

INTELLECTUAL ASYMMETRICAL WARFARE: (AB)USE OF DYSTOPIAN
LITERATURE IN WESTERN MEDIA AND LITERARY CIRCLES



OZAN AYDIN

JUNE,

2021

INTELLECTUAL ASYMMETRICAL WARFARE: (AB)USE OF DYSTOPIAN
LITERATURE IN WESTERN MEDIA AND LITERARY CIRCLES

BY

OZAN AYDIN



DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

IN

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY JUNE, 2021

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 20.05.2012

Name/Surname: Ozan Aydın

Signature :

ABSTRACT

Since the masterpiece of Thomas More, *Utopia*, the concept of a perfectly balanced and harmonious society, has been a concept that took place in both literary works and the political arenas. On the other end of the spectrum, within the first half of twentieth century, the concept of dystopia emerged, not as a reaction to the utopian concept, but more in a way to reflect on the negatives that await the societies in the future in case that the status quo in the eyes of the author continues to be maintained. While the genre of dystopian novel did not receive critical acclaim until the latter half of the twentieth century, it was utilized in ways that are not purely for the sake of art and literature. Specifically, after the Second World War, during the Cold War era, western media noticed the concept of dystopian novel and utilized it in an unprecedented way. While the use of literary works to influence societies have been commonplace since the Roman Empire, this was not for having the audiences to enjoy the work of art, but rather create a monster that haunts people after reading it. This thesis is going to explain how George Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* and Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* have been discovered by the western ideology and how they are used in order to create a demonic image of the Soviet Union, using the most unconventional methods available at their disposal.

Key words: Mass Media, Dystopian Novel, George Orwell, Cold War, Yevgeny Zamyatin

ÖZET

Thomas More' un başyapıtı olan *Ütopya*' dan bu yana, içerisinde yaşayan her insanın kusursuz bir denge ve uyum içerisinde var olduğu toplumlar, hem edebi eserlerde, hem de politik çevrelerde tartışılmaktadır. Diğer bir taraftan ise, yirminci yüzyılın ilk yarısında, distopya kavramı, ütopyalara bir tepki olmaktan öte, yazarın gözündeki statükonun varlığını sürdürmesi halinde toplumları bekleyen muhtemel olumsuzlukların yansıtılması amacıyla ortaya çıkmıştır. Distopik romanlar, yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısına dek anaakım okuyucu kitlelerine erişmemiş olsa da, bu süreçte, sanat ve edebiyat haricinde pek çok alanda kullanılmışlardır. Özellikle, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında ve Soğuk Savaş döneminde, batı medyası, distopik romanları keşfetmiş ve eşi benzeri görülmedik bir şekilde kendi amaçlarına yönelik olarak kullanmıştır. Edebi eserlerin, toplumu yönetmek adına kullanımı, Antik Roma uygarlığından bu yana süregelen bir eylem olmakla birlikte, bahsi geçen dönemdeki eylem, izleyici kitlelerinin, sanatın keyfini çıkarmasını değil, okuyucunun zihninde peşini bırakmayacak bir canavarın yaratılmasını hedeflemiştir. Söz konusu araştırma, George Orwell' in *1984* ve Yevgeni Zamyatin' in *Biz* isimli romanlarının batı ideolojisince keşfedilmesi, ve ellerindeki en sıradışı imkanları dahi devreye sokarak, Sovyetler Birliği' ni bir canavar gibi göstermek için kullanılması üzerine bir araştırma olacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kitleli Medya, Distopik Roman, George Orwell, Soğuk Savaş, Yevgeni Zamyatin

To everyone who believed in me



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to his supervisor, Prof. Dr. Mediha Göbenli Koç, for her continued guidance, encouragement and feedback throughout the research.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE OF EARLIER TWENTIETH CENTURY	3
2.1. Changes in Europe Following the Industrial Revolution	4
2.2. The Bolshevik Revolution – The Ripples of Socialism	5
2.3. Western Response – Rise of Nationalism in Culture After Two Wars	7
3. ARTISTIC PRODUCTION IN A POLARIZED WORLD	10
3.1. Art After “The War to End All Wars”	11
3.1.1. Creation of New Genres and the Concept of Dystopia	13
3.1.2. Intellectual Response to Rising Nationalism	14
3.1.3. Deviation from Freedom – Suppression of Free Speech in Bolshevik Soviet Union	19
3.2. Zamyatin’s Role in the Political Literature	25
3.3. Persona Non Grata – Orwell’s Search Of “Belonging” and Critical Production	31
4. A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE INTO <i>NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR</i> AND <i>WE</i>	36
5. DISCOVERY OF DYSTOPIAN GENRE.....	47
5.1. Why We Read?.....	49
5.2. Zamyatin and the Roots.....	52
5.3. Orwell and the Mainstream	59
5.4. Intellectual Utilization – Discovery Of Dystopias By The West	66
5.5. A Generation Of Bias – Results Of Long-Standing Misunderstandings.....	76
6. CONCLUSION.....	80
REFERENCES	84

1. INTRODUCTION

Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind.

George Orwell, Politics and the English Language

As Walter Benjamin touches on his *Thesis on the History of Philosophy*, throughout the centuries, those who have been victors have been able to write and manipulate the history as they see fit (Benjamin, 2007, p. 256). When this undeniable fact was voiced by a senator of Confederate state of Missouri, George Graham Vest, in 1891, it was only observed in a small portion of a local newspaper, *Parsons Daily Eclipse* printed in Kansas, in the United States of America. Yet, years later, as we see the words attributed to Winston Churchill himself, it is only natural to admire the accuracy of this seemingly anonymous adage. As twentieth century dawned, the world was in a political and social turmoil. All familiar borders and limitations to what people could build were becoming obsolete, and, thanks to the Industrial Revolution communication was becoming available even for the common people. Information and knowledge were slowly turning into accessible concepts for anyone who pursued. Two wars, almost half a century and millions of casualties later, art and literature has transformed in such a way that it was not only for the delight of the elite as it was perceived throughout the middle ages until the nineteenth century, but also for the enlightenment of masses.

This transformation was largely due to the creation of new genres and emergence of new theories that were providing a perspective for the re-interpretation of established artistic values and concepts. Brecht's views and style revolutionized the staging of theater, and long before him, Marx and Engels were providing their input on the production of art. In the midst of all this, in British fiction, the genre of "dystopia" was emerging in full and while the term

became synonymous with George Orwell in the latter half of the twentieth century, well before than his masterpiece of *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*, authors like Aldous Huxley were paving the way for this new, futuristic and macabre genre of literature. The genre seemed to be dealing with various possible dangers of future, and in Orwell's case, authoritarian states to the extent of controlling and manipulating the concepts of truth, lie and history itself in general. Thus, when *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* was published, it was quickly perceived to be the perfect material for planting the seeds of anti-Communist ideologies by the intelligence circles in the minds of the readers. As this thesis is going to benefit from Frances Stonor Saunders' masterpiece, *The Cultural Cold War*, regarding the impact of intelligence agencies in the United States of America in the world of literature and arts.

On the other end of the spectrum, a Russian naval officer decided to become an author and produced a book with a very unobtrusive name. Yevgeny Ivanovich Zamyatin completed his work on *We* in 1921 yet, being a staunch Old Bolshevik himself, his work was banned by the Soviet Union's censorship board. Becoming a political dissident within the Soviet Union following his smuggling of *We* to western publishers to be printed, Zamyatin eventually left the country and his work was not available in his mother tongue for more than half a century. Considering the bold statement from Cohen et al. in their 1943 research, *National Literatures and Universalist Ideals*, "As art, there is hardly a greater literature than the Russian" (p. 908) for the likes of Tolstoy, Pushkin and Dostoyevsky, while a similar conclusion can be drawn for Zamyatin for his creation of a new genre, it is safe to say that it was a difficult time for dystopian literature to gain a widespread audience in the Soviet Union territory. Despite the fact that the book was first published well before the dystopian genre appeared in the British fiction, it would not be fair to oversee the effects Zamyatin had in the development of the genre. While Orwell acknowledged his inspiration from Zamyatin's book when he was working on *Nineteen-Eighty-Four*, Huxley denied this inspiration. Yet, the typological and

even genetical similarities between the *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* and *We* become strikingly clear when observed closely.

While the main focus will be on the “intellectual asymmetrical warfare” conducted between the Soviet Union and the Western states during the Cold War and its effects on British fiction writing, specifically the dystopian genre, this thesis will not solely include a typological comparison¹ between a Soviet dystopia and a British one. Instead, it is the aim of this researcher to provide a deeper insight into the abuse of the political conflict and the Western intelligence leaning on the newly-founded genre as an ideological weapon of mass destruction. Examination of the political atmosphere of the first half of the twentieth century and the polarization of the world will be the primary background for this work and, as its intended result, it is the author’s aim to provide a deeper insight into how art can be (and even still is) used for the manipulation of the masses in line with the ideological agendas of governments.

2. POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE OF EARLIER TWENTIETH CENTURY

While there is a considerable amount of controversy still present in the definition of the twentieth century by historians, this thesis will take Eric Hobsbawm’s theories and perspective as its primary framework when it comes to the timeline of events. In his book, *The Age of Extremes, The Short Twentieth Century 1914 - 1991*, Hobsbawm takes a different approach from the traditional perspective of using the year of 1900 as the turn of the century and considers the beginning of the twentieth century as 1914, with the outbreak of the First World War. Although it looks like an unorthodox point of view at first, it becomes much more clear and well-merited as one delves deeper into his theory. This chapter and the following sub-chapters will provide an analysis of the era and how the political atmosphere,

¹ Typological comparison is fundamentally the comparison between two literary works of art written under similar socioeconomical conditions, in terms of their similarities as they yield finalized results that are analogous to each other, regardless of the interactions between authors.

as well as the events unfolded during the time, paved the way for the dystopian genre to be created with all the catastrophic events and tragedies going hand-in-hand with developments.

2.1. Changes in Europe Following the Industrial Revolution

Following the Industrial Revolution, it would be only fair to conclude that the world has undergone an unprecedented change throughout the better part of the nineteenth century. Although it was not political by any means, the Industrial Revolution arguably started the process of dissolution for former empires longing for their days of glory. Ottoman Empire and Tsarist Russia were two primary examples for that, as the former being an expansionist empire while the latter relied heavily on the production of the rural areas. Being an empire that was built on exploitation of colonies, the British Empire was the main benefactor of the revolution, which also originated from its lands; and this enabled them to accumulate an economic power that was seemingly unmatched throughout the continental Europe. The rise of the European civilization has begun and the shift of power from Asia, such as in the example of the fall of Ottoman Empire with the difficulties it experienced both financially and militarily, also manifested itself in culture. In his book *The Age of Empire, 1875 – 1914*, Eric Hobsbawm makes a bold claim for empires both in Europe and Asia, stating that they would be seen as “doomed to fail” by the believers of Social Darwinism (Hobsbawm, 1989, pp. 277-278). Claiming that the breakdown of these empires would pave the way for both the revolutions of 1910-14 in Europe and in Russian Empire (Hobsbawm, 1989, p. 278) Hobsbawm presents a picturesque definition of this freshly-constructed European civilization of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century:

This civilization was capitalist in its economy; liberal in its legal and constitutional structure; bourgeois in the image of its characteristic hegemonic class; glorying in the advance of science, knowledge and education, material and moral progress; and profoundly convinced of the centrality of Europe, birthplace of the revolutions of the

sciences, arts, politics and industry, whose economy had penetrated, and whose soldiers had conquered and subjugated most of the world; whose populations had grown until (including the vast and growing outflow of European emigrants and their descendants) they had risen to form a third of the human race; and whose major states constituted the system of world politics (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 6).

Personally, I would argue that this would be the most accurate and complete description of the Western Civilization of the late-nineteenth century. The continental Europe was undergoing a considerable change, and specifically the British Empire and France were becoming prominent actors at this stage. At this point, Hobsbawm provides another noteworthy insight for his audience, stating that between 1815 and 1914, there were no major conflicts between two major powers in their immediate regions, yet aggressive expeditions and colonization was prevalent (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 23). These colonial efforts and expeditions will be significant for this research, as one of the authors in discussion for this research, George Orwell, served under the British forces in Burma, contributing to shaping his political views. Hobsbawm calls these expeditions and fighting as “the stuff of adventure literature” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 23) and there is a certain point being made. The power imbalance was becoming more and more evident as years passed and the effects of the industrial revolution were observed throughout. This also reflected on the social production of the continent, with the dawn of new movements and genres, such as modernism, structuralism and dystopias, the latter to be analyzed further in detail.

2.2. The Bolshevik Revolution – The Ripples of Socialism

In Neil Faulkner’s *A People’s History of the Russian Revolution*, one sentence clearly paints the picture of the October Revolution and how it manifested itself; “When a loaf can induce tears, revolution is close” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 113). Although this aforementioned quote is provided in the book regarding the February Revolution against the Tsar, this

particular sentence echoed through my mind as I continued my research regarding the October Revolution of 1917, as this was the most picturesque definition of how Tsarist Russia came to an end and how people gathered behind an idea that empowered them after centuries of imperial oppression and hardships. For the sake of this research, it is impossible to comb through every detail that Faulkner provides in his book, as it would extend this thesis beyond the acceptable limitations, yet his account of the days towards the revolution and the background he provides is immensely valuable for any researcher who is willing to follow a similar path to this thesis. As for Faulkner's reports in his book, it is absolutely possible to draw similarities between the French Revolution and the days leading to the October Revolution in Russia. He does not hold himself back pointing that similarity out as well.

The peasants rolled into action in the manner of all the great land-wars of the past. Manor houses were looted and burned. Grain was seized and livestock driven off. Farm machines and tools were carried away. Whatever could not be taken was smashed (Faulkner, 2017, p. 176).

This particular similarity is highly important as Faulkner is not the only person finding similarities between the October Revolution and French Revolution. Faulkner's grim picture of pre-revolution Russia and peasantry provides a researcher with plenty to discuss, and while it may be the most detailed account of the events that is recently published, Hobsbawm takes the discussion another step further, claiming that "the October revolution had far more profound and global repercussions than its ancestor" (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 55). He also claims that "[the Russian Revolution] became an event as central to the history of this century as the French Revolution of 1789 was to the nineteenth century" (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 55). Yet, following up on Hobsbawm's research into the period, one particular sentence becomes eye-catching. Hobsbawm claims that the Revolution in March 1917, the February Revolution against the Tsar, "was universally hailed by all Western political opinion other than the most

rock-ribbed traditionalist reactionaries” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 57). Here lies the key question that has driven me to have a separate chapter solely for the analysis of the Russian Revolution. While the February Revolution is viewed as a positive one by the Western opinion almost unequivocally due to the abolishment of the Tsar, why would another revolution and its outcome, namely the October Revolution and the formation of Soviet Union, would turn out to be the arch-nemesis of the Western opinion?

This question can be read and answered in a handful of ways. From a Marxist perspective, the answer can arguably be that the October Revolution posed a direct threat to the bourgeoisie and the liberal/capitalist ideology of the ruling class in Western world and it had every reason to do so. Hobsbawm points that out as well, noting that “Karl Marx himself, at the end of his life, had hoped that a Russian revolution might act as a sort of detonator, [...] in the industrially more developed Western countries [...]” (Hobsbawm, 1995, pp. 57-58). This might hold the key of how the Western intelligentsia leaped onto the genre of dystopian fiction as a branch to hold on in a stream, as they found a new way of “justifying” themselves, specifically in Zamyatin’s publishing of *We* outside of Soviet Russia, in their portrayal of Socialism and Soviet Union as the ultimate danger to the Western lifestyle in the minds of the young generation.

2.3. Western Response – Rise of Nationalism in Culture After Two Wars

It would be a fair and accurate definition to name the second half of the twentieth century as one of the most polarized and controversial periods of the human civilization history. Two world wars and about forty years later, almost no country was in a better off situation when compared to the time before the two great wars, except for the USA, arguably. As the second half of the century witnessed a long period of sustained hostility, aptly called “the Cold War” and plenty of close-calls with mutually assured destructions, i.e., Cuban Missile Crisis, it naturally brings a significant rise in nationalistic approaches and ideologies

on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Yet, due to the scope of this research, the focus on this chapter will mainly be on the events unfolding between the United States and the Soviet Union following the Second World War.

Hobsbawm describes the changes in the international political scene after the Second World War in three different categories. First, it eliminated all the political turmoil and rivalries before the Second World War. Second, the events after the Second World War and during the Cold War actually stabilized the world as both sides actually tried their best to avoid a mutually assured destruction. Third, the world entered an arms race that was unprecedented (Hobsbawm, 1995, pp. 252-254). Indeed, the effects of the Cold War is felt throughout Europe, yet as Hobsbawm also points out, “Stabilization did not mean peace” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 252). Armed conflicts throughout the world were either fueled or supported by the two global superpowers that represent two polarized ideologies, and while it was a considerably silent period for the Western European countries such as France, which was almost completely destroyed during the Second World War, countries that are not directly connected to the continental Europe were in almost constant instability. But while Western Europe was trying to dress its wounds and rebuild itself from the ashes and rubble it has been reduced with the Second World War, the political and social agenda was much more different in the United States and the Soviet Union.

