

THE MEANING OF IDEOLOGY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GEORGE
ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* AND YAŞAR KEMAL'S *THE SULTAN OF THE
ELEPHANTS AND RED BEARDED LAME ANT*



ECE ÖZPINAR

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
İSTANBUL, 2023

THE MEANING OF IDEOLOGY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GEORGE
ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* AND YAŞAR KEMAL'S *THE SULTAN OF THE
ELEPHANTS AND RED BEARDED LAME ANT*

ECE ÖZPINAR

SUPERVISOR

PROF. DR. MEDİHA GÖBENLİ

SUBMITTED TO GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
İSTANBUL, 2023

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 : 03.07.2023

Name/Surname: Ece ÖZPINAR

ABSTRACT

In this work, the novels *Animal Farm* by George Orwell and *The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant* by Yaşar Kemal are analysed comparatively through the Marxist literary theory benefiting from Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton and Lucien Goldmann. This study examines how Orwell and Kemal from different geographies, nationalities and traditions have been influenced by the Marxist literary tradition. The figures in the two novels are compared according to their characteristics/profile, the changes they have gone through, and the protagonists' endings in their own story. The features of the works have been also examined through an analysis of the writers' lives.

In the theoretical part, the meaning of ideology in novels, and its reflections have been evaluated. The topic of the third part will be George Orwell's biography as a writer of the modern period, and the ideological elements as well as sociological ones in *Animal Farm*; in the fourth part, the biography of Yaşar Kemal and the ideological elements as well as sociological ones in his novel *The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant* will be studied. The fifth chapter is about a comparative thematic and stylistic analysis of the two novels, which also is the aim of this work.

Key words: Marxist Criticism, Marxist Literary Criticism, Georg Lukács, George Orwell, Yaşar Kemal, Animal Farm, The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada George Orwell'in *Hayvan Çiftliği* romanı ile Yaşar Kemal'in *Filler Sultanı ile Kırmızı Sakallı Topal Karınca* romanları, Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton ve Lucien Goldmann'ın Marksist edebiyat kuramı ekseninde karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmiştir. Bu çalışma, farklı coğrafyalardan, milliyetlerden ve geleneklerden gelen bu yazarların Marksist edebiyat geleneğinden nasıl etkilendiklerini incelemektedir. İki romandaki kişiler, özellikleri/profilleri, geçirdikleri değişimler ve kendi hikayelerindeki sonları açısından karşılaştırılır. Eserlerin özellikleri, yazarların hayatları üzerinden de incelenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Bu çalışmanın kuramsal ve ikinci bölümünde ideoloji ve sosyolojinin romandaki anlamı ve romanlardaki ilk yansımaları değerlendirilmiştir. Üçüncü bölümde modern dönem yazarı George Orwell'in biyografisi ve *Hayvan Çiftliği* romanındaki sosyolojik unsurların yanı sıra ideolojik unsurlar, dördüncü bölümde Yaşar Kemal'in biyografisi ve *Filler Sultanı ile Kırmızı Sakallı Topal Karınca* adlı romanında yer alan ideolojik unsurların yanı sıra sosyolojik unsurlar incelenmiştir. Beşinci bölüm, bu çalışmanın amacı olan iki romanın tematik ve üslup yönünden karşılaştırmalı bir incelemesini içermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Marksist Eleştiri, Marksist Edebiyat Eleştirisi, Georg Lukács, George Orwell, Yaşar Kemal, Hayvan Çiftliği, Filler Sultanı ile Kırmızı Sakallı Topal Karınca



For My Mother and Father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my exquisite supervisor, Prof. Dr. Mediha Göbenli, for her precious guidance, encouragement, and quick feedback throughout the research. I would also like to thank my former supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Catherine Macmillan, for her valuable effort, kind words and support. I would like to extend my thanks to Prof. Dr. Adriana Raducanu, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fiona Tomkinson, Prof. Dr. Charles Sabatos and Prof. Dr. Oğuz Cebeci, as I feel very lucky to be their student, who enlightened my mind with the master's courses they gave and opened new horizons for me.

I thank Dr. Gülhanım Bihter Yetkin, my esteemed friend who is a turning point in my life, my dearest colleague who gave me hope for life, academic goals and believed in me. I am eternally grateful to my family to whom I dedicate this work for their support in every moment of my life.

I close this section with the first lines of Pink Floyd's *Three Different Ones* from *Animals* album and Syd Barrett's *Effervescing Elephant* song, which inspired the burst of this thesis while I was listening to them in 2016:

Big man, pig man

Ha ha, charade you are (Floyd, 1977).

An effervescing elephant

With tiny eyes and great big trunk

Once whispered to the tiny ear

The ear of one inferior (Barrett, 1970).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. POLITICAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	5
2.1. Modern Times: Cultural Propaganda in the Cold War	7
2.2. Modernism vs. Realism: Marxist Literary Theory.....	9
3. GEORGE ORWELL: THE MAINSTREAM OF IDEOLOGY.....	19
3.1. George Orwell's <i>Animal Farm</i>	24
4. YAŞAR KEMAL: A REBELLIOUS DADALOĞLU	30
4.1 Yaşar Kemal's <i>The Sultan of The Elephants and Red Bearded Lame Ant</i>	35
5. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON <i>ANIMAL FARM</i> AND <i>THE SULTAN OF THE ELEPHANTS AND RED BEARDED LAME ANT</i>	41
5.1 Allegory as a Literary Tool.....	44
5.2 Language.....	48
5.3 Theme	54
6. CONCLUSION	64
REFERENCES.....	67

1. INTRODUCTION

“Practitioners of the discipline of comparative literature today often try to ideologize the aesthetic values of literature (and culture) singularly for the purpose of political agendas and this, in my opinion, must not continue” (Galik, 2000, p. 5).

Works become world literature by being taken into the domain of a foreign culture, a space defined in many ways by the national tradition of the host culture and the current needs of their respective authors (Damrosch, 2003, p. 13). If the nature of a work changes, in other words, when it ceases to be national and is included in the field of a foreign culture, it becomes world literature. In this sense, the German philosopher, poet and literary critic, Johann Gottfried Herder, recalls the idea of national language and culture, without which the study of national literature and comparative literature cannot be considered. He states that the works produced by such writers as Homer, Milton, and Virgil “go by the name of epic, and yet, they are very distinct productions according to their inherent conceptions of art” (Herder, 1797, p. 7). Although Herder accepts that these authors are gathered under a common term, he is aware that authors create very different work according to their own understanding of art and culture.

World literature is defined as the most important literature of modern times, by leading figures such as Goethe, Marx, and Engels. However, Goethe asks the question: should we consider only the best examples of all literature from different periods and regions as world literature? Goethe himself, like Marx and Engels, the authors of *The Communist Manifesto*, linked emerging universal world literature not only with the contemporary period in general, but also with the ever-expanding literature, quite concretely (Birus, 2000, pp. 2-3). At this point, a work enters world literature through a dual process: First, by being read as literature; and second, by wandering beyond the linguistic and cultural point of origin to the wider world (Damrosch, 2003, p. 6). However, Göbenli noted the clarity that Fritz Strich, the literature historian, brought to Goethe's concept of world literature:

Fritz Strich, Goethe'nin literatüre soktuğu dünya edebiyatı kavramıyla uluslararası, karaktersiz, halkçı öznelliğini reddeden kosmopolit bir edebiyatı kastetmediğini, tam tersine ulusların aynışmadan karşılıklı birbirlerini algılayacakları, anlayacak, birbirlerini sevmeseler bile birbirlerine katlanmayı öğrenecekleri bir edebiyatı kastettiğini yazmaktadır (Göbenli, 2004, p. 16).

Fritz Strich wrote that with the concept of world literature that Goethe introduced into the literature, he does not mean an international, characterless, cosmopolitan literature that rejects its populist subjectivity, but rather a literature in which nations will perceive each other without becoming the same, understand each other, and learn to endure each other even if they do not like each other.

What is meant by rejecting international and characterless literature? The word ‘rejecting’ here should be related to fields such as sociology and cultural history. Besides, the concept of world literature means national literatures in which nations perceive each other without becoming homogeneous. According to Wellek, comparative literature does not include “only sources and influences, causes and effects”, because no work can be reduced completely to “foreign influences or considered as a radiating point of influence only toward foreign countries” (Wellek, 1964, p. 283). Therefore, the scope of comparative literature is related to fields such as sociology and cultural history. Göbenli states “(...) edebiyat ve tarih arasında daha sıkı bir ilişki söz konusudur. Yoksa belli dönemlerde yaşanan olaylara karşı yazarlarca bir tavır alma zorunluluğu oluşmazdı (Göbenli, 2004, p. 31). “(...) there is a tighter relationship between literature and history. Otherwise, it would not be necessary for the writers to take a stand against the events that took place in certain periods”. It is obvious that there is a close relationship between literature and history. The literary theory which examines this relationship, including social issues and strata from which the authors come, is Marxist theory. “Marksist edebiyat kuramının, edebiyatı sosyal olayların ve ekonominin belirlediği konusundaki görüşü karşılaştırmalı çalışmalarında da belirgindir” (Aytaç, 2016, p. 78). “Marxist literary theory's view that social events and economics determine literature is also evident in its comparative studies”. Writers such as George Orwell and Yaşar Kemal, who are the subjects of this thesis, and will be analysed using Marxist literary theory, have given a lot of thought to events that have been influenced by history in their writings, interviews, and even in their novels.

As a product of social interaction, sociology deals with culture that emerges from past interaction, and guides present and future interaction. Hegel stated that because of the division of labour, the individual is no longer dependent on nature, but is dependent on society. Thus, the social environment replaces the natural

environment. This point is one of the main themes of Hegelian thought, later developed by Auguste Comte, who gave priority to sociology over psychology (Hyppolite, 2016, p. 118). Accordingly, culture influences the personalities of social beings. Literature, as interpreted by the author, is a product that reflects the cultural interaction of the past and affects the interaction of the reader. The effect of literature on social interaction through writers and readers is obvious. “Novels are living sourcebooks to which we go for valid insights about such important sociological concerns as the group, the self, social class, and social institutions” (Merrill, 1967, p. 656). In this view, literature is an important source of knowledge about society, culture, and the authors’ interactions with them.

Orwell chose *Animal Farm* (1945) as his title which recalls a fairy tale; Kemal’s *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lane Ant* (1977) was written as a children’s novel. However, neither writer wrote specifically for children or adults, but for people of all ages, and both placed emphasis on being understood by all. Both authors are known as writers who did not hesitate to express their opinions on social issues. It is understood from their statements and essays that the political views of both authors were very close to each other. Do these parallels allow us to assume a simple connection between Orwell and Kemal? Although Yaşar Kemal is known to be familiar with Western writers and world literature, and refers to the names of foreign writers from whom he drew immense inspiration, he never mentioned Orwell in any of his interviews or conversations. This makes it interesting to conduct a genetic comparison¹ about the novels of these two different authors. When people read the two novels, they expressed in various ways that they immediately identified an Orwellian flavour in Kemal’s work. My aim is to find out why this similarity was established at first glance, and secondly, more interestingly, to establish the parallels between these two novels in quite different aspects. In other words, what is meant in this thesis is to emphasise that superficial similarities in general are not superior to specific differences.

