

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

08 MAI 1945 UNIVERSITY-GUELMA
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Letters and English Language

جامعة 08 ماي 1945 قالمة
كلية الآداب واللغات
قسم الآداب واللغة الانجليزية



Option: Literature

Totalitarianism in George Orwell's *1984* (1949) and Boualem Sansal's *2084: The End of the World* (2015): A Comparative Study

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language and Culture

Board of Examiners

Chairwoman: Dr. BENDJEMIL Khawla (MC/B) Université de 8 Mai 1945 - GUELMA

Supervisor: Miss MOUMENE Soumia (MA/A) Université de 8 Mai 1945 - GUELMA

Examiner: Mrs. AIOUNI Laila (MA/A) Université de 8 Mai 1945 -GUELMA

Submitted by:

SLIMANI Meryem

Supervised by:

Miss MOUMENE Soumia

June 2022

Dedication

By the grace of Allah,

I gratefully dedicate this work to my mother,

SAIDA GUEDOUM

The extraordinary woman without whom I would not be here.

Thank you for all the sacrifices you made to see me reach this far and further.

This is not my success; it is yours.

To my little sister, Zeyneb, my companion in life. Thank you for being the sweetness in bitter times and the sun in gloomy days.

My father and my siblings Yousef and Hadjer.

To my friends

Especially, Nedjemeddine, Bouchra, Akram, Hadia. Thank you for the enormous support, the funny moments and the unforgettable memories.

I LOVE YOU ALL

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor **Miss MOUMENE Soumia** for her support and for believing in my vision and helping me realize it. Thank you for your enthusiastic spirit, precious guidance and trust.

I would like to thank the jury members, **Dr. BENDJEMIL Khawla** and **Mrs. AIOUNI Laila** for taking the time to evaluate my work.

Special acknowledgment to **Dr. ATY Mourad** for his insightful information, inspiration and his delightful discussions. Thank you for believing in me.

Abstract

This study discusses the portrayal of different aspects of totalitarianism as the major theme in both George Orwell's *1984* (1948) and Boualem Sansal *2084: The End of the World* (2015). This work aims at understanding how the different ideologies of the authors, being from different societies, has influenced the way they demonstrated the theme in regards to the political and religious nature of the dystopian genre chosen by the authors. This study analyzes the mis(use) of technology, propaganda and language, and the portrayal of the protagonist character in each novel, as features representing totalitarianism in both novels. Moreover, it sheds light on the reflections of those features in the context of the writing of both works. Using the biographical approach, this paper seeks to understand the experiences involved in the formation of both authors' ideologies and how they implement them in their novels. The use of the historical approach is also crucial to understand the context of writing and the various discourses influencing the authors' productions and their motives. Finally, this work aims at understanding the difference between both authors' motives in their depiction of the theme and to conclude that the perspective from which both novels are read determines the intentions of the writer. Accordingly, the outcome of this study is that the motives of both George Orwell and Boualem Sansal are ideological.

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of Contents	IV
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: The Formation of Literature Through Ideology	7
I.1. Understanding the Concept of Ideology.....	7
I.2. Literature and Ideology	10
I.3. Dystopian Literature	12
I.4. Totalitarianism and its Representation in Dystopian Literature: An Overview	17
I.5. Theoretical Framework.....	24
Chapter Two: Controversial Writers from Distinct Eras: Orwell and Sansal	27
II.1. George Orwell’s Legacy	27
II.1.1. Towards Merging Ideology with Literature: George Orwell’s Views	29
II.1.2. George Orwell’s Legacy as a Genius Political Writer	32
II.2. Boualem Sansal: The Rise of a Controversial Writer	35
II.2.1. Boualem Sansal’s Ideological Stance and Controversial Views	38
II.2.2. Sansal’s Literary Production: An Algerian Style with a Francophone Tongue	42

II.3. Sansal VS. Orwell: Similar or Different Agendas?.....43

Chapter Three: The Representation of Totalitarianism in Orwell’s *1984* and

Sansal’s *2084*.....47

III.1. The (Mis)Use of Technology in Orwell’s *1984* and Sansal’s *2084*.....47

III.2. Propaganda and Language as Tools of Totalitarianism 54

III.3. Orwell’s Winston and Sansal’s Ati: Disillusioned Protagonists in a Totalitarian

Dystopia 64

III.4. Orwell’s and Sansal’s Messages: Success or Failure? 71

Conclusion75

Works Cited..... 81

French Abstract

Arabic Abstract.....

Introduction

Literature is the representation of life through written and spoken stories, events, characters...etc. One can almost vouch that literature has been the first companion of humankind through which they have told and have passed the illumination of human civilization across the generations. Literature does not only aim at telling stories and events, but also at studying human connection through depicting different, sometimes paradoxical, situations, eras, generations and mirroring the emotions and states of mind of people. Consequently, literature reflects on the human relationships from all aspects. Accordingly, any literary work is the author's own creative uniqueness of conveying to the world various thoughts, perspectives and ideologies. Literature is the means by which authors represent societies and give voice to unspoken truths, feelings and the most daring beliefs. For many writers, literature became the weapon they use to defend certain principles and rebel against others. Accordingly, there exists a tight link between the development of human ideologies and the literary works representing them.

From the outset of humanity people sought to fantasize about the perfect society and to predict futuristic worlds, using literature as a means to fulfill their imagination, namely through utopian narratives. In contrast, they inevitably wrote about the opposite vision to the utopian society, which is the anti-utopian or the dystopian, through narratives of the same genre.

Totalitarianism is a major theme in dystopian literatures and is a recurring subject in many works that aim at presenting the collection of values in a certain society.

Probably one of the most prominent works that place totalitarianism as a major theme is George Orwell's masterpiece, *1984* (1948). Orwell's book is argued to be a good analysis of his political tendencies in which he demonstrated his ideology and perspective. Another author with similar literary inclination is the Algerian writer, Boualem Sansal. Inspired by George Orwell,

Sansal wrote *2084: The End of the World* (2015) as a theocratic totalitarian dystopia. The selection of these works is mainly due to their relation, considering that the latter is largely inspired by the former. However, despite the fact that both works share similar characteristics, they differ in their context and the motives fueling the depiction of the totalitarian ideology they attempted to convey.

Totalitarianism has always been a subject of interest and controversy for many scholars, authors and people interested in social and political regimes. Many works try to analyze it and tackle it from different perspectives in an attempt to figure out how totalitarian states rise and develop. According to M. Keith Booker in his book, *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature* (1995), dystopian works aim primarily at showing the human agony and suffering shared in a society. Booker focuses mainly on establishing a firm understanding of utopia and dystopia. Not only that, but also his work serves as an introduction to a thorough examination of the major dystopian works such as Eugene Zamyatin's *We*, Orwell's *1984*. Therefore, the book aims at enriching and deepening the readers knowledge on dystopian fiction. Moreover, this book serves to highlight the different historical, societal and ideological motives and ideas underlying the creation of dystopian fiction. In this regard, the book offers a social criticism of totalitarianism from the perspective of different authors; namely, Huxley and Orwell.

Additionally, George Orwell's *1984* is one of the most prominent literary works that is dedicated to the depiction of totalitarianism. On this account, many published articles and books attempt to analyze Orwell's vision and to understand the implication of such system on the different aspects of life concerning the societies living under a totalitarian regime. Theo Finigan in his article, "Into the Memory Hole: Totalitarianism and Mal d'Archive in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *The Handmaid's Tale*," states that, in both *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *The Handmaid's Tale*,

totalitarian domination is clearly premised on the control of the experience of temporality (2). He sets a comparison between both works to explain thoroughly the notion of time manipulation as a mechanism of totalitarian regimes in which the past, present and future are in constant writing and rewriting.

On the same account, the literary production of Boualem Sansal has been the reason for the publication of different works such as Petr Vurm's paper entitled "1984–2084. Faux-semblants Révélés , Émotions Refoulées: L'amour, La haine et L'indéférence à L'age Totalitaire Chez George Orwell et Boualem Sansal", discusses Sansal's work within its updated context of Islamic totalitarianism in comparison to its hypotext *1984* written by George Orwell. He aims at setting a framework in which he analyzes and explains different emotional aspects in regards to totalitarianism. Moreover, the paper sheds light on the more optimistic open ending of Sansal's work that in one way or another gives hope on the possibility of defeating the totalitarian control. The present dissertation attempts at examining Vurm's reading of Sansal's novel, especially in regards to his analysis of the main character in order to reach a reading that appeals to the aims of this study.

This current work aims at extracting and comparing the motives underlying the choice of totalitarianism as a major theme, as well as its different implications in both George Orwell's *1984* and Boualem Sansal *2084: The End of the World*. Both Orwell and Sansal display totalitarianism at the core of their productions through depicting, not only controlled and oppressed societies, but also societies that are to a certain extent extremists and are deprived of their freedom. Moreover, this theme is common in dystopian narratives even though it stems from different beliefs and is demonstrated in different ways. Therefore, this research seeks to analyze the social and cultural background of George Orwell and Boualem Sansal to understand how

differences in those two elements resulted in shaping different ideologies and different perceptions of totalitarianism resulting in outwardly similar works, but fundamentally different. This research focuses mainly on developing a wider understanding of totalitarianism through the framework of both novels by examining the similar and different motives, conditions and reasons that formed both writers' perspectives.

This work is a comparative study and relies on the biographical approach to examine deeply the authors' experiences and their background in relation to their selected literary productions. In addition, the historical approach is followed in order to understand the effects of the events surrounding both the life of the authors and creation of their works, which will be significant to interpret both works and to achieve a deeper understanding of totalitarianism not only as a theme but also as an ideology. The research relies on both historicism and new historicism in the analysis of the selected works.

This dissertation is structured into three chapters. The first chapter is theoretical in which the focus is on identifying the key concepts of this study. It starts by understanding the term ideology and then it explains the relationship between ideology and literature. It demonstrates the reflections of ideology on literature and the influence it creates. In addition, the first chapter also explains briefly, what is meant by dystopian literature, its characteristics and it gives a special account to three major types of dystopian literature. After that, the concept of totalitarianism is explained and understood within the framework of dystopian literature, as well as its different features and representations in literature; particularly the example of *Animal Farm* and *Brave New World*.

The chapter ends with giving a theoretical framework in which the approach to be followed is explained; thus a brief explication of the biographical approach and the historical approach is to be found.

The second chapter is dedicated to the authors in which their biography is tackled briefly from all aspects. It starts with George Orwell and gives an overview of his upbringing. Then it moves to discuss the formation of his ideology through his experiences and the ways in which he merged them into his literature. After that, the section of Orwell ends by discussing his literary style and understanding his motives. The chapter, in its second section, gives biographical information about the Algerian writer, Boualem Sansal, and his beginnings as a writer which is followed by an understanding of his ideological stance through his interviews and statements. A description of his literary style as an Algerian francophone writer is displayed. Finally, the chapter, in its final section, emphasizes on the necessity to study Orwell and Sansal in comparison, especially regarding the selected works.

The third chapter is the practical part of this study in which the information discussed in both the first and second chapter is used in the analysis of the selected works. The use of technology, propaganda and language, and the protagonist characters in both works are analyzed to understand how both authors demonstrate them to reflect on the context in which their productions were created and published. This analysis also allows for a deeper understanding of how the ideology represented in the works reflect on the authors societies. This chapter concludes by giving an interpretation of the motives intended by both authors and how the perspective from which each novel is read determines the implication of the message it carries.

The current study attempts to tackle the concept of totalitarianism from the point view of two different writers according to the vision portrayed in their dystopian works. Both George Orwell in his book, *1984*, and Boualem Sansal in his, *2084*, display totalitarian society in respect to their ideologies that were constructed through their experiences. Through their works, both authors aim to serve ideological purposes triggered by different motives. This research explores Sansal's

inclination towards Europe, particularly France, from an Algerian perspective. Furthermore, this study seeks to understand Orwell's motives as a writer from a western perspective.

Chapter One: The Formation of Literature Through Ideology

The first chapter explains how literary works are built around the ideology of the writer, especially dystopian literature. First, it starts by defining the concept of ideology from different perspectives. Then, the chapter explains the relationship between literature and ideology and the complexity of their interconnectivity with special account to dystopian literature and its characteristics. Moreover, it focuses on three types of dystopian literature. After this, the chapter introduces the concept of totalitarianism with its various features reflecting on its representation in literature, specifically, dystopian literature. Finally, this chapter concludes by giving a theoretical framework of the two approaches on which this study will rely: the biographical approach and the historical approach. Therefore, this chapter serves as a theoretical basis to elaborate the key concepts and notions involved in the analysis and comparison of the selected works.

I.1. Understanding the Concept of Ideology

It is hard to settle on a single definition for ideology. According to the Oxford English dictionary, ideology “is a set of ideas that an economic or political system is based on” (Ideology). Thus, in order for any society to build an organized system and prosper as a unity of developed economic and political institutions, it adopts a certain ideology as a collection of ideas shared by members of that society. Moreover, it is a set of beliefs, especially one held by a particular group, that influence the way people behave (Ideology). All members of a certain society are bound to the convictions they feel most entitled to, and which determines their actions and the manner through which they function inside that society. Ideology is also defined in Merriam Webster’s English dictionary as “a manner or the content of thinking characteristic of an individual, group, or culture (Ideology). It is, therefore, the essence that constitutes thoughts.

Those definitions however remain basic and do not cover the different aspects related to the concept of ideology.

The French aristocrat and philosopher, Antoine Louis Claude Destutt De Tracy, first coined the word 'ideology' in 1796. Emmet Kennedy in his article, "'Ideology" from Destutt De Tracy to Marx" argues that the term "ideology" was used for the first time in Tracy's book, *Memoir on the Faculty of Thinking*, announcing its importance and necessity to be the new logical perspective, now that neither metaphysics nor psychology were sufficient or valued enough (354). Destutt De Tracy argues:

Je préférerais donc de beaucoup que l'on adoptât le nom d'idéologie, ou science des idées.

Il est très sage, car il ne suppose rien de ce qui est douteux ou inconnu ; il ne rappelle à l'esprit aucune idée de cause.

Son sens est très clair pour tout le monde, si l'on ne considère que celui du mot français idée ; car chacun sait ce qu'il entend par une idée, quoique peu de gens sachent bien ce que c'est.

Il est rigoureusement exact dans cette hypothèse ; car idéologie est la traduction littérale de science des idées. (qtd. in Macherey)

He therefore establishes ideology as the science of ideas or the systematic study of ideas, which aims at examining not only the human ideas but also the different institutions that shape the human life rejecting all kind of ideas that do not appeal to reason as the first reference to justifying them. Moreover, ideology becomes the basis from which all other sciences stem and the top science from which they would be understood.

On another perspective, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, German philosophers and two of the most influential intellectuals of the 18th century, took the term ideology, altered it drastically, and associated it with both power and class. In their book *The German Ideology* (1932), they discuss how social circumstances and economic system are now directly linked to the formation of ideas. Thus, in his arguments on the theories of ideology, Marx states, “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas” (67). It indicates that the means of intellectual production is directly influenced and determined by means of the material productions, which belong to the powerful ruling class or the “bourgeoisie”. According to Marx, not only that the ruling class have material power which enables them to possess consciousness, but also to control the social institutions that influence, largely, how and what people of lower class, the proletariat, think. The conception of ideology for Marx equals false consciousness in which the lower class have an ideology, a belief system, a worldview, a perspective on reality that do not actually reflect reality nor serve them, but is only a view perceived through the propagated ideology by the ruling class.

Louis Pierre Althusser, a French Marxist philosopher, employs the works of many theorists such as Antonio Gramsci, Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan to redefine the given Marxist conception of ideology and elaborate more on its faculties. In his essay “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses”, Althusser discusses ideology, first, as a necessity to achieve social cohesion in the sense that it is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to real conditions of their existence (82). He sees ideology as a needed medium by which individuals of the same society are bound together. It is needed even in those societies that are not considered as class societies. Second, he argues that ideology has a material existence because it is not abstract ideas or the conscious representations in the mind of individuals that constitute ideology, but rather it is their actions and behaviors “within the material existence of an

ideological apparatus” (Althusser 83). He suggests, “every “subject” endowed with a “consciousness” and believing in the “ideas” that his “consciousness” inspires in him and freely accepts, must “act according to his ideas”, must therefore inscribe his own ideas as a free subject in the actions of his material practice” (Althusser 82). There must be a link that explains the relationship between belief and action. Thus, any ideas residing in one’s mind must be in a way or another enacted in his practice.

Althusser’s definition implies that ideology leads to a distortion in one’s perception of the real and the true social conditions. Accordingly, he calls it the “imaginary consciousness” that he argues is achieved through the different social institutions of the “ideological state apparatuses” through which the ruling class secure their interests by promoting certain ideas and perspectives into a society. This view is shared by Terry Eagleton who says that ideology injects its beliefs in society, “denigrates ideas which might challenge it”, excluding rival forms of thought, and “obscuring social reality” (qtd. in Moramollu).

In *Mythologies*, Roland Barthes examines the ways in which societies create and sustain myths. He argues that they are created with a reason that they are formed to appeal to the current ideologies of the ruling class and its media. Since those ideologies are considered as natural and are passed off as the universal truth, they support existing power structures. Thus, Barthes’ use of the term myths is synonymous to ideology.

I.2. Literature and Ideology

The relationship between ideology and literature is undeniably essential. They both coexist in the process of writing, and influence each other. To examine the relationship between literature and ideology, George A. Huaco suggests in his paper entitled: “Ideology and Literature,” that one must first acknowledge that ideology is a concern of sociology and other sciences. Second,

one must understand the difference between literary criticism and sociology. While the former focuses on individual subjectivity, the latter operates at the group level. Thus, many scholars study this relationship: the new discipline of sociology of literature (1). He further examines Marx's notion of ideology concluding that ideology is inevitably imbedded in all cultural creations in the sense that it is a means to examine those creations in relation to specific social dimensions (1-2).