The United States positioned the Soviet Union as an existential threat to itself and used the rhetoric to the extent that most of its citizens thought of the Soviet Union as the anathema. Indeed, as Hobsbawm also suggests, the United States was built on individualism (Americanism) and it would be an antonym of communism in any given dictionary. The political stage was in such a shape that any single person who is good with words could instigate the fear of “Reds” that were threatening the American lifestyle and this rhetoric was read and heard by the public to the extent that it can be labelled as an abuse of power and

authority. Nationalistic ideas went hand in hand with the religious stances as well, as the Soviet Union was essentially considered as an “atheist state” by the American public and communism was considered synonymous with “anti-Christ”, this rhetoric echoed in the minds of each and every American citizen. Also, the experiences of Eastern European immigrants from Soviet satellite states fueled this movement of nationalist and religious “Americanists” and made them hold onto their beliefs with even more strength. Considering the fact that the American politics were shaped in accordance with the anti-communist agendas and even presidents were elected in the name of fighting the “good fight” against the threat of communism, with Kennedy and Reagan being the prime examples of this, it is safe to say that the political stage of the United States and the actors of it were the primary beneficiaries of the Cold War and everything it brought with itself.

On the other side of the spectrum, the USSR had its own problems. Although the ruling conditions were fundamentally different than the US and the west in general, the lack of elections did not mean a smooth sailing process for the USSR after the Second World War and during the Cold War. While the mainland Russia was somewhat stable, as Hobsbawm also suggests, the USSR’s “capacity to assert itself within [the friendly and satellite regimes] was far less” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 253). The regime and the ideology it represented was failing to cope with the capitalism towards the end of the Cold War era, and however hard Moscow tried its best to stay afloat both politically and economically, they failed to address the problems lying at the core of the economies of the member nations of the Union. In essence, as Hobsbawm also suggests, “it was not the hostile confrontation with capitalism and its superpower [but] a combination of its own increasingly evident and crippling economic defects and the accelerating invasion [...] by the far more dynamic, advanced and dominant capitalist world economy” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 251). But how did both superpowers, although only one of them survived the Cold War, cope with the vast amount of internal and

external difficulties that they faced? How did they actually manage to maintain a façade of strength and power during an arms race that almost crippled the whole global economy to one of its strongest crises?

Keyword being “façade” here, the answer is simply propaganda for both sides. While the USSR was much more disconnected from the continental Europe, it did not refrain from the use of the propaganda machine in order to maintain its position as a global superpower. Arms race was one of the methods used by both sides, and its effects can still be observed throughout the globe even after half a decade passed the end of the Cold War. Space race was another method employed by both superpowers, and billions of dollars were put into project after project in order to reach the Moon first. Yet, while all these public relations stunts were employed by both sides, it is beyond any sort of argument that the Western powers made the media and world of art their ideological servants, using every possible method they can to manifest the USSR as the root of all evil against the civilization. The methods they applied will be analyzed further in the following chapter of this thesis.

3. ARTISTIC PRODUCTION IN A POLARIZED WORLD

While the world was divided into two opposing superpowers and their struggles to dominate the political stage, art also had its fair share of influence from the events unfolded during the second half of twentieth century. Following the British Industrial Revolution which transformed the globe and all the means of production alongside with it, modern approaches started to manifest themselves in each and every branch of art. The introduction of motion picture was a revolution in itself, yet the transformation was not limited to it. All branches of art, such as theatre and literature, were undergoing a significant change in themselves and artists were questioning the long-standing traditions that remained as a solid constant throughout the history of art. As Walter Benjamin also suggests in his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*; the reproduction of art “advanced intermittently and

in leaps at long intervals, but with accelerated intensity” (Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, 2007, p. 218). While the ability to reproduce manmade works of art with far less effort was an important development and achievement in itself, the ideological movements and changes came with the dawn of twentieth century had even more far-reaching consequences. Modernism changed the perspective artists employed to see the world and it still poses a significant importance in art almost a decade after its emergence. This chapter will analyze the changes that came to life in art with the dawn of twentieth century, specifically in literature, and how these changes shaped the newly-founded genre, dystopian fiction, and its authors in terms of world views and ideologies.

3.1. Art After “The War to End All Wars”

In retrospect, it is only fair to claim that the period between the two world wars shaped the art forms that are still accepted and adopted today by artists in a variety of fields. Alongside with the creation and exponential growth of new mediums, such as cinema and television to name a few, the accepted forms and boundaries were slowly becoming a concept of the past, yet far from evoking a feeling of nostalgia. On the contrary, artists of the time were actually revolting against the established norms of the art, and the avantgarde of the nineteenth century was becoming the mainstream of the twentieth century.

It is important to discuss the various types of artistic production before settling on the main scope of this research in order to gain a clearer understanding of the movements that were taking place during the first half of the twentieth century. While modernism was the prominent movement that functioned like an umbrella that covered all the different types that emerged from within, it would be an oversimplifying approach to dismiss the shifts in the artistic world by solely calling them a move towards the modern. While cinema, and the invention of television later, revolutionized the entertainment industry and functioned like Prometheus, taking art from the elite and bringing it to the masses, it is even possible to claim

that they were the socialist revolution of the entertainment industry. While they are not considered branches of high art and utilized in order to shape the ideologies of their audiences in ways beyond imagination during the latter half of the century, which will be analyzed in detail in the following chapters, it is only fair to assume that their influence during the first half of the century was no shorter than the invention of the radio and radio dramas broadcast to the public for the first time.

Just as well as the changes in the mediums, the changes in the methods of expression were manifest during the first half of twentieth century as well. In architecture, for instance, functionality was becoming the primary focus of the building designs and use of ornate elements was in decline. Alongside with those aforementioned branches, high art was also undergoing a period of transformation as well. Brecht was revolutionizing theatre and introducing the “alienation effect” to his audiences, transforming the experience of theatre as a whole. In the scene of painting, Dali was subverting the established norms of painting with his liquescent pocket watches. Duchamp was using a public urinal as a piece of “ready-made art” and, also with surrealism, scandalous pieces to evoke the feeling of shock, or even disgust for a nineteenth century art enthusiast were becoming the new form of art.

Apathy towards the established norms was a conscious decision and a revolutionary stance against the bourgeoisie high arts in the first half of the twentieth century, and fictional prose was no different than the aforementioned when it came to the discovery of new methods of delivery. Topics and plots were undergoing significant transformations and intertextuality was starting to manifest itself all the more visibly. While there were re-interpretations of old, even ancient texts, such as *Sons and Lovers* by D. H. Lawrence, were challenging the established forms and norms of traditional literature, the rejection was not limited to the literary styles that were acceptable for the bourgeoisie audiences. A tidal wave of literary revolution was on the horizon, and it was during that period when Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia*

was written from an opposing point of view. Dystopias were coming on to literary stage, and they were about to make their impact.

3.1.1. Creation of New Genres and the Concept of Dystopia

While their primary appearances can be traced back to the last few years of the nineteenth century, new and provocative forms of literary texts started appearing throughout the European literatures like a wildfire during the first half of the twentieth century. Yet, as Hobsbawm suggests, modernism has an “undefined canopy” (Hobsbawm, 1995, p. 178) and while these new methods and stances presented by the authors of the earlier twentieth century can be described as the footsteps of modernism in literature, it would be overly simplistic and even dismissive. The ever-present controversy on modernism enables it to be applied in a vast spectrum of topics, movements and ideas, and with the ambiguity of Modernism, a new genre, dystopias were born.

This brings the question of how the emergence of dystopian fiction was brought onto the literary stage. Indeed, the genre is broadly defined as the polar opposite of utopian fiction, first created by Sir Thomas More as aforementioned, yet even today, with almost a quarter of the twenty-first century is history, the dystopian literature in fact never gained its long-deserved attention from the literary critics. Even today, it becomes more evident as most of the texts that are studied in this genre are famous novels by Huxley, Bradbury and Orwell. It is beyond any doubt that without their contributions, dystopian fiction would struggle to gain the audience it has today. Yet, prior to the discussion of the functions of dystopian literature and how it became an instrument of ideological superweapon through the course of twentieth century, it is critical to clarify the definition of the genre, which is often confused by even an educated person of letters.

As aforementioned, while Orwell, Huxley and Bradbury are the authors that enabled the dystopian fiction to achieve its preeminent status in the twentieth century literature, the

line between dystopian fiction and political satire is often blurred in the eyes of a common reader and oftentimes, albeit mistakenly, it is even used in an interchangeable manner. While they are seen and evaluated within the framework of the same genre, even a common reader with no prior education on literature would be able to distinguish the features that differentiate *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell, *We* by Yevgeny Zamyatin or *Fahrenheit 451* by Ray Bradbury between *The Iron Heel* by Jack London and *The Time Machine* of H.G. Wells. While the latter examples functioned more in a way of a foreshadowing of a distant future where the world is in a complete disarray, the focus has not been primarily the political conditions and situation. On the other hand, authors such as Orwell, Zamyatin, Bradbury and Huxley included in their novels a focus on the possible future political problems that could and still can be observed, such as the caste system in India reproduced in Huxley's *Brave New World*. As this thesis focuses on the functions (and even abuse) of the political satire sub-genre of dystopian fiction, the examples focusing on the science-fiction elements of the genre will be left out of its scope, yet, by any means, the aim is not to categorize these masterpieces and discuss whether they are dystopian arts or not. The focus will primarily be on the political employment of the two books, *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in the following chapters.

3.1.2. Intellectual Response to Rising Nationalism

As the twentieth century dawned, as previously mentioned in this text, the politically turbulent atmosphere was a manifest condition throughout the world, yet it was even more so in the disintegrating empires of the Medieval ages that lasted for centuries as they stood against the test of time, albeit mere ghosts or shells of their former glory. As an example, the Ottoman Empire ceased its existence following the First World War, and while its official date of dissolution is accepted as the end of the WWI, the disarray was easy to observe even before the war began. This obvious condition brings the researcher of this thesis to the

question of why this disintegration was hastened after the First World War, named as “The War to end all wars” yet fell short on its promise in each and every way possible.

The answer to this is the rise of nationalistic ideas following the war and after the disintegration of the centralized power of the empires, mainly with the emergence of a nation-state idea after the French Revolution in 1789. Indeed, it would be an overly simplistic approach to solely blame the concept of nationalism for everything negative that the Third World experienced between the two wars, yet it is beyond question that this ideology played a significant role in the formation of the political stage that affects our everyday lives even today. In order to proceed, it is necessary to look into the definition of nationalism and how it is conceived in the twenty-first century, almost two centuries after its first emergence. I would like to provide two viewpoints on nationalism that are different in each and every aspect before moving on with the intellectual response to the nationalistic surges during the time between the two world wars, and its effect on dystopian genre.

In 2020, in his book *Communication and Capitalism: A Critical Theory*, Christian Fuchs² described nationalism as “a particular ideology that tries to distract attention from capitalism, the class conflict, and the societal causes of social problems.” (Fuchs, 2020, p. 236) Fuchs does not refrain from expressing his political viewpoints and explicitly states that his book is following the footsteps of Hobsbawm, Marx, and the Frankfurt School (Fuchs, 2020, p. 235). He goes further to claim that nationalism is “not a natural feature of humanity and society” (Fuchs, 2020, p. 235) and follows:

In modern society, the nation takes on the form of the nation-state, the national economy, and cultural institutions that are organised within the nation-state.

National spaces, such as the national economy, the nation-state, and national

² Fuchs is a professor of sociology at the University of Westminster, also the editor of journals as well as a prolific author of books on contemporary sociocultural analysis.

culture, have a boundary that defines the inside and the outside of the nation. This means that all nations define their membership. They include citizens and exclude others (Fuchs, 2020, p. 236).

Considering his claims, it is easy to understand where Fuchs takes his stance in the definition and understanding of nationalism in the twenty-first century. In his book, he provides an in-depth analysis of nation-states throughout the centuries, and it is a great source to find out more regarding the historical development of nationalism. Yet, there is one more person I would like to mention his ideas about nationalism, and it will be from the opposite side of the political spectrum from where Christian Fuchs stands and represents.

In 2017, an academic and an active researcher at the New America Foundation³, Anatol Lieven published an article, sternly opposing the Marxist stance against the concept of nationalism and national identity. His claims are based on the foundation he puts forward as that “The strongest states in Asia today are those with strong nationalisms, which are central to the legitimacy not only of the present regimes but of the states themselves” (Lieven, 2017, p. 21). According to him, a national identity that is too weak is as dangerous as having one too strong, and he claimed that the Marxist dream of disintegration of national borders is a “dream now dying in the West” (Lieven, 2017, p. 21). Also, “nationalism therefore worked for EU and NATO expansion and, for a while, for democracy and economic reform in a way that it cannot possibly do in other parts of the world” (Lieven, 2017, p. 23) for Lieven and although his article is focusing on a contemporary understanding of nationalism, his claim of “The New Nationalism aimed at solidarity across class, ethnicity and religion (and now needs to be extended across the races), but it was most emphatically not multicultural, and insisted on loyalty to the nation as a fundamental principle” regarding the nineteenth century is worth

³ The New America Foundation is a think tank group focusing on social issues.

noting. Obviously, for Lieven, a national identity was much more important than having a class consciousness.

All those claims provide an understanding how concepts such as globalization and nationalism are understood in various parts of the world, specifically with the backgrounds that these researchers have. Fuchs is an Austrian researcher and coming from a culture that had its roots in the Age of Empire, as Hobsbawm calls it, and experienced the horrors of both world wars being one of the central stages for them. The representative of the other side of the spectrum, Lieven is a British researcher who has spoken at locations such as the US Congress and have produced works on various topics that would be sympathetic for a conservative Western mindset, and it is understandable why he has an opposing stance against the Marxist theories and approach.

Thus, we are now faced with the question of how nationalism affected the world of arts, specifically literature. Hobsbawm notes that the “avant-garde arts were still a concept confined to the culture of Europe and its outliers and dependencies [...] (and) the non-European avant-garde barely existed outside of the western hemisphere, where it was firmly anchored to both artistic experiment and social revolution” (Hobsbawm, 1995, pp. 190-191). Indeed, there was barely anything beyond canonical and “state-approved” arts outside of the continental Europe, yet here, Hobsbawm’s claim seems dismissive towards the impact that these smaller blips on the artistic radar made on the world of arts in general, and specifically in the latter half of the twentieth century. After all, before Orwell wrote his masterpiece *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or Huxley published his *Brave New World*, Zamyatin’s *We* was a striking example how the seemingly avant-garde arts outside the western hemisphere would affect the global stage in arts.

It is important to bear in mind that Orwell acknowledged the fact that he was appreciative regarding Zamyatin and his work in *We*, calling it “a book to look out for when

an English version appears” (Orwell, 1968, p. 75) as well as considering his review of the book was in parallel with the time period he was writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. That interaction could be the topic for another research in itself, yet regardless of his own progress on *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell calls out Huxley for deriving his *Brave New World* from Zamyatin’s *We* in more than one aspect (Orwell, *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: In Front of Your Nose*, 1968, p. 73). While there is no direct acknowledgement of his inspiration from Zamyatin, the possible typological comparison between the two authors and their novels is striking. Both novels are written in the aftermath of wars in similar socioeconomical conditions, both envisioned a future where authoritarianism was the sole survivor of the political scene, and both had a distant empire built on fears and lack of anything resembling human. Yet, a typological comparison is not the only kind of connection that can be established between the two pioneers of the dystopian genre. It is highly important to bear in mind that both authors have been deemed “undesirable” due to the content of their writings for years, Zamyatin’s book was banned throughout the Soviet Union and Orwell was confined to the peripheries of the literary world, and both of them were utilized in the later years during the Cold War within the mills of the great Western propaganda machine in order to stain the arch-nemesis of the western, capitalist lifestyle, the Soviet Union. Before moving on with the political utilization of the dystopian genre in general, and those two authors in particular, it is important to take an analytical and in-depth look into how they became “the undesirables” of political literature. Specifically, Zamyatin’s fall from grace has a considerable significance here, as he turned his back on Soviet ideals following the publication of his manuscript of *We*. The next chapter will focus on him turning into a dissident in an unexpected turn of events.

3.1.3. Deviation from Freedom – Suppression of Free Speech in Bolshevik Soviet Union

Born as the result of a revolution that promised to take the power from the hands of the oligarchs and the elite few and bring it to people, it is a particularly grim view to observe how Soviet Union became a bureaucratic, corrupt shell of itself, specifically following Lenin's death. In order to understand the title for this sub-chapter and how revolutionary ideas of Lenin was thrown away when the time was right, as well as the difficulties that made Zamyatin the "persona non grata" for Soviet Union, it is necessary to put the period following Lenin's death under the microscope, without omitting any political criticism that should be mentioned. In his book, Faulkner's description for Lenin as "a poignant symbol of the decay of revolutionary hope" (Faulkner, 2017, p. 238) due to his health conditions stand out significantly. Considered as the symbol and face of revolution by the masses, it is beyond any debate that Lenin's illnesses and subsequent death left behind such a power vacuum that anyone with a considerable support could take over the reins in the newly-founded Bolshevik Republic. The death of such an authoritative and prominent figure would be difficult for any nation that is trying to establish itself after decades-long turmoil, yet Faulkner paints the grim situation in which the new Soviet Republic was in a picturesque detail.

The Russian Revolution was left isolated, surrounded by enemies, devastated by war, and impoverished by economic collapse. Struggling to survive in desperate conditions, the Bolshevik regime turned in on itself and, in time, morphed into a hideous mockery of its former socialist ideals (Faulkner, 2017, p. 238).

In the early years of 1920's, during the last years of Lenin as the leader of the Bolshevik Party, it is perfectly observable that the revolutionary, unifying spirit that followed the October Revolution was fading away. In fact, there was a double-headedness that was manifesting itself further on a daily basis. Faulkner describes the period as one in which "two main class forces dominated Russian life: the peasantry, now in control of the land, and the

party-state bureaucracy” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 239). The bureaucracy was, although the land still belonged to the peasantry, gaining a stronger foothold in the everyday politics due to the constant increase of the numbers in the Bolshevik Party. Faulkner claims that “it was the only way to get a job and earn a living” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 239) and this condition of pragmatical enrollment was becoming a destructive force within the Party itself. Lenin observed this, and during the last months of his life, he struggled to make a last-minute effort to make a change. This bureaucracy of the party-state “required a boorish bureaucrat” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 241) and it was no one else than Joseph Stalin, the Secretary-General of the Party at that time.