This thesis will include a genetic comparison between a British and a Turkish novelist. Starting from the understanding of social integrity, Lukács emphasised that

¹ Genetic comparison is fundamentally the comparison between two literary works of art written by the authors in different countries under different socioeconomic, cultural conditions, in terms of their similarities and differences.

historical and social changes should be reflected in literary work. Goldmann, on the other hand, brought a different approach to the sociology of literature with the theory of genetic structuralism, and tried to reveal the relationship between literature and society through structure.

In this thesis, George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm* and Yaşar Kemal's novel *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lane Ant* will be analysed comparatively through Marxist literary theory which benefits from Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton and Lucien Goldmann. The figures in the two novels will be compared according to their characteristics/ profiles, the changes they have gone through, and their endings in their own stories. Features of the works have also been examined through an analysis of the writers' lives. In the theoretical part, the meaning of ideology and its reflections on the novels will be discussed through a critical point of view. The fifth chapter will be concerned with a comparative analysis of the two novels, which also shows the aim of this work.

2. POLITICAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Marxism can be summarised as the theory and practice of the working-class revolution. It analyses class relations and struggles socioeconomically by explicating the historical development of social transformation. It arises from the works written in the nineteenth century by German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They found that a steady increase in the productivity of human labour meant an increased capacity to eliminate poverty. Considering the Marxist point of view, it can be observed that class conflict within capitalism comes from the contradictions between the working-class people, and the bourgeoisie.

Orwell believed that “man’s instinct for power makes the classless society impossible” (Meyers, 2009, p. 31-32). These contradictions can also be observed clearly through the alienation of labour which is another concept explained by Marx. The economic dynamics of production affect other social facts, like social relations, the political system, and ideology. In this sense, the economic system and social relations cannot be thought of as separate from each other. Capitalist production causes class struggle, and it comes into existence between the bourgeoisie as the minority who own the production sources, and the proletariat as the majority who produce the things. According to Marx and Engels, working-class people are not only slaves of the bourgeois class and the bourgeois state; they are enslaved every day, every hour, by the machines, by the inspector, and above all by the bourgeois manufacturer himself (Marx & Engels, 2016, p. 58).

The year 1917 began a whirlwind of a century of war and revolution. Famine, starvation and death, brought on by the war, had harassed the Russian people. The abuse of power, brought about by long working hours, low wages, and war, led to strikes in Russia. “On the anniversary of 1905’s Bloody Sunday massacre, 150,000 workers from a hundred factories had come onto the streets of the capital. It turned into a massive protest against war, inflation, and low wages” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 112). Tsar Nicholas II, instead of listening to the voice of his people, vehemently opposed protest at a difficult moment, such as wartime, and ordered soldiers to fire on anyone who disobeyed him. “The regime had chosen to militarise the crisis. It was attempting to restore order through terror: by turning Russian soldiers against Russian workers” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 124). Solving the crisis by creating another crisis took a heavy toll

on the Tsar. The victory of the Revolution in the Tsarist capital was completed towards evening on February 27.

After the February Revolution of 1917, in the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet there were two prominent parties; the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. The voices of the political formation called the Social Democratic Labor Party were gradually being heard. The general idea of this first Russian Social Democratic Party was to establish a democratic republic instead of the Tsarist regime. At the same time, the Party emphasised the need to take a series of financial measures to improve the financial situation of the working class and the peasantry. The Party also stressed that all citizens should have equal rights. Later, another party to emerge was the Socialist Revolutionary Party. In short, the Socialist Revolutionaries differed from the Social Democrats in that they wanted to make the rights of the peasant class the main revolutionary element, and believed that there should be no landowners other than the peasants. “Devrimci Parti’nin diğer talepleri ise, otokrasinin kaldırılması, demokratik yönetim şekli, eşit hak ve özgürlükler, işçilerin gün içinde fazla çalışması nedeniyle ortaya çıkan sekiz saatlik iş mesaisinin zorunlu hale getirilmesidir” (Yetkin, 2022, p. 11). “Other demands of the party were the abolition of the autocracy, the democratic form of government, equal rights and freedoms, and the obligatory eight-hour working hours due to the overtime work of the workers during the day”. Liberal, conservative, and socialist politicians united against the Tsarist regime and formed the Russian Provisional Government. These politicians shared power with the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, but unification had a major downside, because this dual power regime only lasted a few months. The Bolsheviks came to power in the October Revolution. By the 1920s, the revolutionary spirit that Lenin had continued to carry with the leadership of the Bolshevik Party began to fade, and duplicity began to emerge. According to Faulkner, in this period, “two main class forces dominated Russian life: the peasantry, now in control of the land, and the party-state bureaucracy” (Faulkner, 2017, p. 239). Thus, the bureaucracy began to become more powerful in politics as their numbers increased in the Bolshevik Party. Stalin would emerge from the back rooms of the Bolshevik Party as the political expression of a new bureaucratic ruling class (Faulkner, 2017, p. 236). Faulkner described the turbulent flow in 1925 with the rise of bureaucracy as follows:

The takeover by the party bureaucracy was given clear political expression by the adoption, at the Fourteenth Party Congress in December 1925, of the doctrine of 'socialism in one country'. This amounted to the evisceration of the entire Marxist tradition – which can be defined as the theory and practice of international proletarian revolution – and of the Bolshevik tradition which, true to Marxism, had insisted time... (Faulkner, 2017, pp. 242-243).

This 'socialism in one country' seems like a contradictory statement. Faulkner believed there are two ways in the world, the socialist revolution, and the international capitalist system; that is, there is no 'middle way' (Faulkner, 2017, p. 244). In 1927, 'socialism in one country' eliminated the idea of world revolution, but this situation brought isolation to Russia. Thus, Stalin sought to escape Russia's isolation by seeking respectable allies abroad.

2.1. Modern Times: Cultural Propaganda in the Cold War

When the Second World War ended, the Cold War officially began. The Cold War brought huge changes. America and the Soviet Union had developed a forced alliance against their common enemy, Hitler. However, after the Second World War, the tension between America, which adopted neoliberal policies and wanted to build a global capital, and the Soviet Union, which had a state-centred economy, inevitably increased. In this case, it was obvious that the atmosphere of peace would not last long. However, this time a different method was used to fight. Guns and cannon shots stopped, and frontline warfare gave way to the manipulation of intelligence and the media, including Cold War cultural weapons such as magazines, books, conferences, and art exhibitions.

In 1999, Frances Stonor Saunders wrote her interesting book *Who Paid the Piper?: CIA and the Cultural Cold War*, revealing the history of the CIA-funded Congress for Cultural Freedom. According to Saunders, the group of left-wing intellectuals whose beliefs in Marxism and communism had been shattered by the evidence of Stalinist totalitarianism were well-suited to being soldiers of the Cold War. In addition, European writers became part of an anti-communist program. The non-communist left did not refrain from supporting the ideas of intellectuals who were heartbroken about communism but were still loyal to the ideals of socialism (Saunders, 2000, p. 63).

There was a deep connection between abstract expressionism and the cultural Cold War (Saunders, 2000, p. 259). Being aware of this was important in the context of analysing this deep relationship between the Cold War and art. In aesthetic character, US art was no longer European-influenced, but was recreated as an independent, self-assured, true expression of national will, spirit, and character. As early as 1946, critics were appreciating the birth of this new art. This is where the deep connection between abstract expressionism and the cultural Cold War was born (Saunders, 2000, p. 254).

Modern art represented liberty, and it was “useless for the dictator’s propaganda” (Saunders, 2000, p. 268). This is similar to Oscar Wilde’s rhetoric “all art is quite useless”; modern art stands for total liberation. However, art was not liberated with the glorification of abstract aestheticism, which was politicised under the name of freedom. On the contrary, modern art supporters tried to erase movements such as realist aestheticism by imposing their own art on others. According to Saunders, the Congress for Cultural Freedom’s support for experimental, abstract painting over realist aesthetics, must be seen in this context (Saunders, 2000, p. 272).

Not only paintings, but also films, were among the most suitable arts for propaganda during the Cold War period. In 1950, the International Organizations Division (IOD) outlined some key steps. As Saunders discussed in her newspaper article, “it was this office which subsidised the animated version of George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, which sponsored American jazz artists, opera recitals, the Boston Symphony Orchestra’s international touring programme” (Saunders, 1995). She reveals the truths in detail later in her book. Shortly after Orwell’s death in 1950, the author’s widow, Sonia, had some visitors. These visitors invited her to sign over the film rights to *Animal Farm*. It has been documented that this visit established the future of the cartoon version of *Animal Farm*, which was financed and distributed by the CIA. On November 15, 1951, a huge production team was assembled to produce the film, *Animal Farm* (eighty cartoonists, 750 scenes, 300,000 colour drawings). *Animal Farm*’s publisher, Fredric Warburg, visited the film studio several times and offered his suggestions for script changes. (Saunders, 2000, p. 294). In addition, when the screenplay was scrutinised by the Psychological Strategy Board, its officers realised that there was no great clarity of message in the book. Thus, the script

problems were resolved by changing the ending. “By removing the human farmers from the scene, to leave only the pigs revelling in the fruits of exploitation, the conflation of communist corruption with capitalist decadence was reversed” (Saunders, 2000, p. 295).

Orwell’s *Nineteen-Eighty Four* was filmed with the same approach. Ironically, in the book, the members of the Anti-Sex League are supposed to wear sashes across their chests. However, sashes were worn by diplomats on ceremonial occasions, so this needed change. It was suggested that the characters should wear armbands instead. As can be observed, “the films *Animal Farm* and *1984* were of ideological interest to the American Committee for Cultural Freedom” (Saunders, 2000, pp. 297-98). Obviously, after his death, Orwell became representative of anti-socialist ideology, and especially the apparatus of liberal right-wing governments in the West. By the West’s apparatus, the Cold War strategies of the United States are meant; Orwell’s name has become synonymous with Soviet criticism. However, it should not be forgotten that he was an opponent of authoritarianism and the abuse of language and art for political gain.

As Saunders argued, modern art was an illusion, and even a cultural weapon of war, with an aesthetic understanding that it abstracted. As her extensive research shows, the films made using Orwell’s books were distributed all over the world with the multi-faceted support of the CIA, as one of the biggest cultural operations of the Cold War. Political power was intervening in the literary world, and a literary work was brought to the fore by political methods to be used as an instrument of power relations.

2.2. Modernism vs. Realism: Marxist Literary Theory

Ideology is an important and key term in Marxism. Louis Althusser wrote about this broad concept in *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. He focused on Marxist theory to explain that a social formation is required essentially, continuously, and perpetually, for reproducing the productive forces as labour-power, the conditions of production and the relations of production. He explained the difference between repressive state apparatuses (RSAs) and ideological state apparatuses (ISAs) as follows:

Whereas the Repressive State Apparatus is by definition a repressive apparatus that makes direct or indirect use of physical violence, the Ideological State Apparatuses cannot be called repressive in the same sense as the 'state apparatus', because they do not, by definition, use physical violence. Neither the Church nor the school nor political parties nor the press nor radio and television nor publishing nor entertainment nor sport have recourse to physical violence in order to function with their 'clientele' (Althusser, 2014, p. 78).