Notably, before Marx, many attempts have been made to account for literary works in terms of political and social conditions. In this regard, Terry Eagleton, an English literary theorist and critic argued in his book, *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (1976), that according to Marxism, since the superstructure (politics, religion, art, philosophy. etc.) is determined by the base (economic system or infrastructure), it inevitably supports the ideologies of the base (5). Therefore, literature being part of the infrastructure and a cultural production, it is bound to the political and social conditions in which it was created, thus it reflects and sustains the ideology of the superstructure. Eagleton supports this view in his argument when he remarks that Literary works are related to the dominant way of seeing the world since they are forms of perception rather than being parts of mysterious inspiration. They originate from ideology (15). Georgi Plekhanov, a Russian philosopher and Marxist theoretician, states, "I go further and say that there is no such thing as an artistic production which is devoid of idea" (24). Accordingly, art works cannot be completely free from ideology. In this sense the works of literature are, in the words of Eagleton, 'prisoners of false consciousness'. Thus, they cannot reach the full truth. It is a view shared by 'vulgar Marxist' criticism, which regard literature as solely reflections of dominant ideologies (16). This view, however, cannot explain why many literary works challenge the ideological assumptions of their time. As the Austrian writer and politician, Ernst

Fischer, argues throughout his book *Art Against Ideology* (1969), that authentic art should reveal the true realities hidden beyond ideological limits.

Moreover, on the relationship of literature and ideology, Althusser in his essay, “A Letter on Art in Reply to Andre Daspre,” argues that the relationship between ideology and art is complex and particular in the sense that art cannot be reduced to ideology (223). He explains that literature does not only give conceptual analysis of the imaginary ways men experience the world, which is what ideology indicates. Instead, it delivers the actual feeling in certain conditions. Thus, art, being part of ideology, distinguishes itself from it to the extent of delivering the feeling and perception of the ideology underlying it. He continues to argue that art does not reveal concealed truth, but rather it reveals the nature of ideology (Althusser 223). This view is further elaborated by Pierre Macherey’s “*Pour Une Théorie de la Production Littéraire*” (1966). He claims that by giving ideology shape and structure, art can distance itself from it and reveals its limits. As a result, art helps in freeing us from ideological illusions.

I.3. Dystopian Literature

According to Namrata Purkar, an assistant Professor at the Department of Humanities in Medi-Caps Group of Institutions, Indore, Dystopian fiction finds its roots in utopian literature. This latter appeared for the first time, as a form and term, with the publication of Thomas More’s *Utopia* in 1516. Both utopia and dystopia belong to the subgenre of soft science fiction (1). Therefore, to hold a tight grip on the meaning of dystopia and its implication in modern literature, one must understand the roots from which it stems: utopia. The idea of utopia primarily indicates a perfectionist optimistic idea of the world and suggests the necessary changes that need to be brought about in order to achieve that. The German sociologist, Karl Mannheim, describes utopia in his book, *Ideology and Utopia* (1929), as energies aiming to

change the society, opposing those of ideology that seek to preserve the existing order of things (192).

M. Keith Booker is one of the modern writers who discussed dystopian literature in relation to social criticism and politics in his book, *Dystopian Literature* (1994). In this regard, he asserts:

Dystopian literature generally constitutes a critique of existing social conditions or political systems, either through the critical examination of the Utopian premises upon which these conditions and systems are based or through the imaginative extension of those conditions and systems into different contexts that more clearly reveal their flaws and contradictions.

(3)

Therefore, dystopian literature helps in constructing a perspective on the political and social practices in a certain society, which might appear normal, but can be very oppressive, flawed and problematic. *Gulliver's Travels* by Jonathan Swift is one of the earliest dystopian works that support this claim. Booker, in his book *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature* (1994), argues how dystopias, as opposed to utopias, depict a doomed society by the horrors resulted from political and human evils. A futuristic vision reinforced by oppression and delusional perfection.

In the same regard, trying to understand dystopian fiction, Chad Walsh argues in his book, *From Utopia to Nightmare* (1962), that dystopia is a result of replacing the ideal utopian thinking due to the new political perspectives. This shift resulted in what he called “nightmare” as opposed to the dreaming optimistic aspirations of utopia. Therefore, Jelena Pataki, in her paper “To Read and Learn: The Necessity for a New Definition of Dystopia and Bridging the Gap between the Old and Contemporary Dystopias”, states that: “Dystopia is generally described as a bad place, or even more simply, a utopia gone wrong” (426). The term is constantly defined in

reference to its direct opposite. Dystopian works depict worlds that are necessarily related to a totalitarian state apparatus. Thus, 'inverted utopia' and 'anti-utopia' are the most common synonyms given to dystopia in the attempt to define in (Pataki 426).

According to Chris Jordan, in a YouTube video entitled "What is Dystopian Literature?", the history of dystopia is quiet indecisive, as many people and critics argue that it first appeared after the success of the French Revolution 1799. Nevertheless, *A Trip to the Island of Equality* (1792) is considered as Europe's first dystopian work that warned about the consequences of a total equality between humans. With the genre being unpopular at that time, the work as well did not receive as much recognition and faded into oblivion (Jordan).

The Industrial Revolution is among the most prominent factors that led to the emergence of dystopian writings. While it promised progress and prosperity, it resulted in more oppression and slavery-like conditions in factories. Thus, Alex Gendler, in a lesson presented in the form of a video posted on TED-Ed platform, he explained that the industrial revolution inspired many authors to write about the dystopian worlds that would arise. *The Time Machine* (1895) by H.G Wells portrayed the fears of such conditions through depicting what horrifying future awaits the upper classes and workers as they evolve into separate species. Moreover, the political and social aftermath of the WW1 and WW2 constituted crucial elements in increasing the popularity of dystopian literature as well as the diversity of its themes. Themes such as tyranny, the dangers of technology, the deceiving human nature and the importance of all forms of art, were now notably common (Jordan).

Dystopian literature shares some characteristics, most commonly, the futuristic gloomy setting in which people of the depicted society are always followers of a certain ideology or a figurehead. A subjection that is supported by the individual's limited freedom of thought and

action, which would lead to reinforcing the government control over every aspect of life.

Dystopias are also characterized by the technological control and a disillusioned protagonist that takes the mission of unveiling the truth of the social and political systems of his society (Purkar2-3). Accordingly, those characteristics serve the anti-utopian vision that what seems perfect and in cohesion is in fact chaotic and problematic; that the technological advances along with human selfishness can turn to be a deadly weapon against humanity. Dystopian works can reflect in many ways what might become of humans if they idealize their dreams according to their individual desires and ideologies. This can result in many types of sub-dystopian genres depending on the prominent ideology that the writer wants to depict.

For the purpose of this study, three types of Dystopian Literature are going to be introduced and discussed. Though all dystopian writings share common conventions, there are elements that indicate certain ideological tendencies and the direction towards which the depicted world is headed. Therefore, scientific dystopia, sociopolitical dystopia and religious dystopia will be the main types explained in this section.

Scientific dystopia is associated to technological control through modern, sometimes futuristic, means such as robots and computers. This type of control is what makes dystopian writings a subgenre of science fiction (Purkar 3). Therefore, according to George Gissing, an English novelist, in his book *The Private Papers of Henry Reycroft* (1903), science will be the deadliest enemy of humanity and will bring about its destruction; it will not only control, but also flip all conventions of human civilization and human nature (205). In other words, technology in a dystopian world will surround all aspects of human life controlling and directing it; resulting in what Professor Gorman Beauchamp in his article "Technology in the Dystopian Novel", describes as a technophobia in which technology is not a tool for totalitarian rulers, but it is

totalitarian in its nature (55). Among the most known examples of dystopian works that portray technological control in a scientific dystopia are Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), David Eggers' *The circle* (2013), Zamyatin's *We* (1924) Peter Riva's *The Path* (2015), Allen Steele's *Orbital Decay* (1989) and Ernest Cline's *Ready Player One* (2011).

Sociopolitical dystopia is the second type to be highlighted. Sean Seeger and Daniel Davison-Vecchione in their article entitled "Dystopian Literature and The Sociological Imagination" argue that dystopian literature finds its grounds in social reality as it portrays how social-historical reality is related to the individual. They explain the reciprocal influence of individual's experiences and the historically conditioned social forces and structure. Thus, dystopian literature clearly portrays this relationship (1). Gregory Claeys in his book entitled *Dystopia: A Natural History* (2017), did not only distinguish between three varieties of dystopia, which are the political dystopia, the environmental dystopia and the technological dystopia, but also argues, "It is the totalitarian political dystopia which is chiefly associated with the failure of utopian aspirations, and which has received the greatest historical attention" (5). When utopia aspires to achieve an ideal world where quality and justice reign, it is clear that political utopias portray the exact opposite of that vision. Sociopolitical dystopias therefore aim at using literature to anticipate futuristic states of affair using the already existing social patterns (Seeger and Davison-Vecchione).

Religious dystopia is the last type to discuss. Government control, being a major theme in dystopian literature, it demonstrates how governments can act as theocratic states in which, according to Kaisa Kaukiainen in her article "Challenging Secularity. Spiritual and Religious Undertones in Young Adult Dystopias", "the governments function in the same way as institutionalized churches do, be it by denying religion completely, or by presenting their own

doctrines” (88). Doctrines promoted by such states can indicate ideologies serving the stability and continuity of controlling power. In *Dystopian Fiction East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial* (2001), Erika Gottlieb states, “dystopian society functions as a primitive state religion that practices the ritual of human sacrifice,” which makes it barbaric (10-1). Works such as *Fahrenheit 451* (1953) by Ray Bradbury, *Nineteen Eighty Four* (1949) by George Orwell and *Brave New World* (1932) by Aldous Huxley are best known for depicting state religions. Kaukiainen also argues that modern dystopian works can be classified as post secular. They do not express religious tendencies explicitly; however, religion is implicitly rooted in the social structure, morality, the characters’ actions, and it is often portrayed through symbolism (90-1). A great example of that is Suzanne Collins’ *The Hunger Games* (2008) and Veronica Roth’s *Divergent* (2011).

I.4. Totalitarianism and its Representation in Dystopian Literature: An Overview

According to the English Dictionary of Merriam Webster, totalitarianism is defined as a “centralized control by autocratic authority.” it refers to the “political concept that the citizen should be totally subject to an absolute state authority” (Totalitarianism). Hannah Arndt, a German political philosopher and author, gives a more in-depth definition of totalitarianism in her significant book *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951). She states that totalitarianism, as a new form of government, is also a new form of oppressive political and social ideology. She explains how it has its own way of operating that is different from traditional tyrannies and dictatorships. She links it to Nazism and Stalinism as the major representatives of such regime in which means of oppression, total control, and terror manifested themselves. Further elaborating on the origins of the concept, Anthony Ridgewell in his thesis, *The “Popular” Concept of Totalitarianism* (1970), argued that historically, Benito Mussolini in his *La Dottrina del*

Fascismo was the first to use the term to indicate the notion of a totalitarian state. Therefore, totalitarianism denotes how the states, possessing particular ideological attributes that are moral and spiritual, contained all aspects of a society (1-2). In other words, society is under the absolute control of the state that determines the function and value of everything in that society.

It is crucial to identify and understand the major features that characterize totalitarianism in order to achieve a better understanding of the way it operates in different societies. Thus, Leslie Holmes in her article, "Totalitarianism," explains that totalitarianism is the extreme version of authoritarianism as they share some common ground; however, remains some distinctive characteristics that can be traced and identified in most totalitarian regimes (448). Carl Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski identify in their book, *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy* (1965), six major features of totalitarianism. Briefly, these features are: An official, all-embracing ideology; a typical single mass party that is led by one man (the dictator); a system of terroristic secret police control which effects physically and mentally; a monopoly of the means of communication that is almost absolute; a similar monopoly of the means of armed combat as well; and central control of the entire economy (22).

Holmes elaborates more on those features starting with the crucial role of ideology that is often radical and focused on the future. Thus, she links to propaganda as a major mechanism by which totalitarian states operate. To give a known and accurate example, 'Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer' (One People, One Empire, One Leader) in Nazi Germany was used as a propagandist slogan to promote the communist ideology (448). Particularly, due to the twentieth century technological development in regards to mass communication, it became easier to subjugate the citizens to the state propaganda and to increase the state's indoctrination through education resulting in "thought control or brainwashing". Thus, she explains, "totalitarianism is sometimes

seen as a particular and distorted version of advanced modernity, and as a phenomenon that did not and could not emerge until the twentieth century” (450). In other words, totalitarian states used the 20th century technology to enhance their power through providing means of advocating its ideology and reinforcing the state propaganda. Moreover, totalitarianism is exclusionary in the sense that it randomly condemns a certain group as enemy. This directly leads to the use of terror by which totalitarian states operate (Holmes 448).

In the same regard, Holmes further explains the great and prominent power of the single political party as another major feature of totalitarianism, which despite the presence of some kind of military power; it remains the total and ultimate power. Furthermore, a charismatic figurehead who has an ideal leader image distinguishes totalitarian systems; an image supported and maintained through the propagandist terms to address and salute them. In Nazi Germany, ‘der Führer’ describes Hitler, the ultimate leader and ‘Heil Hitler’ (Hail Hitler) to salute him. On another identifying feature, Holmes states that citizens in totalitarian states have no control on their personal beliefs nor do they have the freedom to disagree or have different views. Control reaches further to include arts and architecture. Additionally, totalitarianism operates on executing total control over the state’s economy. This indicates that in such states there is no economic freedom of any kind. Finally, the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the extension of the soviet power after the Second World War into Central and Eastern Europe, and Baltic states, is the embodiment of the expansionist notion of totalitarianism (Holmes 449).

Accordingly, totalitarianism is the ultimate execution of power held by one political party. It operates on subjugating people through means of mass communication to promote the party’s ideology. Propaganda, thus, is crucial in achieving the view of totalitarian states and the vision of

their total leaders. Particularly, the states monopoly over all aspects of life, namely, religion and economics, is critical in determining the features of totalitarianism.

As previously mentioned, the government control is one major element in dystopian narratives, thus it would only be normal and essential for totalitarianism to be at the heart of such literature. Josh Zuckerman states in his article “Totalitarianism and Dystopian Literature: A Review”, published in the Princeton Tory Magazine, that the futuristic, yet extremely oppressive nature of dystopian settings, inevitably makes the struggle against totalitarian regimes a common theme in dystopian literature. He asserts, “Our perception of dystopia largely revolves around the evils of the totalitarian regime”. Thus, totalitarianism, being a political ideology, it is present in works of literature because there is no more efficient and honest way of displaying ideology, even in an opposing way, than fiction. George Orwell supports this argument in his essay “Literature and Totalitarianism”, by stating, “Politics have invaded literature, to an extent that does not normally happen, and this has brought to the surface of our consciousness the struggle that always goes on between the individual and the community” (Orwell). Speaking of the ‘totalitarian age’, he emphasizes the importance of individual autonomy, which is threatened by totalitarianism, in creating true art; namely, literature. Meaning that literature is the means by which individuals express and criticize the social and political conditions in which they live; something that is needed, yet restrained, within totalitarian states (Orwell). Moreover, Irma Ratiani, a literary theoretician and Doctor of Philological Sciences, argues in her book, *Totalitarianism and Literary Discourse: 20th Century Experience*, how terror promoted by the Stalinist, and in other discourses, any totalitarian state, becomes the link between state and art. Writers turn into ‘ideological zombies’ defending the ideology of the state resulting in the creation of ‘ideological texts’ that had no aesthetic value but still were valuable for the state

(xiii). However, works opposing the state's ideology also emerged as an Anti-discourse of the main ideology, as she elaborates, "Discourse had its opposite side, marked by the struggle of disobedient, fearless nonconformists, writers who opposed the superficial illusion of forced happiness and chose an appealing form of literary protest" (Ratiani xiv) . It indicates that there were writers, unlike those who subjugated themselves to the state, who chose to express their resistance through their literature, defying the restraints of the totalitarian state. Therefore, to understand more efficiently how totalitarianism is depicted and criticized in literature, one must examine some of the major literary works on this matter; most notably, *Animal Farm* (1945) by George Orwell and *Brave New World* by (1932) Aldous Huxley.

Animal Farm is a classic fable novel written by George Orwell to depict the destructive possibilities of the totalitarian rule through animal personification. Through the novel, he gave animals human features and realistically imagined a variety of terrible events in the farm that would occur due to the misuse of power and the unconventional means of gaining control used by the rulers. Totalitarianism is apparent in the novel through the use and misuse of language. The pigs, who became the leaders of the farm after the revolution of the animals and overthrowing the human owner, used language to write the 'seven commandments' as the basic principles of the new system. However, as they gain power and start to replace the humans in the farm, they alter it to one commandment, "four legs good, two legs better." They convince the animals that this was the only rule since the beginning. Thus, they use language to construct facts that ensure the maintenance of their rule. Even further, as the pigs completely merge into the life of humans through living in the house of the previous farmer, eating and drinking like humans, there is one rule left that is "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others."

With the other animals unable to remember the past and the old commandments, they believed whatever the pigs propagated to be the one and only truth.