Here, Faulkner’s description for the period requires a mention. He claims that the new world that was dawning on the horizon was “a bureaucratic dystopia more in keeping with a Kafka novel than a Marxist tract” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 242) and leaving the use of the concept of dystopia aside, this can be argued as one of the best descriptions that is made regarding the time when Stalin rose to power. In December 1925, during the Fourteenth Party Congress, the newly-founded bureaucratic group finally found its political voice and announced the doctrine of “socialism in one country”. As Faulkner also suggests, this was a total abolishment of the original Marxist traditions (Faulkner, 2017, p. 243). This new doctrine, which can also be read as “national socialism” according to Faulkner (2017, p. 244), was contradictory in itself, yet for Stalin, forming a new group of bureaucratic oligarchs was the best method to keep the power in his own hands.

In the midst of all this turmoil, an author who sided with the Bolshevik Party during the October Revolution, became one of the first “undesirables” of the “new” Soviet Russia. It was no one else than Yevgeny Zamyatin, a former naval engineer who turned into an author, one who defined a whole new genre, and became a political dissident with his novel following the rise of Stalin. Being active in the revolution of 1905, he could be considered as one of the “Old Guard” members of the Bolshevik Party if it was not for the rise of the new bureaucratic

and almost tyrannical system that came to life with Stalin. In order to understand his transition from a member and a staunch supporter of the Bolshevik Party towards a political dissident, it is worth reading Mirra Ginsburg's introduction to Zamyatin in her translation of *The Dragon: Fifteen Stories*.

Ginsburg is an essential figure in this research as throughout the world, as most of the research into Zamyatin is based on her translation and editing of Zamyatin's works. She provides an in-depth explanation of Zamyatin's mindset into politics, into literature, arts and how he looked at the humanity in general. In the "Translator's Introduction" part of *The Dragon: Fifteen Stories*, Ginsburg portrays Zamyatin as a champion of positive thought and one of the most productive artists of the era. Indeed, Zamyatin works together with many prominent artists of the time, specifically with Maxim Gorky, yet with the change of the winds of revolution, Ginsburg claims, "very soon he came under fire from the newly "orthodox"-the "proletarian" writers who sought to impose on all art the sole criterion of "usefulness to the revolution"" (Zamyatin, 1976, p. vii). This grim situation, combined with Zamyatin naming himself a "heretic" alongside with the likes of Galileo, provides the first limelight into how Zamyatin became the first "undesirable" of the Russian literature in the Soviet Union. As Ginsburg also mentions, with the latter part of the 1920's, the RAPP, the Association of Proletarian Writers accumulated enough sway within the literary circles in Soviet Russia. Any work of art that did not have the ultimate goal of serving the revolution or the party itself would be considered unworthy for existence and would be outright banned. At this point, it is necessary to refer to Ginsburg's own words for a depiction of how the RAPP created a reign of terror in the literary circles.

All the instruments of power were brought into use in the campaign for conformity.

Faced with grim alternatives, most of Zamyatin's erstwhile pupils and colleagues yielded to pressure, recanted publicly, in many instances rewrote their works and

devoted themselves to turning out the gray eulogies to Communist construction demanded by the dictatorship. Other writers, like Babel and Olesha, chose silence. Many committed suicide (Zamyatin, 1976, pp. ix-x).

While the concept of the suppression of free thinking and speech is deeply disturbing in itself, Ginsburg's account of the period provides an even greater danger that was lurking into the Russian art; rewriting. Zamyatin chose not to stand in silence and accept this suppression, as he thought "Heretics are the only (bitter) remedy against the entropy of human thought" (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 108). He was a heretic, standing against the forces of bureaucracy and newly-budding tyranny that was coming along with the changing political atmosphere of the Soviet Russia. However, there is one question that required an answer, yet went amiss by the scholars studying the era. While there are plenty of sources glorifying Orwell as a champion against authoritarianism and totalitarianism with his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Animal Farm* being the most prominent examples of his struggle as an author that was condemned and confined to the peripheries of literature in his time, there are almost no detailed sources accounting for how Zamyatin strived against Stalin, a political tyrant that is denounced throughout the Western world following the Cold War, and did not kneel before the throne on which someone who was determined to destroy him was sitting. Aside from Ginsburg, the only detailed account that still survives today on the destructive campaign unleashed upon Zamyatin is the account of Max Eastman in his *Artists in Uniform*, printed for the first time in 1934 and forgotten until the May of 2021, when a revival print is published. In his research, Eastman supports Zamyatin against the witch hunt he faces and does not refrain from portraying how his credibility and identity as a man of letters were eradicated in a vivid manner.

According to Eastman, Zamyatin's *We* was not counter-revolutionary at all, yet simply untimely. For Eastman, Zamyatin's work clashed with a time when the Soviet Russia's focus

was on the movement of masses (Eastman, 1934, p. 84). Yet, when it is read together with Ginsburg's introduction, it is obvious that the eradication of Zamyatin's intellectual presence was more political than it was made out to be by the Soviet government. As a record of how Zamyatin was viewed from the Soviet government's perspective, it is necessary to see Eastman's quote from the *Greater Soviet Encyclopedia*.

Zamyatin does not accept the social revolution; it is for him only a link in a chain of universal cosmic revolutions. 'The social revolution (he says) is only one of an infinite number; the law of revolution is not a social, but an infinitely greater cosmic universal law. We must look upon earthly movements from without. Heretics are the sole (bitter) medicine against the entropy of human thought.' These phrases conceal the writer's unbelief and non-acceptance of the social revolution (Eastman, 1934, p. 85).

Even from this sole and simple paragraph, it is possible to see how Zamyatin was looked down on by the government of Soviet Russia at the time. Yet, there is also a secondary power struggle in motion here that is not clarified in any account apart from Eastman's. Indeed, Zamyatin refused to bow down to the bureaucracy and stood his ground against all the accusations thrown at him. Yet, it was not the only reason why he became a target by the Soviet intelligentsia. Also, together with Boris Pilnyak, one of the most active members of the true Author's League in Soviet Russia, Zamyatin was putting a fight against the RAPP in order to prevent them from obtaining total dominance over the Russian world of arts and letters (Eastman, 1934, p. 85). Combined with the new, bureaucratic path the Soviet Russia was starting to take under the leadership of Stalin, the reason for the battle between Zamyatin and the government becomes crystal clear; Zamyatin was becoming an obstacle instead of a follower. So, the press and the media under Stalin decided to take action against this obstacle in a way that would obliterate his existence as a literary figure in a way that is commonplace in any sort of political tyranny, framing him up as a traitor.

According to Eastman, Zamyatin's *We* was pirated by a Social Revolutionary Journal in Czechoslovakia and despite Zamyatin's protests upon learning this, continued to be printed by the journal (Eastman, 1934, p. 86). This gave the Soviet ideological war machine all the fuel and ammunition it required in order to wage a total war against Zamyatin, who was becoming more a problem than a follower with his recent political stance. As both Ginsburg and Eastman explain in greater detail, he had to choose between modifying his works or obliterating his existence as a man of literature.⁴ As he would not be accepting towards the modification of his own works, he decided to face the accusations. Yet the accusations and the cacophony of state-controlled press were so overwhelming that he decided to write a letter to Stalin, in order to be exiled from Soviet Russia. The letter's English translation can be found in Mirra Ginsburg's translation of *The Dragon: Fifteen Stories* and the tone of the letter is of peculiar importance from more than one perspective.

The letter of Zamyatin addressed to Stalin has a particular importance in not only a humanitarian perspective, but also as one of the primary first-hand accounts of how a bureaucratic, tyrannical regime can influence and manipulate the intelligentsia within a country. It provides a vivid manifestation of how a prolific author who dares to challenge the status quo, the established ideology, is almost erased from his home country's literary history by the ones that seemingly continue the ideas that he puts forward. Zamyatin's addressing to Stalin with his first name at the beginning of the letter provides a clue of how Zamyatin refuses to go down on his knees and beg for mercy. Instead, he decides to maintain his stance, accept the consequences of his works, and ask for an alternative punishment for his ideas. As an exile, he knows that he will not be in a much better situation wherever he goes, simply due to his nationality, and his Bolshevik past, yet still, his wish to continue producing art seemingly never diminishes. At the end of his letter, he does not refrain from manifestly

⁴ (Eastman, 1934, p. 85), (Zamyatin, 1976, p. x)

explaining all the other possible reasons that he put forward in order to move away from the country, and while the tone is solemn in general, throughout the letter, it is possible to see that Zamyatin is not a character that can be brought to his knees by simply attacking his personality and credibility. Despite being portrayed as a counter-revolutionary in his home country during the infancy period of the Soviet Union, Zamyatin carries the fierce personality of a true revolutionary from an historical standpoint. His role within the development of political literature, and political satire more specifically, will be the scope of the following chapter.

3.2. Zamyatin's Role in the Political Literature

As mentioned in previous chapters and sub-chapters within this research, Zamyatin and his writing can be seen synonymous with politics. Both as a literary critic and as a thinker, he authored novels and critical essays regarding a wide variety of topics, ranging from the state of art in Russia to political and social criticism. Unlike Orwell, Zamyatin is one of the very few intellectuals who had a scientific educational background and manifested this background in a range of topics in the world of literature. This scientific background set him apart from his contemporaries and gave his words a power resistant to the passing of time. He did not solely want to focus on the moment and crises of mankind, but as Eastman also suggests, he wanted “to say something in his books about the larger destinies of man” (Eastman, 1934, p. 83).

Apart from Mirra Ginsburg's introductory text into Zamyatin and his political mindset, one of the earliest articles focusing on the same topics above is Gleb Struve's article from 1938. Like Ginsburg and Eastman, Struve also provides a summary of Zamyatin's early life and his educational background, as they have a significant impact on his literary life in the following years. Yet, in his article, Struve quotes directly from Zamyatin and sheds light on how a former revolutionary who faced imprisonment and exile during his early life turned

into one of the fiercest critics of how the results of the long-awaited revolution turned out to be. He quotes from Zamyatin's own words uttered in 1924, saying "Then I was a Bolshevik, now I am not" (Struve, 1938, p. 700). Yet, the faith in a revolution that he fought for was in flux for Zamyatin well before that reference from 1924. As mentioned above, Zamyatin was not solely focusing on one branch of art, but rather diversifying his products in a variety of branches. His play written in 1922, *The Fires of St. Dominic*, was set during the times of Spanish Inquisition but according to Struve, the play had a "historical disguise" and "contained a scathing invective of the Soviet regime" (Struve, 1938, p. 701). And his criticism on the Soviet mindset was only going to increase following that play.

In 1923, Zamyatin authored an essay titled *On Literature, Revolution, Entropy and Other Matters*, and the essay is one of the most vivid examples of how critical and sharp Zamyatin can be. It was also one of the reasons why he was directly targeted by the new, bureaucratic Soviet Union and its government, as he did not refrain from calling "social revolution" as "only one of an infinite amount" of revolutions (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 107). For him, humans were destined for far greater things to achieve, and his tone seems to downplay the revolution into almost some trivial concept that should not be held in the highest possible regard. For Zamyatin, one revolution could not mean anything, as a chain of revolutions would lead to "the birth of a new life" (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 108). Clearly, this mindset was deemed dangerous for the Soviet government, and Eastman's argument is a striking one regarding to this perspective. In his book, Eastman claims that Zamyatin was attacked not because his ideas were counter-revolutionary, specifically regarding the publishing of *We*, but it was the wrong time to write and publish such a book. According to Eastman, "the Bolsheviks did not want to dwell on the problem of the creative personality in a civilization which depends upon the energetic movement of great masses of people" and this movement was their primary goal (Eastman, 1934, p. 84). Considering all this, it becomes evident that

Zamyatin was not seen as an enemy of the state during the early years of his career, specifically in the first half of the 1920s. Yet, with the growing suppression of the free speech within the Soviet Union, he became much more of a liability for the government than an asset. But, his works in the first half of the decade have such an amazing level of vision for the future that he can be argued and supported as one of the farsighted visionaries of the century. In a chapter regarding his role in the political literature, some of these works deserve and require a mention and even some analysis before moving on with his *magnum opus* – *We*, as some of his critical essays date back even before the first words of *We* is written on a paper, and they are by no means any less significant for the purpose of this research.

One of the most significant works by Zamyatin regarding the state of the world and its politics is undoubtedly his fiery essay, *Tomorrow*. Written between 1919 and 1920, the essay can be viewed and read as a manifesto of Zamyatin and his perspective into the life itself, including politics, thinking, philosophy and science. While the part focusing on the dialectics of time, yesterday, today and tomorrow, can be the topic of a research itself, for the scope of this research, this dialectic will not be analyzed in detail. Yet the third paragraph provides a far-reaching foreshadowing of the events to occur in the following decades, and the paragraph has to be presented before delving any deeper into it.

Yesterday there was a tsar, and there were slaves; today there is no tsar, but the slaves remain; tomorrow there will be only tsars. We march in the name of tomorrow's free man-the royal man. We have lived through the epoch of suppression of the masses; we are living in an epoch of suppression of the individual in the name of the masses; tomorrow will bring the liberation of the individual-in the name of man (Zamyatin, 1970, pp. 51-52).

The partial paragraph presented above is a striking manifestation of how farsighted Zamyatin was in terms of world politics and the shifting political atmospheres. He was not

only providing a short and clear summary of the previous century, or “the Age of Empire” as Hobsbawm would call it, but, in only a few sentences, talks about the following century’s events to unfold with a striking accuracy. Specifically, his vision for tomorrow, when everyone will be a tsar, is a mesmerizingly accurate definition of rising individualism and the loss of class consciousness that swept through the world’s population almost throughout the latter half of the twentieth century and continuing to do so even more manifestly in the twenty-first. He was focused on Russia, as the later paragraphs explicitly claim, yet it would be oversimplifying to read the partial quote above solely with a focus on Russia, as the predicted individualization can be observed throughout the world today.

One thing that deserves not to go unnoticed regarding Zamyatin is the fact that he is not solely an author, but he was an active participant in political struggles of Russia as well. Apart from being a thinker, an author and a naval engineer, his activism must be counted among the qualities of him, and this sets him apart from many of his contemporaries in the field of political writing. While all of the writers who were producing on the topic of world’s political atmosphere could point to what was going in the wrong direction in accordance with their own political views and ideologies, Zamyatin was not content with simply pointing out what was missing. Instead, he was taking it two steps further: Showing a possible path for correcting the wrongs and a fierce plea for doing so. His conclusion to *Tomorrow* was a call for everyone who had a desire for a greater future for humanity, specifically to the intelligentsia in Russia. He explicitly warned his audience about possible problems that were lurking in the shadows of the everyday life, and showed the right way to tackle them, with words.

Another one of the significant works penned by Zamyatin is his 1923 essay titled *On Literature, Revolution, Entropy and Other Matters* and, albeit aforementioned, deserves a more profound explanation as it manifests Zamyatin’s proficiency in an extensive scope of

topics. Throughout the essay, Zamyatin visits a variety of topics, as the title itself exhibits clearly, yet the concluding paragraphs of the essay provides how Zamyatin became the defining pioneer of a completely new genre.

A new form is not intelligible to everyone; many find it difficult. Perhaps. The ordinary, the banal is, of course, simpler, more pleasant, more comfortable. Euclid's world is very simple, and Einstein's world is very difficult-but it is no longer possible to return to Euclid. No revolution, no heresy is comfortable or easy (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 112).

At this point, it is important to refer to Ginsburg's account of Zamyatin. She reminds us in her introduction to *The Dragon: Fifteen Stories* that Zamyatin "preached heresy again and again" (Zamyatin, 1976, p. viii). For Zamyatin, a stance against any established norms should be a doctrine for anyone who is looking for development, and this is specifically applicable in art. In his essay titled *The New Russian Prose*, where he fiercely criticizes the state of Russian art, Zamyatin boldly claims that "in art the surest way to destroy is to canonize one given form and one philosophy: that which is canonized quickly dies of obesity, of entropy" (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 104) and in *On Literature, Revolution, Entropy and Other Matters*, he takes another step forward, claiming that "the same disease often afflicts artists and writers: they sink into satiated slumber in forms once invented and twice perfected" (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 112). Bordering on a nihilistic mindset, for Zamyatin, established and canonized forms are simply unacceptable as they do not benefit mankind in a longer run, yet they only cause a false sense of security. These forms should be left behind, and an artist should stand against any kind of institutionalized ideology or method that is prevalently used throughout any branch. He realized this view of his with "the Serapion Brethren", a group of young, mostly unknown or aspiring artists that he helped and guided to stand against becoming tools in the hands of political bodies. As mentioned before, he was not only a

thinker, but also an activist, and although he would practically be eradicated from the artistic history of the Soviet Russia in the following years, being a strong believer of resistance against any establishment, Zamyatin tried his best to pass his knowledge and perspective onto others that he hoped to follow his path one day.