RSA is related to the ruling class using physical force. They have a rule over the people, and it consists of the government, courts, police, and armed forces. RSAs are under control of the ruling class because they also control the powers of the State (political, legislative, and armed). Unlike the RSAs, ISAs cover social functions like churches, schools, families, etc. Instead of using physical force, through hegemony and influence, ISAs focus on the rule of society via ideology. Thus, there is no need for legal prosecution or police violence to dominate people.

Some novels, stories, poems, and plays provide information and ideas about the struggles of the period for societal freedom. In Marxist literary theory, literature can be considered to reflect the social problems and realities related to the process of how social rights are determined and social identities emerge in the society. In this respect, especially for Georg Lukács, the response of artists "should be to treat artistic struggles as a direct extension of social struggles" (Roberts, 2006, p. 165). According to this view, artistic struggle and social struggle cannot be separated from each other; the artist must produce to reveal class consciousness, not to tell what is right or wrong.

Georg Lukács focused first on questions about what a human was, arguing that humans were at the focal point of literature. He explained his ideas about humans through Aristotle's term 'zoon politicon', and he concluded that man "cannot be distinguished from social and historical environment" (Lukács, 1996, p. 143). Starting from this concept of Aristotle, Lukács shared the following view: it was impossible for man to survive in isolation from society; "The political covers the meaning of social" and "man cannot fully realise the nature of his being himself and be happy if he is barred from deciding freely, along with his fellow neighbours" (Martins, 2019, p. 1542). Aristotle believed that actions that lead people to happiness can only take

place in society. In this respect, the most important feature that distinguishes humans from other living things is the mind. An animal can look and hear, but cannot see or listen like a human being, as these are two very different concepts. In the same way, a human can form organisations by making judgments with language, the ability to speak meaningfully, and forming associations. For people, living together is not only sharing bodily things, but also sharing thoughts. Therefore, since literature is a human product, and literature itself is human-oriented, it cannot be considered independently of the content they create.

In *The Ideology of Modernism*, Lukács criticised the literary devices used by modernist writers, such as stream of consciousness and inner monologue. According to him, the stream of consciousness aimed for ‘aesthetic ambition’ rather than ‘technical device’. Inner monologue displayed the character’s “relations with his own past, present, and even future experience” (Lukács, 1996, p. 142). Lukács claimed that the stream-of-consciousness technique used in the novel, especially by writers like Joyce, led to a reduction of reality distortion and dissolution of personality. He outlined that the presence of both in a work meant the lack of a consistent view of human nature. “Because of their class location, he argued, the modernists lacked a genuine historical perspective, an understanding of the dialectical nature of historical change and, therefore, they could not penetrate the surface of social reality nor fully comprehend the true nature” (Gluck, 1986, p. 850). Lukács argued that Man, for modernist writers, was solitary, “asocial, unable to enter” social relationships with people (Lukács, 1969, p. 20). In this sense, his attitude towards modernist writers echoes that of Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan*.² Lukács believed that modernist writers presented life under capitalism as a distortion, petrification, or paralysis of the human being, but he stated they were in a complete paradox. Since they presented characters in literature with psychopathology, it led to abstract potentiality. Therefore, abstract potentiality led to psychopathology. Using such psychopathology as the way of escape from this distortion is itself a distortion that creates a vicious circle.

Lukács divided potentiality into abstract and concrete; while he associated the abstract potentiality completely with subjectivity, he connected the concrete potentiality to the dialectic between the subjectivity of the individual and the objective

² According to Hobbes, the life of man is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” (Hobbes, 1997, p. 78).

reality (Lukács, 1996, p. 146). In this sense, concrete potentiality allowed the author to create a character that corresponded to that of a real person in the outside world. Lukács discussed the way a person's environment plays a huge role in determining his personality. As for him, in modern literature, if one really wished to create a real character, then the author must have considered concrete and abstract potentiality.

In addition, destroying or ignoring the fabric of one's relationships with one's environment promotes personality dissolution. For example, Lukács criticised making psychopathology an artistic or aesthetic goal, arguing that such topics were only an abstract movement, and that such issues would lead nowhere because they would not bring any concrete criticism. According to Lukács, social conditions should be at the centre. In a way, the obsession with psychopathology manifested itself in modernist literature as a desire to escape the reality of capitalism. In this context, he reminded us that the obsession with the pathological was not only found in literature. He laid out his thoughts on Freudian psychoanalysis. Freud chose to understand the normal personality in abnormal psychology. However, when we compare Freud's psychology with Pavlov's, we realise that mental abnormality is a deviation from the norm (Lukacs, 1996, p. 155).

Lukács added, "this is not strictly a scientific or literary-critical problem. It is an ideological problem, deriving from the ontological dogma of the solitariness of man" (Lukacs, 1996, p. 151). Pathology and distortion were normalised, and this situation was on the rise, especially in the era of modernism. All these things had become the condition of human existence and the principles of art and literature. According to him, modernism deprived literature of a sense of perspective, whereas in any work of art, perspective was paramount. This was what determined the content, brought together the path being followed and the narrative, and allowed the artist to choose between the important and the superficial.

Lukács finally dealt with the issue of allegory. He defined allegory as an aesthetic genre that distanced people from objective reality. On the one hand, he indicated that it was a problematic genre, because "it rejects that assumption of an imminent meaning to human existence which - however unconscious, however combined with religious concepts of transcendence - is the basis of traditional art" (Lukács, 1996, p. 158). If allegory confronted us with the way modernism handled it,

then the basic ideological determination of form and content, which was the transformation of abstract particularity into the aesthetic outcome of allegory, was seen here. This concluded with the negation of art, not the enrichment, because modernism caused both the destruction of traditional literary forms and literature. According to Roberts, “modernism and its allegorical appropriation of the aesthetic fragment denies the typical” and because of this, “leaves the consciousness of the subjects of the novel in a reified state, and prevents the writer from investing the actions of his or her hero with any socially transformative potential” (Roberts, 2006, p. 165). In other words, modernism and the allegorical appropriation of the aesthetic piece rejected the typical, thus leaving the consciousness of their subjects in a reified state, and preventing the author from investing in the actions of any socially transformative protagonists.

Lucien Goldmann did studies rearticulating “the Lukácsian view of totality, identity, and consciousness” (Zimmerman, 1978-1979, p. 153). Goldmann touched upon Lukács’ typology of the novel consisting of three principles. These were the novels of abstract idealism, the psychological novel, and the bildungsroman. The first was characterised by “the activity of the hero, and by his over-narrow consciousness in relation to the complexity of the world”. The second was “concerned above all with the analysis of the inner life, and characterised by the passivity of the hero and a consciousness too broad to be satisfied by what the world of convention can offer him”, and the last revealed that “although the hero gives up the problematic search, he does not accept the world of convention or abandon the implicit scale of values” (Goldmann, 1996, p. 206). While talking about all this, Goldmann claimed that René Girard and Lukács shared similar ideas about the typology of the novel by making a comparison between them. However, when they fell apart, Goldmann sided with Lukács. Goldmann clarified this situation as follows: in the novel the author’s situation regarding the world he created was different from that of any other literary form. Girard called this special case ‘humour’, while Lukács called it ‘irony’. Both agreed that the novelist must replace the consciousness of his heroes, and that this displacement (humour or irony) is aesthetically constitutive of fictional creation. On this point, it was the position of Lukács that seemed to him to be acceptable, and not that of Girard (Goldmann, 1996, p. 208).

According to Goldmann, the novel was accepted as a biography, and “a social chronicle and so it has always been possible to show that the social chronicle reflected to a greater or lesser degree the society of the period” (Goldmann, 1996, p. 209). When the sociology of the novel was discussed, the first issue confronted was the problem of the relationship between the novel itself as a form, and the structure of the social environment in which it emerged; in other words, the novel as a literary genre and the individualist modern society.

Goldmann wrote that the sociology of literature basically sees a relationship between the most important literary works and the collective consciousness of a particular social group from which they emerged. He examined this subject under four new concepts:

- a) The literary work is not only the reflection of a real collective consciousness, but also an advanced literary culmination of the consistency of the tendencies peculiar to the consciousness of a particular group. The main point that distinguished Marxist sociology from other genres was that it accepted this consciousness, not in real collective consciousness, but only in the concept of constructed (zugerechnet) possible consciousness, which makes it possible to understand the former.
- b) The relationship between collective ideology and great individual literary, philosophical, and theological creations is not found in a content identity, but in a more developed coherence, and a homology of structures that can be represented in an imaginary content very different from the real content of the collective consciousness.
- c) Social character cannot, by itself, contain a coherent worldview that constitutes an individual's mental structure. This structure can only be formed by a group, and the individual can carry it to the level of coherence and transfer it to the level of imaginary creation and conceptual thought.
- d) The collective consciousness corresponds to a primary or autonomous reality. This consciousness is indirectly detailed in the general behaviour of individuals participating in economic, social and political life (Goldmann, 1996, p. 212).

Despite all the differences that Goldmann claimed, he also emphasised that some Marxist theorists argued that social life could only be expressed on a literary, artistic or philosophical plane through the collective consciousness. Goldmann underlined that since important works cannot emerge as the result of purely individual experience, the genre of the novel is likely to emerge and develop only as long as a non-conceptualized, emotional, longing for qualitative values was developed within society - or perhaps only among the middle strata from which most novelists come (Goldmann, 1996, p. 214).

When Eagleton was asked about Goldmann's notion of literary expressionism, he replied that, according to Freud, intentionality is by no means always conscious. Eagleton did not think that the unconscious subtext belonged to the author. Eagleton did not think that the unconscious subtext belonged to the author. Thus, this unconscious is not only more than a text beyond the control of the work, but also a lack of control (Varela & Eagleton, 2001, p. 176). Terry Eagleton noted "the literary text is not the expression of ideology, nor is ideology the expression of social class...[...] but (dramatic) production of ideology" (Eagleton, 1996, p. 297). Dramatic production means that it does not re-enact or reproduce the dramatic text but generates text, transforming it into something unique.

According to Eagleton, the text-production relationship is like the relationship between grammar and speech. Speech is a product of grammar, not a copy, because although grammatical rules constitute the determining structure of discourse, discourse cannot be derived from it mechanically. At this point, it would be correct to say grammar is a formal, abstract set of rules. Speech, on the other hand, is concrete. For this reason, the text-production relationship cannot be considered only in terms of binary opposition (Eagleton, 1996, p. 299).

Eagleton stated that ideology clearly refers to a false consciousness, a veil placed between humans and history that blocked real historical perception. He explained that ideology produces reality by distorting it, yet it carries within itself the element of reality. Just as the meaning of a word cannot be conceived as an object associated with it, the text cannot be conceived as expressing a real history. Language certainly denotes objects, among other things, but it does not do so in a simple relationship, as if word and object were juxtaposed (Eagleton, 1996, p. 301).

