the country listen to Stalin as people in Oceania do for Big Brother. “All life in the country would become still at

this moment. People would freeze where they found themselves-on the streets, in offices, at subway stations, as radio loudspeakers were saturating all the towns and villages of the USSR” (Messerer, 1984, p. 131). Both *Two Minutes Hate* and Stalin’s broadcasts are practised to remind the existence of dictators and impose their beliefs and feelings to community as they are attended by individuals under any circumstances.

O’Brien is a passionate Party member, Big Brother’s physical reflection, and a representative of the authority. He both follows the rules of it and enforces its orders. He is loyal to his Party and principles so much that by hindering his real identity, he is in pursuit of eliminating possible enemies of it and Big Brother. “There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother” (Orwell, 2021 p. 147). In *1984*, his presence is felt stronger than Big Brother because he exists with his opinions, beliefs, and executions while Big Brother is only present with his figure. In other words, the little brother is inferior only in terms of his name tag.

For totalitarian states, the system processes together with a dictator, a group of people who advocate him fiercely, and police force. Even though the totalitarian is responsible from the operation of power and punishments, police force is also a need for this kind of regime to maintain the order in a state. In the novel, the Thought Police is in charge of regulation which comprises all individuals and the prominent character of this institution is Mr. Charrington. Therefore, he is the last character of the work who will be examined in this chapter of the thesis.

3.2.5. The Agent Disguised Behind a Picture

Mr. Charrington has a role in the order of Oceania’s citizens, and he hinders his real identity in the background of frames. His role as a member of the Thought Police is significant because by working together with O’Brien and other Ingsoc representatives, he fulfils directives of Big Brother and the Party. Like O’Brien, he displays enemies of the government by revealing their true identities along with himself. “Mr. Charrington was still wearing his old velvet jacket, but his hair, which had been almost white, had turned black. (...) He was still recognizable, but he was not the same person any longer” (Orwell, 2021, p. 122).

The police force is one of the bases of totalitarianism and its functions determine the lifespan of the authority since the more powerful it is, the longer the reign lasts. Therefore, dictators attach importance to the police for the security and continuity of their systems. In Germany, it is witnessed that Hitler authorizes the police, and they do not hesitate to fear individuals by violence. “While the widespread role of the German police in terror is certain, the question remains how spontaneously they employed it” (Dunnage, 2006, p. 18). The reason behind this authorization is that for the insurance of the Nazi Party, citizens must be observed and silenced when conditions necessitate it. Knowing the presence of police force limits people’s actions, so any kinds of attempts to demolish Hitler’s system are prevented thanks to the guardians of the Nazi power.

Similarly, in the Soviet Union, Stalin organizes a force to conserve his tyranny from enemies. His system also functions covertly as it happens in *1984*. “Secret police records detailing the hostile mood of the population served the police well whose mission was to seek and destroy the enemies of the regime” (Kuromiya, 2007, p. 723). By doing so, he is in pursuit of minimizing possible threats against his authority because like Hitler, he is aware that the organization causes discomfort among society. Therefore, he gathers information about the ideas, feelings, and behaviours of the Soviet people, which is the mechanism Big Brother does for citizens in Oceania.

Under these circumstances, it is impossible for people to be satisfied with their lives because they are deprived of freedom. For that reason, counteractions are inevitable to stay against Stalin’s norms. “Yet it is certainly the case that the vast majority of the Soviet population learnt to hide their private sentiments. This was why the police made every effort to extract the hidden, private thoughts of people, using torture if necessary” (Kuromiya, 2007, p. 723). The society develop several ways to relieve their passions; nevertheless, this opposition brings another problem for people since they are objected to physical violence more. In the light of these, it is true to say that the police force in the Soviet Union is in every division of life and it is opposite to reactions against Stalin. For a potential danger, the police keep their guard up more intensely.

In the novel, Winston is depicted similar to the society in the Soviet Union as he also follows his own methods to continue banned activities. Like the Soviet citizens, Winston takes precautions not to be caught by the Thought Police as he knows the outcomes of this situation. “Even the speck of dust that Winston places on his secret diary

in order to determine if the police have searched his personal belongings is carefully placed back on the book by the Thought Police” (Thorp, 1984, p. 10). By looking at these points, it is true to say that people in the Soviet Union and Winston share common ways to oppose the force because the power against themselves are the products of same system.

Police force is abused on behalf of the totalitarian in Oceania, Germany, and the Soviet Union. The mutual relationship between the force and the controller is present in all federations because they endeavour to eliminate all possible crisis against their structures. Mr. Charrington’s duty is the same with the police force of mentioned countries and their styles include physical violence to society if it is decided as imperative. Therefore, it can be said that totalitarianism utilizes the police not to secure the justice but to mislead law in support of the dictator.

In *1984*, characters carry lots of resemblance with historical figures. Likewise, there are other elements that can be studied in the light of new historicism because they can be compared with events, symbols, and features from tyrannies in the 20th century. Therefore, in the following part of the thesis, other new historicists factors will be analysed by giving particular cases from the work.

3.3. The Representation of Totalitarianism and Power Structures in *1984*

Like *Lord of the Flies*, *1984* contains indications of totalitarianism and power systems not only in characters, but also thanks to the presence of other conceptions. These patterns are presented together with reflections of real incidents, so it makes a way for the application of new historicism to the work. By highlighting definite likeness between the novel and historical events, the better analysis of *1984* will be achievable.

3.3.1. Antagonists of Oceania

A prerequisite for totalitarian regimes is an adversary that poses a threat for the state and its citizens. In *1984*, the system is so strict that Eurasia and Eastasia do not satisfy the authority because they are not enough to justify the system and its regulation, so more need for Oceania. For that reason, Ingsoc uses Emmanuel Goldstein along with

the Brotherhood because “he was an object of hatred more constant than either Eurasia or Eastasia, since when Oceania was at war with one of these Powers it was generally at peace with the other” (Orwell, 2021, p. 7). With these implementations, the Party alleges that its actions and prohibitions are necessary to make provision against these threatening formations.