Before moving on with the author that will consist the other half of this research, as a conclusive summary it would be only fair to appreciate what Zamyatin brought to the world of literature. We cannot be simplified a novel that consisted of a man's fears for the future of the civilization, but it included a tediously planned foreshadowing of how the political atmosphere of the time could shape the future if not steered towards a better direction. Also, the essays manifest his extensive knowledge regarding a wide variety of subjects, ranging from mathematics to philosophy. It is saddening to read Ginsburg's account of Zamyatin's passing, which states that only a handful of close friends attended the ceremony, and his death was not printed in any Soviet newspaper (Zamyatin, 1976, p. xi). Also, it is equally grim to read the final sentence of her introduction, claiming that Zamyatin's name is occasionally mentioned in recent memoirs, but his works remain virtually unknown in Russia today (Zamyatin, 1976, p. xi). Although neither his obituary, nor his masterpiece, *We*, did not appear before the eyes of his home country's audience for decades, it is safe to say that he was the spark that created and defined a whole new literary production mode, the satirical dystopian novel. As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, it is only fair to claim that Zamyatin can be considered synonymous with the early twentieth-century political writing, and his seemingly nihilistic and restless mindset while writing a novel that fiercely criticizes the results and possible long-term outcomes of a revolution which he once has been a part of is best described by Struve in the quotation below.

By nature, Zamyatin was a rebel, a heretic, quite unable to toe any line. In 1921, during a period when certain freedom of opinion was allowed in Soviet Russia,

Zamyatin expressed the view that Communist Russia would not produce real literature. His reason for thinking so was very typical: “Real Literature” he said can exist only where it is produced by madmen, hermits, heretics, dreamers, rebels and sceptics, and not by painstaking and well-intentioned officials.” It was equally characteristic of Zamyatin that he used to be a Bolshevik before the Revolution of 1917 and ceased to be one when Bolshevism came to power. (Struve, 1938, p. 702)

3.3. Persona Non Grata – Orwell’s Search Of “Belonging” and Critical Production

One of the most controversial names ever to grace the world of literature, Eric Arthur Blair, or George Orwell as he is much better known as, is, without a doubt, one of the most prominent writers of the twentieth century English literature. As his written production is heavily influenced by his ever-shifting political standpoint, which Craig L. Carr defined as “Poverty drove Orwell toward socialism and thus effectively shaped his politics” (Carr, 2010, p. 37), it becomes much easier to understand why the name Orwell raises more eyebrows whenever uttered than appreciation for his contributions. He was the ultimate *persona non grata* for any ideology or movement, as he would not refrain from bitterly criticizing it whenever he saw something that he would or could not accept. Just like Zamyatin, as he praised extensively in his own review of *We* that was published in 1946, Orwell was a heretic for any ideology, any established norm and any governmental apparatus. While this heresy did not prevent his name becoming synonymous with Soviet criticism in the West following his death due to an elaborate course of action that was taken by the Western media and government agencies, Western being primarily the American government here, Orwell was against any kind of authoritarianism and a fierce opponent of art and language abused with the aim of political gains. The abuse of Orwell’s literary works in the name of political gains, as well as Zamyatin’s, will be the focal point of the next chapter, yet in order to understand

why Orwell's criticism and seemingly unending satire leave a bitter taste in any researcher's or critic's mouths who have delved deep into his works, one should put a significant time and effort to understand the reasons behind his almost nihilistic life. Orwell was detached from his birth and background from the early years of his career and although he was born middle-class, he made it his life's work to "redeem" himself from this bourgeoisie background by taking the most daring challenges possible. It was his cleansing from the stains of being a middle-class child, and he provided a significant amount of critical works throughout his life.

Born in Bengal to a middle-class family, Orwell had a passion for reading throughout his education. Educated in prestigious Eton as a King's Scholar, his education provided him with a significant time he devoted into sharpening his skills as a man of letters. Yet, his career choice, according to an extensive research penned by J.R. Hammond, was heavily influenced by and "carried the weight of" (Hammond, 1982, p. 13) his family's background in India. This was the first ideological breaking point for young Eric, as his reasons for accepting such a career differed significantly than those of his family, who thought a life as a government official would offer young Eric with a steady income, a respectable position ending with a good pension. For Eric, though, it was more of a journey of self-discovery, rather than a determining choice for his life. Also, in Hammond's research, there is a significant part claiming that Eric wanted to go "out East in the service of the empire" (Hammond, 1982, p. 13). Combining this sentence with his childhood poems provided in the same research, it is safe to conclude that young Eric was supportive of the Empire with a nationalistic impulse in him at the early years of his life. After he was accepted, he was posted to Burma for five years and it took him to various parts of the country. This period of his life came under heavy criticism in 1942, when George Woodcock claimed that Orwell do not present a great example with his past regarding to his critical writing since he served under the Imperial army in Burma (Orwell, 1968, p. 224). Orwell's response to this criticism was fierce, stating that he

left that career “partly because it didn't suit (him) but mainly because (he) would not any longer be a servant of imperialism” (Orwell, 1968, p. 228). He also claimed to be “against imperialism because (he knows) something about it from the inside” (Orwell, 1968, p. 228). Considering his works in the latter years of his career, it is an undeniable fact that Orwell was against imperialism and anything that served as a manifestation of it, and as he did not hold back criticizing Soviet Russia after his trip, it becomes much clearer that Orwell’s only moral compass while writing was his own views, and they were subject to change. He did not resist any changes in his mindset and avoided becoming a fanatic of any sort of ideology throughout his life. Although this resulted in him being criticized as someone with no certain ideology, this also enabled him to create works that manifest the negatives in everything that he observed.

Following the years in Burma, and after accumulating a lot of experiences that left their scars on him, Orwell came back to England and wanted to dedicate himself to writing. He was adamant to find himself being a man of letters, yet his efforts did not yield the results he desired, as his productions were “crude, florid and amateurish” (Hammond, 1982, p. 16). Being driven with a wish to see the world from a working-class eye and “to find some way of getting out of the respectable world altogether” (Orwell, 2001, pp. 139-140), he decided to go to the working class districts of London, in the East End, and Paris afterwards. His experiences were told in great detail in his book *Down and Out in Paris and London*, and the time he spent in these working-class areas of the cities and specifically his job that he held in Paris, being a dishwasher in a luxurious hotel, left his marks on him, yet it was not until his return to England that he found himself as a writer. In 1936, he was sent to write about the poverty and conditions in Northern England, and later on, this experience fruited into a masterpiece called *The Road to Wigan Pier*. This expedition and his participation in Spanish Civil War were the decisive moments for the creation of George Orwell as we know it.

During his time in London and Paris, he experienced being a tramp, yet as he also claims in *The Road to Wigan Pier* himself, one can be close friends with a pickpocket, but it is almost impossible to become friends with a bricklayer (Orwell, 2001, p. 143). Before the two aforementioned events, the expedition and the war, Orwell could not find himself politically, and it was reflected in his writings. The North of England was Orwell's first close encounter with the working-class people of England, and as he admits of being frightened and even abhorred them in the past, the experiences he had were, to say the least, life-changing.

With *The Road to Wigan Pier*, readers begin to see Orwell becoming much more political than his previous works. Orwell himself does not avoid accepting this fact himself, yet, unlike Zamyatin, he does not blatantly disapprove any ideology other than the oppressive imperialism he has been a part of in Burma. On the contrary, he claims that "the economic injustice will stop the moment we want it to stop [...] the method adopted hardly matters" (Orwell, 2001, p. 139) regarding Socialism. While this critical approach against any established ideology seems the most striking similarity between him and Zamyatin, it is also the most differentiating one as well. Although Orwell becomes highly aware of the class injustice and his wrongful prejudices regarding the "lower" classes, he is not able to leave them behind completely. Even in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, Orwell tries to justify his actions while criticizing himself by saying "orientals can be very provoking" (Orwell, 2001, p. 138) and it becomes crystal clear that he is unable to wash himself from all the negativities of his middle-class upbringing.

In his research, J.R. Hammond claims that "it would be difficult to name any other political writer of this century who has demonstrated so powerfully his concern for the underdog, his anger at injustice" (Hammond, 1982, p. 47) and it is maybe one of the most accurate descriptions of Orwell as a literary figure. Orwell himself accepts this as well,

positioning himself not as a champion of the oppressed, but as someone who wanted to fight against the oppression in the front lines.

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 (Orwell, 2001, p. 138).

For Orwell, it is not enough to be against exploitation, against tyranny, but it was a requirement of being human. The expression of it found its manifestation in virtually all his works, specifically in his essays. Like Zamyatin, he did not confine himself within the boundaries of one subject, but he was actively writing and producing works on a variety of them, which sets him apart from his contemporaries. Hammond points out this as well and provides an overview of the scope of Orwell's areas of interest.

His themes ranged from fundamental questions of world politics to all those aspects of daily life which fascinated him so much: curious items of information culled from obscure books and from conversations with friends, superstitions, the climate, wild life, words and their meanings, and the extraordinary diversity of incident and behaviour in wartime London (Hammond, 1982, p. 50).

But, just like one of his greatest inspirations while creating his magnum opus, Zamyatin, Orwell could not stand together with any established ideology for long. In his article, Rob Breton aims heavy criticism towards Orwell regarding this fact, pointing out the fact that Orwell called himself a "Socialist by allegiance and a Liberal by temperament" (Breton, 2002) and accused Orwell of manipulating the fact that public sympathy is always with the underdog, the marginalized. The fact that he receives such heavy criticism after almost half a century following his death manifests Orwell's inability to be a supporter of any ideology, or be supported by thereof, and provides a vivid reasoning why the author of this

research takes the liberty of calling Orwell the *persona non grata* of every ideology. As a writer, Orwell's experiences shaped his ideas, and these ideas shaped his writing drastically. Yet, these shifts also made himself vulnerable to criticism of being "from the opposite camp". Considering the period he lived, it is important to accept that Orwell put an amazing effort to keep an open mind. As Hammond also points out, "in an age of conformity and ideology the freshness of his approach will earn for his nonfiction writings a new and wider audience" (Hammond, 1982, p. 50) and the same should be said for his works of fiction as well.

Before going forward with the dysfunctional use of the two authors that were the focal point of this chapter, it is necessary to look into both novels. Traditionally, the two novels, *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are claimed to share a wide variety of concepts, and there were claims that Orwell's masterpiece was completely inspired by Zamyatin's, a theory which will be analyzed later on in the next chapter.

4. A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE INTO *NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR* AND *WE*

Today, any researcher who sets his mind onto a study regarding George Orwell, Yevgeny Zamyatin or their literary products has to comb through countless stacks of research papers and dissertations. Indeed, to find an original discourse that has not been previously adopted by any researcher would be a true challenge in itself. Specifically, when most of the research into the two authors, and mostly on the two literary masterpieces that are mentioned in the title of this chapter, are focused on the parallels that can be drawn between them, the question of influence becomes a much more commonplace issue. While it is necessary for researchers to be original in terms of their critical research output, this is more often than not forgiven, if not ignored for the authors of literary products. Quoting from Lord Alfred Tennyson's personal correspondence, R.H. Winnick's study into Tennyson's poetry provides an interesting approach into the matter of influencing between authors:

I do not object to your finding parallelisms. They must always occur. [...] Why not? Are not human eyes all over the world looking at the same objects, and must there not consequently be coincidences of thought and impressions and expressions? It is scarcely possible for any one to say or write anything in this late time of the world to which, in the rest of the literature of the world, a parallel could not somewhere be found (Winnick, 2019, pp. 3-4).

Without a doubt, Tennyson's approach is controversial to say the least. While it is almost impossible to create a literary product that is free of any influence from the former authors whose ideologies, life periods or genres in which they provided their output, the fine line between paraphrasing and plagiarizing becomes blurred more often than not. This fact might have found its most vivid manifestation in literary comparisons between Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Zamyatin's *We*, and the parallels, as well as the differences that can be found between the two texts are going to be the focal point of this chapter.

In a strictly stylistic approach, the differences between *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *We* become crystal clear even for a casual reader. *We* is structured in the form of a diary, and each "entry" focuses on a different experience of the protagonist, D-503. Although the narration is seemingly fractured, due to the timeline Zamyatin creates, it becomes possible to follow the storyline. Each "entry" is given with topics that will be covered, and while it provides a much more "personal" feeling to be invoked in the reader, following the footsteps of the protagonist / narrator as well as experiencing the emotional changes alongside with the protagonist. With these stylistic decisions, Zamyatin creates an unprecedented flow of the storyline; with the topics provided at the beginning of each "entry" foreshadows the events to be unfolded in the following pages, a feeling of first-hand experience is evoked within the mind of the readers. This unique style of narration, combined with all the moments of ecstasy, collapse and questioning, only serves the fact that Zamyatin is a true pioneer in political satire genre.

Before moving on with the other aspects, it would be beneficial to provide some examples to the aforementioned moments with excerpts from the text.

And I felt: it was not the generations before me, but I-yes, I- who had conquered the old God and the old life. It was I who had created all this. And I was like a tower, I dared not move an elbow lest walls, cupolas, machines tumble in fragments about me (Zamyatin, 1987, pp. 5-6).

Right at the beginning of the book, in the Second Entry, Zamyatin takes D-503 through a moment of self-absorption where he loses himself in the role of creating the utopian One State and Integral. Apart from the much more “personal” experience the reader undergoes while reading the quote, this method of narration also provides a window to glance into the mindset of the protagonist on a much deeper level than a third-person narration can ever provide with. Another example, yet from the other side of the emotional spectrum, a downfall, can be chosen as follows:

I walked alone through the twilit street. The wind was whirling, driving, carrying me like a slip of paper. Fragments of cast-iron sky flew and flew-they had another day, two days to hurtle through infinity. ... The unifs of passerby brushed against me, but I walked alone. I saw it clearly: everyone was saved, but there was no salvation for me. *I did not want salvation* (Zamyatin, 1987, pp. 185-186).

Compared to the previous excerpt that was provided, this quote manifests the fact that Zamyatin is able to adjust the tone of the narration masterfully, according to the phases of life D-503 goes through. As D-503’s experiences evolve, narration and the word choices become somewhat macabre, with desperation can be felt through the wording of the entry. The excerpt does not feel like a narration towards the end, but gives a feeling of inner monologue, with a stream of consciousness embedded into the closure of the entry. Another example of the employment of stream of consciousness as a technique of strengthening the narration can be

observed in the third excerpt from the book below, providing a vivid scene of self-questioning:

If I had a mother, like the ancients: mine-yes, precisely-my mother. To whom I would not be-not the builder of the *Integral*, and not number D-503, and not a molecule of the One State, but a simple human being-a piece of herself, trampled, crushed, discarded. ... And let me nail, or let me be nailed-perhaps it's all the same- but so that she would hear what no one else heard, so that her old woman's mouth, drawn together, wrinkled (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 216).

At this point, Zamyatin's stylistic decisions become manifest with the three examples provided above. While a first-person narrative enables the reader to have a much more "personal" connection with the D-503, the protagonist, regardless of how stripped he is from the humane characteristics of modern day and reduced to simply a number, "a molecule of the One State" (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 216), the fractured writing and the employment of the stream of consciousness enable Zamyatin to experiment with an unprecedented stylistic approach. Also, while this subject will be visited once again in Chapter 5.2 of this thesis in terms of characters, the employment of Biblical elements and references throughout the text deserves particular attention, elements that are not so overtly observed in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. As Preslar also suggests, having Richard Gregg's research as a basis, Zamyatin's *We* has elements from both the Bible and John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (Preslar, 2008) and these influences are not limited to the aforementioned part, where D-503 mentions being nailed. In the same entry, Thirty-sixth Entry, Zamyatin describes D-503's encounter with the Benefactor, which has a very strong resemblance of meeting with God in Zamyatin's universe (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 212). With all the aforementioned information taken into consideration, being a true heretic, a true "Scythian", Zamyatin's narration is an unprecedented mix of various techniques that are observed in literatures that are not of his home country. While it is

stretching to infer that he was exposed to these literary devices, specifically the stream of consciousness, during his time in the United Kingdom, it is an undeniable fact that Zamyatin's literary composition was pioneering in itself. As Zamyatin claims in his essay, "I Am Afraid": "It is that true literature can exist only where it is created, not by diligent and trustworthy officials, but by madmen, hermits, heretics, dreamers, rebels and skeptics" (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 57). He does not fear the change, he does not fear walking the less well-beaten path, and although his literary success is shadowed by the presence of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Zamyatin's contribution to the literature extend beyond creating a genre that made its mark on the twentieth century.

As the perspective to be employed in this chapter will be a comparative one due to the obvious one-sided interactions between Zamyatin and Orwell, and the commonplace idea that Orwell was "plagiarizing" from Zamyatin's masterpiece when he was writing *Nineteen Eighty-Four* should be challenged in the eyes of the researcher, the necessity to refer to Walter Benjamin's theory regarding the reproduction of art arises.

Indeed, as Benjamin also acknowledges, "in principle a work of art has always been reproducible" (Benjamin, 2007, p. 218). Starting with the invention of the printing press and with new, innovative methods still developed today, it is an undeniable fact that with the reproduction of art, specifically literature for the scope of this dissertation, interactions were no more limited to a small circle between an artist, his or her pupils and a limited group of audience who were lucky enough to be able to own a handwritten copy of the original manuscript. Instead, the developments enabled interactions to occur between artists with significant ease and made it possible for artists to reach an audience that would be beyond imagination prior to the possibility of widespread mechanical reproduction. These interactions, while Benjamin prefers devoting a larger part on the visual and performance arts in his essay, are not less important for the literature as well, as Benjamin also acknowledges

(Benjamin, 2007, p. 219). It would be highly dismissive, and even borderline wrong, to claim that Zamyatin had no influence whatsoever on Orwell while he was busy writing his masterpiece, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Some aspects of the two books; namely a totalitarian regime of oppression that is present in distant future, technology utilized to control, manipulate and suppress people so that they will not become dissidents for the regime, as well as the rage against the oppression followed by rebellious acts that are doomed to fail, ignited with the protagonist meeting a woman, have striking parallels between each other, and this led to numerous research papers claiming that there is an obvious, genetic connection between the two books. The primary supporting evidence presented by the supporters of this idea of connection is primarily the fact that Orwell penned a detailed commentary on Zamyatin's *We*, and the article's tone was full of admiration from Orwell to his Russian counterpart, ending his review by claiming *We* "is a book to look out for when an English version appears" (Orwell, 1968, p. 75). As aforementioned, it is simply impossible to claim there is no interaction between the two authors, with Orwell professing that he was able to read the book from a French translation (Orwell, 1968, p. 72). Yet, are a simple genetic connection and a similar framework of stories enough to claim that Orwell was absolutely under the influence of Zamyatin while he was writing his magnum opus?