A text might speak of real history, but it will always remain a fictional study, an operation of historical data according to the laws of textual production. In such a case, unless real history can be read as fiction, it must be accepted as historiographical, not literary discourse. So, history certainly enters the text, and when it does, it enters it literally, as ideology. This does not mean that actual history exists in the text, only in a disguised way. "Within the text itself, then, ideology becomes a dominant structure, determining the character and disposition of certain 'pseudo-real' constituents" (Eagleton, 1996, pp. 302-303).

According to Eagleton, the literary text does not take history as its object, yet it has history as its object; not the text itself, but in forms opened to criticism. The absence of any historical truth gives literature the air of freedom. But in the text most meaningfully referred to - it was precisely in the absence of this fact that it referred not to concrete situations, but to an ideological formation produced by concrete situations (and thus indirectly to history). It clarified situations that were imaginary, pseudo-events, because they lay not in their reality but in how they contributed to shaping and sustaining it. Moreover, if it drove history away, it was not because it turned it into fantasy, but because the interpretations it turned into fiction were already representations of reality, rather than reality itself (Eagleton, 1996, pp. 304-305).

Fiction's history is fictitious because it reveals a certain ideological experience of real history. In addition, this, of course, is not because fiction is untrue, and thus an appropriate tool for false consciousness, but rather because in order to reconstruct a society's self-representations we would eventually be faced with the need to deconstruct them (Eagleton, 1996, p. 307).

To quote again from Eagleton:

The text's materials are ideological rather than historical - because, as it were, the text exists in the 'hollow' it has scooped out between itself and history that it lacks a real particular referent and displays that lack in the relative autonomy of its structuration. The 'poetic' text displays it also in its disproportioning of signifier and signified, whereby the absence of a concrete historical object is proclaimed, made manifest, in the very predominance of the signifying process over the 'pseudo-real' (Eagleton, 1996, pp. 309-310).

The materials of the text are ideological rather than historical - for the text exists, as it were, in the gap it has dug between itself and history; it lacks a real referent and shows this lack in the relative autonomy of its structuring. The poetic text also displays this in the disproportion between the signifier and the signified. In this way, the absence of a concrete historical object is declared and made visible in the dominance of the signification process over the pseudo-real.

Ideology precedes the text; but the ideology of the text defines and processes that ideology in unpremeditated ways. The specific production of ideology, which we might call the ideology of the text, has no prior existence: it is identical with the text itself. The pre-textual ideology can be found in the work in various forms: in ordinary language, in the sanctioned symbol and tradition, in the codes of perceptual habit. It also presents itself in forms that are more formal: in those aesthetic, political, ethical, and other formulas that can immediately permeate ordinary language but emerge as distinct crystallizations of meaning from it. For example, in the case of Stalinism, aesthetic categories (socialist realism) were particularly directly related to general ideology, producing aesthetic modes of discourse that seemed to imitate only general ideological modes. However, even in such a study, it was out of the question to reduce textual discourse to ideological discourses. The categories of an ideology produced a set of ideological meanings that formed the immediate materials of the text; and these significations could be seen as a concrete production of ideological categories (Eagleton, 1996, pp. 310-311).

Eagleton argued about the importance of the relationship between the literary work and ordinary language, and drew attention to the following: ideology is produced and expressed in ordinary language, and the relationship of the text with it is a crucial indicator of its ideological character. However, he unveiled that the ideological potential found in a literary work is blocked or suppressed by the peculiar influence of its mythological forms. Although ideology and aesthetic mode of production are both typically complex formations, many specific relations of homogeneity and contradiction are possible between these elements (Eagleton, 1996, p. 311).

According to Eagleton, it is important to grasp here the closeness of the relationship between the ideological and the aesthetic. The text does not merely take

ideological conflicts to resolve them aesthetically. He explicated how close the relationship between ideological and aesthetic is. It is not just ideology that provides the author with the necessary materials for the formal aesthetic operations of the text; it is the mutual articulation of the two together with the textual process (Eagleton, 1996, p. 316). In this way, aesthetic styles define and determine ideological problems within certain limits so that they can continue to reproduce themselves. More interestingly, he cited Freud's uppermost dream layer to explain the close relationship between aesthetics and ideology. Eagleton reconsidered that Freud's uppermost dream layer existed to systematise the dream, to fill in its gaps and soften its contradictions, to produce a relatively coherent text from it. However, beneath this layer lies the real, incomplete, mutilated text of the dream itself, which resists interpretation. Eagleton assumed that the real dream text corresponds to the literary text, and is therefore not conscious of itself, which is created by this close relationship with ideology, to which it cannot speak directly, but which can manifest within itself. In mentioning this, he propounded that the critic is not the therapist of the text. The critic's task is not to refine or complete the text, but simply to explain why it is as it is. Of course, here, he suggested "because literary discourse has no real referent, its significations remain multiple and partly open in a way which enables those displacements and elisions of meaning occasioned by its relation to ideology" (Eagleton, 1996, p. 319).

3. GEORGE ORWELL: THE MAINSTREAM OF IDEOLOGY

George Orwell's life involved many experiences. Researchers refer a lot to his life and views, as he consciously reflected them in his works. However, although some of his writings were to some extent autobiographical, or seemed to express his own views on politics and art, any criticism that related his work to his life must proceed with care (Fowler, 1995, p. 1).

George Orwell was the pen name of Eric Arthur Blair, born on June 25, 1903, in Motihari, Bengal. His family belonged to what he called the 'lower-upper-middle classes'. His father worked for the Indian Civil Service (specifically as an official in the opium department), so his income was always meagre (Bounds, 2009, p. 15). In Orwell's opinion, middle class people were not rich, and did not live in prosperity.

Orwell's admiration for working people turned into a real commitment to socialism. He travelled to the North of England to write a book on the effects of decline on industrial communities, living in towns such as Wigan and Leeds, "predominantly in working-class households and being shown around by a variety of left-wing activists – many of them communists" (Bounds, 2009, p. 20). Thus, *The Road to Wigan Pier* was written. In this work, Orwell documented sociological investigations of the relationship between the working class and dreary living conditions in the Northern English towns such as Wigan, Liverpool and Sheffield.

The relationship between literature and film played a very important role in the first half of the twentieth century because of the documentary nature of texts such as Orwell's *The Road to Wigan Pier*. "Orwell's experiences of going down into the coal-mines and watching the miners at work were at the heart of his text" (Marcus, 2009, p. 202). It has been argued that the connections between documentary writings such as Orwell's and cinema played an important role in bringing the concepts of aesthetics, politics and culture to the agenda. Marcus writes "The image of the 'heroic worker' inflected Orwell's highly visual descriptions of the miners..(and) ...his narrative has intersected with a number of documentary films, including *Coal Face*" (Marcus, 2009, p. 202). In addition to this, Bluemel described Orwell as an intermodernist.³ She believed that, in this way, it led him to potentially innovative

³ Intermodernism is a term used by Bluemel to describe the literary periods and categories belonging to the writing of the pre-war, the war, and immediately post-war years in terms of its qualities, ambitions, and contexts (Bluemel, 2006, p. 1).

approaches to his other works that did not fit into existing categories. “In contrast to modernist writers, intermodern writers tend to have their origins in, or maintain contacts with, working or lower-middle-class cultures” (Bluemel, 2004, p. 7). Saunders referred to this categorization and cited her comment, stating that writers like Orwell were “very much writer-workers who wish to appeal to a working-class audience, and in so doing are to an extent writing against the dominant narrative aesthetic of the 1930s” (Saunders, 2008, p. 3). Orwell, who was not seen as a totally modernist writer by Bluemel, but defined as intermodern, had his roots in lower-middle class culture and was known to continue his contact with that culture. He employed many of his writings to appeal to working-class audiences. For this reason, it can be seen that he did not write in accordance with the dominant narrative aesthetics of the West, or modernism, especially in his early work in the 1930s.

It was widely known that Orwell was against Stalin, and began to believe he was the greatest obstacle to the establishment of socialism. This began in December 1936 when Orwell went to fight in the Spanish Civil War, and to observe and write about the war as a journalist. While there he joined the POUM (United Marxist Workers Party). Disappointed with the Soviet Union, he later transferred to the Independent Labor Party union. The rest of 1937 was spent writing the Spanish record *Homage to Catalonia*, working as a journalist in conflict with the British Left (Fowler, 1995, p. 3). The British Left was defeated by compromise of the trade union leaders. In particular, “the general strike of 1926 was a major working-class challenge to the existing political regime” but it was a turning point, and it caused the “further development of bureaucracy and centralised control within many of the most important unions” (Williams, 1989, p. 134). An undemocratic and unstable atmosphere prevailed in the country.

Orwell was anti-imperialist, anti-totalitarian, and especially anti-Stalinist. The Bolshevik Revolution, as the academic field of Soviet history, has been dominated by anti-communist bias, while anti-Stalinism was based on Nikita Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party, and leader of the Soviet state (Furr, 2014, p. 20).

For Orwell, the absolute problems of the system were unemployment and exploitation, but he believed democratic socialism was necessary for a solution. Then he began to think about class-consciousness. He was firmly convinced that socialism

was the only solution for the world. “Orwell was trying to save the world for socialism as he understood it, and not for Western capitalism or for right-wing individualism” (Ingle, 2006, pp. 2-3). He was strongly opposed to Western capitalism and right-wing individualism, and believed that the world needed socialism, the true essence of which he later realised.

Ordinary working-class people had potential power coming from class-consciousness. This unity should have changed the existing order in this worldly political system. Burmese experience was identical in respect to Orwell's political thinking. It was the Burmese experience that shaped Orwell's political understanding and his analysis. Besides, Spain was a milestone in respect to Orwell's fundamental political experience. It was the first time that he met with horrible murder and terror. Orwell believed that socialism because a democratic socialism could not be established, and the rise of totalitarian power was clearly observed. Orwell underlined his opinion as follows:

I underwent poverty and a sense of failure. This increased my natural hatred of authority and made me for the first time fully aware of the existence of the working classes, and the job in Burma had given me some understanding of the nature of imperialism: but these experiences were not enough to give me an accurate political orientation. Then came Hitler, the Spanish civil war, etc. By the end of 1935 I had still failed to reach a firm decision. (...) 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, 1946).

Orwell clearly intended to put forward suffering, poverty, and the sense of failure, as the main inspirations of his novel. Familiar with feelings of poverty and failure, Orwell, as noted above, felt hatred for economic and political authority. His Burmese experience and imperialism were just the beginning. Orwell, who came face-to-face with fascism spreading around the world in Spain, openly admitted that he wrote his articles directly or indirectly against totalitarianism, and that he wrote because he was on the side of democratic Socialism. However, as well as Orwell's experiences with imperialism, Nazism, totalitarianism, and war, the reason for his sense of failure

might also come from the comprehension of the resemblance between the bourgeois-dominated society of the nineteenth century, and the socialist movements of the 20th century. “He recognized the crucial importance of making socialism - in Lukács’ phrase – ‘man-centred’, so that it could confront the growing threat of totalitarianism” (Ingle, 2006, p. 65). Orwell thought this was the only way to counter the growing threat of totalitarianism. He was critical about the Soviet Union, and control of the masses through repressive means. After returning from the Spanish Civil War, where he volunteered as a fighter against Franco’s regime, he criticised the Soviet Union becoming a dictatorship. Orwell took these issues for granted as among the biggest motivations and resources to be written about. Nevertheless, reality was very different from what Orwell perceived. As Furr points out,

POUM leaders, including Kurt Landau, had tried to organise in Barcelona a conference of anti-Soviet forces to discuss the overthrow of the Spanish Republican government, culminating in the “May Days” revolt. Meanwhile in article after article the POUM newspaper echoed Trotsky’s attacks on Stalin and the USSR (Furr, 2019, p. 131).