Another representation of totalitarianism in the novel is the presence of an enemy and constant conflict. To cover on their exploitations and the wrongs in the society of the farm, the pigs needed to create diversion to shift the other animals' attention and prevent them from thinking about their actual state. The enemy in the novel was Snowball, the pig who left after he failed to seize power from Napoleon. A list of crimes was attributed to him; thus, it was easy for the ruling pigs and the other animals to blame him for any inconvenience in the farm regardless of reality, and despite the fact that they are oblivious of his whereabouts or if he is even still alive. Finally, totalitarianism was represented in the novel through the figurehead of the farm, Napoleon. He was chosen for his wisdom and intelligence to represent the animals that praised him, considered him as a leading figure, and attributed all their deeds and success to him; they regarded him in high position, almost that of worship. Therefore, all the animals were subject to him and to the words of pigs that constructed the reality that would appeal to their purposes in gaining and preserving power. Accordingly, George Orwell demonstrates the features of totalitarianism in his novel, *Animal Farm*, to the extent of delivering a prophetic vision through political ideology. He further portrays how the farm is ruled under a totalitarian system and what would become of it and the animals as a result to that system; thus, warning and predicting about the consequences of totalitarianism in real life.

Brave New world is a dystopian novel by Aldous Huxley that is considered one of the most prominent examples of totalitarian representation in literature. Totalitarianism is a major theme and is depicted through various elements in the story. An all-controlling power, being a major feature of totalitarianism, is present in the world of the novel through the government that does

not control its subjects through fear or direct oppression; but rather implicitly through providing everything they convinced the people they need; namely, sex and drugs. Moreover, this totalitarian control is apparent in the way the government controls the life of people to the extent of creating them to fit predetermined positions in their society and dividing them into classes. Furthermore, the state uses propaganda appropriate to each class to convince them of the validity and the superiority of their class over the others, and then it uses propaganda to show the whole society the perfection of the system that provides them everything they need, happiness and organization. This is done through processes such as brainwashing and targeted newspaper.

Moreover, technology is largely present in the world of the novel; actually, technology builds and sustains the whole society. The people are not normal born, but rather they are born out of advanced machines. They are designed to look, feel, behave, and function in a certain way. Thus, the state controls all means of reproduction. This is done through biological engineering, which, in the novel, is very advanced, that the people do not age. Science and technology control the life of people and takes several forms. One of which is the drug Soma that all people have access to, and the government promotes its use. Drug use is employed by the state to keep people under control and create a superficial happy society in order to preserve the stability of the system and preserve the power of the state. *Brave new world* is a novel that portrays what would become of societies if the state takes control over technological and scientific advances, and further exploit them to establish a totalitarian rule that seeks to subjugate people using any necessary means, even if it was pleasure. Aldous Huxley portrays a totalitarian dystopia in which technology is the main element of control. Dangerously, the state uses those means to erase individuality and impose a totalitarian control.

I.5. Theoretical framework

Drawing from traditional historicism and new historicism approaches, the present work aims at shedding light and analyzing the chosen novels, mainly to understand the events surrounding the creation of both novels and to shed light on the conditions influencing their interpretation. This approach is closely related to the biographical approach that is employed to investigate the life of the authors and the events that occurred and influenced their literary production. Understanding the major events in the upbringing and the life of the writers will help in identifying the relationship between the environment in which their literature was created and the final product, achieving a broader understanding of the ideologies underlying them.

The study of the relationship between literature and history had been and still of concern to many critics who try to answer this question through establishing various models to this relationship. Most notably, the model that stresses the importance of the historical context in achieving a suitable comprehension of the literary work. According to Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle in their book, *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory* (1995), this approach is appealing to “background” critics. As its name indicates, the historical background, including biographical, political, linguistic or cultural, is the means through which literary works are analyzed (114). Meaning that those circumstances surrounding the literary work are essential in understanding it.

In the same regard, “new historicists argue that the production of literary texts is a cultural practice different only in its specific mode or formulation from other practices – from furniture-making to teaching to warfare to printing” (Bennett and Royle 115). Simply, literature is undistinguishable from any other cultural practice; it is part of the culture; thus, part of its history. Moreover, social and economic conditions, being subject to transformation, carry within

them the literary texts. This makes literary texts that are not only products but also an influence on the culture and ideology, “part of a larger circulation of social energies” (115).

New historicism is defined in Lois Tyson’s *Critical Theory Today* as “the history of stories cultures tell themselves about themselves” (288). Therefore, literature in its broader term is an account of the cultures in which it was created; it represents the history surrounding its creation. Tyson further argues that literary texts, being social artifacts, they convey the meanings attributed to the different events and situations taking place when the text was written (291). Thus, both the text and the context are important since they create each other, in the sense that “literary texts shape and are shaped by their historical contexts” (292). It indicates that one cannot interpret the meanings of a text without referring to the history surrounding its existence, specifically, to the meanings of that history and its different interpretations. This is supported by Tyson in the same book in which he argues, “no historical event, artifact, or ideology can be completely understood in isolation from the innumerable historical events, artifacts, and ideologies among which it circulates, and our own cultural experience inevitably influences our perceptions, making true objectivity impossible” (299). Therefore, to comprehend the ideology of the selected literary works and their interpretation in real life according to their context, one must investigate the relationship between them and the various discourses of the time.

Any literary work is, in one way or another, the sum of the author’s experiences and states of mind. The life of the author is present in his creations whether in his characters, the setting, the plot or the general ideology of the work. Therefore, literary texts help the reader to identify with both the character and the author (Bennett and Royle). In his article “Steinbeck: a defense of Biographical Criticism,” Jackson J. Benson argues that the biographical critic relates the author and the reader through relating their experiences, of course by means of literary texts (112).

Notably, biographical approach to literature regards the life of the author as the most significant element in studying his work.

Notably, the traditional historical approach and the new historicism approach to literary texts appeal to the vision of this study, as they will deliver a thorough reading to both novels through the lenses of the major historical events that accompanied their creation. The biographical approach is also crucial to reflect on the experiences of the authors and investigate the ways in which they formed their ideology and developed their literary careers.

Chapter Two: Controversial Writers from Distinct Eras: Orwell and Sansal

This chapter is concerned mainly with giving a brief account of George Orwell and Boualem Sansal's biography. The first section of the chapter starts by giving basic information about the upbringing of Orwell, his education, and the major events and experiences he undergone. Then it moves to detailing the influence of those major events in the formation of his ideologies and to giving examples of some of his literary productions in which he started documenting his experiences, and indeed the development of his ideology. After that, a special account is given to his literary style and to his writing motives. The first section shows the development of Orwell as a controversial writer. The second section of this chapter is dedicated to Boualem Sansal in which it starts by giving biographical information and his literary awards. It also emphasizes on the author's ideologies and controversial stances. Moreover, it tackles the author's literary style as a francophone writer. Finally, the chapter concludes by arguing on the relevance of this comparative study by comparing both authors in relationship to their similar works that will be used in this research.

II.1. George Orwell's Legacy

The history of contemporary literature is full of writers who reshaped and marked the production and reception of literary works of that era. Remarkably, George Orwell is undeniably one of the most influential contemporary authors in Britain and the world. He has been a subject of interest and study for many scholars and critics for his strong ideologies, fascinating contradictions, and mostly his powerfully relevant works. Therefore, this research is interested in discovering the life of this author and understanding the experiences that shaped his perception

of life, society and literature. This will eventually lead to a deeper understanding of the origins of his most famous works.

Before being known as George Orwell, his birth name was Eric Arthur Blair. He was born on June 25, 1903 in Motihari, Bengal, India. His father worked in Indian civil service and his mother was of French descent. According to Marcus Bachler in his article “George Orwell: The Fight against Totalitarianism”, published on the Free Radical online Magazine, Orwell’s family belonged to what he called “lower-upper-middle class” in which he lived the life of “Impoverished snobbery”. In 1907, his family returned to England. Shortly after, they assigned him in a school on the Sussex coast, and due to his family’s financial status and his brilliance, he was granted a reduction of fees. However, his background and lower social rank caused him to suffer from constant bullying throughout the years he spent at the school (Bachler). In a YouTube video entitled George Orwell: The Uncompromising Visionary, Simon Whistler gives biographical details about Orwell’s life. He asserts that in 1917, Orwell was granted a scholarship to Eton, one of Britain’s leading schools, in which he studied until 1921.

The year after he finished school, he decided to join the Indian Imperial Police Force in Burma instead of joining university. He served for five years in different country stations and tried to befriend the Burmese; however, the reality of him being part of the imperialist power was a barrier for him to establish a relationship based on more than mere control and oppression, a reality that he hated which eventually made him resign from the colonial police in July 1927. Following his return to England, tripping in guilt from being part of the privileged oppressor in his experience in Burma, he decided to live the low life mainly in the slums of London and Paris, experiencing a range of sluggish and lowly jobs such as in hotels and grimy restaurants (Whistler). This and many experiences to follow will later be the flame that launch and empower

his writing career and ideological tendencies. In 1936, he sets out on a new experience to explore and document the mining conditions of northern England. Months later, in June 9, 1936, he married Eileen Maud O'Shaughnessy and they lived in a cabin in Hertfordshire, England. The following year in 6 march, 1937 Orwell joined the Spanish Civil War where he survived death after being shot in the throat. This did not stop him from volunteering for military administration when Britain entered World War II; However, his declining health did. After the death of his wife in May 29, 1945, he remarries again, Sonia Brownnell, a publication collaborator, in October 14, 1949. Unfortunately, tuberculosis holds grip on him in January 21, 1950 leading to his demise at the age of 46 (Biography.com Editors). Since boyhood and throughout his life, George Orwell always was a man of many opinions and modes of thinking.

II.1.1. Towards Merging Ideology with Literature: George Orwell's Views

George Orwell's political views started to form around the time of the First World War and the period following it; especially, after the disillusionment it caused for young men who despised and rebelled against the class system, intrinsically linked to capitalism, and people in power who had lead them to such meaningless bloodshed (Bachler). Speaking about his political views and ideology, Orwell states in his book *The road to Wigan Pier* (1936):

At the age of seventeen or eighteen, I was both a snob and a revolutionary. I was against all authority ... and I loosely described myself as a Socialist. But I had not much grasp of what Socialism meant, and no notion that the working class were human beings ... Looking back upon that period, I seem to have spent half the time in denouncing the capitalist system and the other half in raging over the insolence of bus-conductors. (155)

By that time, one can see that Orwell was developing a mind of his own despite the contradictions that were not yet to be determined. Moreover, his experience in Burma proved his

believe that the upper class who controlled the British Empire was helpless and took advantage from its colonial territories while impoverishing the native population and England's own working classes (Bachler). Probably this realization was a major reason for why he chose to quit his job in Burma and set for a new experience in England. In the same book, Orwell asserts, "I was conscious of an immense weight of guilt that I had got 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" (165). It indicates the reasons behind his choice to mend his conscience by experiencing the life of poverty without yet constructing a clear idea about neither socialism nor any other economic theory. Sir Bernard Crick, an academic, essayist and journalist, states in his article, "George Orwell: Voice of a Long Generation", published on the BBC platform that Orwell's political orientation in the period between 1927 and 1934 were characterized by deep resentment for any kind of power that imposes its values on others. He further explains that Orwell would simply say, "I'm a Tory anarchist", not yet openly a socialist despite, at that point, being aware of its implication (Crick). It simply means that he grew aware of the socialist values and its arguments regarding economics but he did not identify as a socialist.

Simultaneously, he was sharpening his writing skills resulting in his first book, *Down and Outs in Paris and London* (1933); a chronicle of his time in poverty and it was published for the first time under his pen name George Orwell (Whistler). His book was considered of great social importance. His next experience in the coal-mining town of Wigan Pier shaped his new socialist ideal through what he observed and lived. In this regard, he wrote an essay entitled, "Down the Mine", in which he documented, not only a detailed account of the miner's rough life, but also

highlighted the unequal gap in the living conditions of the various classes. This reinforced his belief in the absurdity of class differences. In this regard, he commented in his book, *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1936), “Everyone, barring fools and scoundrels, would like to see the miner better off” (178). He further adds, “every empty belly is an argument for Socialism” (191). Throughout his book, he addresses the hypocrisy of the orthodox Marxists and expresses his detestation towards them. Despite the fact that Orwell was himself considered among those intellectuals but he openly criticized them and considered them unworthy of holding the socialist ideal.

Continuing his fight for Socialism, Orwell’s participation in the Spanish Civil War against Francisco Franco and Fascism established clearly his political thinking. According to Seema Syeda in her article “War Reporters: George Orwell”, Orwell stated “I’ve come to fight against fascism”, a declaration that he announced to John McNair of the Independent Labour Party Office (Syeda). He fought alongside a Marxist militia group linked to Leon Trotsky, which was allied with a communist militia group, associated with Stalin and the Soviet Union. His service came to end when he was declared unfit for duty after having miraculously survived a shot in the throat. After this, the government, being now led by communists, it declared the POUM, the faction in which Orwell was part of, as illegal and fascist thus condemning its members as criminals. Unlike many of his comrades, he managed to escape, but with a growing despise for both Fascism and Communism (Syeda). In *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), he explains, “...And this story was spread all over Spain by means of posters, etc.,and repeated over and over in the Communist and pro-Communist press of the whole world”(Orwell 30). He further states “This, then, was what they were saying about us: we were Trotskyists, fascists, traitors, murderers, cowards, spies, and so forth” (Orwell 30). Clearly, the propaganda spread by the communist press was not pleasant for him as it distorted the truth. All sense of objective truth was

manipulated by those totalitarian regimes. He witnessed on how the reality of the Spanish Civil War was rewritten by piled lies and biased news. In this regard, it would only make sense that this experience marked him deeply, defined his political thought and literary orientation.

Unlike many left-wing intellectuals who accepted the Russo-German Pact of 1939 and were against war, Orwell adopted a completely different stance from them, one that he continues to hold throughout the Second World War. He was pro-war and held a strong anti-fascist stance (Bachler). He continued his political revolution through his words resulting in his work, *The Lion and the Unicorn* (1941), seeking to rescue patriotism from nationalism; he aimed at demonstrating that one should view English patriotism as radical rather than conservative and greatly hoping that the different ranks of the British army would rise into a social revolution (Crick). Unfortunately, he could not join military service because of his tuberculosis; instead, he worked for two years in the BBC before being appointed as a literary editor of the Tribune, a weekly left wing publication in which he successfully became a famous journalist publishing articles, reviews, and books (“BBC - History -Historic Figures: George Orwell (1903 - 1950)”).

II.1.2. George Orwell’s Legacy as a Genius Political Writer

“From a very early age, perhaps the age of five or six, I knew that when I grew up I should be a writer”, declared Orwell in his essay “Why I Write”. Some people are meant to be certain things; definitely, George Orwell was meant to be the great writer the world knows today. Despite stating in the same essay that he tried to abandon the idea of writing for a long time in his life, he acknowledged his literary perspective to the world and he knew deeply that his path is meant to be through his words. Literature was part of his life since boyhood, as he explains that he engaged in various literary activities throughout the years; ranging from his first poem at the age of five, newspaper poems, attempts of short stories, school plays...etc (Orwell). In a sense,

he had the descriptive literary mind all his life; safe to say that literature and writing were part of him as he and his life details were part of it. Moreover, Orwell believed in the potential of communicating the true image of the world using the English language words and despised all attempts to weaponize it to coat reality with lies. Orwell revealed in the essay, “When I was about sixteen I suddenly discovered the joy of mere words.” Not only did he realize the power of words, but also the pleasure they generate. Their ability to describe the world down to the smallest details fascinated him; this gave him an insight about what he wanted to write and how he wanted to write it. In this regard, he further asserts, “I wanted to write enormous naturalistic novels with unhappy endings, full of detailed descriptions and arresting similes, and also full of purple passages in which words were used partly for the sake of their sound” (Orwell).

Orwell believed that understanding the upbringing and the environment in which the writer was brought in impact the modes of thinking of a writer and are crucial in understanding his motives. In the same article, he further elaborated four major motives for writers that according to him exist in varying degrees in every writer and are influenced by his environment. First, “sheer egoism”, the writers’ urge to be the center of attention, to be more than a mere passenger in life but rather mark his contribution in history for generations to come. Second, “aesthetic enthusiasm”, it is the aim of every writer to make his literature look and sound good, and to appeal to him in one way or another. Third, “Historical impulse”, which is the desire to see things as they are, to find out true facts and store them up for the use of posterity”. Finally, writing for political purposes since no book can be free from politics. For this motive, the writer seeks to make people see the kind of world they truly want to live in. those impulses must compete with one another and differ from person to person through time (Orwell).

In the same essay, George Orwell describes himself as a hybrid of a politician and a writer; there is always a thought, a view and a message in what he writes. In his words, “When I sit down to write a book, I do not say to myself, ‘I am going to produce a work of art’. I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing” (Orwell). However, he also sheds light on the importance of the aesthetically pleasing language for him as he tries to merge politics into literature in a way that still pleases his artistic side and “to make political writing into an art” (Orwell). This task, of course, is not easy as it may potentially diminishes the value of the written work.

The genius of George Orwell is glamorously apparent in his works, and in the impact they inked in the 20th century literature that still shows traces today. He is known for influencing the popular culture with his works in the sense that many words used in his works are now part of popular language; for example, Thought Police, Prolefeed, Big Brother. In addition, today, speaking about something being “Orwellian,” this directly refers to his dystopian account of future totalitarian state. Furthermore, his direct and clear writing style is also a remarkable notion in his genius that still inspires not only young writers, but also readers who are impressed by his ability to use language sophisticatedly and purposely.