Indeed, both Zamyatin and Orwell have striking parallels between their storylines, and with Orwell's acknowledgement of reading Zamyatin in 1946, about two years prior to the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is only natural that such comparative inquiries occur. Yet, as it will be manifested in the following chapters of this dissertation once again, in the case of "Newspeak" being a concept in which Orwell's own ideas in his essay *Politics and the English Language* taken to its utmost possible extremes, most researchers focusing on Orwell simply pick the Orwell that would support their arguments and ideas. Reading both novels in combination with possible other sources of knowledge on both authors, with sources

regarding Orwell primarily being his own essays and correspondence, Benjamin's claim of each work of art being unique finds its perfect manifestation when one compares Orwell and Zamyatin, due to a handful of reasons, among which there are unreliable witnesses of the interactions, Orwell's life experiences in his own words, and the stylistic differences between the books, as well as the structural ones.

As previously mentioned, comparisons between Zamyatin's *We* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are mostly focusing on the similarities between the two texts, and the review of Zamyatin's novel by Orwell in 1946, in an article for *Tribune*. Although these similarities and parallels might seem valid for a casual reader, as one delves deeper into details, the discrepancies start to surface, the amount of which is more than enough to question the commonplace ideas and arguments. In an article published in 1975, researcher James Connors takes part in the debate, challenging the already established conclusions that Orwell's work was heavily influenced by Zamyatin. While the whole article reveals striking discrepancies and problems regarding the similarity comparisons for *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the following excerpt deserves particular attention on his own, as it features one of the prominent witnesses of Orwell's inspiration from Zamyatin, George Woodcock, regarding his notes in *The Crystal Spirit*.

In his opening chapter entitled "The Man Remembered," Woodcock recalls a day "in the spring of 1946" when Orwell pulled a copy of Zamyatin's *We* from a bookshelf and showed it to him. "But," Woodcock notes, "he gave no indication of the extent to which the chance acquisition of this volume would help to determine the shape of *Nineteen Eighty-four*..." One's confusion when confronted with this discrepancy is compounded when Woodcock's faulty chronology is noted: Orwell's review of *We* appeared in the January 4, 1946 edition of *Tribune*, yet Woodcock says the review

appeared "a few weeks" after his spring conversation with Orwell (Connors, 1975, p. 108).

Indeed, the discrepancy of the timeline that Woodcock presents can be dismissed as a simple lapse of memory in terms of the time of his meeting with Orwell. Yet, the fact that his book is used as evidence for supporting the argument that Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is shaped in its ultimate form following his encounter with Zamyatin would be an extreme case of overreach. Connors' argument that "the chief concerns which shaped 1984 are present and fully articulate in Orwell's thought several years before he ever heard of Zamyatin" (Connors, 1975, pp. 108-109) is one that is much more possible to support and is better merited, as Orwell's personal memories also points out.

In 1943, parts of Orwell's personal essay of "Looking Back on the Spanish War" are published on *New Road* publication. While the full version is later published in his collected essays archive, volume titled *My Country Right or Left*, there are parts that deserve particular attention for anyone who is willing to conduct research on the creation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In the essay, Orwell claims that "History stopped in 1936" (Orwell, 1968, p. 179), reminiscing a conversation he had with Arthur Koestler. Indeed, Orwell's experiences during the Spanish Civil War had a transforming effect on his ideologies and perspectives, as mentioned and analysed in further detail in this dissertation as well. Orwell remembers the lies propagated by the newspapers at the time, stating the following:

This kind of thing is frightening to me, because it often gives me the feeling that the very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world. After all, the chances are that those lies, or at any rate similar lies, will pass into history (Orwell, 1968, p. 180).

Connors' claims become well-merited with the reading of this excerpt. Written in 1942, Orwell's fear of totalitarianism and oppressive regimes obviously begins to take shape and find articulation in his writing. Apart from the discrepancy in timeline, Orwell starts to

worry about the manipulation of history, and the truth manipulated in the hands of victors. Right at this point, it is necessary to turn to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* for the following passage, regarding the manipulation of truth taken to the extremes:

As soon as all the corrections which happened to be necessary in any particular number of the *Times* had been assembled and collated, that number would be reprinted, the original copy destroyed, and the corrected copy placed on the files in its stead. This process of continuous alteration was applied not only to newspapers, but to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, films, sound-tracks, cartoons, photographs-to every kind of literature or documentation which might conceivably hold any political or ideological significance (Orwell, 2008, p. 42).

Just as “Newspeak” can be argued as Orwell’s six-article manifesto of language simplicity taken to its extremes in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is observed that Orwell’s fears of truth bent and twisted for serving a certain political agenda finds its manifestation in his masterpiece. Considering the fact that Orwell’s “nightmare vision” (Meyers, 2010, p. 142) is well-documented prior to his reading and review of *We*, it is a simply dismissive attitude towards the author who created one of the most influential storylines in political satire genre in the twentieth century to claim that his text is written under a heavy intellectual influence of Zamyatin, despite the similarities that the two novels have.

Another particular point that deserves further attention and detailed analysis is the fact that stylistically, the two novels are as different as they can be. While Zamyatin employs a first-person perspective throughout the novel and narrates his story from the eyes of his protagonist, D-503, in the form of diary entries, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the narration is from a third-person perspective. There is not enough evidence to conclusively claim that whether the narrator of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is omniscient or not, yet the form of narration itself separates the two novels. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, even at the climax of the storyline, where

Winston is taken to Room 101 by O'Brien, the employed form of narration prevents the reader to have an experience as personal as the one Zamyatin provides through the eyes of D-503's encounter with the Benefactor. Indeed, Orwell's employed form of narration makes it possible for him to maintain an atmosphere that would very well be worthy of a horror movie at the climax of the novel, yet, as previously mentioned, yet it presents a significantly different experience than that of Zamyatin's personalized inner monologues and stream of consciousness.

On a final note, it is noteworthy to consider the styles of oppression pictured in the two novels are evidently different. In Zamyatin's *We*, the focus is placed on removal of human-specific elements, such as to err and to feel. The rationality is placed on the highest possible altar as a sacred value in One State, and anything humane is scorned upon. This reflects on the language and the metaphors used by the two authors as well. While in D-503's accounts, the events are presented in a manner that is simply focused on reflecting what happened as it is, in Orwell's case, the truth becomes a subjective matter as a whole. In D-503's account, even the detail of how many times he kissed O at the end of Second Entry requires consideration and correction in case of a mistake (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 9), and the language itself is much more robotic when compared to the one of Orwell's, and naturally Winston's. It is my conclusion that the backgrounds of the two authors play a significant role at this point. With Zamyatin being a naval engineer as his primary occupation, the style and the language of the novel feels somewhat engineered even to the casual reader. In parts, it lacks the finesse of the carefully-crafted descriptions of Orwell's Ingsoc and the horrors it creates. At this point, while it is possible to draw parallels between the two texts, it is not possible to defend the argument of Orwell is intellectually indebted to Zamyatin regarding the success of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. They both are ultimately concerned regarding the presence of an oppressive regime that an absolutism can pave the way for, but as Connors also

suggests, Orwell's "concerns are vastly different from those of Zamyatin" (Connors, 1975, p. 109). While Zamyatin, being an engineer and a man of science in his past, is concerned about a total and absolute rule of rationale, Orwell's ideas are regarding the truth being bent, twisted and history being continuously rewritten, as he also suggests in his essay, "Looking Back on the Spanish War" (Orwell, 1968, pp. 174-186). Hence, despite the one-sided interaction between Orwell and Zamyatin, as it is manifested by his review of *We*, it is necessary to state that the similarities are limited, to the fact that they share similar frameworks in terms of theme and other similarities can be drawn such as the presence of a rebellious temptress, Julia and I-330, the oppressive regimes, One State and Ingsoc, and a failed attempt of rebellion against the established regime. On the contrary, the differences are much vaster than they seem to be to a reader who is unfamiliar with the other texts of Orwell, and a detailed comparative research into the two author's other texts, as well as ideologies and concerns regarding the future, manifests these differences plainly.

As of the halfway mark into the twentieth century, regardless of Hobsbawm's timeline that differs a good twenty-five years from the calendars marking the beginning and the end of the century in question, with the popularity that Orwell brought to the genre of dystopias and political satire, the frenzy was destined to pick the attention of those who had a political agenda. While Zamyatin penned the book that would lead to the creation of a completely new genre, at the time Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published, this new kind of storytelling has already become a focal point for readers. As Benjamin suggests, "The conventional is uncritically enjoyed, and the truly new is criticized- with aversion" (Benjamin, 2007, p. 234) and Orwell's book enjoyed the frenzy surrounding dystopias for the second half of the twentieth century, even arguably well into the twenty-first. The aforementioned interest of political circles was only natural into a heavily-political story, and their employment of the story for their own political gains will be the topic for the next chapter.

5. DISCOVERY OF DYSTOPIAN GENRE

Before starting to write about the utilization of the dystopian political satires in the name of political gains, it is necessary to look into the definition of the genre, of which two primary examples have been analyzed in the previous chapter. The Dictionary of Cambridge defines a dystopia as “a very bad or unfair society in which there is a lot of suffering, especially an imaginary society in the future, after something terrible has happened; a description of such a society” (2021) and this definition does not provide the political ingredients of the genre for its reader. Historically, the genre was first brought on stage by *The Time Machine* by H.G. Wells and while it can be considered to be the earliest example of a modern dystopian novel, it is by no means close to the political messages that dystopias are messengers of today. On the contrary, earlier examples of dystopias were more of “anti-utopias”, simply providing an alternative for the future where technological developments brought the humanity’s doom. Yet, a few years after Wells’ *The Time Machine*, Jack London’s *The Iron Heel* made its appearance on the literary stage and it was, chronologically, the earliest example of a dystopian fiction work which put a strong emphasis on the political oppression. Followed by Zamyatin’s *We*, the genre started to gain popularity, yet the authors of political satire, except for Jack London, were mostly confined to the periphery of literature, locked on the fringe. For the likes of Zamyatin, it was not a particularly troublesome situation, for he claimed that “in art the surest way to destroy is to canonize one given form and one philosophy: that which is canonized quickly dies of obesity, of entropy” (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 104) and he was explicitly against being recognized and canonized. Yet, for those whose lives were absolutely focused on creating literary works that reached wider audiences, like Orwell, this confinement brought a significant number of problems.

And they were read, specifically following both author’s deaths, and much more widely than they originally predicted. Specifically, after Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and

Animal Farm, the dystopian political satire was taken out of the forgotten peripheries of the world of literature and became a literary genre that was widely considered as an alternating voice for the root causes of everyday problems. Yet was it solely the creative genius of the authors, combined with the possibility of mechanical reproduction opportunities that Benjamin widely discussed that gave the political satire a popularity that crossed not only boundaries, but even oceans? Or was there something else lurking in the shadows? With the emergence of the Cold War era, and the polarization of the world that was unprecedented in the history of humankind, politics were going through a period of turmoil that was never seen before, and there was a requirement for new weapons to utilize in the intellectual battle. Weapons that did not kill, but convinced, manipulated, and recruited the minds of generations in order to gain political advantages. In the midst of all this, the Western media and intelligentsia discovered the dystopian political satire. Not only they discovered the genre and its rising popularity, but they also saw much more than simply a literary expression in the two books that are the main scope of this research, which are Zamyatin's *We* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. For the intelligentsia that was already under the scrutiny of the intelligence agencies, Orwell became a champion against tyrannical regimes of the time, yet this praise was solely focused on the Soviet Union due to the political aims of the United States during the Cold War era. Though Orwell himself claimed that his works did not target any specific regime or community, even today, any common reader of dystopias would believe that *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are works of criticism aimed against the Soviet Union in particular. So far, the historical and political background was provided in order to create a vivid reflection of the situation for both the authors and the world that they were living in, and the following sub-chapters will entirely be on debunking the misconception that Orwell was, in fact, writing the *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as an attack against the Soviet regime. It is inconceivable that how two men with only their consciousness as their

moral compasses could be subjects of such manipulation in terms of their messages that they provide in their novels, and in order to understand the process, it is necessary to identify ourselves, readers, as we are.

5.1. Why We Read?

In his essay *Why I Write*, George Orwell, in vivid detail, describes his reasoning of writing his literary works up until the date of 1946, and claims that “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, 2004, p. 4). He claims to have an objective of making “political writing into an art” (Orwell, 2004, p. 5) and goes on to explain that his point of origin is “always a feeling of partisanship, a sense of injustice. [...] I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and [...] to get a hearing” (Orwell, 2004, p. 5). Indeed, for someone as heavily focused on political writing as Orwell, it is perfectly understandable to embark on a crusade against totalitarianism, the corruption and the lies that come with such. As almost all kinds of political writing, except those which strive for an objective presentation of events and of which existence would be up for a great deal of controversy, have a mindset that it tries to convince its audience into an ideology or against one. Yet, political writing also requires a first-hand experience of struggle, as it would be extremely difficult to understand the problems that create the tidal wave for creating any political work of art without living through them in the first place. Orwell also acknowledges this fact, saying “in a peaceful age I might have written ornate or merely descriptive books, and might have remained almost unaware of my political loyalties” (Orwell, 2004, p. 3). So, the creation of a work of art that focuses on the political atmosphere that one lives in or turmoil of a society needs a mind that not only observed but absorbed the underlying conditions. Yet, the question of why one would feel the urge to read such a book remains to be answered.

In his book, *Orwell, Politics, and Power*, Craig L. Carr claims that both *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* “are scary and haunting stories, and this might explain why they still command an audience” (Carr, 2010, p. 128). Indeed, as he also suggests, it can be tied, albeit in an oversimplifying manner, that “everyone enjoys a scary story” (Carr, 2010, p. 128) yet the political reasoning beyond the act of reading is left unattained in such an approach. As a reader, specifically of political fiction, one feels a need for his fears to be addressed. Carr claims that “stories about the threat political power poses to the ideals of liberty and equality are thus particularly scary for liberal spirits” (Carr, 2010, p. 128) and there is, undeniably, a strong merit to this sentence. Yet, it might only hold true for someone who is actually living in a liberal society. For readers who are striving under totalitarian regimes, dystopias strike a much different chord than others. Such readers seek for affirmation of their struggles. They seek for someone, regardless of his or her nationality, race, gender, or political stance, raising the issues that is commonplace for them in their daily lives. The author becomes their champion, someone who is ready to fight the good fight in their name, someone who can be heard. What is, for the audiences living in liberal societies, a beacon of warning in case the political power is gathered too centrally, becomes a manifestation of everyman’s struggle under a totalitarian society, regardless of how much it is taken to the extremes. The argument Carr mockingly puts forward that “now that 1984, the year, is long gone, and Big Brother seems to be nowhere in sight” (Carr, 2010, p. 132) remains a constant presence in the lives of a considerable portion of world’s population, even if it is not as hyperbolic as Orwell makes it to be in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The rejection of this fact of presence might be destructive for those who have to strive under the oppression for their ideal, let alone derogatory.

The dystopian genre fills a void in the world of literature in the aforementioned sense. It provides us with a vivid description of how the societies that we live in and in which we uphold the decency of individuals as well as basic humanitarian virtues sacred, might come to

unfold in case the political power is not contained and directed in a way that it benefits all humanity. Artists are also human beings with their choices and their ideologies, regardless of how different and opposing to those we might have. And, as Orwell himself suggests, one of the four factors that push an author to create works of art is a political purpose and Orwell defines the factor as follows:

Desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other peoples' idea of the kind of society that they should strive after. Once again, no book is genuinely free from political bias. The opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude (Orwell, 2004, p. 3).

In the description that is provide above, another key to the reasoning behind reading political fiction lies between the lines. Readers have a tendency to read the authors with whose ideas and political views they find themselves aligned with, and it creates a sense of believing that someone is advocating for us while we, as mere readers, cannot proclaim our ideals in ways that an artist can. We read for the underlying warning messages, for the joy of observing how an author, or an artist in general, can see through the distances between them and our society and describe our problems ever so accurately. And with such influence on audiences, there comes the ability to manipulate them. It solely falls on the moral compass of the author to or not to manipulate masses of readers towards whatever he or she seems fit. Yet, as it is observed in Zamyatin, even when the morality of the author is simply pure, the message can be taken, manipulated, and presented in such ways that even the author's cries for attention would fall on ears deafened by the cacophony created, as it can easily be observed in Zamyatin's case. Or, as in both Orwell's and Zamyatin's cases, their messages could be twisted and distorted to such extents that the authors might end up being portrayed as believers and defenders of opposing ideologies than their own. This bending of messages can be called as "ideological weapons of mass destruction" and their use can be defined as an

intellectual asymmetrical warfare. In order to see and analyze the long-standing results of the adoption and usage of these “weapons”, the following chapters will focus on how the messages of the two authors were, and sometimes still are, manipulated by both governments and media circles.

5.2. Zamyatin and the Roots

A solitary, savage horseman-a Scythian-gallops across the green steppe, hair streaming in the wind. Where is he galloping? Nowhere. What for? For no reason. He gallops simply because he is a Scythian, because he has become one with his horse, because he is a centaur, and the dearest things to him are freedom, solitude, his horse, the wide expanse of the steppe (Zamyatin, 1970, p. 21).