Even if it is not known whether Emmanuel Goldstein is real or not, his name is quoted a lot because the regime demands his occupancy in politics. “Goldstein, in spite of his isolation, his helplessness, and the doubt that hung about his very existence, seemed like some sinister enchanter, capable by the mere power of his voice of wrecking the structure of civilization” (Orwell, 2021, p. 8). While showing him as an inferior figure in face of Big Brother, it is reminded to citizens that he is always a hazard for the state, and the authority performs what is necessary to stabilize peace and safety in Oceania. Therefore, supporting Big Brother is not an option; it is an obligation as with his help, Goldstein can be defeated.

Emmanuel Goldstein is Big Brother’s, Ingsoc’s, and the citizens of Oceania the most hazardous hostile. His existence in the minds is crucial for the process of Ingsoc. With his strategies and representation, he is likened to Trotsky, the political opponent of Stalin. Similarly, Goldstein’s book is seen as his principles, and it is compared with Trotsky’s bureaucratic concepts. “The chapters from Goldstein’s book are a summary or a parody of Trotsky’s political sociology” (Enteen, 1984, p. 207). At this point, it can be comprehensible that Big Brother is the reflection of Stalin whereas Goldstein is the figure of his rival because both authorities strengthen their political structures thanks to their antagonists. “The self-satisfied sheep-like face on the screen, and the terrifying power of the Eurasian army behind it, were too much to be borne: besides, the sight or even the thought of Goldstein produced fear and anger automatically” (Orwell, 2021, p. 7). Therefore, the dangers that they pose are evoked in every possible way, which makes the existing authority stronger and more influential.

Throughout history, governments use this “enemy concept” to the degree that it can support the existing regime and its executions against external factors. By doing so, the authority paves the way for unequal treatments, restrictions, and punishments. These programs are arranged according to the needs of the regime, so they can concern both inside and outside the country. In Germany, Hitler and his system indicate the danger

outside the country, so he legitimizes his preparations for a future war as a defensive mechanism: “He declared that Germany must have air forces and an army of more than 100,000 which was permitted by the Versailles treaty, because France was ready to attack Germany at the slightest provocation” (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 419). From this aspect, what Hitler does is that like Big Brother, he tries to take advantage of present conditions considering them from his point and justify his actions by asserting that he is in a struggle against possible future enemies.

It is appropriate to indicate that Oceania’s condition against Eurasia and Eastasia is a reflection of the Cold War. There are several justifications for this theory. To begin with, it is stated in Goldstein’s book that the world has been divided into three super-states, which involve specific counties according to their benefits. This division brings nations together that idealize similar strategies and principles as it happens in the 20th century. It is stated by Orwell (2021):

The splitting up of the world into three great super-states was an event which could be and indeed was foreseen before the middle of the twentieth century. (...) Eurasia comprises the whole of the northern part of the European and Asiatic land-mass, from Portugal to the Bering Strait. Oceania comprises the Americas, the Atlantic islands including the British Isles, Australasia, and the southern portion of Africa. Eastasia, smaller than the others and with a less definite western frontier, comprises China and the countries to the south of it, the Japanese islands and a large but fluctuating portion of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet (pp. 102-103).

At this part of the novel, it is seen a similar polarization of the world with the Cold War period. Mainly, it eventuates “between two rigidly hostile blocks, one led by the Soviet Union, the other by the United States” (Schlesinger, 1967, p. 22). Therefore, Eastasia is demonstrated as minor than the two because the major struggle is between Oceania and Eurasia, which are reflections of the United Kingdom with the United States and the Soviet Union respectively. “For an analogue to the Soviet Union, the reader must look to Eurasia, of which little is said outside clear Ingsoc propaganda” (Senn, 2015, p. 156). Another reason of this implication is that there is no evidence of war among these super-states except for the broadcasted news. In other words, it is not a physical battle that soldiers take place; it is “cold.” This condition is only a kind of psychological tool to manipulate citizens; a kind of mind games that enables implementations of the authority. In addition, the enemy for the country is not stable; it changes from time to time as Winston realizes. “I remember that until only a week before I was arrested, we were not at war with Eastasia at all. We were in alliance with them. The war was against Eurasia” (Orwell, 2021, p. 135). Likewise, countries in the world change their sides for the future

of their states because their interests alter by following the profits and policies. Therefore, the opponents of Oceania are placed in *1984* to illustrate the Cold War period and governments' conditions for the readers.

As a result of these examinations, it is true to consider Oceania as a representation of different states. With its domestic policy, Germany and the Soviet Union are displayed with their dictators and executions. When it is considered from the part of foreign policy, Oceania is the United Kingdom with its place next to the United States and due to the name of the Party. "The party in control of Oceania is named Ingsoc, abbreviated from its predecessor, English socialism" (Thorp, 1984, p. 9). Therefore, different historical representations are witnessed from the beginning to the end of the novel by considering the incidents which make the analysis of novel possible from diversified perspectives for readers.

The existence and possibility of an enemy opposing to the system and threatening all citizens are common features of totalitarian regimes, and it is an endeavoured strategy for the reign in Oceania and other states during the 20th century. Thanks to these allegations, dictators abuse every possible mean since they chase their own dreams, not the principles of countries. George Orwell is conscious of this procedure and his ideas about the states' situation after the Second World War find a place for themselves in *1984*. "Orwell was convinced that western leaders in the initial stages of the "cold war" were as corrupted by power as their Russian counterparts and that the bloodletting of war had not cured the political ills apparent to Orwell in the 1930s" (Thorp, 1984, p. 6). With these impressions, Orwell demonstrates results of totalitarianism and the future of most countries including the United Kingdom, which is why Oceania comprises London.