In this regard, George Orwell in his relatively short life wrote many pieces that granted him recognition as a great political writer. Notably, a large number of his works were documentary accounts of his experiences and political and social commentary; namely, *Burmese Days* (1934), *A Clergyman's Daughter* (1935), *Keep the Aspidistra Flying* (1936), *Coming Up For Air* (1939), *Down And Out in Paris and London* (1933), *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1936), *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), *Animal Farm* (1945), *1984* (1948). However, those two latter works remain his biggest success in which he demonstrates his stance against totalitarianism in all its forms

and advocates for democratic Socialism as he asserts, “Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written directly or indirectly against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it” (Orwell). Particularly, *Animal Farm* is a novel in which he used animal representation to satire Marxism, Communism and the Russian Revolution. It represents the dictatorship resulting from the misuse of power and constant change of ideals. Through this book, he issues a criticism of left-wing ideologies, expressed in Marxism and Communism, which he was at odds with because of his intellectual honesty and objective truth, justice and honesty. A criticism he previously expressed in his book *The Road to Wigan Pier*, as well as the disagreement he demonstrated for their dishonesty.

George Orwell, therefore, is the creation of a lifetime experiences and built up of ideologies that are courageously expressed in canonical works, and gratefully appreciated throughout time and across the world. A writer, who the world regards today as one of the most avant-garde intellectuals of the 20th century for his anticipations and analysis of futuristic reality.

II.2. Boualem Sansal: The Rise of a Controversial Writer

Many things can make a writer famous and recognized; it could be the way he puts his mind into words, his imagination, the message he wants to carry across to the world..etc. for Sansal it was the daring and controversial opinions and attitudes he conveyed through his works. A writer with a radical stance and harshly criticizing tone especially to the government and religion; particularly, Islam. However, in Algeria, his works were perceived negatively and were censored for a long time. The polemic nature of his statements and his literature made him, not only target for life threats from those he attacks through his pen, but also an interesting subject for this study. It is important to dive into the circumstances that molded his problematic ideologies and

contributed to his development as a writer appealing to the western audience more than his society's audience.

In her Encyclopedia publication entitled "SANSAL BOUALEM (1949-)", Denise Brahimi, a literature professor at the University Paris-VII-Denis-Diderot, gives some biographical information about the author as well as some analysis to his style and publications. According to her, Boualem Sansal was born on October 1949 in the village of Theniet el Had, Algeria. Like Albert Camus, he spent some of his childhood in the neighborhood of Belcourt in Algiers (Brahimi). "Internationales Literaturfestival Berlin", the official webpage of Berlin International Literature Festival, posted an account of the author's biographical information in which they stated that he studied engineering and then obtained a Ph.D in economics. After many years occupying different jobs as a teacher, consultant, business manager and senior civil servant at the Algerian Ministry of Industry, he started writing relatively late in life. The assassination of President Mohamed Boudiaf in 1992, and the rise of Islamic Fundamentalism in Algeria played a major role in his decision to start his journey as a writer (Internationales literaturfestival berlin). He started writing as a reaction to the Islamic terrorism that took place in Algeria during the Black Decade and he was highly encouraged by his friend the Algerian writer, Rachid Mimouni, resulting in his two first novels, *Le Serment des Barbares* (1999) and *L'Enfant fou de l'arbre creux* (2000) (Brahimi). In an article written by the German journalist Silke Bartlek and translated into Arabic by Abbas Al-Khashali, it is noted that he refused to use a pseudonym to publish his first novel as suggested by the French publishing house of Gallimard. He explained that one who dedicates himself to certain cause should not give up nor hide behind a pseudonym, which will result in his suspension from work then finally dismissal in 2003. (Bartlek and Al-

Khashali). Simply put, this choice was the first step he took in the path of announcing his extremely unsolicited ideologies.

Today, Boualem Sansal is a recognized writer, mainly in France and Germany, and his books have received numerous awards, unlike in Algeria where he is barely acknowledged and he is considered a controversial character. In 2005, his novel, *Harraga*, and in 2008, *Le Village de l'Allemand*, were hugely successful and for which he received the most praise. Particularly, he received the Grand Prix de la Francophonie in 2008 and the German Booksellers' Peace Prize at the Frankfurt fair in 2011 (Brahimi). For this latter, the reactions in Algeria were not as intense as in France and Germany; Sansal himself noted that no one in Algeria spoke about this award except for one or two mentions in passing news (Bartlek and Al-Khashali). As for the Arabic Novel Prize awarded to him in 2012 for his book, *Rue Darwin* (2011), it sparked a violent debate (Brahimi). However, the controversy caused by its withdrawal due to the author's visit to Israel was even more violent and harsh. This is further asserted in an article by Tony Todd entitled "Arab countries withdraw prize reward for novelist who visited Israel", in which he quotes the words of the French-Lebanese writer and jury member, Venus Houry-Ghata, who said in an interview with France24, "But the jury believes culture, and in this case a novel, should not be restricted by borders or by politics. We will continue with the award in the future" (qtd. in Todd).

Sansal's accusations to the Algerian government did not change throughout all his appearances in the French media. For further polemical vigor, he expresses his accusations also through writing essays and open letters that earned him censorship in his home country. Namely, *Poste restante : Alger. Lettre de colère et d'espoir à mes compatriotes* (2006), and *Gouverner au nom d'Allah: Islamisation et soif de pouvoir dans le monde arabe* (2013). He once again attacks contemporary Islamism, its misdeeds, even its crimes (Brahimi). In 2015, he was granted

Le Grand Prix du Roman de L'Académie Française for his novel, *2084: la fin du monde*. In This science fiction novel, he describes a world based on amnesia and submission to a single God, Yolah. Inspired by Orwell's *1984*, the extremist religious power launched a new language called Abilang, and imposed a totalitarian control. Recently this year, he was awarded the Mediterranean Prize of Literature for his latest novel *Abraham ou la Cinquième Alliance* 2020. Sansal, despite all the challenges, continues to live in Boumerdes near Algiers.

Since his beginnings, he became known as a writer with ruthless criticism for religions in general, and Islam in particular. Moreover, Sansal never hesitates to show his radical hate and refusal for Islamism. This is further declared and confirmed in an interview with journalist, Marianne Payot, for L'Express Magazine in which he claims that he considers the brutal and totalitarian side of religion dangerous, “L'islam est devenu une loi terrifiante, qui n'édicte que des interdits, bannit le doute, et dont les zéloteurs sont de plus en plus violents. Il faudrait qu'il retrouve sa spiritualité, sa force première. Il faut libérer, décoloniser, socialiser l'islam” (Sansal). It indicates that he views Islam as a religion of extremism that only produces fanatic individuals who promote violence and restriction of thought. Accordingly, his controversial unhinged ideologies granted him the headlines of many daring articles, and resulted in him being the subject of several critiques.

II.2.1. Boualem Sansal's Ideological Stance and Controversial Views

Probably, his pro-Israeli position and declarations are among the major causes that opened fire on him from many fronts and led to his boycott. Most notably, his visit to Israel attending the Jerusalem Writers Festival– as a guest of honor. This led to a wave of attacks on him. Hamas said that his visit was “an act of treason against the Palestinian people” (qtd. in Todd). Nevertheless, Sansal insisted that the true interests of the Palestinians rely on the necessity to break the taboo with Israel (qtd. in Todd). To say the least, his declarations always supported his pro neutralization attitudes. Furthermore, not only did he accuse Arab countries, particularly

Algeria, of struggling with a “non-existent” conflict with Israel, but also that they had “shut themselves in a prison of intolerance.” In his words, he claims, “Yes, there are complicated relations with Israel, but we are not at war with them. And if we really want to help the Palestinians, people like me should be able to visit the country freely” (qtd. in Todd). He published an article in the Jewish Tribune entitled “Mon Impardonnable Voyage En Israël”, describing his thrilling journey to Israel, mentioning all the details of his staying in Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv, never hesitating to describe Israelis as “Friends” (Sansal).

Regarding the reactions his visit created in Algeria, Oren Kessler reports on the declarations of Sansal through his interviews in which he said that it was divided in half between those who wished to deliver him the same ending as Muammar Gaddafi in Libya, and those who happily welcomed his initiative and the knowledge it may bring. In the Arab world, however, they were largely negative (qtd. in Kessler). Najwan Darwish, a Lebanese columnist, states that the colonialist Fascist regime seeks to wipe all its crimes using arts and literature, and she describes Sansal as Israel’s “token Arab” (qtd. in Kessler). In this sense, Sansal allowed himself and his literature to be a tool in the hands of the oppressing power to normalize a long history of crimes and animosity between Arabs and Zionists.

In the same vein, his stance regarding religion characterizes the controversy that mark him as a problematic writer. In an interview with journalist, Mohamed Berkani, he declares “Je suis islamistophobe, contre les islamistes,” and that he is not Islamophobic (Sansal). In an interview with L'invité that was published on YouTube under the title, “Boualem SANSAL: “J’écris Face à La Menace Islamiste Sur Le Monde””, he further reinforces this declaration and elaborates more his fears of extending Islamism in France and the growing totalitarian religious existence preventing the human evolution. He also says that he writes against the threats of Islamists in the

world (L'invité). Remarkably, not only that he dedicates his pen to his ideologies and opinions but also his words through all his interviews and announcements. In his novel, *2084: la fin du monde*, he writes, “ La religion fait peut-être aimer Dieu mais rien n'est plus fort qu'elle pour faire détester l'homme et haïr l'humanité”. Thus, implying that religion is dangerous and holds back the development of human relations. Not only that, but he dangerously links Islamism with Fascism in an interview entitled “Boualem Sansal : “Je fais de la littérature, pas la guerre” with Sid-Ahmed Hammouche, in which Sansal states, “ L’islamisme est un fascisme, totalitaire, belliqueux, sectaire, tout comme l’a été nazisme” (Sansal, “Boualem Sansal : “Je Fais de La Littérature, Pas La Guerre””). Actually, writing against Islamism is the major reason that involved him into literature; especially after witnessing the Algerian Civil War led by radical Islamists. He declares in an interview with Alain Barbanel that he chose writing as a means to fight, “J’ai rejoint un groupe d’intellectuels qui s’était donné le devoir de témoigner, d’alerter le monde, les Européens en premier... Voilà comment je suis devenu un écrivain engagé” (Sansal, “Boualem Sansal : “Je Dénonce Les Religions Lorsqu’elles Prétendent Gouverner La Cité””).

The intensity of his opinions reaches further to the extent of firing harsh political and social statements about Algeria and the Arab world. When journalist Hammouche asked him about his constant criticism to the Arab world, he openly expressed his pessimism about the ability of the Arab Muslim to evolve and build a better future, saying, “Le monde Arabo-musulman a beaucoup de mal à entrer dans la modernité, pris en tenaille qu’il est entre la dictature militaro-policière et l’islamisme” (Sansal, “Boualem Sansal : “Je Fais de La Littérature, Pas La Guerre””). Sansal never hesitates to comment on the Algerian government in his interviews. For example, in both his interview with Hammouche and his interview with Mark Reynolds which entitled “Boualem Sansal: Resistance Writer”, he criticized harshly Algerian presidents who rose

to power after the country gained independence and accused them of corruption and worsening the situation in Algeria leading to an increase in the immigration rates among young people.

In addition, in his interview with Barbanel, he spoke about the freedom of speech in Algeria saying that it is a strange concept for the country because of the military regime that restrict it, if not forbid it.

Commenting on the Hirak that took place in Algeria in 2019, he said that it is in vein, again blaming the military regime for holding back the advance of democracy in the country. In his words, “Soyons clair, la démocratie et la liberté d’expression ne sont pas mises à mal en Algérie, elles n’existent tout simplement pas, n’ont jamais existé et n’existeront pas tant que le régime militaire sera là” (Sansal, “Boualem Sansal : “Je Dénonce Les Religions Lorsqu’elles Prétendent Gouverner La Cité.””). This shows that Sansal considers Algeria a country with no possibility of freedom of expression and a country that is overwhelmed by military restriction on the individual’s intellectual freedom. However, what the Algerian government did after the Hirak indicates otherwise. It invited all the representatives of the opposition to a national debate so the country will not face destruction and ruin like other Arab countries in what is known as the Arab Spring.

Consequently, Sansal’s provoking opinions and writings made him subject for many critics, not only from the Algerian press and government, but also from Algerian intellectuals. Most notably, Rachid Boudjedra, who, according to Hassane Saadoun in his article *Contrebandiers de l’Histoire : Boudjedra persiste et s’explique*, attacks harshly the controversial writer in his pamphlet book entitled, *Les Contrebandiers de L’Histoire* (2017). He accused Sansal of being “L’homme du système algérien” (qtd, in Saadoun) and accused him of using his position in the government to benefit from multiple advantages such as building a beautiful villa in an exceptional place near Algiers. Saadoun also asserts that Boudjedra criticized harshly Sansal’s visit to Israel and his two novels, *Le serment des Barbares* and *Le village de l’Allemand*, saying that they are nothing but mere attempts to appeal his Zionist masters. In Boudjedra’s words, “une démarche dont l’objectif est de plaire et complaire à ses maîtres sionistes” (qtd. in Saadoun). This was specifically addressed to his latter book, *Le village de l’Allemand*, in which Sansal presents Algerians as Nazis and puts in parallel the Algerian Revolution with Nazism. Thus, Boudjedra goes further to accuse him of being a liar who tries to damage the reputation of the Algerian Revolution (Saadoun).

II.2.2. Sansal's Literary Production: An Algerian Style with a Francophone Tongue

Boualem Sansal can be regarded as an absolute francophone writer, who since his beginnings strived to advocate for the same ideas through his writing, remarkably through the evolution and diversity of his novels. Brahim details on this regard, she explains that for several years, he adopted a colorful upfront language through which he expressed his denunciation using a humorous style. A style he is said to owe to Rachid Boudjdra and Rachid Mimouni, and which characterizes most Algerian writers who use it to express the experiences and disillusionment of the Algerian people. Moreover, Sansal's style is described as Picaresque, which he uses to describe a society that, while apparently framed by democratic modernity, owes a lot to the medieval way of life (Brahimi).

However, since the publication of his *Harraga* (2005), his style took another form different from that of his beginnings, both in narration and vocabulary. This evolution was a result of his desire to achieve more readability. Thus, his language became more emotional and truthful as it lost much of its humor and inventiveness. He combined emotions with a fascination for the world's diversity and he skilfully used fable and myth to express his fears (Brahimi). Additionally, the author's choice of the French language as his pen language is apparent in all his productions without exception. When Daniel Bermond asked him if writing in French is something natural for an Algerian writer, he asserted that according to him, this choice is due to the Algerian audience readability and the majority of the Algerian literary production that is in French. French is the language of business and administration in Algeria despite the Law of Arabization and all the attempts to repress francophone writers. Therefore, he declares that writing in French is an unescapable and an obvious choice. (Sansal, "Boualem Sansal").

Accordingly, one can conclude that throughout more than 20 years of being a writer, Boualem Sansal created a reputation for himself, to say the least, problematic. With his numerous controversial literary works and fiery political and ideological stance, he managed to capture the attention of western media, particularly French media, and to claim many prizes. On the contrary, he is almost unknown in the Algerian arena except for a small number of francophone readers and the government that attentively censors him due to his unapologetic challenging criticism.

II.3. Sansal VS. Orwell: Similar or Different Agendas?

One may ask, why studying Orwell and Sansal in parallel? And why put them into comparison? Two distinct writers from different eras, different societies, using different languages; simply, from completely different backgrounds. This comparison became particularly relevant after the Algerian writer Sansal published his novel *2084: la fin du monde* (2015) in which he obviously refers to the famous novel by the English writer George Orwell. The former is a modern rewriting of the latter and it draws inspiration from most of its literary elements, even the details of the setting and characters, as well as the ideology that prevails in the world of the novel. Not only that, but also the title itself is evidence of the connection of the two novels in one way or another. Anyone familiar with Orwell's book will realize this connection upon the first encounter with the title of Sansal's novel. The title suggests that one hundred years have passed since the world of Orwell. This raises many questions about the symbolism of the date chosen by Sansal. The reader may be curious about whether the reality of the two worlds are the same and about the prevailing system and ideology. These are questions that may find their

answer within the book through many symbols and signs that actually indicate that the world of Sansal's novel came after it overthrew the rule and the controlling ideology in the world of Orwell.

In his book, *1984*, George Orwell imagines a world ruled by a political regime inspired by the horrors of Stalinism and Nazism, a world where political and ideological totalitarianism of Big Brother controls the slightest details of its subjects, even their thoughts and emotions. The author portrays the state of Oceania, which is an extremely totalitarian state that operates through the Party, in constant conflict with Eurasia and Eastasia. The society is under constant surveillance using means of technology and different state apparatuses such as Thought Police, which are responsible on monitoring people's thoughts. The aim of the state is to fully subjugate people and make their life revolve around the Party. In doing so, propaganda, censorship, manipulation of facts are means used by the state to evoke fear and remind the people by the control of the Party. This is done through the three contradictory ministries: the Ministry of Truth, the Ministry of Peace, the Ministry of Love, and the Ministry of Plenty. Not only that, but also it seeks to eliminate any emotional and sexual connection between people in order to ensure their obedience and devotion to Big Brother and to his ideology. In the middle of this dystopian world chained by all sorts of limitations, Winston Smith is the main character around whom the story revolves. His longing for freedom and refusal for all the ideologies and fake reality advocated by the Party will lead him to embark in a series of experiences to challenge and to rebel against the power of Big Brother. The novel shows the power of the state against the autonomy of Winston who ends up by losing his individuality for good this time. The book is a mixture of political, economic and emotional philosophies, mainly related to totalitarian control over people and the struggles one faces in order to reach his freedom.