The paragraph above, provides the most vivid and picturesque definition of its author's, Zamyatin's, mindset in the years prior to the production of his masterpiece, *We*. Following the establishment of Glavlit in 1922, which coincided with Zamyatin's most active years both as a thinker / activist and an author, the literary stage within the borders of the Soviet Union was shaped in a ruthless fashion, abolishing any kind of production that was not for the benefit of the revolution and even labelling them treasonous and counter-revolutionary. The “neo-realism” was the prominent method of expression under the influence of Glavlit, and as William Hutchings also point out, he was “consistently advocating the avant-garde and the ‘heretical’ in all forms of expression” (Hutchings, 1982, p. 82). Standing with his own ideals of detachment from any sort of ideology, method of expression and political fanaticism, Zamyatin, coming under heavy fire from Glavlit-influenced literary circles and state-controlled media and unable to speak of anything in his defense, had to emigrate from Russia; yet as the paragraph above suggested, he was detached from any sort of ideology so long as it hindered the humanity to reach its greater goals destined. The roots that Zamyatin sowed brought life to a whole new genre, political satirical dystopian fiction, in the

following decades, and in order to see their utilization and abuse within the following decades, it is mandatory to take an in-depth look into the elements of the novel that manifest the unrelenting cynicism that Zamyatin penned.

The first element that Zamyatin integrated into his novel, although it is not explicitly acknowledged or denied, is the concept of “scientific management”, more commonly known and abbreviated as Taylorism, named after the pioneer of the concept, Fredrick Winslow Taylor. The concept of “scientific management” strives for the increasing the efficiency of the workflows and labor productivity, mostly at the expense of human factor. Cold and rationalistic in nature, the concept was first tried to be adapted and adopted in the Russian culture by Alexei Gastev, one of the most popular worker-poets of the early years of the Soviet Union. Taking his views on scientific management into consideration in great detail, Kendall E. Bailes provided an insight into Gastev’s mindset and claimed that Gastev believed “that the workers themselves would become increasingly mechanized and standardized, like cogs in a vast machine” (Bailes, 1977, p. 378). Also, Bailes quotes the following lines directly from Gastev:

The psychology of the proletariat is already now being transformed into a new social psychology where one human complex works under the control of another. [...] This psychology reveals a new working-class collectivism which is manifested not only in relations between persons but in the relations of whole groups of people with whole groups of mechanisms. Such a collectivism can be called mechanized collectivism. The manifestations of this mechanized collectivism are so foreign to personality, so anonymous, that the movement of these collective complexes is similar to the movement of things, in which there is no longer any individual face but only regular, uniform steps and faces devoid of expression, of a soul, of lyricism, of emotion,

measured not by a shout or a smile but by a pressure gauge or a speed gauge (Bailes, 1977, p. 378).

This argument coincides with Zamyatin's fears. In *We*, Zamyatin takes the visions and fears of Gastev, and takes them to a new level, with every humane aspect of life, joy, passion, feelings and unique personalities, are stripped from humans, called ciphers now, to the extent that they are simply numbers in a large pool of flesh and bones. They live and breathe for the One State, they pledge not only their lives, but their minds, hearts, and souls to the One State, and they are willing to become the aforementioned "cogs" in a grandiose wheel. This vision of future constitutes a beacon of warning for the future audiences of Zamyatin, and although the utilization of the book itself will be the topic of the following chapters, it is particularly interesting to see Bailes' almost hostile final comment on Gastev's vision, where he claims that Gastev's "shade has returned to trouble the friends of other values, the Bogdanovs, Kerzhentsevs, Zamyatins, Orwells and Huxleys, past and future, who prefer another vision of human work and culture" (Bailes, 1977).

At this point, it is necessary to take a deeper look into the loss of identification and differentiating traits in Zamyatin's One State. Compared to the latter *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Zamyatin's inhabitants of One State, as it is clearly impossible to call them citizens, are stripped of their uniqueness and characteristics to such an extent that they are simply called by designated numbers, and while there is an admitted influence on Orwell by Zamyatin, which leads to numerous genetical comparisons between the two novels, this absolute loss of identification is one of the main factors why a typological comparison between the two novels might end up being fruitless. For Zamyatin's *We* is written from a much more personal point of view from the eyes of D-503, the language and flow of the story is irregular in itself, unlike Orwell's third-person narration over Winston. Yet, right at this point lies one of the key elements of Zamyatin's success in narration and his condemnation from the Soviet Union in a

highly bureaucratic period of time, *We* is focusing on the element of humanity even when it is torn into pieces and barricaded behind the sturdiest walls. Although the ciphers are stripped off of their personalities, even souls, and everything that might define them as human beings, all D-503's excitements, disappointments, surprises and questions seep through the cracks of the macabre setting Zamyatin created. Right at the first page of the "First Entry" of the book, D-503 ardently takes this new form of identification, when he calls everyone living in the One State as "numbers" (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 1) .

While there are plenty of articles and research focusing on the similarities between *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and quite understandably so due to Orwell's self-acknowledged admiration for Zamyatin in his review for *We*, there is one specific comparison that has gone quite unseen throughout the studies on Zamyatin's masterpiece. Published in 1965, in his article, Richard A. Gregg draws the first parallels between Zamyatin's mockery of the utopian community and one of the most substantial books humanity conducts research on for centuries, the Holy Bible. In his article, Gregg claims that "Only when the traditional aspects of *We* have been properly assessed can the edge of its satire be fully felt" (Gregg, 1965, p. 680). And the parallels he draws become stunning as his research is read to say the least. Just as Ginsburg, in the introduction to *We*, calls the book "a Freudian charade" (Zamyatin, 1987, p. xx), the condition of a God complex manifests itself for the first time, and maybe in the most striking way it could ever be, when D-503 claims that he "had conquered the old God and the old life" and he "had created all this" (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 5). Yet, while there are moments where D-503 loses himself in the achievements he made himself, as Gregg also suggests, he can be interpreted as Zamyatin's equivalent of Adam from the Genesis, being "the dedicated architect, labors to improve the "glass paradise" of the Well-Doer" (Gregg, 1965, p. 682). For each Adam requires an Eve, a temptress, if one is going to follow the Biblical mythology patterns, Zamyatin presents I-330 to his audiences, the temptress who

enables D-503 to sin for the first time, by offering him a drink, which would be the equivalent of the forbidden fruit of knowledge, as also suggested by Mark Preslar in his research (2008, p. 40).

Another point that requires a significant amount of attention in order to understand the satire behind Zamyatin's text is none other than the name Benefactor or Well-Doer in earlier translations of the text. Here, as there are already plenty of research on the parallels between Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Zamyatin's *We*, I will apply one term that is used by Craig L. Carr on *Nineteen Eighty-Four* on *We*, and the term is "bureaucratic parentalism". He defines the term as follows:

[...] the new managerial elite replaces liberal morality with its own sense of what is in the best interest of society. Its wisdom, its professional insight, is what matters, and the new managers must achieve control of society in order to protect people from themselves and their own ignorance. [...] They seek control because they know what is best; their professionalism is the source of their elitism and the force that erodes liberal egalitarianism (Carr, 2010, p. 131).

The parallel between what Carr calls as "bureaucratic parentalism" and the Benefactor becomes clear even with a superficial reading of the text. The Benefactor, and the managing elite in Zamyatin's One State know the best for the people living in it. The Benefactor becomes a father figure, a God for those who are living within the boundaries of One State, and unbeknownst to them, the State apparatus is not only restricting their ability to seek knowledge, but the knowledge they get itself. Mark Preslar provides a perfect summary of how this manipulation takes place:

In *We*, the OneState restricts and manages people's access to knowledge in order to control them. It does so with a method more insidious than simple propaganda, censorship, or physical coercion. It manages the entire worldview of the populace by

controlling not only what knowledge is available to people but the very systems used to structure knowledge: science, religion, art, social life, and the natural world. The One State does not eliminate these systems. It tames them, circumscribes them, builds a metaphorical wall around them, and offers a neat, apparently rational, neutered version of each (Preslar, 2008, p. 35).

With this quote borne in mind, it becomes even clearer how the name Benefactor is actually a striking example of a paradox. On the surface, and for those who are obediently living within the borders of the One State, the Benefactor is their protector and caretaker. As aforementioned, even a parallel between the Biblical God and the Benefactor can be drawn. There is harsh punishment, and even exile waiting for those who venture out from the boundaries that are set by either the rules or the glass walls surrounding the city, something which D-503 worships, claiming that “Man ceased to be a wild animal when he built the first wall. Man ceased to be a savage only when we had built the Green Wall” (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 93). The wall, and its creator, the Benefactor, are the ones protecting the inhabitants, in exchange of their identities and personalities. Claiming himself as the “heretic” of the Soviet literature, this mockery of established religious dogmas is befitting Zamyatin perfectly. Again, as previously mentioned, it is worth to remember Gregg’s words when reading any kind of literary work produced by Zamyatin, as the mockery lies beneath make his writing a much more bewildering experience for his audiences in case that they are not informed regarding the traditions that are a part of daily life for the time of production.

Another prominent, and maybe the most critical and vital, element of Zamyatin’s masterpiece, and maybe one of the most significant and obvious parallels that *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* share, is the concept of fear. Every character in the book, seemingly aside from the temptress I-330, have a strong sense of fear against one concept or another. On one side, the Benefactor is obviously afraid of everything that represents the individuality of a

human being. Names, the ability to dream, the ability to think, liberty and personality are namely some of the humane characteristics that are stripped from the Ciphers / Numbers of the One State. On the other side of the spectrum, in the thirty-sixth entry of the book, where he questions D-503, the readers encounter the Benefactor described as someone who is simple, even banal, by D-503 (Zamyatin, 1987, p. 215). This, in my opinion, holds one of the key moments of the book and one of the main parallels between Zamyatin's *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, as the fear of an unknown person who is attested God-like attributes by his subjects is a common ground for both books. Yet, in *We*, there is a moment which the subject is able to raise his head and see through the veil that is created by the oppression. While in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the only act of subversion is simply joining forces with a rebellious group, here Zamyatin takes it one step further. By looking directly at the oppressing Benefactor, Zamyatin destroys the glorified image in a single sentence. While the fear rushes back in mere seconds, this particular act and moment is simply too strong to ignore, as in the years to follow, Zamyatin is observed committing the act himself, in his letter to Stalin, addressing him with his first name, in the name of comradeship and refusing to bow down to oppression.

Taking all of the above into consideration, before the publishing of *We*, the dystopian fiction genre was more focused on the science-fiction elements and although both books, *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* include those elements to some extent, it was with *We* that political satire found its way to modern literature. Before taking it into consideration in much more detail in the following chapters, there is one point that should be borne in mind. The pirated publishing of *We* in Czechoslovakia was viewed as an act of rebellion and subversion by the Soviet regime of the day, and it is interesting to see how western researchers and intelligentsia of the twentieth century, such as Eastman who became a staunch anti-communist in the latter part of his literary career and whose research on Zamyatin had already been cited in this

research previously, did not miss the chance to glorify Zamyatin as the victimized champion of resistance against Soviet oppression and try to land a blow on the image of Soviets. It was not an accident how books such as *We* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* came to the attention of wider audiences, on the other hand it was a well-organized scheme that was cultivated in decades. No matter how one reads Zamyatin's masterpiece, it stands against the test of time as a magnificent example of political satire, and while Orwell might be the better-known person for taking the political satire in dystopian genre to the mainstream and generating a wider audience, for a genre that is previously dismissed to the peripheries of the literary world, Zamyatin creates a world that can be even sharper and more cruel than those created by Orwell, Huxley and the likes. The level of detail in Zamyatin's world, specifically about the scenes consisting of machinery and technology are unmatched by many of those who followed his footsteps. His brilliant descriptive writing, combined with his scientific upbringing and a relentless critical approach, creates a world that is macabre, unforgiving, and striking from the first page to the last, although unconventionally in the form of a diary, putting the roots of the dystopian political satire genre deep into firm grounds.

5.3. Orwell and the Mainstream

Following a handful of both fictional and non-fictional works of literature and a large number of essays and correspondence that have been compiled into volumes in the following years with the tidal wave that he created, George Orwell's appearance on the literary stage with the creation and publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has been nothing short of captivating. Partially written in ill health, Orwell could not live to witness the groundbreaking success that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* have achieved, yet, alongside with *Animal Farm*, his two works that he penned and published in the final years of his life and literary career have brought him such fame and legacy that was, and arguably still is, virtually unmatched for a political author before him. Contributing concepts such as "Newspeak" and "Doublethink" to

the dystopian genre and even popular culture in time, it was, without a shadow of doubt, Orwell who took the dystopian political satire and shaped it in such a way that it was appealing for not only readers who had a considerable amount of knowledge regarding the conditions in which it was written, but also for common audiences who held entertainment as a primary aim from reading. As revolutionizing as it sounds, it was the reason for both Orwell's rise and abuse by those who had political agendas to serve their own benefit. By making him a popular culture icon and diminishing the gravity of the political concerns that he tried to raise and express in his books, Orwell was systemically reduced to a fringe character, and his ever-changing ideological loyalties made it even easier for those who wanted to do so. Prior to moving on with his abuse in modern media circles, it is necessary to delve deeper into his literary steps towards the creation and publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, as well as some of his ideas regarding the language and literature that were formed well before his final publication, his magnum opus, for that some of the concepts in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are actually his own ideas, simply taken to the extremes and twisted.

In order to write regarding *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, a researcher has to take the journey of Orwell's life and literary career, with breaking points towards the creation and publication of the book itself. While his early life, political stance and the influences of his earlier experiences have been analyzed previously within this research, it is vital to continue this research by linking his life and literary career together with one sentence from his highly influential *Why I Write* essay, claiming that "in a peaceful age I might have written ornate or merely descriptive books, and might have remained almost unaware of my political loyalties" (Orwell, 2004, p. 3). When the subject matter of any research includes Orwell's political allegiances and loyalties, it is easy to find him supporting or denouncing any political ideology, and this condition of support might be subject to change. For instance, in his journalistic book *The Road to Wigan Pier*, Orwell does not refrain from criticizing British

socialists, claiming that “the mere words of ‘Socialism’ and ‘Communism’ draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex-maniac, Quaker, ‘Nature Cure’ quack, pacifist and feminist in England” (Orwell, 2001, p. 161). It is particularly interesting how someone who does not hold his words back regarding to the supporters of an ideology finds himself among them in due time. Indeed, prior to the experiences he had on the front lines of Spanish Civil War, despite the words that he had used when he was commissioned to write about the poverty-stricken Northern England in his days of journalism, his writing is not as political as it is following the publishing of *Homage to Catalonia*, and this fact is acknowledged by Orwell himself:

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, 2004, p. 4).

This political line of artistic and critical production has resulted in a variety of creations by the prolific author, some better known than the others. Among the lesser-known ones, I believe one of the most significant productions penned by Orwell was his essay *Politics and the English Language*, published originally in 1946. With its distraught tone of language, Orwell focuses on the use of language in a very particular way, claiming that “political language [...] is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind” (Orwell, 2013, p. 20). This quote becomes particularly interesting when it is reviewed in combination with two other elements of the essay. First, within the essay, Orwell provides a striking description of a political speaker. Stating that using political and obscure words makes a speaker sound like a dummy instead of a human being, Orwell goes further to claim the following:

If the speech he is making is one that he is accustomed to make over and over again, he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying, as one is when one utters the responses in the church. And this reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, is at any rate favourable to political conformity (Orwell, 2013, p. 14).

Apart from being fascinatingly familiar for anyone who has witnessed at least one political speech in any given time of their lives, there is further importance to this quote provided above. Indeed, it can be argued that Orwell's vivid, albeit grave, descriptions and macabre settings were the primary reasons why his works of fiction gained such a popularity worldwide, yet it is impossible to deny that he drew a lot from real life as well. Although his masterpiece which took him from the muddy and clouded peripheries of literature to being a central figure of political satire, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, had been compared in many of its aspects prior to this research, it was shocking to see that I was not able to find any researcher who thought it would be worthy to point out the parallel between the quote above and the Two Minute Hate in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. As Orwell religiously attacks politics in this essay, the reduced state of consciousness that he mentions is synonymous with the state of attendees of the Two Minute Hate sessions against Goldstein in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, yet, this is not the only part where Orwell takes the concept of language towards the extremes in his magnum opus. In *Politics and the English Language*, Orwell goes on to state the "cure" for the follies of political language and its effects on users, as well as listeners. He provides a list of what should be done in order to remove the insincerity from language, which will be called as his "Six Commandments" hereafter for the ease of use in the following stages of this research.

- i. Never use a metaphor, simile or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.
- ii. Never use a long word where a short one will do.

- iii. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.
- iv. Never use the passive where you can use the active.
- v. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.
- vi. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous (Orwell, 2013, p. 19).

On the surface, these six commandments might look like they are basic and fundamental. Orwell accepts this fact as well, claiming that “these rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who had grown used to writing in the style now fashionable” (Orwell, 2013, p. 19). From a common reader’s standpoint, it can be easily concluded that this list of six rules to be observed practically forms the heart of Orwell’s literary style, specifically in the latter stages of his career as an author. Yet, just like the previous example that is provided above regarding the political speeches, he takes his own rules to the extreme in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, embedding the “Newspeak” within the storyline, a connection which goes unnoticed by researchers on Orwell as well. Quoting from his own explanation on the nature of the “Newspeak”, Orwell claims the following:

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought — that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc — should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words (Orwell, 2008, p. 312).

The example he provides within the text about the formulation of the same language is equally striking.