What prompted Orwell to think the way he did can be understood by looking at some unknown details of Soviet history. Orwell wrote about the general ideas which caused his way of criticism, in his essays, such as “The Frontiers of Art and Propaganda” (1941), “Literature and Totalitarianism” (1941), “Literature and the Left (1943), and “Why I Write” (1946). In these writings, he convinced himself that all works of literature had some political implications. He set out that “cultural and intellectual life of the community - newspapers, books, education, films, radio - is controlled by monied men who have the strongest motive to prevent the spread of certain ideas” (Orwell, 2020a, p. 2). In short, the way of thinking, and life of society, were controlled by media tools such as newspapers, books, education, movies, radio, and this control was managed by moneyed people with strong motives.

Politics invaded literature, and this brought the eternal struggle between the individual and the community. A writer should not tell lies, he should follow what he really thinks and feels. The worst thing is if a work of art is insincere. Modern literature is essentially an individual art. The individuality of literature was something that did not fit with Orwell, because as mentioned above, he believed Socialism had to

be, in Lukács's terms, man-centred, and his literary perspective leaned on it. For example, English ballads composed communally cannot be attributed to any individual (Orwell, 2020b, p. 16). They were the truthful expression of what man thought and felt (Orwell, 2020b, pp. 13-14). Totalitarianism dictated what a person should think, it created an ideology for people, so the totalitarian state tried to control the thoughts, emotions of their subjects to control their actions because it needed absolute obedience from them (Orwell, 2020b, p. 15). Whoever has felt the value of literature, and observed the central part it played in the development of human history, must have seen the life and death necessity of resisting totalitarianism, whether it was imposed on us from without or within (Orwell, 2020b, p. 19).

Orwell criticised the deeply partisan stances of some of his Marxist contemporaries, warning that certain types of political allegiance could have a particularly bad effect on literature itself. "Orwell's anxiety about the 'invasion of literature' by politics was largely a consequence of his early exposure to the art-for-art's-sake movement, whose ideology he had only partly outgrown" (Bounds, 2009, p. 86). Contrary to popular belief, Orwell did not fully embrace political literature. Yet, the aesthetic relativism of Oscar Wilde, one of the leading names that comes to mind when it comes to aesthetics, was seen as a prerequisite for personal freedom. On the other hand, Orwell saw it as a nightmarish source of uncertainty (Bounds, 2009, p. 190).

For Orwell, the relationship between language and ideology was like walking a tightrope. He argued that the further language moved away from ordinary life, the more abstract and untestable it became. Moreover, he argued, the more abstract and untestable it became, the more likely it became ready to serve ideological purposes, because ideology served power, not truth. For example, Hitler had his own political language. Stalin had entire schools of creative writing to make modern intellectuals into language acrobats (Colls, 2013, p. 157). Orwell was aware that language was an integral part of the universal political battle. Such leaders reached large audiences through the media; speech had many roles, from ensuring the credibility of leaders like Hitler, to attempts to justify exploitation or genocide. According to Bounds:

He also argued that new forms of media technology could make an important contribution to some much-needed cultural reforms, such as the reshaping of

the English language and the popularisation of serious literature. On the other hand, deeply influenced by Marxist approaches to culture, he consistently portrayed the media as one of the main means by which the ruling class disseminated its ideology (Bounds, 2009, p. 63).

Orwell had mixed feelings. Although he argued that new media technology could make an important contribution to some needed cultural reforms, he was influenced by Marxist approaches to culture, and consistently regarded the media as one of the main vehicles through which the ruling class propagated its ideology. Then, he envisioned that the media of the future would be used primarily to strengthen the power of totalitarian governments, as he detailed in part in *Animal Farm*, and particularly in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. His later views in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* on the dehumanising threat of all totalitarian regimes, and their characteristic persecution of specific groupings were viewed as a threat to the ruthless political ambitions of an elite minority (Brennan, 2017, p. 95). He laid out his last shaped and matured views in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell believed in the danger of all totalitarian regimes and saw the persecution of certain groups as a threat to the political ambitions of an elite few. Also, referring to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in a letter to F. A. Henson on 16 June 1949, Orwell claimed: “My recent novel is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labor Party (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realised in communism and fascism” (Orwell, 1968, p. 502). He stated in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that he conceived it as a manifestation of the aberrations that a centralised economy was prone to, and which had partially realised.

As a result, contrary to what was seen, Orwell comprehended that the real struggle was not between those who spoke up and those who did not, but only between the exploiters and the exploited. His enlightenment started with his Burmese experiences, through such events as the shooting of an elephant.

3.1. George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

George Orwell wrote *Animal Farm* in November 1943 and finished it in February 1944 (Hammond, 2000, p. 66). After some publishers' rejections, Fredric Warburg agreed to publish it as soon as supplies of paper were adequate (Hammond, 2000, p. 70). He was interested in adapting fairy tales for radio, so the sub-titles

should be considered by readers. The subtitle 'fairy tale' is rather ironic, because the essence of a fairy tale is that a hero overcomes the most undesirable circumstances. Indeed, a peaceful and just end to a violent revolution would truly be a fairy tale. However, this farm does not cause a revolution any more than in Soviet Russia or Spain (Davison, 1996, p. 126). Orwell's intent to deliver a powerful message in understandable and plain language that could be understood by everyone was confirmed by writer Margaret Atwood, who read it as a nine-year-old-child:

I read it at age nine (...) children have a keen sense of injustice, and this was the thing that upset me the most: the pigs were so unjust. The whole experience was deeply disturbing, but I am forever grateful to Orwell for alerting me early to the danger flags I've tried to watch out for since (Atwood, 2014, p. 154).

It can be understood from this quotation that literature can have a great impact on children, and people of all ages understand these novels. Was that Orwell's sole purpose in writing this book? This is the question, because it is a well-known fact that "Orwell found some shops that placed *Animal Farm* among children's books and he took it upon himself to move them surreptitiously" (Davison, 1996, p. 125).

Beginning with the Spanish Civil War, Orwell had difficulty publishing some of his more partisan writings. *Animal Farm* was an example, because the book was very clearly aimed at Stalin and the Soviet Union (Ingle, 2006, p. 2). In addition, Orwell's motivation in writing *Animal Farm* can be highlighted by quoting from a preface that he wrote in 1947 for a Ukrainian edition of the novel:

(...) On my return from Spain, I thought of exposing the Soviet myth in a story that could be easily understood by almost anyone and which could be easily translated into other languages. However, the actual details of the story did not come to me for some time until one day (I was living in a small village) I saw a little boy, perhaps ten years old, driving a huge carthorse along a narrow path, whipping it whenever it tried to turn. It struck me that if only such animals became aware of their strength we should have no power over them, and that men exploit animals in much the same way as the rich exploit the proletariat. I proceeded to analyse Marx's theory from the animals' point of view. To them it was clear that the concept of a class struggle between humans

was pure illusion, since whenever it was necessary to exploit animals, all humans united against them: the true struggle is between animals and humans. From this point of departure, it was not difficult to elaborate the story (Orwell, 1947).

When Orwell returned from the Spanish Civil War, he admitted that he was considering exposing the Soviet fairy-tale in a story that could be easily realised by almost everyone, and easily translated into other languages. Orwell drew attention because he attacked Soviet communism, not only for himself, but because he wanted to attack the Soviet myth accepted in England that harmed the Socialist movement itself. After finding the inspiration for *Animal Farm* as described above, he analysed Marx's theory from the animals' point of view. Therefore, the real struggle was not between those who spoke up and those who did not, but only between the exploiters and the exploited; the real struggle was between animals and humans.

At the time *Animal Farm* was published in England, in August 1945, there was a wartime alliance between England and the Soviet Union, but it was already in question. The publication of the novel coincided with the first period of significant leftist rule in Britain. Although each event of the story has a historical parallel, Orwell feared that *Animal Farm* would be rejected on political rather than aesthetic grounds, because he thought a form of British Fascism from the late 1930s was at least possible (Marks, 2011, p. 139). "Animal Farm", Orwell wrote in his essay, "Why I Write", "was the first book in which I tried, with full consciousness of what I was doing, to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole" (Orwell, "Why I Write" 1946). Therefore, this work is not just an animal story, but a fiction that makes a political statement about dictatorship, indirectly and through literary techniques.

As a summary of the novel, one night, all the animals in Mr. Jones's Principal Farm are assembled to listen to Major, an old pig. Major tells of a dream in which he saw animals. In his dream, the animals free themselves from the persecution of people and live on the freeway.

Animal Farm is an account of a revolution on Manor Farm. This revolution occurs after a speech, delivered by Major, an old and respected boar. The speech, modelled on the concluding section of *The Communist Manifesto*, declares that all animals are equal and all men enemies; only by continuing to

eschew the customs of humankind can the animals maintain their conditions of equality. Major sets the chief task of the days ahead: to create a true political consciousness (Ingle, 2006, p. 83).

Animal Farm is the story of a revolution in Manor Farm. The fuse of this revolution is ignited by a powerful speech by Major, an old and respected pig. The speech, modelled on the conclusion of *The Communist Manifesto*, as noted above, suggests that animals can achieve equality only by avoiding human conventions. Their main task is to create a real political consciousness. Not long before the old Major died, two other pigs, Snowball, and Napoleon, set up a system called 'Animalism'. One night, when Mr. Jones comes home drunk and forgets to feed the animals, the animals revolt and take the farm away from the people. The animals change the name of the farm and hang 'seven orders of Animalism' on the wall of the barn. However, even in the first stages of the revolution, the pigs demand some privileges for themselves. During the first summer, the new system is successful, and the animals are happy. The revolution spreads to neighbouring farms. Mr. Jones attempts to get back to the farm, but he is sprayed back by the animals. According to Meyers, "Orwell probably took a hint from the final part of *Gulliver's Travels, Book IV*, where Gulliver encounters a society formed by a superior species of horse, the Houyhnhnms, who are able to talk and conduct their lives rationally, so the relationship between intelligent horses compared to primitive and savage humans may have suggested the form of Orwell's pamphlet"⁴ (Meyers, 2009, p. 25). It is known that Orwell had read, and even wrote about, Swift's novel. Before Meyers, Roger Fowler drew attention to this:

Orwell's principal source was surely the section of Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) in which Gulliver travels to the land of the Houyhnhnms, a race of benevolent horses who rule their own society, with the humans or Yahoos in a role of servitude. But the beast fable is in fact much older, a classical genre dating at least from the Greek fables of Aesop of the fifth century BC, in which the sayings and deeds of animals represent human moral dilemmas. Hence, he (Orwell) may have taken a cue from the last chapter of his (Swift's) book [...] Humans are in a primitive state while animals are superior in this society" (Fowler, 1995, p. 161).