3.3.2. The Ingsoc Mask

As it is true for every individual in the world, citizens in Oceania have their masks when they are together with other people. This is a natural way to be a part of the society in normal regimes, but there is a specific aim for the community of Oceania; the importance of this camouflage lies behind the reason of mask usage. People in this state cover their identities with masks not to be subjected to the punishments or tortures. Even if public masks are diverse and they are worn according to the condition in other countries, the shape and the purpose is the same for people in this state: hiding their real

thoughts and obeying the established rules due to the fear of totalitarianism. For that reason, it is a requirement to have “the mask”, otherwise discipline performs its duty which is controlled by the designer of the mask.

The proles and the Outer Party members have the same sort of cover for their real personalities. Their positions, occupations, ages, and positions can be different, but the necessity concerns all in the same way. Therefore, they utilize the mask of obedience for Ingsoc and Big Brother even if the imposed belief is not true. “In the end the Party would announce that two and two made five, and you would have to believe it. It was inevitable that they should make that claim sooner or later: the logic of their position demanded it” (Orwell, 2021, p. 43). As time passes, they stop thinking about the accuracy of alleged concepts because there is no chance to correct them even if they are not accurate. Thus, the sole remedy is to wear the mask and judge the Party’s allegations and desires with the consideration it which will direct you to Big Brother’s trueness.

This circumstance can be resembled with people’s condition who experience the same kind of totalitarian regime in their states. In the Soviet Union, citizens must fulfil the responsibilities of standing by Stalin as for them, outcomes are not that different from Oceania’s methods. Like Ingsoc and Big Brother, Stalin’s impositions include the fact that: “both the party and the people were told to forget about Trotsky’s role in 1917 and during the civil war, even though every citizen of the country recalled it well” (Reiman, 2016, p. 39). He dictates forgetting the past, which is only possible by having a Stalin mask since people remember the reality vividly. Nevertheless, they know the outcomes of opposition, so it keeps them silent against the distorted data, and the only way to endure the process is to hide behind the Stalin’s camouflage.

The situation in Germany is even worse than the Soviet Union since the Aryan society must have the Hitler mask too. In other words, their race, which is one of the utmost trait Hitler wants from an individual, is not enough to stay away from his inequality and limitation. Therefore, citizens need to show their respect and support to Adolf Hitler if they want to avoid potential penalties. “The Nazis have burned non-German books and have even threatened to sterilize the Jews. (...) Pure Aryans are barred from these positions too unless they swear unconditionally to support the National State” (Jones & Meltzer, 1933, p. 418). By looking at these incidents, it can be said that in totalitarian regimes, the logic, race, ideas, feelings, and truth are not considered because

there is only one reality which can be observable behind the dictator's mask of totalitarianism.

During his lifetime, Orwell needs to have a suitable camouflage according to conditions of the place where he spends time because he is in danger of being silenced. For that reason, he uses a pen name for himself, and he rejects his British identity. Similarly, in his novels, it is possible to see some marks from his features hidden in characters and events. About his traces in characters, Woodcock (1966) says:

When we consider his novels, or even those autobiographical works which, no matter how many masks they may wear, still seem so intensely characteristic of the man who wrote them, we cannot escape from the close interconnection between ideas and personality, and in this context the question whether it is the original Eric Blair or the new self George Orwell we are dealing with is not very important (p.189).

George Orwell can be classified in the same category with people who live in totalitarian tyrannies because even though he does not witness this kind of authority physically, his mentality and psychology survive under the hard living conditions of dictatorships. Not only the state that he lives, but also all dictatorial regimes bother him, so he produces these kinds of works which show the dangers of totalitarianism. Therefore, he needs to wear a mask during his life not to become the target of the totalitarian authorities and their components.

In each state, it is a necessity for people to wear their social mask spending time with other community members. In totalitarian states like Oceania, the Soviet Union, and Germany, the type of masks is identical since the society's goal is to rescue from the authority's control mechanisms which use terror to secure the future of the regime. These masks also provide to silence people even if they are conscious of unfair and incorrect executions of the system. Also, George Orwell has the same mask because he lives in the totalitarian conditions in more than one state, so he hides his real identity even in the literal works. For that reason, every member needs to have the same mask which will direct the way of truth according to the totalitarian in the novel and in the 20th century.

3.4. A Study of Further New Historicist Features in *1984*

New historicism grasps literature from the aspects of history because each component of a literal work includes historical features for this theory. Different from traditional historicism, the objective reality of literature in terms of historical facts is not

in the foreground because it is possible to include figures of history in various forms that may not illustrate the past directly. To comprehend and analyse literal piece of arts, the writer, the period, characters, and events must be examined as a compact integrity. For that reason, the study of other new historicist features in *1984* will present a better examination of the 20th century.

For new historicism, ordinary people's everyday lives carry historical marks, so their analysis is significant to find data about the past in literal works. By considering this viewpoint, it is true to emphasize that people belonging to the upper classes are replaced with lower class individuals in the novel. In other words, ordinary people's living conditions are integrated in the centre of *1984* since there is a struggle of remarking the hardships of being an individual in a tyranny. In fact, it is not possible to be a different or independent person in the community because of dictatorship, so it is endeavoured to mention this conclusion in the novel. "Not only personal relationships, but even the establishment of one's individual identity is impossible in these circumstances, for there is no access to the experiences of other human beings in time" (Thorp, 1984, p. 12). Therefore, the protagonist of the work is Winston, not Big Brother.