To give a single example. The word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as ‘This dog is free from lice’ or ‘This field is free from weeds’. It could not be used in its old sense of ‘politically free’ or ‘intellectually free’ since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless (Orwell, 2008, p. 313).

The oversimplification of the language might lead to saying something “barbarous” as Orwell himself puts it, and considering that “Newspeak” is an extreme oversimplification of the established language before the occurrence of Oceania in the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it becomes even more evident that as one delves deeper into Orwell’s prior works, regardless of the question whether they are critical, fictional or non-fictional, the number parallels that can be drawn between his earlier ideas, which he explore in depth in his earlier works, and his latter productions, which brought him the fame he has today, increase exponentially.

Aside from the extreme take on language being a prominent element of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is worth discussing how significant his use of the language itself and literary devices in order to further and better understand his flight from a frustrated author, who was previously confined to the peripheries of the literary stage, to a mainstream rebel who shook the political satire genre from its core and shaped it into such a way that it became a masterpiece that is taught in almost every single literary curriculum throughout the world. Hammond also points out another interesting fact regarding to this flight into the mainstream, stating that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* “has never been out of print” (Hammond, 1982, p. 183). Yet, it is worth delving a little deeper into the causes of this situation, and Hammond provides an extensive research on why Orwell is one of the authors who contributed to the shaping of the literary stage in England after the Second World War. The following quote, is worth considering in a journey to understand Orwell and his effects.

From a literary standpoint, then, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* must be counted as one of Orwell's outstanding artistic achievements, a work which marks a watershed in the history of sociological literature and has given the word 'Orwellian' to the English language as a term denoting nightmare oppression and thought control (Hammond, 1982, p. 183).

Indeed, Orwell provided plenty of new terms for the genre of political satire, which are quite often used nowadays, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Hammond also claims the same, stating that “the title itself is known to many thousands simply by hearsay, as a synonym for the regimentation and despotism of the monolithic state. Its influence as a warning of the erosion of individual freedom has been profound” (Hammond, 1982, p. 183). This brings a researcher on Orwell to the question of what can actually be called “Orwellian” as there already are a wide variety of dispositions among scholars producing critical studies on Orwell, conflicting with each other more often than not. While, as previously mentioned, Hammond claimed *Nineteen Eighty-Four* paved the way of a term called “Orwellian” to come to the literary stage denoting “nightmare oppression” (Hammond, 1982, p. 183), on another hand, another researcher into Orwell's literary contributions, Jeffrey Meyers, sternly opposed the view, saying “the most common cliché of Orwell criticism is that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a “nightmare vision” of future totalitarianism” (Meyers, 2010, p. 142). Furthermore, for *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, while Hammond claims that “as a literary composition it is superior to those which inspired it since it possesses a cohesion and inner logic lacking in the dystopias of Wells, Zamyatin and Huxley” (Hammond, 1982, p. 183), Meyers, again on the opposite end of the spectrum, calls out Orwell for the book to be “composed of five poorly integrated elements” (Meyers, 2010, p. 154). While even scholars' definitions and descriptions may vary in such extremes regarding to arguably the most controversial author of the twentieth century and his masterpiece, it becomes much more understandable why Orwell became a mainstay

figure within the political satire genre. He provides a different experience for anyone who reads his books. For a conservative mindset, his novel is simply located too much on the left of the political literary spectrum. For a leftist mindset, he is simply “too liberal”, as Rob Breton calls him out for and as previously mentioned within this research⁵. He is not a clear supporter of Soviet Union or Communism, yet he believes in a form of “democratic socialism”⁶ as he puts it. Just like Zamyatin, Orwell determines his actions according to one simple thing, his own moral compass. And the most prominent reason why he is the author who took the genre of political satire and brought it to the attention of the masses, instead of a niche group of readers, is the fact that every reader can find something that he, or she, can relate to, or feel angry about, in his storylines and characters. As Hammond puts it clearly, “to absorb Orwell's nightmare, to ponder upon it and reflect on its implications for the human spirit is an essential part of our intellectual pilgrimage” (Hammond, 1982, p. 183).

5.4. Intellectual Utilization – Discovery Of Dystopias By The West

With Zamyatin's *We* translated into English language and published in 1924, a twenty-year long process of the dystopian political satire genre being brought to the attention of masses began. In his 1993 article, Phillip Wegner opens his discussion with the reasons why *We* became a mainstay material of dystopian studies, claiming that “it might well have begun with Orwell's own discussion of the text, and, later, would have been bolstered by efforts to recover literary precursors to Cold War attitudes toward socialism” (Wegner, 1993, p. 94). Orwell's own review of Zamyatin's book in 1946 and his subsequent publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, alongside with other prominent titles such as *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, took the genre from the fringe of the literary world, and created a frenzied audience who enjoyed reading about an imaginary, distant regime who were oppressing its subjects in

⁵ The relevant quotation can be found on page 35 of this research.

⁶ The relevant quotation can be found on page 38 of this research.

unimaginable ways. The attribution of those imaginary regimes to the real-life people and states were, arguably, unavoidable, as the twentieth century itself was not short of political turmoil. Yet, considering the political atmosphere of the day, it was also beneficial for those who had their own political agendas to push, and western media, mostly under the influence of Hollywood and American press, did not hesitate to take advantage of this newly-found genre. When Orwell passed away in 1950, it was not only marking the halfway point of the twentieth century, regardless of Hobsbawm's definition of it, it also marked the beginning of decades of asymmetrical intellectual warfare, not fought in trenches, or cities, but in media and by intelligentsia.

The term "Orwellian" was first used in 1950⁷, and even this fact could be argued as a proof of how significant the impact of the author was on the society. Arriving in the early 1980's, although both the cultural and political Cold War were in remission and the continental Europe was gathering around the capitalism and Americanism, a frenzy regarding the works of Orwell was still in full effect. His photograph was printed on the cover of Time magazine in November 1983 (Rodden, 1989, p. 245), and "the 1984 'countdown' began" (Rodden, 1989, p. 49). John Newsinger, quoting from John Rossi, points out the importance of this as well.

1984 was not only reviewed favourably by *Time* but also a special editorial in *Life* called the American public's attention to it. *1984*, they argued, pointed up the dangers confronting the free world with special impact because 'it comes from a leftwinger who is cautioning his fellow intellectuals of the left to beware lest their desire to help the common man wind up in trapping him in hopeless misery (Newsinger, 2018, pp. 138-139).

⁷ According to the Dictionary of Merriam Webster.

Yet, this period of almost half a century had so much more to it than it would seem like on the surface. While the literary stage was undergoing a significant change, from Realism and Modernism, towards Surrealism and Postmodernism movements being the pioneering stylistic movements in not only literature, but in art itself, the Western intelligentsia was almost completely absorbed in what was fed to them. A shift from the real, concrete issues of the society towards the artistic productions created “for the sake of the art itself” was becoming more and more prominent, and it was a perfect ground for those with political agendas to make their moves for reshaping the public opinion on subjects that actually mattered.

In her book, Frances Stonor Saunders provides a stunningly detailed account of all the dealings behind closed doors during the aforementioned half of the twentieth century. Her definition of “Doublethink” and attribution of it to the Cold War politics in the 2013 edition Preface of her book provide an interesting analysis to start reading into her research.

The counterfactual imagination thrived in the Cold War. George Orwell’s concept of “doublethink” (a cliché now, but only because it was so apt in the original) exposed the mechanisms by which ideologues tamper with reality. Doublethink is, *inter alia*, “to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies . . . to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it.” Orwell, of course, was warning of the compromising manipulations by which the totalitarian state asserts itself (Saunders, 2013, p. xi).

In her research, I believe the most complete and realistic conclusion regarding the period of Cold War is as follows, providing not only a summary for her further analysis, but also a very grim picture:

Yet it was doublethink that gave us a Congress for Cultural Freedom that was sponsored, managed, and ultimately decapitated by a CIA that was simultaneously

supporting and installing right-wing dictatorships; that commanded credibility for a campaign called “Militant Liberty”; that saw the insistence on paying any price for freedom plunge the anti-Communist cause into the jungles of Vietnam; that conjured the Nobel Peace Prize for Henry Kissinger in 1973 (prompting Tom Lehrer to say he would retire from comedy, for there was no way he could out-satirize the Stockholm committee) (Saunders, 2013, pp. xi-xii).

Indeed, the political turmoil of the era was significant in itself, and it was covered in this research, albeit not as extensively as the subject matter deserves. Yet, the political power struggle between the two superpowers and the events that took place was rightly attributed to Orwell. While Zamyatin was being portrayed as a victimized champion by the likes of Max Eastman, Orwell was becoming a kind of a “prophet”, as John Rodden claims (1989, p. 244). The Western media, under the influence of the United States both artistically, and economically, due to the Marshall Plan of 1948, was utilizing all the means at his disposal for the portrayal of the Soviet Union, and with the events unfolding, Orwell and his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was gaining more and more attention throughout the world. Indeed, Orwell’s nightmare visions were partially coming true. Following the Second World War, both superpowers of the world, the United States and the Soviet Union, were confined to their borders due to the threat of nuclear mutually assured destruction (commonly abbreviated as MAD and will be used as so henceforth), and wars, like the ones between Oceania and Eurasia in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, were fought in the peripheries, such as Vietnam, Korea and the Middle East. The two decade-long American humiliation in Vietnam War fueled the politically-driven abuse of political literature by the intelligentsia, and the CIA as the supporter behind closed doors, even further, and it was not solely confined to the libraries this time.

Indeed, Orwell's political ambiguity provided the manipulators with more material than they could ever wish for. In his book, *Hope Lies in the Proles*, John Newsinger provides a detailed insight regarding Orwell's manipulation, and his quote from Orwell himself, "there 'are certain people like vegetarians and communists whom one cannot answer" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 136) manifests how Orwell's political position was in a constant state of flux. This enabled his book embraced by the right-wing political thought while his objective could not be further from that. As Newsinger also pointed out, "Orwell was very much aware of the hijacking of the book in the months before he died and did his best to counter the development" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 137) by issuing statements regarding *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, claiming that "*Nineteen Eighty-Four* was NOT INTENDED as an attack on Socialism" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 137). Yet, alongside with the world and civilization, the media was undergoing a drastic change in the years that Orwell passed away and, despite his best efforts, his clear statement about his magnum opus mostly fell on deaf ears.

Instead, the book was seized upon by both the United States and the British governments as a potent propaganda tool in their Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union and in defence of their global imperial interests. Indeed, this great exposé of the Secret Police State, of the systematic lies continually reinvented by the Ministry of Truth, became itself a weapon in the hands of the US and British secret states, used for purposes that its author would never have sanctioned had he lived (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138).

As aforementioned, the book provided plenty of material for the right-wing political agendas to twist Orwell's words in ways that could not be further from his original intentions. But, even more significantly, with Orwell's life cut short, they were able to manipulate the messages of the book even further, with the contributions of an interesting character. A controversial figure to enter Orwell's personal life during the worst days of his ill health to

say the least, Sonia Orwell's role in the progress of transforming Orwell into the champion of anti-Soviet movement of the Cold War era is definitely worth mentioning. Marrying Orwell shortly before his demise, it is true that Sonia did not have a profound influence on Orwell's life as a literary figure, although some biographers such as Hillary Spurling claim that "she was the model for the high-spirited Julia in 1984" (Schiff, 2003). Yet still, her influence after Orwell's death remains significant for a number of reasons. Saunders' analysis into her role remains vital to understanding the process and the effect of Hollywood in 1950's England:

Shortly after George Orwell's death in 1950, Howard Hunt had dispatched Alsop and Farr to England to meet the author's widow, Sonia. They were not there to console her but to invite her to sign over the film rights to *Animal Farm*. This she duly did, having first secured their promise that they would arrange for her to meet her hero Clark Gable (Saunders, 2013, p. 247).

Indeed, at the time of Orwell's death, societies were shifting from books and newspapers, towards the new arts, most significantly towards cinema. From that perspective, it becomes evident that the Hollywood effect, crafted meticulously in order to reflect the American ideals throughout the allied countries, had already reached England and rooted itself in the minds of younger generations of the time. *Animal Farm* was made into a movie after acquiring the rights for the book adapted into a screenplay and following a long process of deliberation and subtle changes into the adaptation, the book was finally made into a film. Yet, Saunders' analysis speaks for itself regarding the movie.

The script problems were resolved by changing the ending. In the original text, Communist pigs and capitalist man are indistinguishable, merging into a common pool of rottenness. In the film, such congruity was carefully elided [...] and, in the ending, simply eliminated. In the book, "[t]he creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say

which was which.” Viewers of the film, however, saw an altogether different denouement, where it is the sight of the pigs which impels the other watching animals to mount a successful counterrevolution by storming the farmhouse. By removing the human farmers from the scene, to leave only the pigs reveling in the fruits of exploitation, the conflation of Communist corruption with capitalist decadence was reversed (Saunders, 2013, p. 248).

While the first move into the dystopian genre by the western intelligentsia was with the *Animal Farm*, by the Psychological Warfare Workshop ran by Howard Hunt, who commented on the visit to Sonia Orwell as “from this [visit] was to come the animated cartoon film of Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, which the CIA financed and distributed throughout the world” (Saunders, 2013, p. 247), the next step was obviously going to be *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which was much widely read and critically acclaimed. The rights for the book were not handed over by Orwell himself, but shortly after his death, the rights came to the position of Peter Rathvon, former president of RKO, one of the major film-making companies in the United States at the time. He was politically well-connected, with his close friendship to John Ford. Following the founding of the Motion Picture Capital Corporation, “the corporation—and Rathvon himself—enjoyed a close relationship with the U.S. government, financing films for the Motion Picture Service” (Saunders, 2013, p. 248). With all the necessary ties to the government and the intelligence agencies, the movie adaptation of Orwell’s masterpiece came to fruition in 1956, with Edmond O’ Brien, Michael Redgrave and Jan Sterling at the starring roles of the film.

The adaptation’s existence is much more relevant to the scope of this research than its success in the world of cinema. According to Saunders, “Orwell’s nightmare vision of the future in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* appealed to cultural strategists on a number of levels” (Saunders, 2013, p. 249) and it was “required reading” for the officers of Psychological

Strategy Board (Saunders, 2013, p. 249). “Although the book’s targets were complex, the overall message was clear: it was a protest against *all* lies, against *all* tricks played by governments. But American propagandists were quick to designate it in terms of a specifically anti-Communist tract” claims Saunders (2013, p. 249), regarding to its manipulation for throughout the Cold War in accordance with American strategies. In his 2007 book, *Hollywood’s Civil War*, Tony Shaw focuses on the subject which Frances Saunders did decades ago and claims the following regarding the utilization of the book’s concepts.

In 1951, US Secretary of State Dean Acheson singled out it and *Animal Farm* for having been of great value to the Department in its psychological offensive against Communism’. In these ways *Nineteen Eighty-Four* came to be used for the very purpose it warned against: propaganda for the maintenance of a super-state conflict.

‘Whatever Orwell believed he was doing’, argues literary critic Alan Sinfield, ‘he contributed to the Cold War one of its most potent myths . . . In the 1950s it [Nineteen Eighty-Four] was marvellous NATO Newspeak.’ (Shaw, 2007, p. 86)

Taking the quote above from Shaw’s research into consideration, Sinfield’s claims regarding Orwell’s utilization is much more significant than that of a US Secretary of State’s comments. It provides us with a vivid manifestation of how Orwell became an unwilling victim of an anti-Communist campaign waged by the United States, and how deep the connections went in the media industry when it came to the utilization of art for political agendas. As Saunders also points out, “the manipulation of Orwell’s parable to suit the prejudices and assumptions of the film’s makers was, of course, entirely consistent with the *parti pris* of the cultural Cold War” (2013, p. 249). With Orwell’s own political stance being in a constant state of flux, this manipulation became even easier for the manipulators. Orwell’s clear intention of producing a warning message against any sort of totalitarian regime, whether it is right or left, became a strictly right-wing message in the adept hands of

intelligence-backed media industry. Quoting from David Caute, John Newsinger points out that:

Nineteen Eighty-Four “exercised a greater impact on the culture of the Cold War than any work of history, political science or reportage’. It had been broadcast as a serial by the Voice of America and the CIA sponsored its translation into over thirty languages. It provided a whole ready-made vocabulary for the cultural battle with the Soviet Union that was waged across the world (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138).

While Orwell’s book and its adaptation rights were quick to be claimed by the new media circles, it was not the same for the other author this research focuses on. Regarding Zamyatin, American-influenced western media was much more silent, and it deserves an analysis section of its own.

While there are plenty of research into Orwell and his books taking the political satire genre to the attention of mass audiences, the same is impossible to say about Zamyatin. This can be largely attributed to the fact that Orwell was already read by a group of followers before the publications of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but Zamyatin’s presence in the European literary stage was limited due to both linguistic and political obstacles. After the first publication of *We* outside the borders of the Soviet Union, it was not until 1946 that Orwell was able to publish a review of Zamyatin’s genre-defining novel, and even he was able to read the novel from French. Today, most literary reviews of Zamyatin’s works base their research into his literary background on Mirra Ginsburg’s prefaces and Max Eastman’s *Artists in Uniform* book. It is worth noting that, due to a lack of research material into Zamyatin’s past, the already-present research portrays Zamyatin as either one of two distinct personalities; first being a dissident champion of the Stalin’s oppression, the other being a proud, yet victimized old Bolshevik whose moral compass was the only belief system he held sacred. It is not surprising to see that Eastman, once a supporter of the Socialism and a

supporter of McCarthyism later, chose the first portrayal. It was not Zamyatin's book, *We*, was brought forward mostly by both researchers, but it was his personality that was the primary focus when authoring an analysis into Zamyatin's political production. While this lack of resources from the period between 1940 to 1990 can be attributed to the presence of Iron Curtain between Europe and the Soviet Union, as the researcher of this dissertation, I believe Zamyatin's experiences also played a part regarding the lack of research material. As Ginsburg suggests, "Zamyatin's last years in Paris were years of great material hardship and loneliness. As Remizov wrote, 'He came with sealed lips and a sealed heart'" (Zamyatin, 1976, p. x). A great critical and literary producer, Zamyatin passed away in loneliness, and "his death went unmentioned in the Soviet press" (Zamyatin, 1976, p. xi). In the light of all these, comparing Zamyatin and Orwell regarding to their political impact would be unfair. Orwell was championed as a voice against oppression and totalitarianism before his production of two masterpieces, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. On the other hand, Zamyatin, in his letter to Stalin, wrote the following:

I know that life abroad will be extremely difficult for me, as I cannot become a part of the reactionary camp there; this is sufficiently attested by my past (membership in the Russian Social Democratic Party [Bolshevik] in Tsarist days, imprisonment, two deportations, trial in wartime for an anti-militarist novella). I know that while I have been proclaimed a Right-winger here because of my habit of writing according to my conscience rather than according to command, I shall sooner or later probably be declared a Bolshevik for the same reason abroad (Zamyatin, 1976, p. xvii).