⁴ Perhaps Meyers refers to Orwell's keen interest in collected pamphlets, which are also believed to have been a source of inspiration in the writing process of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with a so-called notion of pamphlet literature.

This comparison between animals and humans might have inspired Orwell. In addition to the summary, Snowball suggests to Napoleon the idea of building a windmill to reduce the workload of the animals. This dispute results in Snowball being chased from the farm by Napoleon's 'secret police' dogs. Animals work harder than ever. Meanwhile, pigs begin to change the seven orders of Animalism, according to their interests.

Napoleon agrees to the idea of Snowball making a windmill and starts building the mill, but one night, after a violent storm, the windmill is destroyed. Napoleon confesses that some animals are working against him, and he sets up a show court to execute them. Fearing this, the animals start making the windmill again. Meanwhile, Napoleon starts to trade with neighbouring farmers. People attack the farm again and blow up the windmill.

Even though daily food is greatly reduced, the animals keep working. The horse, Boxer, is stoned but he continues to work. He suffers as things get tough, and looks forward to his retirement. Instead, he is sent to the slaughter by Napoleon. Years pass, many animals die. Other animals see that all the commandments are made in favour of the pigs. In his review of *Mein Kampf* by Adolf Hitler, Orwell describes Napoleon, Hitler, and Stalin, as the quintessential modern dictators, who stayed in power for similar reasons; "All three of the great dictators have enhanced their power by imposing intolerable burdens on their peoples" (Orwell, 1940). In the book, pigs wear clothes and start behaving like people, especially like the former owner of the farm. In the evening, when people and pigs drink and play cards, the other animals that see it can't see a difference between people and pigs.

Orwell's critique of Soviet communism is a beast-fable, a satiric form in which animals are used to represent human vice and folly. Chaucer's "Nun's Priest's Tale", one of the *Canterbury Tales*, is an early example in English. On one level, Chaucer's tale is a comic farmyard tale of a proud cock, Chanticleer, who falls prey to the fox and manages to escape; on another it is a witty and learned essay on the significance of dreams; on another, and more seriously, level it is an allegory of the Fall of Man, in which Chanticleer represents Adam being tempted by the Devil (Meyers, 2009, p. 25).

To summarise this passage, Meyers argued that Orwell criticises the Soviet Union as an animal tale, a satirical form in which animals are used to represent human flaws and stupidity. Chaucer's story exemplifies a funny farm tale. It can be interpreted as

an allegory of the Fall of Man, in which Chanticleer represents the Man tempted by Satan, like the pigs tempted by arrogance of having power. Indeed, Orwell admires animal or fairy tales, and similar highly imaginative books for children. One of his childhood favourites was Beatrix Potter's *Pigling Bland*, which includes two pigs walking on their hind legs” (Davison, 1996, 125). Moreover, *Animal Farm* certainly uses fables in ways comparable to East European political satirists, like Naomi Mitchison in her short story *The Fourth Pig*, and Clemence Dane in her original vivid fable, *The Arrogant History of White Ben* (Maslen, 2009, p. 35).



4. YAŞAR KEMAL: A REBELLIOUS DADALOĞLU⁵

Yaşar Kemal is the pen name of Kemal Sadık Gökçeli who was born in 1926, in Turkey's Hemite village, in the Kadirli district of Osmaniye, where he settled after a long migration process due to the Russian occupation in the First World War. When he was young, he worked as a windlass clerk, capstan head, teacher's deputy, library officer, tractor driver, and controller in paddy fields, and so on.

Kemal was a novelist and political critic, and his best-known novel is *Ince Memed* (1955) which was translated into English as *Memed, My Hawk* (1961). Besides this, he wrote stories such as *Sarı Sıcak*, poems like *Bugünlerde Bahar İndi*, and collected works and essays. Kemal also owed much of his access to novels, stories, and folklore investigations to this period of interviewing. Characterising himself as a 'socialist', Kemal focused on class issues and social injustice in his interviews.

Yaşar Kemal's interviews and literature were predominantly about urban and rural poor, landless peasants, agricultural workers, precarious workers, catastrophes, and street children, within the context of social problems. The social issues that constituted the content of Kemal's works were social justice, education, health and social security. In this sense, Yaşar Kemal gave the most important examples of this approach and dealt with them by using all the possibilities of journalism and literature. Kemal mentioned that a 'Dadaloğlu' was a poet of rebellion. He pointed out that this revolt was a revolt against outside intervention. For this reason, he said that if a poet became a rebel poet, it was necessary to accept that he was a rebel poet of humanity (Sönmez, 1978).

According to Yaşar Kemal, the job of the novelist is to reach the deepest part of human psychology. In his opinion, there are infinite stages in human psychology, and the artist creates them. He argued that there are many things waiting to be discovered, down to the atoms in the world, and that great possibilities await us in nature that we do not know. He believed that there are endless possibilities in human

⁵ This title was inspired by a sentence Kemal said in an interview in 1978. He expressed that Dadaloğlu was the poet of rebellion. He pointed out that this revolt was a revolt against outside intervention. For this reason, he said that if a poet became a rebel poet, it was necessary to accept that he was a rebel poet of humanity.

psychology. Nevertheless, he also emphasised that to determine this psychology correctly, it is necessary to know that framework very well (Sönmez, 1978).

Yaşar Kemal was not only a writer who reflected what he had lived and observed, and who held a mirror to society, but he was also one of the writers who created new novel worlds with their imagination from what they observed and knew. In addition to dealing with social issues, another feature that made him an important writer, was the poetic language he used in his novels. In addition, Yaşar Kemal brought works that contained striking characters, events beyond the ordinary and ordinary, reality intertwined with legends, and Anatolian folk tales, to the world of literature. It was also necessary to state that he had an egalitarian approach to the readers. In an interview with Erdal Öz,⁶ he talked about this as follows:

Çocuklar için ayrı ağaç, ayrı deniz, ayrı gökyüzü yapmamış doğa (...). Doğa, herkesin kendi dünyasına, herkesin kendi kişiliğince giriyor. İşte bu yüzden, köylüler için başka roman, kentliler için başka roman, işçiler, aydınlar, çocuklar için başka roman olmaz (Kemal, 2015, p. 222).

I cannot think of a literary form for children differently (...). Nature did not have a different tree, sea, or sky for children. Nature enters in everybody's own world in its way. That is why; there is no other novel for villagers, another for urbanites, labourers, or children.

Yaşar Kemal said that he did not believe in differentiating children's literature. He could not categorise literature for children, or ignore them as readers. Of course, when Kemal placed emphasis on this issue, he meant folklore tales, epic or anonymous stories, novels, poems, or odes. In his hometown of Çukurova, the stories of minstrels like Dadaloğlu, Karacaoğlu or Köroğlu were told by elders, especially in the villages or small towns, as folk tradition, and children in those regions listened to them with adults. One of those children was Yaşar Kemal. He talked about writing the story of *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lane Ant*:

Ben bu romanı yazmaya hazırlanırken, çocukluğumda dinlediğim o Köroğlu hikayeleri geldi aklıma, Karacaoğlu geldi, Pir Sultan Abdal geldi, Dadaloğlu geldi. Bunları bir çocuk nasıl sevebiliyordu? Bu şiirlerde, destanlarda,

⁶ Erdal Öz was a Turkish author and founder of Can Yayınları. His interview with Yaşar Kemal was published on *Ağacın Çürüğü* which is a compilation of articles and speeches of Yaşar Kemal.

masallarda çocuğun da ilgisini çeken öğeler nelerdi? (...) Bu destanlardaki, türkülerdeki, masallardaki ana temalar, bir kere, halkın, insanın doğayla olan ilişkisinin, insanın insanla olan ilişkisinin bize öğrettiği ana temalardı. (...) Sorun, insanlığın ana temaları sorunuydu. (...) Bu konular, sanatçının elinde yapıtlaşır. Bu konuları, bu temaları alıp işlemek gerek.

While I was preparing to write this novel, the epic stories of Dadaloğlu, Karacaoğlu, Pir Sultan Abdal came to my mind. How can a child love those stories? Which elements of those stories or tales arouse a child's interest? (...) The main themes in these epics, folk songs and fairy tales were the main themes taught to us by the people, the relationship of man with nature, and the relationship of man with man. The problem was that of the main themes of humanity. These subjects become artworks in the hands of the artist. It is necessary to take these subjects and these themes and process them (Kemal, 2015, p. 222)

Yaşar Kemal's vast knowledge of verbal culture increased with folklore comprehension, which was reflected in his works of art, and marked his characters with successful identities in Turkish language. The traces of the tradition of the minstrel ship that lasted for hundreds of years in Anatolia were also seen in the novels of Kemal, who grew up in Çukurova where this tradition is kept alive until the present day. Kemal was described as an Anatolian *âşık*, or wandering bard, before he learned to read and write, and he gave a new impulse to modern Turkish language and literature in the creation of stories and novels. He also used techniques and perspectives from the Homeric epic (Tharaud, 2012, p563). Kemal wanted to explain the problems experienced by the working people of society, and he realized these problems by living and experiencing those problems personally. In addition to his work, he also cared about his testimony in his novels, and made it the source of all his accounts. In these literary works, the working-class people, villagers, and their problems are always discussed with total reality. "Yaşar Kemal, yaşantısına ve tanıklığına bağlı kalmış, ger-çekçilikten saptamıştır. Bunun içindir ki Türk köylüsünü olduğu gibi tanımak için elimizdeki tek kaynak, Yaşar Kemal'in romanlarıdır." (Naci, 2004, p. 8). "Yaşar Kemal adhered to his life and testimony and determined it from realism. For this reason, the only source we must know about the Turkish villagers is

Yaşar Kemal's novels''. In this context, Kemal's motivation in producing such novels is important. According to Moran:

İkinci Dönem diye adlandıracağımız yılların romanında ise toplumsal yapıdan kaynaklanan haksız dü-zen sorunlarının ağır bastığı görülür. Burada bizi asıl ilgilendiren, Türkiye'de meydana gelen toplumsal ve ekonomik değişimle, 1950 sonrası romanında belirginleşen sorunsal değişikliği arasındaki ilişki. Neden 1950'lere kadar ana sorunsal Batılılaşma olarak kaldı ve sonra sınıfsal içeriği olan toplumsal bir sorunsala dönüştü? Bu sorunun cevabını çok basite indirgemeyerek ve çok kısa bir şekilde ifade etmek istersek, diyebiliriz ki, Cumhuriyet döneminde güdülen politika zamanla sınıflaşmayı ve sınıf çatışmasını getirmiş ve böylece başka bir sorunsalın öne geçmesine neden olmuştur. (...) yazarlar egemen ideolojiye dışarıdan baktılar ve onu yeniden üreten romanlar değil, düzeni sorgulayan romanlar yazdılar. (...) Kentlerde kapitalist sınıfla işçi sınıfı henüz, bir sanayi toplumunda olduğu denli tam anlamıyla oluşma-dıkları için, haksız düzenin en açık olarak görüldüğü yer kırsal kesimdi ve bu kesimin gerçeklerini dile getiren yapıtlar dönemi temsil eden romanlar olarak birbirini izledi. Kısacası, 1923-1950 arasında Türkiye'de sömürünün, sınıflaşmanın ve tek parti rejiminin getirdiği haksız düzen, romanda da Batılılaşmanın yerini, düzene dönük yeni bir sorunsalın almasına neden oldu diyebiliriz (Moran, 2001, p.7-8-9, 14).