The reason of this effort results from George Orwell who is in the notion that a totalitarian regime kills individualism because it is not possible to talk about the presence of individualization under the regime of dictatorship. For that reason, "he devoted himself to the fight against injustice and oppression of every kind" (White, 2008, p. 78). For him, all people are considered as the same part of the mechanism in a totalitarian state. Therefore, the Proles' lives are not considered as a subject matter for Ingsoc in *1984*: "In reality very little was known about the proles. It was not necessary to know much. So long as they continued to work and breed, their other activities were without importance" (Orwell, 2021, p. 38). The major concern about them is not their personalities, but the continuation of their work because for the system, they represent task force which ensures the progression of the authority.

New historicist theory alludes that by looking at these incidents, it can be drawn a parallelism between the people in the novel and citizens in the Soviet Union. Since both states are ruled by totalitarianism, their communities are subjected to the identical practises, so they lose their identities eventually. Enteen (1984) argues:

Not a citizen, the person was not even a subject in the traditional sense, thanks to the Party's constant tendency to mobilize his efforts and his passions. The utter lack of freedom and

absence of rights of a Soviet individual is perhaps shown its starkest relief in the post-Stalin years (p. 210).

Another incident which compels individuals of the period is the never-ending war process. During the 20th century, people were exposed to different kinds of wars so much that this condition became a natural situation for them. In totalitarian states, the feeling of pressure is combined with it, which makes life more intense, so people must stay alive and healthy both physically and psychologically against all these struggles. In the novel, most citizens in Oceania acknowledge that the war against the other super-states is permanent since as long as they remember, the state battles with them. Even at the beginning of the work, “WAR IS PEACE” (Orwell, 2021, p. 3) is stated as the Party’s slogan with the aim of reminding people the seriousness and endlessness of this condition.

In addition, the never-ending war process contains the whole world because this condition is the same in every state according to the Ministry of Truth, so there is no escape from war in *1984*. At this point, it is possible to mention Foucault’s power theory, which contains the force distribution among several mechanisms. More importantly, he considers power as a non-stop practice in a society, which means its implementation tools alter, but it is eternal. For that reason, Foucault (1980) says: “Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain” (p. 98). This progression can be seen in the novel too thanks to Big Brother, O’Brien, Ingsoc, and the other ministries that establish the authority in Oceania. In every part of the work, power is displayed by different structures. Similarly, it is indicated the in Eurasia and Eastasia, circumstances are the same as Oceania, so power restricts people’s right and liberties in all parts of the world. As a result, these become the elements which obstruct individualization in the society and make the life difficult for people.

In this post-war period and in the novel, the circulation of power combines with totalitarianism in the hands of a dictator, and they form the prototype human being for the late 20th century. Also, the mental set of the era is set by these structures. In other words, discourses and epistemes are mainly the products of power and its exercises in a totalitarian society because they appear as the form of information which make rules and laws. “We should add that the exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information” (Foucault, 1980, p. 51). Therefore, understanding the period necessitates the comprehension of discourses and epistemes of a period. In *1984*, power is hidden in discourses such as blackwhite,

doublethink, or newspeak since they carry the knowledge, and this knowledge is utilized by these power tools to control the society. For that reason, characters in the novel and citizens in the totalitarian states are ruled by similar methods which incorporate the force of language with their systems, and they must be studied together to grasp the important events of the era. About the importance of discourses and manipulation, Foucault (1980) argues:

With the prisons there would be no sense in limiting oneself to discourses about prisons; just as important are the discourses which arise within the prison, the decisions and regulations which are among its constitutive elements, its means of functioning, along with its strategies, its covert discourses and ruses, ruses which are not ultimately played by any particular person, but which are none the less lived, and assure the permanence and functioning of the institution. All of this has to be brought together and made visible by the historian (p. 38).

In the work, it is emphasized that Ingsoc uses these discourses along with the Party's slogans to strengthen its authority. In each possible way, individuals are subjected to the exposure of mottos and language practises. The main goal of these methods is to limit people's consciousness; furthermore, to block all the ways to go reasoning. "But in any case, (...) Newspeak words CRIMESTOP, BLACKWHITE, and DOUBLETHINK, makes him unwilling and unable to think too deeply on any subject whatever" (Orwell, 2021, p. 115). With the consideration of these, it can be said that Foucault's theories about power, knowledge, and manipulation are implemented in *1984* thanks to Big Brother, Ingsoc, and the propaganda of the Party.

In this kind of environment, it is inevitable for logic to lose its validity and efficiency as tools of power eradicate reason so fiercely that even the utterance of the word is prohibited. Totalitarianism involves obeying and accepting the established rules and systems without considering their rightness, so there is no room for logic in dictatorships. Similarly, any sort of activity that involves sense is suppressed by power and authority in the novel because Big Brother and the Party monopolize the control over individuals' every action. An explicit incident that power overwhelms reasoning is witnessed during Winston's interrogation:

'You are a slow learner, Winston,' said O'Brien gently.

'How can I help it?' he blubbered. 'How can I help seeing what is in front of my eyes? Two and two are four.'

'Sometimes, Winston. Sometimes they are five. Sometimes they are three. Sometimes they are all of them at once. You must try harder. It is not easy to become sane.' (Golding, 2021, p. 138).

By looking at this incident, the replacement of logic and the potential of authority are observed apparently. Also, it is viewed that people struggle, live, and die for the sake of power in a totalitarian state because it is the ultimate matter which must be protected and sustained. The identical mentality exists in *1984* as well, so it is endeavoured to maintain the regime with all possible ways and against all kinds of dangers. For that reason, every kind of threat is prevented by authority even if there are sensible reasons to question the Party and its policies because “whatever the Party holds to be the truth, is truth” (Orwell, 2021, p. 137).