Similarly, Sansal imagines a parallel world, even an extension to Orwell's world, under the control of the delegate of Yolah, Abi. In *2084*, Abistan is a theocratic totalitarian state that brainwashes and terrors people continuously, exercises the power of oppression through an Apparatus as obscure as the Party in Orwell's *1984*. The Just Brotherhood sits on top of the hierarchy and it is responsible for governing people and spreading the commandments of Abi. People in Abistan are under the mercy of many bureaucratic ministries and Apparatuses that control each aspect of life, such as the ministry of War and Peace, the Ministry of Sacrifices and Pilgrimages the Ministry of Archives, Sacred Books, and Holy Memories and the Ministry of Moral Health. This leaves people in constant confusion and overwhelm, thus they are occupied by their desperation to be good believers who appeal to all the apparatuses, to the Just brotherhood, to Abi and to Yolah. Abistan is in constant war against the Enemy, which is reincarnated in many forms and is given many names, the Devil, Satan, the Chitan, and the Renegade. In the novel, the enemy of Abistan is mostly referred to as Balis and his followers as the Renegades or the Regs. However, the nature of this enemy is ambiguous and throughout the novel, it shifts from being an external enemy to becoming an eternal enemy.

The story begins and ends with Ati. The protagonist who is in search of the truth. After he spent two years away from his home in Qodsabad, his city, the capital of Abistan, because he was in a sanatorium in the mountains. This gave him an opportunity to develop thoughts of his own away from the voices of the state dictating on people what they believe to be the reality, overwhelming them with constant ideological propaganda. The desire to unveil the truth and find freedom follows Ati home and it becomes the reason he embarks in dangerous and challenging adventures especially after meeting Koa and Toz. Experiences that would raise a lot of questions in the protagonist's mind regarding the state and its religion, the ideologies circulating in

Abistan, the human freedom and the true nature of the world in which he lives. Some questions he ends up by answering and others remain unanswered while he embarks in one last adventure seeking truth. The book is a representation of a theocratic totalitarianism in which religion becomes a political institution.

Interestingly, both authors manifest their ideological stance through their literature. Not only that, but they also give a largely detailed prediction of their imagined futuristic dystopian worlds. Reading both works, one can catch a glimpse of the reality of today's world. However, questions rise to whether their productions carry the same message and whether they are empowered by the same motives; especially, regarding the previously mentioned connection between them. Both authors are worthy of their controversial reputation due to their explicit opinions.

Both Orwell and Sansal denounce the authority of religion and government in the sense that they both demonstrate their opposition to those powers in their literature as a way of rebellion. On the one hand, Orwell called for equality and the fair distribution of power in a way that guarantees the rights of the oppressed lower classes. On the other hand, Sansal called for liberalism and revolution against any form of radicalism attacking in particular Islamist extremism. Both used literature as a means to voice their messages and ideological stances. Nevertheless, despite sharing some similarities, there is a huge gap in both the readability and the perception of both authors' productions. Accordingly, it is needed to refer to both authors in this study to understand, first their backgrounds and ideologies, and second their similarities and differences. This will eventually pave way to the third chapter in which a deeper comparison of their perspectives on totalitarian control will be put into investigation through the lenses of their highly similar works.

Chapter Three: The Representation of Totalitarianism in Orwell's *1984* and Sansal's *2084*

The third chapter is practical in nature in which aspects of totalitarianism are examined in the selected works. The first section of this chapter deals with technology as an instrument of totalitarian government; particularly, its depiction in both Sansal's and Orwell's novels with highlighting the differences between them and referring to the context of writing. The second section analyzes aspects of propaganda and language use in the dystopian narratives of *1984* and *2084* as a means of spreading totalitarian control. The third section focuses on the representation of the protagonists in both novels, analyzing some examples that demonstrate their rebellion and resistance inside a totalitarian world. The final section focuses on drawing a conclusion about the authors' motives in regards to their respectful works.

III.1. The (Mis)Use of Technology in Orwell's *1984* and Sansal's *2084*

The presence of technology in dystopian literature, in which totalitarianism is the main theme, is largely essential and notable in most works of this genre. Totalitarian states exploit technology in favor of their interests; thus, any form of technology, being it advanced or not, is used as a means to advocate the ideology of the state; to embed totalitarian beliefs in the core of the society. Interestingly, the presence of technology and science in totalitarian states depicted in dystopian literature is inspired from real life examples of such states. In his book, *Totalitarian Science and Technology*, Paul R. Josephson states that Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin, the most prominent figures of totalitarianism, employed science to solidify their states (9). It is therefore crucial for such totalitarian states to depend on technology with all its forms. Josephson further argues, "technologies are various devices, techniques, or systems intended to give us control over the natural environment—and also over our political, economic, and social structures" (118). It indicates that technology is used to influence all aspects of human life especially for the ruling

power who have total control over different means of technology that enables them therefore to control people and implement their ideology.

Remarkably, in Orwell's *1984*, technology constitutes a crucial part in the world of Oceania; it surrounds the life of people everywhere and at any time. Orwell depicts a gloomy world where people look like herd sheep, emotionless and passive robots in human flesh. Oceania is under the control of the Party led by Big Brother, the eye that sees everything and the ear that hears everything. Orwell imagines a totalitarian state governed by the Party that controls everything through different apparatuses and ministries such as Ministry of Truth, which in fact is responsible on the constant alteration of history and facts; Ministry of Peace which is concerned with war affairs; Ministry of Love serves to evoke fear and loyalty to the system, and Ministry of Plenty, which is responsible on economic matters. The novel portrays brainwashed dehumanized individuals who know nothing but to blindly obey the state. In this dystopian society, the protagonist Winston, a disillusioned proletarian individual who works in the Ministry of Truth, seeks to rebel against the prevailing ideology. Embracing a mixture of fear from being caught by thought police or any apparatus of the party and the longing for truth and freedom, he indulges in an adventure of rebellion against Big Brother that will only end by his submission and conformity to the system.

In *1984*, technology is employed to execute an extreme form of surveillance over the citizens through telescreens that one can see everywhere, in the streets, the offices, and even in each house. Big screens that are developed to the point of receiving and delivering audiovisual content in the sense that it is used to monitor peoples' lives. In the novel, the narrator describes the way they function, "the telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it, moreover, so long as he

remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard” (Orwell 2). Through this description, it is clear that, even inside one’s house, there is no privacy and no freedom; thus, any political or ideological thought is severely restricted. With the screens, or more precisely the people behind the screens, watching everything one says or does, the totalitarian control of the state is obvious. It ensures that no individual has enough autonomy even to speak to himself, even to flinch or express any emotions except those of love and acceptance to the state, the Party, and to Big Brother. The technology of the telescreen in *1984* was used, not only to keep people submissive to the idea that they are watched and heard all the time, but also to implement fear of any idea or act that would lead to punishment or vaporization. Thus, they cannot do anything nor think about anything rather than obeying the rules of the party and reinforcing its control. In this sense, telescreens are used to tighten the totalitarian grip of the party over the people. In this regard, Namrata Purkar, in her article, “Dystopian Writing as a Part of Science Fiction,” comments on the use of such technology by the government in the novel. She confirms, “The effect of technology in controlling the political thought of the society by the government is so evident in the novel that at the end even the protagonist of the novel deviates from his path of betraying the government and instead becomes one of the staunch believers in the philosophy of the government” (3).

Another form of technology that was prominent in the novel is the extensive use of cameras and microphones to spy on people. Orwell observes through the novel, “..there was always the danger of concealed microphones by which your voice might be picked up and recognized” (Orwell 54). This shows how the totalitarian system of Big Brother surrounds the everyday life of people and alters it to equal total surveillance. What’s more dangerous is that such system convinces people that those means of surveillance actually serve to protect them and to give

them more freedom and security. In Oceania, people believe that this sort of technology proves the good care and protection displayed by Big Brother against any outer enemy and even against themselves.

Similarly, but not to the same extent, *2084* by Boualem Sansal shows how theocratic totalitarianism in Abistan, the world of the novel, controls any means of technology and exploits them for its sole benefit. The story revolves around Ati, a questioning rebellious individual who embarks in a series of experiences to unveil the truth about his world. Abistan is a bureaucratic religious world where everyone conforms to Yolah the absolute ruler and his delegate on earth, Abi. It functions on a series of complex and harsh rules reinforced by many apparatuses such as the Just Brotherhood, Agents of the Apparatus, the Civics, the Vs, the Apparatus's spies, the AntiRegs, the Army Patrols, the Volunteer Law-enforcing Believers, the Volunteer Militia, the Judges of Moral Inspection and the Mockbis. The presence of technological forms is relatively shy compared to Orwell's novel. Sansal portrays a primitive destructed land with no sign of progressivity; there is no sign of modern technology present in the life of people, even electricity is described to be a luxury for those on top of the hierarchy, those with the most influence and richness. Through Alison Anderson's translation of the original work from French, the narrator tells, "Electricity was rationed and so expensive that only top leaders and rich merchants could afford it; the former did not pay for it and the latter made their clients pay" (Sansal 100). Even this access to the simplest form of technology is limited and exclusive only to people in power. One can argue that this restriction of electricity symbolizes the desire of the state to keep its believers faithful and guided only by the light of Yolah and his commandments.

Moreover, and much like the world of Orwell, all the walls in the streets of Abistan are covered in wall screens, the Nadirs, that mainly report news and messages of the leaders. As

Sansal describes in his novel, "...they addressed them through the nadirs , the wall screens you could find all over the country..." (34). In addition, they function as capturers of people's thoughts, as the narrator describes, "...and the nadirs not only broadcast images, they also filmed those who looked at them, and picked up their thoughts?" (Sansal 63-4). They are one of the very few forms of technology that people are acquainted with, and see in their everyday life.

Nevertheless, they still influence people in the sense of delivering the commandments of Abi and of the state's leaders; they make people develop a sense of submission as they are surrounded by those screens that remind them of the all-controlling power of Yolah and of Abi.

Cars are another form of technology that people of Abistan rarely saw. They were only used by high-ranking officials and leaders to add to their charisma and power. Despite the fact that the common people of Abistan have never witnessed the existence of high technological tools but they have formed superstitions and rumors about the great power of the leaders, particularly of Abi. They exchanged words of exaggeration on the unlimited power of the leaders, which is what Sansal explains through the novel, "For them the world was a small place, they could hold it in the palm of their hand, they had planes and helicopters to dash about the sky, and speedboats to cross the seas and the oceans" (33). It is only later in the novel that the reader learns about the actual existence of such means and that they are restricted only to people at the top of the hierarchy. Even without being physically present, means of technology were used as an abstract idea to create and sustain power for the state. Not only that those means were used to ensure the absolute control of the state over people, but also to terrorize them using fear. This is confirmed by the narrator, "the internal tension that dwells inside them charges the air around them and that is enough; the Vs have ultrasensitive antennae" (20). The Vs are the service responsible of monitoring people's thoughts and intentions. They are said to possess special abilities that enable

them to catch all straying, blasphemous thoughts, by means of very developed tools, or as legends claim, by means of holy superpowers. This, much like in *1984*, makes people submit themselves to the power of ruling figures, much of which is the creation of people's fear and blurred perspective. Sansal further asserts this, "It was not so much that they feared they might be rebuffed, or tapped and scanned by the Vs" (38). Even the thought of having an unorthodox glimpse of an idea, helped in subjugating them more and place them under the mercy of the system.

While both works were written almost 70 years apart, they are certainly relevant today for the prophetic vision they depicted. Particularly, Orwell who succeeded in delivering a futuristic vision on how a sociopolitical dystopia may develop through using technology as means of imposing totalitarian rule. In Orwell's fictional work, technology is used today to preserve the political power of such totalitarian states. On the contrary, Sansal uses technology in the novel to portray the religious limitations on progressivity through denying the people access to developed tools, rather they should remain submissive to their belief only. With the world depicted by Sansal being a theocratic totalitarianism, it clearly foreshadows the Islamic state through exaggerating the elements of the religion and altering the names to suit his fictional depiction.

In another perspective, if we analyze this feature of totalitarianism in regards to different discourses influencing the authors' inspirational triggers, one can notice there exists some level of accuracy regarding both visions. On the one hand, Orwell wrote the book in 1948, a time where the Second World War has just ended resulting in a technological advance as a prominent aspect of its aftermath in Europe. Shortly after the war, Orwell witnessed the beginning of the Cold War in which means of spying and data collection were the primary weapons of such ideological war. In this war between communism and capitalism, both fronts sought to gain total

power over the world and to subjugate people to their ideology. In this sense, Orwell's depiction of technology in totalitarian dystopias is not only a prediction to the destination of those exploitations by the state, but also a reflection on the human experience of people living in the age of technological development and being subject to it.

On the other hand, Sansal reflects on the Algerian Civil War in the 1990s in which Islamic fundamentalists rose into power and controlled people's lives largely, through intensified fear and oppression. It was a period where Algeria was still falling behind on the technological field; actually, in comparison to Europe, it was the case for all the Arab world countries. Thus, Sansal reminds of that epoch and portrays it through his work. Furthermore, Abistan in the novel is a post war world suffering the aftermath of the Great Holy War, a nuclear war that led to millions of deaths and severe environmental damage. In this world, people did not care about technology nor did they know it because it was part of the old world that was annihilated and long forgotten according to the teachings of Yolah's sacred book, the Gkabal. All the Abistanis cared about was their belief and satisfying the apparatuses responsible on enforcing it, thus satisfying Yolah. Noticeably, Sansal's work can be interpreted as the representation of various discourses taking place in Algeria upon independence after one hundred years of French colonialism. People were busy with the horrible aftermath of such occupation and with the price paid for their independence: more than a million deaths and extremely destructed infrastructure. Thus, in hopes of restoring political and economic power, people looked up for the new government as the savior; the same way Abistanis looked up for the religious state as their salvation. Consequently, in both Sansal's fictional world, and the real Algeria, people did not care much about technology or possessing control over technological means; thus, the only control was that of the state.

Accordingly, the representation of technology in both novels as a feature of totalitarianism and its imposed control can be traced to the history of the author's societies both in the past and in the present, even possibly the future. This representation is accurate to the extent of serving as an example of demonstrating that totalitarian control is promoted and sustained through means of different technological tools which serve more as advertising tools for the ideologies of the state and as tools that shape individuals' identity as subjects to that ideology.

III.2. Propaganda and Language as Tools of Totalitarianism

The control of totalitarian ideology is constructed of interrelated features that work together to complete and solidify the oppressive shell under which people are subjugated by that ideology live in the darkness of illuded vision, confusing it with protection and perfection. The term propaganda, according to Douglas Walton in his article, "What is Propaganda and What Exactly Is Wrong With It," denotes a suspicious information that one cannot confirm its reliability. A message that has been intentionally manipulated to deceive (384). Propaganda, being part of this web of totalitarian devices, plays a major role in building that totalitarian system. According to Ryan J. Barilleaux in his article, "Dystopia and the Gospel of Life," propaganda is particularly relevant in dystopian literature because it plays three major roles. It serves as a tool of validating the rightness of the system and convincing the citizens of its actions; it is a means by which the state constantly condemns its enemies, and it is the most functional tool of misleading people through reinforcing the state's ideology (266). Notably, the dystopias of Orwell's *1984* and Sansal's *2084* are great examples of using propaganda as a control mode to establish their ideologies.

On the one hand, in Orwell's novel the government used propaganda to embed its political intentions through constantly airing ideological messages that serve to brainwash the people and

remind them of the Party's supremacy. Oceania is an extreme propagandist world to the extent of employing telescreens everywhere to address individuals through videos and praises for 'Big Brother'. On this matter, M. Keith Booker, in his book, *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*, states, "The two-way screens allow the Party both to keep its members under surveillance and to bombard them with a constant barrage of video propaganda" (78). It shows the interrelationship between various methods of control used solely to erase people's individuality and evoke fear that eventually will lead to absolute subjugation. In this case, it was by merging means of technology to propaganda. This latter takes many forms, one of which is through altering history and facts by changing books and articles, which was, ironically, the job of Winston at the Ministry of Truth. This alteration is part of the process of preserving the Party's ideology regardless of the truth, and it aims at disregarding any opposition and outer facts that do not serve the state. In the novel, Orwell narrates in the voice of Winston, "It was true that there was no such person as Comrade Ogilvy, but a few lines of print and a couple of faked photographs would soon bring him into existence" (32). Winston explains how, as part of his job, he had to make a non-existing person named Ogilvy somehow appear in the records as an idealized Party leader.

Additionally, the Big Brother posters placed on every wall and everywhere on the screens functioned to enhance the Party's propaganda and to constantly remind people of his omnipresent surveillance. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator describes the poster that Winston was seeing in his building, "It was one of those pictures which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move. BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU, the caption beneath it ran" (1). Another propagandist form was the Two Minutes Hate in which people had to express despise and anger towards Goldstein, the first enemy of the state and to whom many

crimes and outlawed deeds were attributed. Its purpose was to ignite violence towards anything and any person who do not comply with conformist ideology of Big Brother. Orwell describes how this ritual starts, “The next moment a hideous, grinding speech, as of some monstrous machine running without oil, burst from the big telescreen at the end of the room. It was a noise that set one's teeth on edge and bristled the hair at the back of one's neck. The Hate had started” (5). Then he further gives an example of the demonstrated hate:

As usual, the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the People, had flashed on to the screen. There were hisses here and there among the audience. The little sandy-haired woman gave a squeak of mingled fear and disgust. Goldstein was the renegade and backslider who once, long ago (how long ago, nobody quite remembered), had been one of the leading figures of the Party, almost on a level with Big Brother himself, and then had engaged in counter-revolutionary activities, had been condemned to death, and had mysteriously escaped and disappeared. (5)

The ritual always ends with the overly repeated slogans of the state of Oceania; the paradoxical slogans that demonstrate the “Doublethink” concept promoted by the government and imposed on the people. Those slogans are “WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH” (7). They are a constant reminder of the Party’s principals.