In hindsight, he was right in his assumptions regarding to his future. He was never able to integrate into the society during his years in France. So, it is easy to come to the conclusion that although he stood his ground against Stalin's bureaucratic Soviet regime's attacks on his literary persona, the west neither accepted him as he was, nor gave him the

attention and credit for the contribution to the emergence of the genre, which was later on their primary ideological weapon of mass destruction in making a monster out of the Soviet Union.

5.5. A Generation Of Bias – Results Of Long-Standing Misunderstandings

To start this final chapter of this research, it is necessary to reiterate some of the objectives after putting together such a heavily politicized text. It is neither my objective to make an ideological champion out of, nor victimize, any of the authors that constitute the scope of this research. It is, according to my own point of view, without a shadow of doubt that both Orwell and Zamyatin contributed to the literary stage beyond many of those who claim themselves to be the new generation of literary critics today, such as Rob Breton attacking Orwell for having the guilt of a liberal (Breton, 2002), and it is only necessary to respect those contributions. It was a good fifteen years ago when I first picked up a copy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and I was instantly enamored with the portrayal of a grim, although realistic future. A few years later, it was time for me to read *We* for the first time, and despite the fact that it was not as finely-written in my opinion as *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, considering the time of its creation, combined with the hardships Zamyatin endured during its publication and the fact that it was *the* book which defined the genre I was fascinated about for years, it still and always will hold a prized place in my library. Throughout the years, the desire to delve deeper into the minds that created such masterpieces fueled my drive towards the creation of this research, and, as aforementioned, I believe both authors deserve immense respect for their literary and critical productions, regardless of their political positions and solely for their ability of being able to speak clearly and loudly whenever they see something that conflicted with their own moral compass.

Indeed, considering the concept of a “moral compass” is a highly subjective and debatable matter, it is necessary to bear in mind that both authors were highly influenced with

their experiences in their lives. From Zamyatin's imprisonment in the Tsarist Russia to Orwell's involvement in POUM in Catalonia, it is such experiences that mold and shape the authors we witness today. Although, it has to be acknowledged that Zamyatin's political stance was much more unwavering throughout his life when compared to Orwell, and this fact is recognized by Orwell himself as well. And, as aforementioned, due to the fact that there is no aim of glorifying any of the authors whatsoever within the scope of this dissertation, it is worth noting that Orwell was partly to blame for all the Cold War manipulations that were discussed previously. His famous notebook, consisting of names and more commonly known as Orwell's blue book, was handed over to the Information Research Department shortly before his demise. The reasons for the inclusion of the names in the book were almost as varied as the names themselves, ranging from being "anti-white" and "anti-USA" to "tendency towards homosexuality". Understandably, this pendulum movement between the persona an intelligent of post-war England and a policeman, which might be attributed to his days in Burma, created a considerable backlash against him, and enabled Orwell to become a "hero" of right-wing, conservative politics throughout the Cold War. His works were acknowledged by the conservatives and anti-Communist groups throughout the west, and this enabled a half-century long generation who were extremely biased regarding to the messages he had in his books.

Yet, there is a large gap on Orwell's productions within academia. John Rodden also points that out, claiming the following:

Animal Farm is a high school staple. 1984 is also fairly widely taught in Anglo-American schools. His essays are likewise standard requirements in introductory university composition classes. Yet these writings are rarely encountered in more advanced courses. Nor, apart from the special attention accorded Orwell's *oeuvre* in

1984, are any of his other works usually taught in the academy. Nor are there any Orwell literary societies or publications (Rodden, 1991, pp. 503-504).

It is fairly easy, even for a common reader, to understand most of the blatant anti-totalitarian messages within *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and, although improbable, it is possible to understand the anxieties of post-World Wars era. Yet, it is impossible to understand how meticulously concepts such as “Doublethink” and “Newspeak” were designed without poring through Orwell’s *Politics and the English Language*. Without reading *Homage to Catalonia* or *The Road to Wigan Pier*, it is never possible to comprehend Orwell’s anger and dedication to stand with those who he saw as oppressed. The lack of academic inclusion of Orwell, specifically in higher education, with the exception of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* being taught as an example of postmodern-era fiction, is another factor feeding this prejudice towards his books. Yet, the greatest reason of why Orwell was claimed as the champion of anti-Communism in the U.S. and the U.S.-influenced west lies in the employment of his legacy by the intelligence-powered new media. Tony Shaw’s book provides a great conclusion to his chapter regarding *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Orwell in general as follows:

To attribute the presence of dog-eared copies of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in homes and libraries scattered across the world largely to the promotional efforts of Washington and London would naturally be absurd. Yet it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the work of the CIA, PSB, USIA, IRD and others at least helped to lift Orwell’s profile, especially during the Cold War’s early years (Shaw, 2007, p. 94).

Indeed, it would be overreaching to claim that Orwell’s legacy is solely as it is due to the American efforts of making a right-wing author out of someone who fought side-by-side with POUM (Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista / The Workers' Party of Marxist Unification) fighters. Yet, considering almost anyone who claim to be interested in English

literature, political literature in general or dystopian fiction knows the names George Orwell, *Animal Farm* or *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is fair to come to the conclusion that Langley's efforts to portray Orwell in the way they intended were successful. Although even shorter than one-tenth of the two aforementioned novels, the confinement of *Politics and The English Language* or *The Lion and the Unicorn* to those who solely had a drive to learn about Orwell enabled this prejudice and bias to stay throughout the second half of the twentieth century. The two masterpieces were the only ones that were critically and continuously acclaimed throughout the circles of intelligentsia, and people were encouraged to read them. With the efforts, Orwell became one of the subjects of Oceania himself, with his book effectively becoming "Prolefeed"⁸ in this intellectual asymmetrical warfare with its place in the popular culture, albeit misunderstood, as an attack against Soviet Union. To conclude the chapter and start concluding the dissertation itself, I believe Shaw's comment on Orwell's place in the latter half of the twentieth century provides a picturesque definition of how he and his books were canonized in the western media, in accordance with their own agendas, turning both the books and the prolific, yet eccentric author into ideological weapons of mass destruction so to speak.

The more long-term effects of these efforts is even more difficult to determine, but it is worth noting that by the time of the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had sold almost 40 million copies in more than 60 languages, more than any other pair of books by a serious or popular post-war author (Shaw, 2007, p. 94).

In his book, Shaw provides a much more contemporary research into the topic which was first researched and penned by Frances Stonor Saunders. Yet, the quote aforementioned

⁸ Prolefeed: "the rubbishy entertainment and spurious news which the Party handed out to the masses" (Orwell, 2008, p. 320)

provides a significant detail hidden between the lines, when it is thought in combination with the research of Saunders. Considering the fact that the translation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* into more than thirty languages was funded by the CIA during the height of the Cold War, as well as the book's broadcast as a serial over the Voice of America radio channel (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138), while I personally agree with Shaw's aforementioned statement that it would be absurdly far-reaching to "attribute the presence of dog-eared copies of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in homes and libraries" (Shaw, 2007, p. 94), it is impossible to deny the fact that CIA both benefited from and fueled this popularity, as it provided them with "bullets" to penetrate into minds, souls and hearts of casual readers, with their nightmare propaganda against Communism.

6. CONCLUSION

During the height of it, the First World War was named as "The War to End All Wars", and history proved that this name could not be further from being accurate. Instead, it paved the way for two more major wars in its wake, one fought in the battlefields of continental Europe and one fought in the minds of the people, with the exchanges of gunfire confined to the peripheries of the world for that time. The tidal wave of Socialism found its way into the political stage of the world, and the end of the First World War buried formerly glorious empires into the tomes of history books. Between the two world wars, an author emerged with a new genre, from the same part of the world that brought the idea of Socialism into existence. Yevgeny Zamyatin, with his book *We*, defined the genre of dystopian political satire, and despite the vicious backlash from Stalin's government ending in his emigration / exile from his homeland, brought life to a genre that would become a canon of ideological and psychological warfare in only three decades. Yet, Zamyatin's *We* was mostly obscured by the works of George Orwell, partly because of Orwell's much more eccentric personality, and partly because of the fact that "even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking

in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be” (Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, 2007, p. 220). Taken away from its unique place of creation, combined with the prejudicial attitude towards Russian authors, regardless of their political position, at the time, Zamyatin’s masterpiece never found the audience it deserved in the continental Europe. Even today, with the ban imposed by the Soviet Union has been long lifted, Zamyatin is not widely accepted even in his home country of Russia, let alone in other countries in continental Europe.

Unlike Zamyatin, Orwell enjoyed a widespread fame with both his fictional and non-fictional writing. Yet, it was not until 1936 when he found his true devotion, being the voice speaking up “against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism” (Orwell, 2004, p. 4). Indeed, this quote from his own words can be opened for debate due to the latter revelation of him passing information on people who were “undesirables” in his eyes to the western intelligence agencies. Yet, while Orwell was collecting the names of “undesirables” according to his own set of values, both him and Zamyatin were becoming “undesirables” as well, although for different reasons. As aforementioned, Zamyatin was mostly rejected due to his nationality and being an Old Bolshevik. Yet, in Orwell’s case, his rejection was coming from those who he had seemingly sided with. While those with right-wing political agendas were glorifying Orwell for presenting a macabre description of a totalitarian, oppressive Soviet regime, the left in general and the British left in particular was furious with him, due to his commitment to the destruction of the “Soviet myth” (Newsinger, 2018, p. 137). Newsinger also pointed out that:

A L Morton, the CP historian, author of the excellent *A People’s History of England*, was typical in the way that he tried to portray the book as an attack on socialism, as deliberately intended to undermine the struggle for socialism and to strengthen the right (Newsinger, 2018, p. 139).

Yet, there was something much sinister lurking in the shadows of all those misunderstandings created over Orwell's publications. With the acquiring of the movie adaptation rights from Sonia Orwell shortly after George Orwell's demise, CIA-backed Hollywood companies lost no time on producing movie adaptations of the two masterpieces of Orwell, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, carefully transforming the messages presented in both texts, effectively turning them into "Prolefeed". The companies, indeed, did not act on their own behalf, as *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was specifically "seized upon by both the United States and the British governments as a potent propaganda tool in their Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union and in defence of their global imperial interests" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138). Employing all the assets they had in their hands, broadcasting the book on Voice of America radio channels and translating it into more than thirty other languages than English, "this great exposé of the Secret Police State, of the systematic lies continually reinvented by the Ministry of Truth, became itself a weapon in the hands of the US and British secret states" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138). At the height of the Cold War, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was not only a book that contained a message of warning against totalitarianism and the "perversions to which a centralized economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in Communism and Fascism" (Newsinger, 2018, p. 138), but an ideological weapon. Despite the fact that we, as humankind, know how long the effects of a nuclear bomb will last in any given territory, as Tony Shaw also points out, "the more long-term effects of these efforts is even more difficult to determine" (Shaw, 2007, p. 94) as today, most of the common readers of the two novels instinctively come to the conclusion that Orwell's book was an attack on Socialism itself. This is, partly due to the bias that was fueled by this ideological and psychological warfare, and partly due to the lack of inclusion, and recognition thereof, of Orwell's other texts, essays being the most important. If a reader wants to understand the underlying messages, as well as commonplace concepts that came to be called

as “Orwellian” such as “Newspeak” and “Doublethink”, it is necessary to analyze the essays and the critical works of Orwell as well. In Zamyatin’s case, on the other hand, once again, reading through his essays, specifically “Scythians”, “Tomorrow” and “On Literature, Revolution, Entropy and Other Matters”, will provide great insights of a man with a solid faith in Socialism did not bow down to the systematic intellectual attacks targeting himself, and addressed Stalin with his first name in the name of comradeship. The genre of dystopian political satire is a blade with a very fine edge. As the examples from the Cold War era manifest, if used appropriately, they can become a much more dangerous ideological weapon of mass destruction than a nuclear missile. To guarantee one’s integrity against any prejudicial thoughts that systemic placement of propaganda using those weapons, be it a common reader or an academic, one as to prepare and arm oneself, so that human decency will prevail against any kind of intellectual oppression, political agendas or biased sway.

REFERENCES

- Bailes, K. E. (1977, July). Alexei Gastev and the Soviet Controversy over Taylorism, 1918-24. *Soviet Studies*, 373-394. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/150306>
- Benjamin, W. (2007). The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. In W. Benjamin, *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Benjamin, W. (2007). Theses on the Philosophy of History. In H. A. Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (pp. 253-264). New York: Schocken Books.
- Breton, R. (2002). Crisis? Whose Crisis? George Orwell and Liberal Guilt. *College Literature*, 29(4), 47-66. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25112677>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (2021, February 10). *Dystopia definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary*. Retrieved from Cambridge Dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/dystopia>
- Carr, C. L. (2010). *Orwell, Politics and Power*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Cohen, G., Lechoń, J., Lednicki, W., DeVoto, B., & Undset, S. (1943). National Literatures and Universalist Ideals. *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, 1(4), 854-942. Retrieved October 27, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24724375>
- Connors, J. (1975). ZAMYATIN'S "WE" AND THE GENESIS OF 1984. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 21(1), 107-124. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26280262>
- Eastman, M. (1934). *Artists in Uniform*. New York: Knopf.

- Faulkner, N. (2017). *A People's History of the Russian Revolution*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fuchs, C. (2020). *Communication and Capitalism: A Critical Theory*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Gregg, R. A. (1965, December). Two Adams and Eve in the Crystal Palace: Dostoevsky, the Bible, and We. *Slavic Review*, 24(4), 680-687. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2492898>
- Hammond, J. R. (1982). *A George Orwell Companion: A Guide to the Novels, Documentaries and Essays*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1989). *The Age of Empire, 1875 - 1914*. New York, USA: Vintage Books.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1995). *The Age of Extremes, The Short Twentieth Century 1914 - 1991*. London, The United Kingdom: Abacus.
- Hutchings, W. (1982). Structure and Design in a Soviet Dystopia: H. G. Wells, Constructivism, and Yevgeny Zamyatin's "We". *Journal of Modern Literature*, 9(1), 81-102. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3831277>
- Lieven, A. (2017, July / August). The New Nationalism. *The National Interest*, pp. 21-29.
- Meyers, J. (2010). *Orwell: Life and Art*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Newsinger, J. (2018). *Hope Lies in the Proles: George Orwell and the Left*. London: 2018.
- Orwell, G. (1968). *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell Volume II: My Country Right or Left 1940-1943* (Vol. 2). (S. O. Angus, Ed.) New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.
- Orwell, G. (1968). *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: In Front of Your Nose* (Vol. IV). (S. O. Angus, Ed.) London: Secker & Warburg.

- Orwell, G. (2001). *The Road to Wigan Pier*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Orwell, G. (2004, July 24). *Why I Write*. Retrieved from University of Warwick:
https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/english/currentstudents/postgraduate/masters/modules/humanrights/why_i_write_orwell.pdf
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books.
- Orwell, G. (2013). *Politics and The English Language*. London, The United Kingdom: Penguin Classics.
- Preslar, R. M. (2008). Yevgeny Zamyatin's "WE": Forbidden Knowledge and Coercion in Utopia. *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 91(1/2), 33-61. Retrieved from
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41179177>
- Rodden, J. (1989). *The Politics of Literary Reputation: The Making and Claiming of 'St. George' Orwell*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rodden, J. (1991, September). Reputation, Canon-Formation, Pedagogy: George Orwell in the Classroom. *College English*, 53(5), 503-530. doi:10.2307/377460
- Saunders, F. S. (2013). *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*. New York: The New Press.
- Schiff, S. (2003, June 15). *The Widow Orwell*. Retrieved from The New York Times:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/15/books/the-widow-orwell.html>
- Shaw, T. (2007). *Hollywood's Cold War*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Struve, G. (1938, April). Evgeny Zamyatin. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 16(48), 700-702. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4203434>

Wegner, P. E. (1993). On Zamyatin's *We*: A Critical Map of Utopia's 'Possible Worlds'.

Utopian Studies, 4(2), 94-116. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20719963>

Winnick, R. H. (2019). *Tennyson's Poems: New Textual Parallels*. Cambridge, The United

Kingdom: Open Book Publishers. doi:10.11647/OBP.016

Zamyatin, Y. (1970). *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*. (M. Ginsburg, Trans.)

Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zamyatin, Y. (1976). *The Dragon: Fifteen Stories*. (M. Ginsburg, Trans.) Chicago: The

University of Chicago Press.

Zamyatin, Y. (1987). *We*. (M. Ginsburg, Trans.) New York: Avon Books.