As it has been presented so far, individualism is not the subject matter in *1984*. But still, it is possible to witness the class distinction among people since characters belong to different groups in the community. “Below the Inner Party comes the Outer Party, which, if the Inner Party is described as the brain of the State, may be justly likened to the hands. Below that come the dumb masses whom we habitually refer to as ‘the proles’” (Orwell, 2021, pp. 113-114). According to this hierarchy, citizens have different rights, and their actions are evaluated with the consideration of their status in the society. Therefore, different practises for the same kind of act are observable in the work. Even the meaning of Newspeak words is different for people who belong to separate society classes:

The keyword here is BLACKWHITE. Like so many Newspeak words, this word has two mutually contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent, it means the habit of impudently claiming that black is white, in contradiction of the plain facts. Applied to a Party member, it means a loyal willingness to say that black is white when Party discipline demands this. But it means also the ability to BELIEVE that black is white, and more, to KNOW that black is white, and to forget that one has ever believed the contrary (Orwell, 2021, p. 115).

This hierarchical order represents the dangers of totalitarianism clearly in the novel because for citizens in Oceania, it is not possible to talk about equality. Disguising behind the Party for the committed actions is the method to acquit the Inner Party members while punishing the other people is demonstrated as a requirement by Ingsoc. Thus, injustice is present in the judicial system of Oceania and the citizens are aware of it. A similar way of judgement is applied in the Soviet Union due to the totalitarian executions. Together with Stalin’s regime, the same action is evaluated differently by the system because the agent’s position is the determiner of crime. “In the future, arrests were to take place only on an individual basis, with consent from a prosecutor” (Reiman, 2016, p. 119). For that reason, it can be said that in Oceania, in the Soviet Union, and in the

other totalitarian states, inequality is a visible form of dictatorship, which considers people's status rather than their action while deciding the penalty.

In 1984, people surrender themselves willingly to the regime not by standing against these power structures. Among all society members from the bottom to the top, power circulates, and citizens who are subjected to this dominance accept the circumstances with their own desires. Because of that reason Winston and Julia become Ingsoc supporters together with the others who do not dare to sustain their opposed beliefs against the regime. By looking at this point, it is correct to deduce that the nation is prepared to obey the system which is set to reinforce its strength. In other words, the community is ready to perform what the situation necessitates for the benefit of power holder, which is the eventual purpose of the authority with its all structures.

These implementations are executed together with the observation of individuals in Oceania, which makes the state a panopticon. The presence of telescreens and hidden microphones in every possible location, Big Brother's posters, his warning beneath them, and the slogans of the party set all features for a panopticon system to govern Oceania. Even the smallest disobedience is observed, and it is notified by the authority in this mechanism: "'Smith!' screamed the shrewish voice from the telescreen. '6079 Smith W.! Yes, YOU!'" (Orwell, 2021, p. 19). For that reason, citizens must arrange their behaviours wherever they are and whenever they are awake. In the end, Winston realizes how he has been monitored during his insubordination journey: "He knew now that for seven years the Thought Police had watched him like a beetle under a magnifying glass" (Orwell, 2021, p. 153). This panopticon mechanism is established thanks to totalitarianism; also, it strengthens the authority's power tools in 1984.

With the cooperation of all political structures, Oceania represents a dystopia for its citizens. Each applied method is against individualism, and it is not possible to question equality. Logic is left behind power, which is the way of the reign to silence people. Restrictions and oppression are accompanied with punishments, so people do not have any other choices instead of accepting the authority. This compliance promotes the efficiency of the system, from which individuals cannot escape. There are no rooms for better living conditions because dictatorship overlaps all super-states in the novel as it is the same for most states in the 20th century. Therefore, citizens in Oceania are like the prisoners in a panopticon who do not have any hopes about the present and future.

The characters, events, topics, symbols, and concepts in *1984* keep specific implications and illustrations from the post-war period. The political and social atmosphere of most states along with their totalitarian executions in the 20th century are exhibited, from which it is expected to receive essential messages about the dangers of dictatorship. According to George Orwell, not only in Germany and the Soviet Union, but also in the other countries like England, the effects of this system will be the same, so people must be conscious of its treats.

1984 is a depiction of the future of totalitarian reigns and it includes representations of 20th century states. For that reason, it is a necessity to examine the work by considering the political, social, and mental set of the period, which will make the novel more meaningful, demonstrate the covered notes among the lines, and comprehend the actual history behind the depictions.

CONCLUSION

New historicism is a fresh approach thanks to its unconventional arguments about the evaluation of literature and history. Mainly shaped by Stephen Greenblatt, its primary aim is to concentrate on the alternative ways of grasping the past. To achieve this purpose, it is determined that a combination of literal and non-literal texts is essential as this solution will build the necessary bridges between obvious information and hidden knowledge in history. Mechanisms of traditional historicism are not enough to comprehend what happened previously, so precision and privacy of history are rejected by new historicism because it is asserted that writers of history are ordinary human beings whose claims are the products of subjective reality.

For new historicism, authors of a historical source and a literal piece of art are the same in terms of their viewpoints. Regardless of the type of a work, that means whether it is a history book or a literal work, it is certain that it carries personal judgements and interpretations. At that point, new historicism interiorizes Louis Montrose's concept of "historicity of texts and textuality of history." For that reason, different from new criticism, new historicism asserts writers' life bears significant data which must be analysed with the artists' lenses while studying every sort of work. Because only in that way, more and correct interpretations will be achievable. Similarly, what Greenblatt argues is the social, cultural, and political conditions of the author's society also determine the background of a work because these are the factors shaping writers' perspectives and feelings. Hence, authors with their community's norms are indispensable elements for the study of a work.

The mentioned "background" that writers have contain specific language of their society. This jargon contributes to the development of the mental set which is present in a particular time and place. As a result, discourses of a community are formed, and they control people's words and notions. These discourses play a role for the establishment of standards in a public, which are called as epistemes, so together with discourses, they influence writers. Likewise, authors' works are regulated by the stated components, so their analysis is required to comprehend the writers' mindset. Therefore, according to new historicism, characters in a novel display diverse figures for readers since they sense disparate aspects of people in the works. Also, new historicism supports that characters

must be studied by thick description as Clifford Geertz suggests because this method completes missing pieces in a work.