Notably, the control of this totalitarian system reached as far as to interfere in one’s cognitive abilities. They worked to limit the process of thinking; thus, preventing any individual from having divergent thoughts that may lead to rebellious modes of thinking which will threaten the sovereignty of the Party. The tool for this was the “Newspeak” which is a new simplified version of the English language that serves to diminish the means of expression through minimizing the number of words and their expressionism; eventually, its aim is to prevent “thoughtcrime”. In

this regard, Booker explains the purpose of such language stating that the Newspeak “is designed to make it impossible to describe reality in ways other than those congruent with the official ideology of Ingsoc (English socialism)” (70). Thus, its primary aim is to preserve the ideology of the state. In a conversation between Syme, a philologist working in the Research Department, and Winston about the Newspeak, Syme says, “Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten” (Orwell 24). Thus, language was centralized and merged with propagandist tools to become itself a form of propaganda in the hands of the government serving to advocate its political agendas. Accordingly, Orwell's *1984* uses interrelated methods of propaganda to engrain the Party's truth as the only truth. In this sense, propaganda was used to execute extreme control.

On the other hand, similar methods are used in Sansal's dystopia as to show extreme forms of religious control in a harshly totalitarian system that is eager to maintain its power by any means necessary. Much like in Orwell's novel, the only knowledge people have is that dictated by Abi and the absence of any form of rival thought helped in reinforcing whatever was said as the absolute reality. This is explicitly stated by Ati in an internal dialogue, “..there are no competing opinions..” (Sansal 23). To solidify more their claims, the government had many ways of spreading information, indeed anything they wanted people to believe. One of these ways is the NeF communiqués, the News from the Front, a kind of newspaper responsible on reporting news from the alleged war between Abistan and its unknown enemy. Aldus Huxley in his article, “Propaganda in Democratic Society,” stresses on the ability of mass communication, namely, the

press, to become a weapon in the hands of dictatorships to help the ruling totalitarian man (3). Therefore, since Absitanis have never left the only land they know and they have never seen that alleged enemy, in fact, deeply they are not even sure it exists, the only thing they could do, they should do, is to believe whatever they are exposed to. The narrator comments on this by; “Every day the NeF reported on the war in breathless communiqués which the people read and discussed avidly, but as Abistanis never left their neighborhoods, and the country had no maps on which to visualize the combat zones, it might have seemed to some that the only true reality of war was in the NeF communiqués” (Sansal 52). This indicates how constant the propaganda of the state was and it demonstrates its essence as a promoting tool for the political cause of the state.

Actually, to convince the people of the existence of the enemy and of the war, the state went further to plant commemorative steles in different parts of the country indicating places of previous wars and of soldiers who died there. It is planted by agents of Yolah, by servants of Abi; thus, there is no reason, indeed, no courage to doubt its validity; for doubting what the state tells is doubting the authority of Yolah. Not only that, but also the Nadirs, those screens spread all over the streets of the country, often aired messages and news and everyone had to stop whatever they are doing to listen to the Nadirs and to whatever propaganda they carry. One prominent example in the novel about the work of such tools is the discovery of a new sacred place; as stated in the different media of Abistan in the novel, “a new holy shrine of prime importance had been discovered!” (Sansal 59). The narrator tells, “It was a thunderclap in the drowsy skies of Abistan. Oh, indeed, there was a commotion, and so much repetition! The information went around the country a thousand times in a short week of seven days—through the nadirs, the gazettes, the NeF, the mockbas —on call twenty-four hours a day—not to mention the town criers who spared neither vocal cords nor megaphones” (Sansal 59). While in

fact, the discovered place is an already existing village from long ago. The existence of this mysterious village was attributed to Abi because in Abistan anything that does not comply with the teachings of religion and of its propagated truths, threatens it. Thus, the village that was turned into a shrine immediately converting people into believers of its holiness and driving them to pray for Yolah to grant them pilgrimage there, is deemed sacred which means unquestionable. This is a portrayal of how such media in the world of Abistan works on the alteration of reality through advocating propagated alternatives. Further, the state instantly proclaims any unexpected rival facts that may emerge; as the Sansal declares in the story, “The System is never threatened by the revelation of an embarrassing fact; rather, it will be reinforced by making this fact its own” (62).

In another form, speeches are common propagandist tools either by Mockbis during prayer times in which they preach on the righteousness of Abi’s government and what praises await his most faithful and submissive subjects, or by one of the Honorables in the Great Mockba. Such preaches were loaded with slogans, undoubtedly, the most common chants are always repeated: “Yölah is great and Abi is his Delegate!” (Sansal 35). In Sansal’s words, “the Honorables, the great masters of the Just Brotherhood, and the leaders of the Apparatus knew these things and everything else; they defined and controlled all of it” (33). Thus, it would only be normal that they would advocate for the validity and durability of their rule disregarding all opposition. A description of their speeches in the novel goes as follows:

Every week one Honorable, chosen by his peers according to a protocol that was too complicated for the common people to understand, led the prayer, and after that commented on a verse from the Gkabal having something to do with current affairs, in particular with the current Great Holy War, or the one that was being prepared in secret. The faithful

punctuated his words with powerful, virile cheers: “Yölah is great!” “The Gkabal is the way!” “Abi will win!” “A curse upon Balis!” “Death to the Enemy!” “Death to Regs!” “Death to traitors!” After which, cleansed of their sins, the flock headed joyfully toward the great stadium that could hold as many people as chose to show up. (68)

Similar to Orwell’s Newspeak, Sansal created in his novel what he called “Abilang” the official language of Abistan that, by obligation, all people must speak. According to the novel, “Abilang” “was magnificent, but ever so wrongheaded, according to the law all inhabitants must speak Abilang, the sacred tongue Yölah taught Abi in order to unite the believers as one nation” (Sansal 32). Abilang is the language of the Gkabal; it serves ideologies and beliefs of the religious state. It aims to destroy discourse of any meaning outside of the religious sphere since Abi already preordains all discourses that may be carried in Abilang. The narrator notes:

that abilang was not an ordinary language of communication, since the words that connected people went through the medium of religion, which emptied them of their intrinsic meaning and instilled in them an infinitely moving message, the word of Yölah; in this respect the language was a reserve of colossal energy that emitted an ionic flux of cosmic scope, acting on universes and worlds but also on an individual’s cells, genes, and molecules, which it transformed and polarized according to the original plan. (47)

In this sense, language isolates the individual from any outside voices and makes him a receiver of what it dictates only. As explained, “this language had created a force field around the believer that isolated him from the world, and made him deaf” (48). One can argue that creating Abilang serves not only as a propagandist tool for the ruling power but also as an insurance that future individuals of Abistan would not know anything else except that which is dictated by Abilang. In this sense, language is a tool to shape individuals into submissive believers with an

extremely narrow perspective on their world, a perspective that only supports the sustainability of the totalitarian system engrained in its subjects.

Furthermore, the novel highlights the relationship between religion and language. On the one hand, language leads, eventually, to a perfect reality that inevitably becomes sacred. While, on the other hand, religion chooses language to carry across its specific messages through playing on its rhetoric and faculties. This is showed through a series of questions asked by Ati and Koa:

What was the connection between religion and language? Can religion be conceived without a sacred language? Which comes first, religion or language? What makes a believer: the word of religion or the music of language? Is it religion that creates a special language out of a need for sophistication and mental manipulation, or is it language which, once it reaches a high level of perfection, invents an ideal universe, one which it is bound to make holy? Is the postulate according to which “Whoever has a weapon will end up using it” still valid? In other words, does religion intrinsically turn to tyranny and murder? (Sansal 56)

People in Abistan are subjugated totally by religion and they submit to it blindly, religion that is led by Abi the delegate of Yolah on earth; thus, anything he says is the absolute truth unquestionably. Consequently, Abistanis adopted Abilang cheerfully believing in its power since Abi ordained it, as he says, “With the holy language my adepts will be valiant unto death; they will need nothing more than the words of Yölah to dominate the world. These words made my companions into commanders of genius, and so now will they make them into elite soldiers; the victory will be rapid, total, and final” (Sansal 60). Indeed, the words of Abi through Abilang served to convince people of the legitimacy of and the necessity to take part of the war, as well as to advance duty and obedience. Notably, the world of Abistan in Sansal’s book is an extension

of Orwell's world; thus in the book, the narrator explains how founders of Abilang realized the immense power of language in establishing the perfect totalitarian system and maintaining it, "Its conception was inspired by Newspeak, from Angsoc. When we occupied that country, our then leaders discovered that its extraordinary political system was founded not only on weapons but also on the phenomenal power of its language, Newspeak" (130). Therefore, they followed the same principal by creating the perfect language to spread their ideology unquestionably.

Accordingly, the totalitarian regime of both Orwell's depicted world and Sansal's religious dystopia relied on many forms of propaganda in order to establish their ideologies and apply versified methods of control. In addition, which is very important, they were able to harness language for the same reason. Eventually, the power of such systems to control people reaches its limits.

Interestingly, reading Orwell's *1984*, one can easily link it to the political discourse of Europe upon the Cold War. The novel was written at a time where such ideological war was just starting, threatening to spread one globalized perspective that would subjugate people under one totalitarian energy. Such means of propaganda demonstrated in Orwell's work recalls some Stalinist strategies to manipulate history and facts. Booker gives an example of how such strategies work to pull media materials out of their context in order to employ them as propagandist tools for their purpose. He recalls Sergei Eisenstein's film *October* that was a fictionalized retelling of the October Revolution in Russia served to condemn Kerensky and favors Lenin and the Bolsheviks, a film that was later abused by the Soviet propaganda as they used some of its scenes as if they were genius documentary shots of actual historical events relating to the revolution (87). Booker further explains how this example of history rewriting in the Soviet system is one of many. It would only be normal, then, to find a reflection of this type

of propaganda in the satire of *1984*'s Party. Booker argues that the book obviously refers to the constant manipulation of history by Stalinist system, and indeed the rewriting of history by the ruling power to what suits its political tendencies (87). This is clearly demonstrated in Orwell's novel through Party's motto, "Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past" (Orwell 117). Moreover, the use of language in *1984* is similar, if not in fact, inspired by two realities, that of Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany being the major powers that characterized the spread of totalitarian ideology in the twentieth century. In this regard, Magda Stroinska in her article, "Language and Totalitarian Regimes", argues that: "One of the reasons why these ideologies were able to get their grip of ordinary people was the linguistic mastery of their propaganda experts" (24). Thus, one can argue that Orwell reflects on such totalitarian regimes to show the relationship between their political discourse and language, a mixture that results in the perfect propaganda to support the ideology of the state. One can go further and say that Orwell's vision of propaganda is applicable in today's world with the development of mass media and the popularity of the newly emerging social media that work altogether to saturate people by a flux of different ideologies and perspectives, resulting in a state of constant confusion.

In the same vein, a historical reading of Sansal's novel in terms of the propaganda portrayed can find its traces in the postcolonial Algeria, particularly in the period of the Black Decade. The Bloody decade was characterized by the emergence of the Islamic fundamentalists who used different means of propaganda to disregard the potential and credibility of the opposition. This stream of individuals, who are religiously extremists and who used means of terror and violence to subjugate people, explained the backwardness and deterioration in the economic and social level to Muslim's distance from the correct application of the texts of Islamic law and to the

influence of their governments on politics. Thus, one of the most important methods used to spread the propaganda of this stream's ideology is gatherings in public places in which people responsible for presenting these propaganda discourses aimed to spread their own thoughts and argue on their right to prevail. Not only that, but also they harassed, and violently threatened, anyone who does not adopt the principles of this stream and consider them non-believers who must be eliminated. Similarly, in Sansal's *2084*, any news or Mockbis speeches call for the destruction of the Regs, the Renegades, because they represent pure evil and hold nothing but harm for the believers and for Abi, while in fact they are just non-believers who refuse the conformity and subjugation of the Abistanis. Emphasizing on how people in Abistan regarded the Regs, Sansal tells, "...in keeping with the Gkabal 's spirit of goodness; to be sure, the Regs were abominable creatures, unholy and dirty" (74).

Accordingly, both Orwell and Sansal's work can be taken as a historical interpretation of the discourses that inspired them, each in the culture and society of its author. They demonstrate the specific type of propaganda used in Algeria and in Europe as seen by both writers.

III.3. Orwell's Winston and Sansal's Ati: Disillusioned Protagonists in a Totalitarian Dystopia

At the heart of a dystopian realm, a disillusioned questioning character seeks to answer the doubts accumulating from his society's oppression. It is the brutal nature of the totalitarian rulers in dystopian narratives that calls for resistance, which is represented in a character that takes on the mission of unveiling the horrors and deception lying in the superficially perfect system. Purkar stresses this view as she explains, "Believing that something is awfully wrong with the society in which he/she lives, the protagonist in a dystopian literature questions the existing social and political systems. It is only through the protagonist that the readers come to know

about the adverse aspects of the dystopian world” (2-3). It would only be normal then to examine aspects of totalitarianism from the retrograde viewpoint of the protagonist in a literary work. Thus, Winston and Ati, as the main characters of the selected works represent the resistance rising inside a tightly oppressive totalitarianism.

In Oceania, the world depicted by Orwell, everyone is a passive subject under the constant surveillance and the total control of the Party. The plot follows Winston Smith, the low-ranking member of the Party, who, through the novel delivers the gloomy image of a captive society under a severely oppressive regime. The revolutionary spirit of the protagonist and the deep despise for the wrongs he senses in his society, reinforced by the questions he raises, make the reader engage in the world of the novel and grow aware of the dangers of the totalitarian system surrounding it. The beginning of the novel marks the first hints of the existing all-controlling power through the giant poster of Big Brother that encounters Winston as he enters the building then the screens that follow him along. The first act of rebellion he intended to do, even if at that time he did not mean it exactly to be rebellious, was when he held the pen and initiated a diary, which was punishable by death or long imprisonment regardless of the existence of laws explicitly indicating that. This was triggered by the Two Minutes Hate of the same day in which we see the first glimpse of his hatred towards the Party, as the narrator describe, “All that they did was to keep alive in him the belief, or hope, that others besides himself were the enemies of the Party” (Orwell 8). This hate soon manifested itself in the diary through the overly repeated sentence he unconsciously has written on the paper saying, “DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER” (8). Actually, the symbolism of what Winston did lies in the fact that he had the courage to think freely and develop a sort of negative emotions towards the Party; especially, considering that the

Though Police monitors all thoughts and vaporizes anyone with a divergent mind. This marked the first rebellious act of him, opposing the Party's restrictions on free thought.

Additionally, in this imagined world, restriction of thought is one only form of oppression executed by the Party; another is the suppression of desires and the weakening of instincts that results in an extremely deprived individual who is devoted to the service of the Party only.

Winston therefore commits his next act of rebellion in the form of developing love and desire towards one of his fellow party comrade, Julia with whom he ends up having a love affair. The narrator, in the voice of Julia explains the significance of this restriction on sexual desire in such totalitarian world state:

When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and the Three-Year Plans and the Two Minutes Hate and all the rest of their bloody rot? (Orwell 62)

This indicates that the sole aim if the Party is to achieve full devotion and willingness to serve the ideology of Big Brother. It would only be normal then to result in the conclusion that this act by Winston is far more than just following his instincts but rather he sees the challenging undertones it carries for Big Brother; he feels certain freedom from the highly abnormal oppression of the Party. Winston reflects on this idea and he realizes that "The sex impulse was dangerous to the Party, and the Party had turned it to account" (62). Moreover, his eagerness to end and to destroy this dystopia goes further to lead him to be affiliated with the anti-Party Brotherhood that aims to put down the control of Big Brother.

In search for freedom, Winston embarks in a series of dangerous deeds empowering himself with fake hope of success, knowing well the improbability of it. He grew paranoid of the inevitable fate that awaits him after eventually being caught by the Party. However, at the end Winston's attempts of rebellion are met with failure in the face of the power of the Party. He is caught and he faces what is worse than death to him, conformity. From the standpoint of Winston, one can understand that such totalitarian system's goal is to erase the possibility of divergence; it works on emptying persons from their individuality and freedom so that the only thing left is the system's ideology. This is clearly shown in the destiny of Winston who, after a painful resistance in face of a long torture, denies all form of an opposing thought than that of the Party. This is symbolized in the last sentence of the novel, "He loved Big Brother" (Orwell 143). The tyranny and terror evoked by this totalitarian system was able to replace all rebellious thoughts, all emotions and desires of Winston by one thing only, the love of Big Brother; the ideology of the Party.

Conversely, Ati, the protagonist in Sansal's *2084* had similar rebellious tendencies to those of Winston; however, unlike Winston who is pessimistic and paranoid, Ati is more open and curious. The plot of the story revolves around his journey to discover the truth behind his world and find the freedom he feels entitled to. The perspective from which the reader approaches the narrative is of an unaffiliated protagonist who does not belong to any organization unlike Winston who is a member of the Party, thus at the center of the dystopia and of the totalitarian system. At the beginning, the story portrays Ati living in an isolated sanatorium in the mountains due to his tuberculosis, thus, away from all the propaganda dictated by the state. It was there that he learned to think independently and see his world for what it really is. The narrator tells, "Ati found his hospital outside of time unsettling: every day he learned of dreadful things that would

have gone unnoticed in the commotion of a city, but here they filled the space and invaded minds that were constantly heckled, crushed, humiliated. The isolation of the sanatorium was one explanation” (Sansal 20). Questioning everything around him and revealing the inconsistencies in the seemingly perfect ideology, he develops a curious spirit longing for truth.