In the novel of the years, we will call the Second Period, it is seen that the problems of unjust order arising from the social structure predominate. What really interests us here is the relationship between the social and economic change that took place in Turkey and the problematic change that became evident in the post-1950 novel. Why did it remain as the main problem of Westernization until the 1950s and then turned into a social problem with class content? If we want to express the answer to this question by not oversimplifying and in a very short way, we can say that the policy pursued in the Republican period brought classification and class conflict over time, thus causing another problem to come to the fore. (...) writers looked at the dominant ideology from the outside and wrote novels that questioned the order, not novels that reproduced it. (...) Since the capitalist class and the

working class in the cities were not yet fully formed as they were in an industrial society, the unjust order was most clearly seen in the countryside and works expressing the realities of this segment followed each other as novels representing the period. In short, we can say that the unfair order brought about by exploitation, classification, and the one-party regime in Turkey between 1923 and 1950 caused a new problem of order to replace Westernization in the novel.

Yaşar Kemal, who could be counted as an author of novels of the Second Period, touched on the problems of unfair order arising from social structure. The relationship between the social and economic change that took place in Turkey and the problematic change that became evident in the novel after 1950, was important in terms of understanding the changing subject of the novel. The policy pursued in the Republican period brought classification and class conflict over time, thus causing another problem to come to the fore. Writers, including Kemal, looked at the dominant ideology from the outside, and wrote novels that questioned the order, not novels that reproduced it. Since the capitalist class and the working class in the cities were not yet fully formed, as in industrial society, the unjust order was most clearly seen in the countryside. In short, the unfair order brought about by exploitation, stratification, and the one-party regime in Turkey between 1923 and 1950 could be seen as the reason why Westernization was replaced by a new problematic of questioning order in the novel. According to Evin:

Yaşar Kemal's works, an expansion in terms of the dimensions of his subjects immediately draw attention. With its peasants, landlords, overlords and gendarmes; it would be appropriate to mention a world that deals with all social issues. employed a sophisticated approach in bringing to light a complex set of historical and cultural effects underlying the conflict between the landlord and sharecropper (Evin, 1984, p. 12).

In other words, villagers, landlords, and gendarmes, that is, all social issues, were the focal point of Yaşar Kemal's novels. His work aesthetically revealed a series of complex historical and cultural influences underlying the conflict between landowner and sharecropper in villages. "The mainstream of Turkish social realism was concerned with exposing inequality and exploitation, and showing how the existing

social order perpetrated these injustices” (Evin, 1984, p. 12). Kemal believed that victims, exploited by the Aghas, or powerful ones, were victims, not because they were individually vulnerable, but because the entire political and economic system had allowed them to become victims, and placed them in a state of vulnerability.

In addition, in his works, Kemal used many folkloric elements such as pigeons, trees, mythical mountains, fertile soil, the elixir of life and the cults. Generally, he wanted to represent the poverty and suffering of the village, masterfully interspersed with these kinds of folkloric elements throughout the flow of events. Many novels were rich in terms of folkloric materials, and rich elements of folklore are found in cults. Kemal’s works, as seen above, included those who experienced the worst conditions and social problems. He turned the device of the interview onto social groups who needed to care for the working class and maintain social justice. In the broadest sense, the social segments with which he was concerned constitute the 20th century members of the proletariat, and thus he presented a cross-section of the historical struggle on social rights in his own age.

4.1 Yaşar Kemal’s The Sultan of The Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant

Yaşar Kemal’s lesser-known novel, *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lane Ant* was published as a children’s book in 1977. It was translated into many different languages such as Persian, Swedish, and French. Kemal, who had shown his strong expressive ability in his other works before this novel, demonstrated the same skill but with a different technique. “Karıncalar ve fillerin öyküsünü roman biçiminde kurgulayan Kemal, bu romanla, yazın kariyerinde, biçim ve anlatım tekniği açısından bir ilke imzasını atmaktadır” (Tan, 1997, p. 141). “Constructing the story of ants and elephants in the form of a novel, Kemal leads the way in his literary career in terms of style and expression technique with this novel”. It is a story which explores dictatorship and the mechanisms of oppression and manipulation, both using an external enemy, or keeping people occupied with work or entertainment, twenty-four hours a day. It refers to the manipulation of history: the Sultan of the elephants imposes his version of history on the ants, according to which they attack the elephant kingdom, and the elephants must invade to defend themselves. The ants are forced to accept this invasion, as they are threatened by a renewal of hostilities.

Kemal wrote this novel as a fearless social critic, after his famous, heroic, well-known long-descriptive works. “Kahraman ağırlıklı romandan, olay-konu ağırlıklı romana geçişi deneyen yazar, bu yapıtında diğer romanlarının aksine betimlemelere çok fazla yer vermez; karakter çözümlemelerini ön planda tutmaz” (Tan, 1997, p. 141). “The writer, who tried to transition from the hero dominated novel to the plot-based novel, does not give much space to descriptions in this work, unlike his other novels; does not prioritise character analysis”. In this novel, it is clear to read his thoughts on the bureaucracy of Turkey, class conflict, political groups, and the intelligentsia, in which he makes subtle references to several words or phrases that a foreign reader cannot easily understand. “Anlatım ve gerekçelendirme, toplumcu dünya görüşü etrafında yoğunlaşmaktadır. Bunun en çarpıcı örneği, bu dünya görüşünü benimseyen aydınların sürekli kullandıkları barış, özgürlük, dayanışma, birleşme... gibi söylemlerin roman kurgusunun içine sıklıkla serpiştirilmiş olmalarıdır” (Tan, 1997, p. 155). “Narrative and justification are centred on the socialist worldview. The most striking example of this is the fact that the discourses such as peace, freedom, solidarity, and unification that intellectuals who adopt this worldview are constantly interspersed within the fiction of the novel”. Kemal shows how a totalitarian reorganisation destroys equilibrium and is characterised by relations of domination and submission or exploitation. However, this is not called exploitation by the elephants; it is called liberty. The concept of ‘divide and reign’ is also present; the elephants split the ants into clans and make these clans hate each other.

The story is like a manual of world domination. However, due to the animal characters, and being written in a fable style, the story is enjoyable for children to read. If we want to find out Kemal’s motivation for writing such a novel, we should look at some historical events as he pointed them out.

In 1917, the socialist system spread widely under the favour of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which overturned the Tsarist regime in one of the most important events of twentieth century world history, and led to the establishment of the Soviet Union. Socialism was gaining momentum, and in 1955, the Warsaw Pact, also known as the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance, was created by Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Soviet Union, in a political and military alliance which was responsive to NATO. In 1968, this Treaty of Friendship, as Warsaw Pact nations

(except for Albania and Romania) invaded Czechoslovakia. Yaşar Kemal condemned the Soviet Union in the strongest terms with his left-wing identity when they de- forced Czechoslovakia. He labelled them as colonial, and these kinds of historical or political events are underlined in his novel.

The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant adlı romanımda işlediğim ana tema, ana konu, ana sorun, çağımızın yarattığı ve alabildiğine geliştirdiği, artık bütün halklara, bütün insanlığa malolmuş büyük bir sorundur, büyük bir temadır. Sömürülenlerle sömürücüler arasındaki büyük çelişki, çağımızdaki kadar hiç bir çağda böylesine belirgin hale gelmemiştir. Bunu anlatıyorum ben bu romanımda, bu korkunç çelişkiyi (Kemal, 2015, p. 226).

The main theme, the main subject, the main problem, which I dealt with in my novel titled *The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lane Ant* is a great problem created and developed by our age, now costing all peoples and all humanity, a great theme. The great contradiction between the exploited and the exploiters has never been so evident as in our own. This is what I am telling in this novel, this terrible contradiction.

He specifically indicated the Soviet Union as the exploiters, and the countries like Czechoslovakia as the exploited. He was affected by these kinds of events and his response appeared as symbols in this novel. However, he also expressed his regrets for choosing elephants or animals instead of humans to represent exploiters. “Aslında bütün araştırmalarımıza rağmen, bu küçük fablın yazılı kaynaklara geçmiş bir metnine rastlamamız mümkün olmamıştır. Yaşar Kemal, bu eserinde de gizli folklorculuğundan yararlanmış ve daha önce Anadolu’da halktan duyarak derlemiş olmalı” (Çiftlikçi, 1993, p. 380). “In fact, despite all our research, we have not been able to come across a written text of this little fable. Yaşar Kemal must have benefited from his secret folklore in this work and compiled it by hearing from the people in Anatolia before”. Most probably, he wrote this novel inspired by the ant and elephant legends. He never mentioned the story’s first origin, but it is known that he was familiar with fables and oral folk tradition. For example, the story of the ant and the

elephant is mentioned in a prayer to God in *Secere-i Terakime* (1659).⁷ The word ‘ant’ here is used as a symbol of poverty and weakness. “Burada Tanrının, canlılara hepsinin durumlarına göre rızıklarını paylaştırdığından bahsedilirken, yoksul ve padişah, karınca ve fil gibi birbirine zıt olabilecek örnekler verilmiştir” (Bahadır, 2015, pp. 203-204). “While it is mentioned that God shares the sustenance of all living things according to their situation, examples that can be opposite to each other such as the poor and the sultan, the ant and the elephant are given”. Moreover, another detail that supports my idea is handled by Boratav as follows: “Fil ve karınca daha çok ahlaki içerik-leriyle fabl türüyle akrabalık gösteren Süleyman efsanelerinden biridir. Yollarda giden karıncaları ezen fillerin öyküsü ör-nek verilebilir” (Boratav, 2012, pp. 45-46). “The elephant and the ant are one of the legends of Solomon, which is related to the fable type with its moral content. The story of elephants crushing ants on the roads can be given as an example”. The ants complain to Süleyman. Unable to persuade these large animals to choose another path, the ants decide to take revenge; after long efforts, they dig a tunnel that passes right under the elephants’ path, making their enemies fall, and so the ants defeat the elephants. At the end of Kemal’s novel, very similar to the story, the ants unite under the leadership of the red bearded lame ant, and work for the Sultan of the elephants during the day. At night, for their struggle, they dig the ground. When they are ready, they declare war. Upon this, the Sultan of the elephants, jumping with a fury, falls into the pit dug by the ants. All the other elephants are buried in the ground dug for them as soon as they step on it. Thus, the ants end the exploitation of elephants and regain their freedom.