This theory advocates that history does not only consist of events which concern the upper-class people such as kings, queens, or generals. Similarly, it is not merely about affairs of states, wars, or bureaucracy. Therefore, traditional historians cannot reach the absolute truth because their studies solely include these characters and cases. As a result, there are unknown sides in the past, which prevents the formation of a chronological order of history. Thus, it is not possible to discuss the past as serious of events which are connected to one another with a cause-and-effect chain since these dark parts contain other significant details about history as well.

As a consequence of these evaluations, new historicism does not endeavour to specify direct meanings in a work. Rather, new historicists comment about the possible representations. Thus, events that show similarities with history are perceived as clues revealing probable information about the past by being combined with Foucault's power and knowledge theories.

In this project, new historicism has been studied in *Lord of the Flies* and *1984* by considering all the factors. Both novels are products of the 20th century, so they involve reflections of what the First, Second, and Cold War bring to humanity in social and political fields. One of the most important matters is the novelists, so their beliefs and experiences light the way for a better examination of these pieces of art.

William Golding realizes the evil side in every individual after he notices his power of harming others, and he is in the notion that even children have a capacity to terrorize people. Therefore, his main characters are children in *Lord of the Flies* who continue to sustain their own battles with themselves and fight against possible threats on the island. Similarly, effects of World War I and II are visible in all children because of their way of thinking. This struggle never ends during the work as Golding reflects most states' conditions in the post-war era. The circulation of power is a visible aspect in the novel, and it is controlled by an authority which has enough knowledge to manipulate it in Jack's hegemony.

Actions and characters in the novel correspond to the leaders and political methods in the second half of the 20th century. The work starts with democratic implementations, but it collapses due to the power of totalitarianism and its advocates, which is the

fundamental point that Golding wants to emphasize. Along with his description of a tyranny, he attempts to warn humanity about the dangers of totalitarian regimes and their capabilities. While Jack is the reflection of Hitler and Stalin in the novel, his hunters are followers of dictatorship, and their executions are identical with dictatorial designs. Ralph and Piggy are images of salvation and equality with their beliefs, behaviours, and hope about the future. Similarly, these two are impressions of all victims in the world during the 20th century.

By illustrating how a totalitarian regime is formed step by step, William Golding primarily makes an effort to alert his generation about the consequences of a dictatorship. Characters, events, symbols, and indications of hope are critical for a larger judgement of what is represented. Therefore, their examination gives the essential messages hidden in *Lord of the Flies*.

George Orwell is against all kinds of inequality, so it is not surprising that he does not welcome any totalitarian actions. During his life, he fights against injustice and tyranny both physically and by following the ways of literature. Because of the same reason, he quits his job while he is working as a BBC officer in Burma, and he rejects his British identity. For him, freedom and equality are necessary for every individual.

With these ideas and beliefs, he pens *1984*, which is still accepted as a flawless example of dystopia ruled by a fierce dictator. By forming a totalitarian regime, he is in pursuit of displaying the future of a state which is ruled by dictatorship. Necessary tools such as a party supporting the authority, the police force, observation of the society, punishment mechanisms, and fear are in the centre of the novel. Therefore, an obvious form of totalitarianism is present for readers of *1984*.

The purpose of this piece of art is to provide the prevention of any totalitarian state by showing the hardships which most citizens witness in every part of their lives. Like William Golding, George Orwell aims to signal threats of dictatorship arising as a result of countries' circumstances in the post-war period. The inner thoughts of characters are depicted explicitly by Orwell because he also attempts to be the voice of everyday people in the 20th century.

This thesis examines the two novels together with new historicism and its methods because they involve the representation of the same period. Even if their writers are different, they mainly carry the same uneasiness about the future of the countries. For that

reason, they endeavour to show the dangers, threats, and possibilities which wait for citizens in case of the presence of dictatorship. While doing so, both novels focus on the power structures and circulation of power in states since they are depicted in a never-ending cycle. By starting from the top, power shows its presence in every field of political and social life till it reaches to the bottom. Even if some characters are on an island whereas others are in a super-state, the circumstance is the same for them in both works since they are required to survive against challenging conditions which are implemented together with power tools. Similarly, characters in both novels continue being a part of these power mechanisms because they also contribute to the distribution of it among community.

From both works, it is feasible to infer some historical matters whose existence is implemented thanks to several symbols and motifs. Additionally, this process is executed with discourses and epistemes which Golding and Orwell naturally have thanks to their identities in their communities. Although these pieces of art are subjective products, they reflect what is viewed as objective incidents such as most people's worries about the future. This proves that history is not only present in historical books or anecdotes which are alluded to unbiased writers. In other words, to learn history, literature is a source with its own indicators and style.

Lord of the Flies and *1984* are previews of the forthcoming social and political structures of most countries in the second half of the 20th century if totalitarian executions continue their presence. Their directives are hidden in actions, and characters are the images of historical faces in the post-war period. They are distinctive novels which have been formed by different authors, and yet they have the similar representations about the same era. To comprehend what have been narrated in them, they must be examined together with William Golding's notions and George Orwell's views, which necessitate the combination of discourses and epistemes of their era.

This thesis has shown that thanks to new historicism, reflections of historical events can be found and assessed in literal works. The description of the same period in a similar way in both novels provide the significance of literature in terms of historical reality. Lastly, the missing parts in history books can be filled with data in literary outputs since there is always a piece of puzzle about the past in each literal work.