A major quest for him and one of the major questions with which he was tormented, is the question about borders since what the state teaches them is that there are no borders and all the land is Yolah’s. In the novel, Sansal reveals, “The notion that a border might exist was shattering. The world might be divided, divisible, and humankind might be multiple? Since when? Since always” (20). Those ideas hunted Ati concluding always with one ultimate question, “What is the border, dammit, what is on the other side?” (20). This indicates the first sparkle of freedom from which Ati will ignite the flames of rebellion against the oppressive system that he observes later when he returns home and joins his community. Ati begins to answer those questions, demonstrating the gap between reality and the government's promises. The hunt for answers enables us to see that the dystopian world of Abistan is marked by the presence of a totalitarian power that controls people. Ewa Drab in her article “La dystopie musulmane en tant qu’expression du conflit L’exemple de *2084: La fin du monde* de Boualem Sansal ” argues, “La notion de frontière géographique implique automatiquement la présence de l’autre qui peut être dangereux ou qui peut, par comparaison, mener à la réfutation du gouvernement” (65). Simply, she argues that the presence of borders inevitably indicates the presence of an “other” who might cancel the validity of the government, thus, threatens its rule. According to this, one can argue that Ati’s quest for the borders is actually a desire to distance himself from the ideology of his world state and to discover new perspectives; thus, eliminating the totalitarian possibility.

Moreover, in his search for freedom, Ati with his friend, Koa, embarked in an adventure, a dangerous and rebellious one, to the Ghetto, the forbidden suburbs of the non-believers. Sansal narrates:

When all was said and done, Ati and Koa preferred wandering around the devastated suburbs, where a shred of freedom still reigned, too tiny to be of any use, and you need a lot of freedom to start attacking the secrets on which unshakeable empires are founded. And indeed, this was rebellion of the purest kind: they'd reached a point where they actually thought they might go one day to live in the ghettos of death, those faraway enclaves where ancient populations had survived and clung doggedly to old heresies that had disappeared even from the archives. (50)

The search for freedom was stronger than any fear to be caught or even to be killed. He sought truth regardless of the outcome, seeking to unveil the secrets of such tyranny under which he is living. Furthermore, throughout his journey with Koa, Ati comes to realize and confirm the absurdity of the system that feeds on evoking terror and submitting people. It is noted in the novel that they start to realize the mechanisms by which the world state operates, "The two friends were beginning to realize that the Just Brotherhood reigned over Abistan in a strange manner: it was total yet cowardly, omnipresent and distant, and in addition to the absolute power it had over people, it seemed to possess other unknown, enigmatic powers that were turned toward who knew what parallel, higher world" (Sansal 80).

Soon Ati embarked in his major adventure in the novel that would put him in the middle of the dystopian world; he finds himself a part of an internal conflict of power between those on top of the hierarchy. His illegal journey to the City of God with Koa led to a huge development in his

character and his perspective because he realized the wrongs of the system and developed a stronger persistence to reach the freedom he desires. Petr Vurm in his paper, “1984–2084. Faux-semblants Révélés , Émotions Refoulées: L’amour, La haine et L’indéférence à L’age Totalitaire Chez George Orwell et Boualem Sansal”, argues that similar to Winston, Ati’s revelations made him more eager for freedom. On that Vurm says, “Ati, tout comme Winston Smith, arrive peu à peu à aimer la liberté grâce à la découverte des failles dans le système” (203). Likewise, Sansal tells in the novel the results of Ati’s rebellious experiences, especially his last one visiting the City of God and getting involved in the conflict between powers:

In which Ati discovers one conspiracy can hide another, and that truth, like falsehood, only exists insofar as we believe in it. He also discovers that the knowledge of some does not make up for the ignorance of others, and that humanity models itself upon the most ignorant of all its members. Under the reign of the Gkabal, the Great Work has been achieved: ignorance dominates the world, and has reached a stage where it knows everything, can do everything, and wants everything. (106)

Unlike Winston who ends up by becoming a believer in the legitimacy of the Party and who substitutes all the love and eagerness he had for freedom with the love and devotion to big Brother, Ati does not face the same fate. In fact, Ati does not want to change the system like Winston; ever since he was in the sanatorium he always wanted to find the Border and to cross it. In this regard, the narrator reflects on Ati’s thoughts, “What was urgent, now, was to go to find those borders and to cross them” (Sansal 30). Indeed, Ati manages to pursue his goal regardless of the fact that the possibility of reaching it was left for the reader’s imagination in the novel.

III.4. Orwell's and Sansal's Messages: Success or Failure?

Boualem Sansal's *2084* is clearly, and to a great extent, inspired by Orwell's *1984*. The former can be read as a rewriting of the latter with a new perspective; that is of Sansal and his view regarding the destination of religion. This view is specifically directed towards the vision of a totalitarian Islam, of which he tries to portray various discourses relating to its development as an extreme political force. In this regard, Vurm asserts that Sansal in his *2084* "represents a modern rewriting of Orwell, updating the context of totalitarianism in the direction of the rule of Islam" (193). Moreover, Sansal asserts, "Dans mon analyse c'est le totalitarisme islamique qui va l'emporter parce qu'il s'appuie sur une devinite et une jeunesse qui n'a pas peur de la mort" (qtd. in Ouali). This insinuates that through his novel Sansal portrays Islam as cruel and extreme. Amer Ouali observes in his article, "L'écrivain Algerien Boualem Sansal Met L'islamisme au Pouvoir Dans *2084*", that Sansal, through Abi, creates an Islamic Big Brother. Indeed, with all the similarities portrayed in the novel to the actual aspects of Islam, such as the prayers, the Burniqabs, the Mockbi, the absolute god and his messenger. Etc. one can argue that his view to totalitarian ideology is directly linked to Islam as religion and that his motive is to securitize Islam, especially in Europe. Regarding this point, Sansal claims, "le terrain à observer est l'europe, après le monde Arab et l'afrique , l'islamisme se propage aussi en occident avec une présence physique de en plus visible de barbus, des femmes voilees et de commerces halal" (qtd. in Ouali).

Ironically, he published the novel in 2015 in France, a time that witnessed the rise of political Islam in France and it coincided with the French elections. Thus, one can argue that he invested in the fear policy in order to cope with mainstream media and various discourses of the epoch. In another perspective, an alternative interpretation can be attributed to his work, which is that *2084*

is the result of his experience as an Algerian who witnessed the Black Decade. This latter was characterized by religious extremism, oppression and violence; it intensified the fear of a future Islamic fundamentalist totalitarianism. A fear that Sansal adopts after almost 20 years and directs to Europe and France in the form of an overly exaggerated prediction of politicized Islam. Not only that, but also the influence of the political scene which surrounded the time of his publication, a scene that was mainly triggered by the Arab Spring and the rise of the Islamic state in Syria, Iraq and many Arab countries, plays a crucial role in his portrayed form of totalitarianism.

Sansal's aim behind depicting such theocratic totalitarian conflict can be traced back to his denial of religion particularly Islamic domination. Thus, he resorts to dystopian fiction to manifest his ideological fears. It is, therefore, according to Drab, evident that he uses means of dystopian narratives to highlight political and social questions and to consider a possible future of Muslim supremacy exaggerated by many fears (63). She further argues that the world of *Abistan* inspires its principals from Islamist ideology (68). While he tries to exaggerate the link between Islam and his dystopian world, he gives a portrayal that the audience might take out of its literary fictional purpose, particularly, the western audience for whom it would be considered a relevant work especially if linked to the context of fundamentalists and terroristic image of Islam propagated in the media. Thus, it is safe to say that the vision he tries to portray is unrealistic and biased by hate, especially considering his background as a non-believer who chose to be hypercritical towards Islam.

In a similar vein, George Orwell's *1984* demonstrates the manifestation of his anti-communist ideology. Influenced by his life experiences, notably his experience in the Spanish war, he managed, to some extent, to demonstrate the features of totalitarianism in a dystopian world. A

vision that is still relevant today and proved to be accurate largely, especially in predicting the harmful consequences of communism on its societies. Bachler in his online article, “George Orwell: The Fight against Totalitarianism”, asserts that *1984* “is another attack on the communist regime of Russia and the English left-wing intelligentsia that happily supported it”. Through the novel, it is clear that Winston is the voice of Orwell’s ideology in insisting on the power of the working class to make change if they only see their world for what it is truly rather than through the lenses of the ruling power’s ideology. Thus, the writer aims to warn against the dangers of totalitarianism and the extremes it will reach in the future, especially considering the context in which his novel was written. One can say that Orwell is a political writer who uses means of literature to denounce political totalitarianism, in his words he states, “The Spanish war and other events in 1936-37 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism, as I understand it” (Orwell). Thus, it is evident to conclude that his motive to write *1984* is largely intended as a political and ideological resistance of the prevailing ideology in the time of writing his work.

Indeed this chapter represents the core of this comparative study. Considering the analysis made in regards to both Orwell’s *1984* and Sansal’s *2084*, one can conclude that even though Sansal was inspired by Orwell’s work, the conclusions made regarding each one of them are different. Read from an Algerian perspective, Sansal’s work is an overly exaggerated depiction of its context of writing; it is a distorted depiction that is fueled by biased affiliations and a desire to appeal to the westerner view of Islamic religion as extreme. His motives to write this work are primarily ideological aimed at liberating religion and igniting fear in Europe, especially France. Read from a western perspective, Orwell’s work serves to warn against the possible

sociopolitical totalitarianism that threatens Europe and the World. His motives are also ideological, but he seeks to raise a global warning for all humanity, as he harnesses his literature to fight for the right cause. The experiences of both authors shaped largely their ideology and the motives

Conclusion

Dystopian literature is interested in depicting the dark possibilities of the human future through envisioning a dehumanized gloomy world that is seemingly based on utopian ideals. Dystopian fiction reflects the ills of the human mind fantasies to reach a perfect world that, instead, turns into a chaotic society coated in ideological struggles and oppression. Further, it shows the totalitarian extremes restricting the life of people and depriving them from their freedom in an attempt to achieve power for one ruling segment of that society. At the heart of this literary genre, totalitarianism is always a recurring theme in one way or another. Many authors of dystopian fiction try to portray a world oppressed under such political and social ideology that seeks to subjugate people and deny them the possibility to see the truth of the world. Despite dystopian literature being soaked in fictionalized elements and, sometimes, exaggerated forms of totalitarian oppression, it is usually a reflection of the human reality, whether it being the futuristic imagined one, the declining present one, or the traumatizing past one.

Many authors dedicated their works to the representation of totalitarianism in their dystopian narratives. They used literature as a means to depict the social and political reality of the world. In many cases, fiction is employed in the political resistance of the author and in the display of his own ideology. No doubt, George Orwell is the most prominent writer of dystopian political fiction that he used as a channel to deliver his futuristic visions to the world, and to fight totalitarianism, particularly in his most popular work, *1984*. Through the lenses of his protagonist Winston, Orwell depicts the totalitarian society under the rule of the Party extremely subjugated and brainwashed. Through means of technology such as the telescreens and hidden microphones,

the Party controls all aspects of people's life spreading the ideology of Big Brother. Means of propaganda and language mutation were also used in the novel for the same purpose.

Following the lead of Orwell, the Algerian writer, Boualem Sansal, sought to rewrite the masterpiece of Orwell putting it in a new context whereby he imagined a new form of totalitarianism coated by religious extremism and restriction of freedom. His novel, *2084: The End of the World*, demonstrates the features of a totalitarian state by means similar to those employed by Orwell. In fact, the world state he tries to describe is largely inspired, and is a continuation, to the world of Oceania. Sansal used his novel to rebel against certain religious ideologies, especially the ones he believes to be of an extremist nature, which he excessively tried to depict.

Therefore, the present study tackles the theme of totalitarianism in both novels. The first chapter starts with giving an overview about the main concepts involved in the study. First, starting with ideology that is understood as the set of ideas that hold members of the same society together sharing the same perspective to the world. Here its relationship to literature becomes inevitable in sense that they influence each other. Ideology is reflected in literature that seeks to depict the social and economic state surrounding its creation. Second, it moves to explaining dystopian literature, which is the type of narratives concerned with depicting the failure of an imagined perfect world that turns to be extremely oppressive, and socially and politically corrupt. Third, it addresses the representation of totalitarianism in literature starting by defining it as an extreme social and political ideology that seeks to subjugate people under a total control using some special means such as, propaganda, the all controlling ideology, evoking fear and surveillance. Two prominent examples of a dystopian works that represented totalitarianism as their main theme are , *Animal Farm* (1945) by George Orwell and *Brave New World* by

(1932) Aldous Huxley. Finally, the chapter gives a brief overview on the approaches that were used in this study which are the biographical approach and historical approach.

The second chapter is dedicated to the authors and analyzes the life events influencing both their ideology and literary production. First, it starts with highlighting the main events in the upbringing of George Orwell from his birthplace in India until his death in England, and how they shaped his perspective to the world and to the ideologies he adopted, resulting in many literary productions that are considered an account of those experiences. Second, it moves to shed light on his literary style and motives in relationship to his anti-totalitarian ideology in which he seeks to use his words as political resistance and denunciation of any controlling ideologies. Third, it shifts the focus to the Algerian writer, Boualem Sansal, and follows a similar manner of tracing his career as a writer with a special consideration to the development of his ideology opposing religion and government. His ideological stance and choices resulted in him being one of the most problematic Algerian writers. Fourth, it investigates his tendencies to write in French and the changes in his literary style that reflect his ideological changes. Finally, the chapter concludes by arguing on the necessity to study Orwell and Sansal comparatively in regards to their respectful novels within the theme of totalitarianism to understand more the motives and ideologies lying behind both depictions. On the one hand, Orwell sought to depict his denunciation of the oppression practices on the lower class and the ideological powers of the totalitarian government to erase equality and freedom. On the other hand, Sansal called for the resistance and revolution against any form of religious radicalism.

The third chapter is the crucial part of this study in which the theoretical concepts mentioned in the first chapter and the biographical information analyzed in the second chapter are combined and used in the analysis of the theme in hand. It tries to put a comparative framework to some

features of totalitarianism and their representation in both dystopian works. First, it tackles the means of technology as instruments used by the totalitarian government depicted in both novels to control people. In *1984*, the use of technology was varied and present largely in the novel through telescreens, microphones and the overly developed machines used by the Party.

However, in *2084*, the presence of technology was less explicit and restricted to people on top of the hierarchy whereas the common people are portrayed as ignorant and unaware of the existence of such technology except for what they are exposed to, mostly the Nadirs. Second, it moves to another feature of totalitarian presence in the selected dystopian narratives which is propaganda and language use. Those two were demonstrated similarly in both works. Orwell focused on both the propagated realities advocated by the Party through the telescreens and the overly repeated slogans, and the creation of the “Newspeak” as a means to control people’s freedom of thought and ease the process of deceiving them by fake information. Interestingly, Sansal followed the lead of Orwell in using almost the same ways of propaganda through the slogans and the media responsible on spreading whatever the religious state wants the people to believe, and the creation of “Abilang” that, similar to Orwell’s “Newspeak”, is used to ease the subjugation of people to the total control of the state. These two aspects of totalitarianism are followed by an interpretation relating them to the actual context of writing in the case of both novels.

This results in the analysis that, first, Orwell is delivering a futuristic vision about the future of totalitarianism and the possibilities of its extremism, a vision that is reflected on Europe upon the Cold War with all the horrors it brought on people. Second, Sansal is both reflecting on the Algerian society upon the Civil War, and imagining the religious extremism that would rule in the future, with particular reference to Islamic extremism.

Third, this chapter moves to tackle the experiences of the main protagonists of both novels, Winston and Ati. Both characters embarked in a series of adventures to seek freedom and truth, Winston ended up defeated by the system and rendered a subject of its totalitarian ideology: however, Ati realized the conviction in his own view of reality and he eliminated the extreme religious ideology governing his world while he set for a new final adventure to find the absolute truth. Finally, the chapter concludes with arguing on the possible motives of both writers that led them to depict totalitarianism each from his particular perspective. It asserts that Orwell uses the novel as a direct political stance against totalitarianism in its extreme political and social form that aims at controlling the lower class and depriving them from their freedom. It further argues that Sansal is aiming to appeal certain tendencies that oppose religion, specifically Islam since the author sees the possibility of it becoming an extremist power oppressing people's liberty, especially in Europe. It further.

Therefore, both novels, *1984*, by George Orwell and, *2084: The End of the World*, by Boualem Sansal are used as a means to voice the authors' ideologies. While they share some similarities in the ways they portray the theme of totalitarianism, they differ in the context in which their works may be interpreted. Orwell's work is interpreted in regards to the European society, first, focusing on the social and political oppression executed by the state in his depicted world and the oppression demonstrated by many totalitarian government in Europe, namely the Stalinist state upon the Cold War. Orwell's work can be interpreted also as a futuristic vision of the global totalitarian possibility that is threatening the world. Sansal's work, however, is largely interpreted within the context of the discourses related to Algeria and those related particularly to Europe in regards to religion and Islam, considering the controversy this latter rises in France and how this imagined destination of religious totalitarianism appeals to that controversy.

Accordingly, the motives underlying the choice of totalitarianism in both novels is largely dependent on the standpoint from which the work is read. Orwell's motives are largely political, in which he warns against such possible oppression that would diminishes the human freedom particularly that of the lower classes. The imagined sociopolitical totalitarian future he demonstrated is more inclusive due the globalized prophetic vision he had which today is coming into realization in one way or another. Reading Sansal's work from an Algerian standpoint, his motives are biased against religion in the sense that he chose to imagine a theocratic totalitarianism filled with religious symbolism that could easily be traced back to Islam. Furthermore, he intended to appeal to the western media by intensifying their Islamophobia through means of literary exaggeration.

Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. "A Letter On Art in Reply to Andre Daspre." *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. NYU Press, Monthly Review Press, 2001. 5.
- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses by Louis Althusser 1969-70." *Marxists.org*, 1970, www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism. I*. Harcourt Brace, 1985.
- Bachler, Marcus. "George Orwell: The Fight against Totalitarianism - the Free Radical Online." *Www.freeradical.co.nz*, www.freeradical.co.nz/content/58/Orwell.php.
- Barilleaux, Ryan J. "Dystopia and the Gospel of Life." *Catholic Social Science Review*, vol. 17, 2012, pp. 259–272, 10.5840/cssr20121717.
- Barthes, Roland. *Methologies*. Translated by Annete Lavers, The Noonday Press, soundenvironments.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/roland-barthes-mythologies.pdf.
- Bartlek, Silke, and Abbas Al-Khashali. "تكريم ألماني للروائي الجزائري بوعلام صنصال، بوعلام صنصال - Qantara.de." *Qantara.de* 9, موقع قنطرة للحوار مع العالم الإسلامي، Sept. 2011, ar.qantara.de/content/tkrym-lmny-llrwy-y-ljzyry-bwlm-snsl-bwlm-snsl-yukrwam-fy-mrd-frnkfwrt-llktb.
- Beauchamp, Gorman. "Technology in the Dystopian Novel." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1986, pp. 53–63, 10.1353/mfs.0.1315.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Nicholas Royle. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. Routledge, 2016.
- Benson, Jackson J. "Steinbeck: A Defense of Biographical Criticism." *College Literature*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1989, pp. 107–16. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25111810>.
- Biography.com Editors. "George Orwell." *Biography*, A&E Television Networks, 11 Aug. 2016,

- www.biography.com/writer/george-orwell. Accessed 22 Apr. 2022.
- Boualem Sansal. *2084 : The End of the World*. Translated by Alison Anderson, Europa Editions, 2017.
- Boualem, Sansal. “Boualem Sansal: “Il Faut Libérer L’islam.”” *L’EXPRESS*,
www.lexpress.fr/culture/livre/boualem-sansal-il-faut-liberer-l-islam_1023226.html.
 Accessed 11 May 2022.
- Boudjedra, Rachid. *Les Contrebandiers de l’Histoire : Pamphlet*. Editions Frantz Fanon, DI, 2017.
- Brahimi, Denise. “BOUALEM SANSAL.” *Encyclopædia Universalis*,
www.universalis.fr/encyclopedie/boualem-sansal/.
- Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia : A Natural History*. Oxford University Press, 2017,
www.worldcat.org/title/dystopia-a-natural-history/oclc/984775983.
- Crick, Bernard. “BBC - History - British History in Depth: George Orwell: Voice of a Long Generation.” *Www.bbc.co.uk*,
www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/britain_wwtwo/orwell_01.shtml. Accessed 30 Apr. 2022.
- Drab, Ewa. *La Dystopie Musulmane En Tant Qu’expression Du Conflit. L’exemple de “2084: La Fin Du Monde” de Boualem Sansal*. Aug. 2019, pp. 62–71,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335207327_La_dystopie_musulmane_en_tant_qu’expression_du_conflit_L’exemple_de_2084_La_fin_du_monde_de_Boualem_Sansal.
- Durand, Marine, and Vincy Thomas. “Boualem Sansal et Hédi Kaddour, Grand Prix Du Roman de l’Académie Française 2015.” *Www.livreshebdo.fr*, Feb. 20AD,
www.livreshebdo.fr/article/boualem-sansal-et-hedi-kaddour-grand-prix-du-roman-de-lacademie-francaise-2015. Accessed 11 May 2022.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Routledge, 2002,
dtllc.fflch.usp.br/sites/dtllc.fflch.usp.br/files/Eagleton%20-%20Marxism%20and%20Literary%20Criticism.pdf.
- Finigan, Theo. ““Into the Memory Hole”: Totalitarianism and Mal d’ Archive in Nineteen Eighty-Four and the Handmaid’s Tale.” *Science Fiction Studies*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2011, p. 435, [10.5621/sciefictstud.38.3.0435](https://doi.org/10.5621/sciefictstud.38.3.0435).
- Fischer, Ernst. *Art against Ideology*. New York Braziller, 1969,
books.google.dz/books/about/Art_Against_Ideology.html?id=7FMAAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y.
- Friedrich, Carl J, and Zbigniew K Brzezinski. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Praeger, 1972, academic.oup.com/ahr/article-abstract/63/2/367/172503?login=false.
- Gendler, Alex. “How to Recognize a Dystopia - Alex Gendler.” *YouTube*, 15 Nov. 2016,
www.youtube.com/watch?v=6a6kbU88wu0.
- Gissing, George. *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*. 1998, www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/1463.
- Gottlieb, Erika. *Dystopian Fiction East and West : Universe of Terror and Trial*. McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001.
- Holmes, L. “Totalitarianism.” *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001, pp. 15788–15791, [10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/01240-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/01240-7).
- Huaco, George A. “Ideology and Literature.” *New Literary History*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1973, p. 421,
www.jstor.org/stable/468528, [10.2307/468528](https://doi.org/10.2307/468528). Accessed 22 Sept. 2019.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Propaganda in a Democratic Society*.
- Ideology. “Ideology Noun - Definition, Pictures, Pronunciation and Usage Notes | Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary at OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com.”

Oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com, 2022,

www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/ideology#:~:text=a%20set%20of%20beliefs%2C%20especially. Accessed 5 Apr. 2022.

“Ideology.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/ideology. Accessed 18 Apr. 2022.

Ideology. “Ideology Noun - Definition, Pictures, Pronunciation and Usage Notes | Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary at OxfordLearnersDictionaries.com.”

Oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com, 2022,

www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/ideology#:~:text=a%20set%20of%20beliefs%2C%20especially. Accessed 5 Apr. 2022.

Internationales literaturfestival berlin. “Boualem Sansal — Internationales Literaturfestival Berlin.” *E-Laborat.de*, 28 Sept. 2011, ilb.e-laborat.de/autoren-en/autoren-2008-en/boualem-sansal.

Jordan, Chris. “What Is Dystopian Literature?” *Www.youtube.com*, 2021, www.youtube.com/watch?v=0PitvTFjdX4. Accessed Mar. 2022.

Josephson, Paul R. *Totalitarian Science and Technology*. Prometheus Books, 2005.

Kaoutar Harchi, and Jean-Louis Fabiani. *Je N’ai Qu’une Langue, Ce N’est Pas La Mienne Des Écrivains À L’épreuve*. Paris Pauvert, 2016.

Kaukiainen. *Challenging SeCulariTy: SpiriTual and Religious UnderTones in Young AdulT DysTopias Kaisa Kaukiainen*. 1 Sept. 2020.

Kennedy, Emmet. ““Ideology” from Destutt de Tracy to Marx.” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 40, no. 3, July 1979, p. 353, www.jstor.org/stable/2709242, 10.2307/2709242. Accessed 14 Nov. 2019.

Kessler, Oren. "Algerian Author Sparks Uproar with Israel Visit." *The Jerusalem Post*, 16 May 2012, www.jpost.com/Middle-East/Algerian-author-sparks-uproar-with-Israel-visit.

Accessed 11 May 2022.

L'invité. "Boualem SANSAL: "J'écris Face à La Menace Islamiste Sur Le Monde.""

Www.youtube.com, 1 Oct. 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=TLQ9T-KDQeA. Accessed 12 May 2022.

Macherey, Pierre, and Anthony Glinoe. *Pour une théorie de la production littéraire / Pierre Macherey*. Edited by Anthony Glinoe, ENS éditions, 2014.

Macherey, Pierre. "Idéologie : Le Mot, l'Idée, La Chose." *Méthodos*, no. 8, 26 Mar. 2008, journals.openedition.org/methodos/1843, 10.4000/methodos.1843. Accessed 16 Sept. 2020.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*. Routledge, 2003,

edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4621877/mod_resource/content/1/MANNHEIM%2C%20KARL.%20Ideology%20and%20Utopia.pdf.

Marvin Keith Booker. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature : Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport, Conn. U.A., Greenwood Press, 1994.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The German Ideology*. International Publishers, 1995, www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/.

M Keith Booker. *Dystopian Literature : A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport ; London, Greenwood Press, 1994.

Moramollu, Gülrah. (2016). IDEOLOGY AND LITERATURE. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*. 455-460.

Orwell, George. *1984*. Pearson Education, 8 June 1949.

- . *Homage to Catalonia*. Bibliotech Press, 2018.
- . *Homage to Catalonia : And Looking Back on the Spanish War*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1989.
- . *Literature and Totalitarianism*. 19 June 1941,
www.orwell.ru/library/articles/totalitarianism/english/e_lat.
- . "Why I Write." *The Orwell Foundation*, 1946, www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/why-i-write/.
- Ouali, Amer. "L'écrivain Algérien Boualem Sansal Met l' Islamisme Au Pouvoir Dans "2084.""
Le Point, 15 Aug. 2015, www.lepoint.fr/culture/l-ecrivain-algerien-boualem-sansal-met-l-islamisme-au-pouvoir-dans-2084-19-08-2015-1957626_3.php.
- Pataki, Jelena. "To Read and Learn: The Necessity for a New Definition of Dystopia and Bridging the Gap between the Old and Contemporary Dystopias." *Anafora*, vol. 4, no. 2, Dec. 2017, 10.29162/anafora.v4i2.16.
- PlekhanovGeorgiï Valentinovich. *Art and Social Life*. Aakar Books, 2011,
www.marxists.org/archive/plekhanov/1912/art/index.htm.
- Purkar, Namrata. "Dystopian Writing as a Part of Science Fiction." *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, vol. 4, no. 0976-8165, Oct. 2013, www.the-criterion.com/. Accessed Mar. 2022.
- Ratiani, Irma. *Totalitarianism and Literary Discourse : 20th Century Experience*. 2010. Cambridge Scholars, 2012.
- Ridgwell, Colin Anthony. *The "Popular" Concept of Totalitarianism*. 1970,
core.ac.uk/download/pdf/56370359.pdf.
- Saadoun, Hassane. "'Contrebandiers de L'Histoire' : Boudjedra Persiste et S'explique." *TSA*, 25

- Jan. 2018, www.tsa-algerie.dz/contrebandiers-de-lhistoire-boudjedra-persiste-et-sexplique/.
- Sansal, Boualem. "Boualem Sansal." *L'Express*, 2000, www.lexpress.fr/culture/livre/boualem-sansal_804906.html. Accessed 13 May 2022.
- . "Boualem Sansal : "Je Dénonce Les Religions Lorsqu'elles Prétendent Gouverner La Cité."" *Le DDV*, www.leddv.fr/entretien/boualem-sansal-je-denonce-les-religions-lorsquelles-pretendent-gouverner-la-cite-20220213. Accessed 13 May 2022.
- . "Boualem Sansal : "Je Fais de La Littérature, Pas La Guerre."" *Rue89*, www.nouvelobs.com/rue89/rue89-rue89-culture/20080313.RUE3434/boualem-sansal-je-fais-de-la-litterature-pas-la-guerre.html. Accessed 12 May 2022.
- . "Boualem Sansal. Mon Impardonnable Voyage En Israël." *Tribune Juive*, 19 May 2012, www.tribunejuive.info/2021/07/12/boualem-sansal-mon-impardonnable-voyage-en-israel/. Accessed 11 May 2022.
- . "Boualem Sansal: "Je Suis Islamistophobe, Pas Islamophobe."" *Francetvinfo*, www.francetvinfo.fr/monde/afrique/algerie/boualem-sansal-je-suis-islamistophobe-pas-islamophobe_3065347.html. Accessed 12 May 2022.
- . "Boualem Sansal: Resistance Writer." *Bookanista*, bookanista.com/boualem-sansal/.
- Seeger, Sean, and Daniel Davison-Vecchione. "Dystopian Literature and the Sociological Imagination." *Thesis Eleven*, 16 Nov. 2019, p. 072551361988866, 10.1177/0725513619888664.
- Stroińska, Magda. "LANGUAGE and TOTALITARIAN REGIMES." *Economic Affairs*, vol. 22, no. 2, June 2002, pp. 23–29, 10.1111/1468-0270.00353.
- Syeda, Seema. "War Reporters: George Orwell | Military History Matters." *Www.military-*

- History.org*, 22 July 2019, www.military-history.org/war-reporters/war-reporters-george-orwell.htm. Accessed 11 June 2022.
- Todd, Tony. "Arab Countries Withdraw Prize Reward for Novelist Who Visited Israel." *France 24*, 22 June 2012, www.france24.com/en/20120622-arab-countries-withdraw-reward-novelist-israel-france-literature-palestinians-sansal. Accessed 13 May 2022.
- "Totalitarianism." Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/totalitarianism>. Accessed 31 Mar. 2022.
- Tyson, Lois. *CRITICAL THEORY TODAY : A User-Friendly Guide*. Routledge, 1998.
- "BBC - History - Historic Figures: George Orwell (1903 - 1950)." *Bbc.co.uk*, 2014, www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/orwell_george.shtml.
- "Ideology." *Oxford English Dictionary*, www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/ideology. Accessed 18 Apr. 2022.
- Vurm, Petr. "1984–2084. Faux-Semblants Révélés, Émotions Refoulées : L'amour, La Haine et l'Indifférence à l'Âge Totalitaire Chez George Orwell et Boualem Sansal." *AUC PHILOLOGICA*, vol. 2018, no. 3, 23 Nov. 2018, pp. 193–204, 10.14712/24646830.2018.47. Accessed 5 Mar. 2022.
- Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare*. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1972, archive.org/details/fromutopiatonigh0000wals.
- Walton, Douglas. "(PDF) What Is Propaganda, and What Exactly Is Wrong with It?" *ResearchGate*, Dec. 1996, www.researchgate.net/publication/251886575_What_Is_Propaganda_and_What_Exactly_Is_Wrong_with_It.

Whistler, Simon. "George Orwell: The Uncompromising Visionary." *YouTube*, 29 Nov. 2019, www.youtube.com/watch?v=gfabA0KdniY. Accessed 13 Apr. 2020.

Zuckerman '18, Josh. "Totalitarianism and Dystopian Literature: A Review." *Princeton Tory*, 24 Nov. 2014, theprincetontory.com/totalitarianism-and-dystopian-literature-a-review/. Accessed 2 Apr. 2022.

Résumé

Cette étude représente des différents aspects du totalitarisme comme thème principal dans les œuvres : « 1984 » - George Orwell [1948] et « 2084 : La Fin Du Monde » - Boualem Sansal [2015]. Ce travail met en évidence comment les différentes idéologies des auteurs, enracinées dans de différentes sociétés, ont influencé la manière dont ils ont dépeint le thème en ce qui concerne la nature politique et religieuse du genre dystopique choisi par les auteurs.

Cette étude analyse ainsi l'utilisation et l'abus de la technologie, de la propagande et du langage, ainsi que la représentation du personnage protagoniste dans chaque œuvre, en tant que caractéristiques distinctives représentant le totalitarisme dans les deux romans. De plus, l'étude a mis en lumière les réflexions de ces caractéristiques dans le contexte de l'écriture des deux œuvres. En s'appuyant sur l'approche biographique, cette thèse cherche à comprendre les expériences impliquées dans la construction des idéologies des deux auteurs et comment ils les mettent en œuvre dans leurs romans. L'utilisation de l'approche historique est également substantielle pour comprendre le contexte d'écriture et les différents discours influençant les productions des auteurs et leurs motivations. Enfin, ce travail vise à saisir les différentes motivations des deux auteurs dans leur illustration du thème et à conclure que les perspectives de lecture des deux romans déterminent les intentions de leurs auteurs. En somme, le résultat de cette étude est que les motivations de George Orwell et de Boualem Sansal sont idéologiques.

ملخص

تناقش هذه الدراسة تصوير جوانب متنوعة من التيار الشمولي باعتباره الموضوع الأساسي في كل من كتاب "1984" من تأليف جورج أورويل سنة 1948 وكتاب " 2084 :نهاية العالم" من تأليف بوعلام صنصال سنة 2015. يهدف هذا العمل إلى فهم تأثير أيديولوجيات المؤلفين، كونهما ينحدران من مجتمعين مختلفين، على الطريقة التي صوروا بها موضوعهم وما يستتبعه من خلفيات سياسية ودينية لأدب الواقع المرير الذي سبق وان اعتمده. و تحلل هذه الدراسة الإستخدام -خاصة السيئ منه- للتكنولوجيا والدعاية المغرضة وكذلك اللغة، وتصوير الشخصية الرئيسية على أنها مجموعة من السمات التي تمثل الشمولية في كلتا الروايتين. كما تلقي هذه الدراسة الضوء على انعكاسات تلك السمات وتأثيرها على سياق كتابة العملين. و باتباع نهج قائم على السيرة الذاتية، تسعى هذه المذكرة إلى فهم التجارب التي ينطوي عليها تكوين أيديولوجيات المؤلفين و نقلهم لها في رواياتهم. وهذا لا يستبعد أهمية استخدام النهج التاريخي لفهم سياق الكتابة والخطابات المختلفة التي تؤثر على إنتاجات المؤلفين ودوافعهم. في الأخير، يهدف هذا العمل إلى فهم دوافع كلا المؤلفين باختلافهما في تصويرهما للموضوع واستنتاج أن ما يحدد نوايا الكاتب هو المنظور الذي يقرأ من خلاله العمل. و عليه كانت نتيجة هذه الدراسة أن دوافع كلا من جورج أورويل و بوعلام صنصال أيديولوجية بحتة.