REFERENCES

- ALEXOPOULOS, G. (2016). Medical Research in Stalin's Gulag. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 90(3), 363–393. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26310926>
- Arslanoğlu, C., & Kayabalı, İ. (1983). *Propagandanın Sosyo-Psikolojik Temelleri*. Ogun Kardeşler Matbaacılık Sanayi.
- Barry, P. (2009). *Beginning Theory an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism* (3rd ed.). Manchester University Press.
- Basirat, S., & Farhoud, F. (2015). Lord of the Flies and implications of tutelage. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 42, 189-199. <https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.42.189>
- Booker, M. K. (1996). *A Practical Introduction to Literary Theory and Criticism*. Longman Publishers.
- Bounds, P. (2009). *Orwell & Marxism: The Political and Cultural Thinking of George Orwell*. I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd. <https://epdf.tips/orwell-and-marxism-the-political-and-cultural-thinking-of-george-orwell.html>
- Brannigan, J. (1998). *Transitions: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. St. Martin 's Press.
- Bressler, E. C. (2003). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. Pearson Education Inc., New Jersey.
- Bychowski, G., & Bychowski, G. (1943). DICTATORS AND THEIR FOLLOWERS: A THEORY OF DICTATORSHIP. *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, 1(3), 455–457. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24725069>
- Chavan, P. (2013). Subversion of civilization in William Golding's Lord of the Flies. *European Academic Research*, 1(7), 1516-1526. https://www.academia.edu/39992783/Subversion_of_Civilization_in_William_Goldings_Lord_of_the_Flies_Dr_P_M_Chavan
- Churchill, W. (1946). *Churchill's "Iron Curtain" Speech, "Sinews of Peace"* [Speech transcript]. History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, CWIHP archives, <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/116180>
- Çavuş, R. (2002). Towards a new turn to history in literary studies. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(1-2), 121-133. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2153124>

- Davies, S. (1997). *Popular Opinion In Stalin's Russia, Terror, Propaganda and Dissent 1934-1941*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deyab, M. (2016). A new historicist reading of William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954). *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture (Lingua-LLC)*, 3(2), 74-96.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312031812_A_New_Historicist_Reading_of_William_Golding%27s_Lord_of_the_Flies
- Dunnage, J. (2006). Policing right-wing dictatorships: Some preliminary comparisons of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and Franco's Spain. *Crime, History & Societies*, 10(1), 93-122. <https://doi.org/10.4000/chs.200>
- Enteen, G. M. (1984). GEORGE ORWELL AND THE THEORY OF TOTALITARIANISM: A 1984 RETROSPECTIVE. *The Journal of General Education*, 36(3), 206–215. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27797000>
- Feder, L. (1983). Selfhood, Language, and Reality: George Orwell's "Nineteen Eighty-Four." *The Georgia Review*, 37(2), 392–409.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41398529>
- Friedrich, C. J. (1968). In Defence of a Concept [Review of *The Politics of the European Communist States*, by G. Ionescu]. *Government and Opposition*, 3(2), 249–254. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44481868>
- Frye, R. M. (1998). Hitler, Stalin, and Shakespeare's Macbeth: Modern Totalitarianism and Ancient Tyranny. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 142(1), 81–109. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3152266>
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published in 1971)
- Foucault, M. (1980). *POWER/KNOWLEDGE: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published in 1972)
https://monoskop.org/images/5/5d/Foucault_Michel_Power_Knowledge_Selected_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1972-1977.pdf
- Gallagher, C., & Greenblatt, S. (2000). *Practicing New Historicism*. The University of Chicago Press Chicago and London.
https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=8atGSHPGHZEC&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=new+historicism&ots=CE9uzh8-sW&sig=QU3XGB5WnII9CdC5gWAuPWTHpAE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Gallagher, C. (1989). Marxism and the New Historicism. In Harold A. Veesser (Ed.), *The New Historicism*. (pp. 37-48). Routledge Chapman and Hall.

- Glad, B. (2002). Why tyrants go too far: Malignant narcissism and absolute power. *Political Psychology*, 23(1), 1–37. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792241>
- Gindin, J. (2016). *William Golding*. Springer.
https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=VGRaCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=william+golding&ots=4fHpl2w0Z&sig=TiOicjrh5Dfcl4XFfsQuwP3IeGGY&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Golding, W. (1954). *Lord of the Flies*. Global Village Contemporary Classics.
<https://d2ct263enury6r.cloudfront.net/X2bpH13Xn4ZJspWQzb5LMu7BGp5CUGaPGFQqVXvLT2M1AW.pdf>
- Golding, W. (1966). *The Hot Gates, and Other Occasional Pieces*. Faber and Faber.
<https://archive.org/details/hotgates0000unse/page/n7/mode/2up>
- Gordin, M., Tilley, H. & Prakash, G. (2010). Introduction. Utopia and Dystopia beyond Space and Time. In M. Gordin, H. Tilley & G. Prakash (Ed.), *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility* (pp. 1-18). Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400834952.1>
- Greenblatt, S. (1982). *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*. Norman Okla: Pilgrim Books.
- Greenblatt S. (2013). Towards a Poetics of Culture. In H. A. Veese (Ed.), *The New Historicism* (pp. 1-14). Routledge.
- Hitler, A. (1924). *Mein Kampf (My Struggle)*. Fairborne Publishing.
<https://childrenofyhwh.com/multimedia/library/Hitler/mein-kampf.pdf>
- Hyland, P., Boduszek, D., & Kielkiewicz, K. (2011). A Psycho-Historical Analysis of Adolf Hitler: The Role of Personality, Psychopathology and Development. *Psychology and Society*, 4(2), 58-63.
https://www.academia.edu/30648612/A_psycho_historical_analysis_of_Adolf_Hitler_The_role_of_personality_psychopathology_and_development
- Ireland, B. (2017). William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* in Historical Context. In *Critical Insights: Lord of the Flies* (Critical Insights series). Salem Press.
https://salempress.com/Media/SalemPress/samples/ci_lord_of_the_flies_pgs.pdf
- Jones, D. D., & Meltzer, S. L. (1933). Hitler and Hitlerism. *Social Science*, 8(4), 412–419. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41882439>
- Julie, R., & Ryan, M. (Eds.) (2004). *Literary Theory: An Anthology: Discipline and Punish* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Kastan, D.S. (2006). *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of British Literature*. Oxford University Press.

- Kuromiya, H. (2007). Stalin and His Era. *The Historical Journal*, 50(3), 711–724. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20175118>
- Leitch, V.B. (2001). *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (2nd ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Li, X., & Wu, W. (2009). On symbolic significance of characters in Lord of the Flies. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 119-122. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1082261.pdf>
- Lord, C. (2001). LEADERSHIP AND STRATEGY. *Naval War College Review*, 54(1), 139–144. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26391131>
- Macdonald, H. (1999). *Mussolini and Italian Fascism*. Cheltenham, Stanley Thornes Publishers Ltd.
- Magstadt, T. *Understanding Politics: Ideas, Institutions, and Issues*. Cengage Learning.
- Messerer, A. (1984). ORWELL AND THE SOVIET UNION. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 41(2), 130–134. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42576669>
- Murfin, R., & Ray, S. (1998). *The Bedford glossary of critical and literary terms*. Retrieved from http://bcs.bedfordstmartins.com/virtualit/poetry/critical_define/crit_newhist.html
- Montrose, A. L. (1989). Professing the Renaissance. In H. A. Veenser (Ed.), *The New Historicism* (pp. 15-36). New York, Routledge.
- Montrose, A. L. (1997). Louis A. Montrose: ‘Professing the Renaissance: the Poetics and Politics of Culture. In Newton, K.M. (Ed.), *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory* (2nd ed., pp. 240-247). Palgrave, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-25934-2_47
- Olatunji, F. O. (2013). Democracy and the challenge of the rules of law in developing democratic society. *Beytulhikme An International Journal of Philosophy*, 3(2), 67-79. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/40527>
- Orwell, G. (1986). *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Secker & Warburg.
- Orwell, G. (2004). *Why I Write*. Penguin Books.
- Orwell, G. (2021). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Global Grey eBooks. (Original work published 1949). <https://www.globalgreyebooks.com/nineteen-eighty-four-ebook.html>
- Ostrow, J. M. (2012). *Politics in Russia: A Reader*. London, Sage Publications.
- Pfanner, T. (2004). Military uniforms and the law of war. *The International Review of the Red Cross* 86(853), 93-124. https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/other/irrc_853_pfanner.pdf

- Quinault, R. (2001). Churchill and democracy. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 11, 201–220. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679421>
- Reiman, M. (2016). *About Russia, Its Revolutions, Its Development and Its Present*. Peter Lang Edition. <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/5cefa4f2-07de-4169-83e2-06372acde311/650055.pdf>
- Sarsılmaz, N., & Yiğiter, K. (2012). How World War II shaped the art and literature. *ABMYO Dergisi*, 25, 50-58. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/747568>
- Sauvain, P. (1996). *Key Themes of Twentieth Century*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes Publishers Ltd.
- Saxena, S. (2015). *Political and Economic Systems: Dictatorship, Fascism, and Totalitarianism*. Rosen Publishing Group.
- Schlesinger, A. (1967). Origins of the Cold War. *Foreign Affairs*, 46(1), 22–52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20039280>
- Senn, S. (2015). All Propaganda is Dangerous, but Some are More Dangerous than Others: George Orwell and the Use of Literature as Propaganda. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 8(3), 149–161. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26465253>
- Spitz, D. (1970). Power and Authority: An Interpretation of Golding’s “Lord of the Flies.” *The Antioch Review*, 30(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4637248>
- Stone, J. (2016). George Orwell on politics and war. *Review of International Studies*, 43(2), 221-239. doi:10.1017/S026021051600036X
- Suvorov, S. (2009). *Buzkıran* (Bahram Abdurahimov Trans.). Delta Kültür Yayınevi. (Original work published 1988)
- Thomas, B. (1989). The New Historicism and Other Old-Fashioned topics. In Harold A. Veesser (Ed.) *The New Historicism*. (pp. 182-203). New York, Routledge Chapman and Hall.
- Thorp, M. R. (1984). The Dynamics of Terror in Orwell’s “1984.” *Brigham Young University Studies*, 24(1), 3–17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43041004>
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Urhan, V. (2000). *Michel Foucault ve Arkeolojik Çözümleme*. Paradigma Yayıncılık.
- Veesser, H. A. (1989). Introduction. In Harold A. Veesser (Ed.), *The New Historicism*. (1989, pp. 9-16). Routledge Chapman and Hall.
- Wade, R. A. (2005). *The Russian Revolution, 1917*. Cambridge University Press.

- White H. (1989). New Historicism: A Comment. In Harold A. Veesser (Ed.), *The New Historicism*. (pp. 293-302). Routledge Chapman and Hall.
- White, R. (2008). George Orwell: Socialism and Utopia. *Utopian Studies*, 19(1), 73–95. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20719892>
- Wilson, M. (2012). 7 leadership lessons from the life of Winston Churchill. *The Possibility Press Thought Leadership Series*, 1-3. <https://transformationsystems.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/ChurchillLeadership.pdf>
- Woodcock, G. (1966). *The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell*. Little, Brown, and Company. https://files.libcom.org/files/Woodcock_Crystal_Spirit.pdf

CURRICULUM VITAE

Emre Can ŞENEL was graduated from Safranbolu Anatolian High School and continued his education at TOBB University of Economics and Technology. In 2018, he received a bachelor's degree in the department of English Language and Literature. He has been working as an English instructor since 2020.