“Yazar işbirlikçi tipi için hayvanlar arasından neden Ulukepez adını verdiği hüthütü seçtiğini açıklamamıştır. Yaşar Kemal, hüthütü belki karınca ve böceklerle beslendiği için belki de bilinmeyen başka bir amaçla seçmiştir” (Çiftlikçi, 1993, p. 389). “Kemal did not explain why he chose the *Hudhud*⁸, which he named Ulukepez, among the animals for the spy type. He chose the Hudhud for another unknown purpose, perhaps because it fed on ants and insects”. In my opinion, Yaşar Kemal chose the *Hudhud* with a specific purpose, and this may be related to the fact that this is a messenger bird, especially in epics and fairy tales. In addition, Türkdoğan

⁷ Ebülğazi Bahadır Han's work on the Oghuz Han lineage and Turkmens. *Secere-i Terakime* is also an important literary work as it tells countless Turkmen folk legends, tales, etymologies of ethnonyms, proverbs, and sayings. The village where Yaşar Kemal was born had been a settled Turkmen village since the 19th century.

⁸ Hudhud is the wise hoopoe, the hoopoe playing the role of a spiritual guide (Douglas, 2009, p. 21).

mentions that, with the news brought by *Hudhud*, who discovered the country of the Queen of Sheba, Belkıs, King Solomon becomes aware of this country (Türkdoğan, 2010, p. 85). In Kemal's novel, Ulukepez is the hoopoe bird known also as *Hudhud*, a messenger for the elephants, and which relies on the ants for its food.

As for me, these legends may be based on the war of Dandanakan. According to Sümer:

Oğuzlar'ın pek büyük bir kısmı Balhan dağlarına gitmişlerdi: İbn ul-Esîr, Gazneli Mahmud'un İsfahan hâkiminin Oğuzlar'ın kafalarını kendisine yollamasını istediğini, bunu öğrenen Oğuzlar'ın oradan kaçtıklarını yazar. Sultan Mes'ud (1031-1032) valisinden Oğuzlar'ın başında bulunan Yağmur, Kızıl, Buka ve Gök-Taş'ın yakalanması istedi. Gazneli ordusu 3000 atlı ve filler ile Oğuzlar'ın karşısına çıktı. Ordu altındaki fil telef edilerek yere düşürülmüş, daha önce Sultan Mes'ud'un emri üzerine öldürülen yurttaşların öcünü almak için parça parça edilmişti. Bu savaşta, filler Oğuzlar'ın eline geçmişti (Sümer, 1972, pp. 71-72).

Most of the Oghuz had gone to the Balhan Mountains: Ibn ul-Esir writes that Mahmud of Ghazni wanted the ruler of Isfahan to send the Oghuz's heads to him, and the Oghuz, who learned this, fled from there. Sultan Mes'ud (1031-1032) asked the governor to capture Yağmur, Kızıl, Buka and Gök-Taş, who were at the head of the Oghuz. The Ghaznavid army faced the Oghuz with 3000 horsemen and elephants. The elephant under the army was destroyed and fell to the ground, and it was cut into pieces to avenge the citizens who were killed on the order of Sultan Mes'ud before. In this war, the elephants fell into the hands of the Oghuz.

Interestingly, there is a Turkmen tale called 'revenge on the elephant'. According to this tale, a self-indulgent elephant who owns a large forest is rubbing against a tree to scratch his shoulder. Another animal living in the tree is disturbed by this, and asks other animals for help to defeat him. They all say that the elephant is very dangerous, and decide to defeat it by uniting. One of these animals is the crow, which blinds the elephant by gouging its eye with its beak. The elephant, who cannot see anything, falls into a well. The conclusion drawn from this tale is that the friends unite to get rid

of the self-indulgent elephant who persecutes the helpless (Gökçimen, 2000, pp. 150-151). In this sense, first, it is important to remember that the village where Yaşar Kemal was born was a settled Turkmen village in the nineteenth century, and it is also a well-known fact that he was familiar with Turkmen folk tales. In the novel, an elephant is identified with actions such as self-indulgence and scratching trees. Moreover, the elephant Sultan is often referred to as ‘the mountain of blind-eyed cruelty’, and ‘blind fool’. In addition, while the ants try to find a way to defeat the elephants, they even mention the option of blinding them. The elephant collaborator, the treacherous wasp, suggests that the ants will be vaccinated to make them grow up to five or ten times the size of the elephant.⁹ Then, they agree and decide to dig wells in the path of the elephants.

In another Turkmen tale, one day, while an ant drinks from the stream, a hurricane throws it into the water. Seeing this, the pigeon shows mercy to the ant and flies to its aid (Gökçimen, 2000, p. 141). At the end of Kemal’s novel, hearing the ballad, the pigeon comes to the aid of the ants. Then, he goes to Sultan to throw the heads of the traitorous wasps. The ancient and rich origins of this novel’s story may give rise to the idea of the existence of a close relationship between Yaşar Kemal, Turkmen history, and its folk tales.

⁹ At this point, it reminds people of human experimentation including vaccine testing at Dachau, Auschwitz, Birkenau, and other National Socialist concentration camps. Human experimentation in Nazism was conducted from the beginning of Hitler’s reign until the end of the Second World War in the twentieth century.

5. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON *ANIMAL FARM* AND *THE SULTAN OF THE ELEPHANTS AND RED BEARDED LAME ANT*

It is possible to find many sources and researches about George Orwell and his work, which have been studied extensively today. The same can be said for Yaşar Kemal. However, people have expressed in various ways that when they read these two novels, they immediately sense an Orwellian taste in Kemal's work. However, my aim is to find out the similarities established at first sight, and secondly, and more interestingly, to establish the parallels between these two novels in similar and yet dissimilar respects. In other words, what is meant to be evaluated in this chapter is that what is similar on the surface, is not superior to what is specifically different.

The main similarity between the two authors is that they both had similar life experiences in their pasts, as discussed in the third and fourth chapters. Orwell came from a middle-class family with a poor living. Kemal, being a working-class child and not being indifferent to social issues come together as a common ground between these two writers. Sociological, ideological, economic, and cultural influences direct their writing styles. According to Goldmann, since important work cannot emerge as the result of purely individual experience, the genre of the novel is likely to emerge and develop only as long as a non-conceptualized, emotional longing for qualitative values is developed within society, or perhaps, only among the middle strata from which most novelists come.

As discussed in the second chapter, for Lukács, humans are always at the focal point of literature since humans cannot be separated from their social and historical environment. Yaşar Kemal supported the idea that his working style was in favour of the people. What he really wanted to say is that it was not possible to separate his personality and art from the public. He defined himself as a working artist, a writer working with the public. The reason for this is the emergence of left-wing thought in his mind at the age of seventeen or eighteen. He emphasised that he created his art with the public. He believed that his politics could not be separated from his art, and clearly stated that he was against whoever oppressed the people and exploited them, whether through feudalism or the bourgeoisie. He clearly stated that what he wanted to do in literature was to raise awareness of the workers through his art (İpekçi, 1971). Like Kemal, Orwell was affected by events and reflected this in his work. As he

stated in “Why I Write”: “I do not think one can assess a writer’s motives without knowing something of his early development” (“Why I Write”, Orwell, 1946). When he was in Spain as a civil war reporter, he joined the republican militia, which established the grounds for his hatred of fascist figures, which can be firstly seen in *Homage to Catalonia* and later in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Thus, literature is a human product and human orientated. The writer and his product cannot be considered separately from the content they create. As mentioned before, since Lukács discusses that a person’s environment plays a huge role in determining his personality, Orwell and Kemal combine the subjectivity of the individual and objective reality. “Orwell’in gerçekçiliği Lukács’ın toplumcu gerçekçiliği ile doğalcı gerçekçiliğin ilginç bir karşımıdır” (Batum, 1981, p. 7). “Orwell’s realism is an interesting mix of Lukács’ socialist realism and naturalistic realism”.

Yaşar Kemal claimed what he did in literature was to create a story parallel to his own culture as a writer. Therefore, as an artist, he tries, as far as possible, not to become alienated from his own values. He consciously tried to stay loyal to the realities of the country, to human values. He frequently underlined that he did not separate his art from the conditions, personality, and colour of his hometown. He clearly stated that he was in the business of creating a world of literature in which part is based on society, part is based on nature and the rest is based on human values (İpekçi, 1971). As was mentioned in the theory chapter, the relationship between the novel itself as a form, and the structure of the social environment in which it emerged, is important. Goldmann denotes that the sociology of literature basically has a relationship between the most important literary works and the collective consciousness of a particular social group from which they emerge. The literary work is the reflection of a real collective consciousness.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the problems of real people are described in a realistic and serious way, while the facts of the world are distorted and appropriated for their purposes, and the systematic abuse of ordinary people by several propagandas is explained in *Animal Farm*. The fact that Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini saw the rise of power during the period of their existence constitute the basis and cause of Orwell’s anti-totalitarian intellectuals.

As was mentioned in the second chapter, the obsession with psychopathology in modernist literature, which Lukács strictly criticises, manifests itself as a desire to

escape the reality of capitalism. Yaşar Kemal stated that his art was at the disposal of the interests and profits of the working-class people, which he defined as the class to which he belonged. He did not believe in an art that was separated from the people in this age. He clearly stated that what he wanted to do in literature was to raise awareness of the working people over many years (İpekçi, 1971). Therefore, he himself was never concerned with the pathological; when he chose between the important and the superficial, he chose the most important. Kemal, while describing himself as a socialist man of literature, mentioned that a man of letters had a struggle. This war was the war to save the world. He saw himself as a person who tried to save the sweat of the human being, the humanity of the human being and the human value of the human being, while trying to save the nature on which the human being lives. For him, the capitalist class, which exploits the creativity of humanity and destroys everything, also exploits, and destroys nature along with it. Kemal wished to oppose this terrible destruction and exploitation in his novels. He explained using the mechanisation developed thanks to the capitalist order; humans exploit nature, giving them something to live on, like the workers they exploit. He also believed the capitalist order, which must leave the worker with something to live on, exploits nature without giving anything away. He clearly mentioned that this pain was the main subject of his novels, and that he did not think that he would touch on the subject further. Moreover, he gave examples from history while explaining this. He described how the bourgeoisie, overwhelmed by the working-class people in Germany, had resorted to Nazism. According to him, a democracy takes place when the working-class people seize power one hundred percent. He discussed that when economic equality is achieved, political equality will surely follow. He suggested that all the oppression in the world will perpetuate economic inequality because inequalities lie at the root of oppression. Like Kemal, Orwell agreed insincere literature is the worst thing, and that modern literature is essentially an individual thing. However, the individuality of literature is something that did not fit Orwell. A work of art should be the truthful expression of what man thinks and feels. Whoever feels the value of literature and sees the central part it plays in the development of human history must also see the life and death necessity of resisting totalitarianism.

5.1 Allegory as a Literary Tool

Each culture has its own genres, and there is no need to compare the idiosyncrasies of traditions such as Chinese, Arabic, English, Irish, and Turkish with the original character of the Greco-Roman genres. because modern genre theory allows that “traditional kinds may be mixed and produce a new kind” (Wellek & Austin, 1956, pp. 228, 234-235). In this context, the combination of culture and novel genres should be considered as the creation of a new genre. The consciousness of each nation contains certain distinctive characteristics according to their socioeconomic development. In Marxist sociology, it is possible to see and interpret these distinctive perspectives in literary works. The literary work is not only the reflection of a real collective consciousness, but also an advanced culmination of the consistency of the literary tendencies peculiar to the consciousness of a particular group. Goldmann’s Marxist sociology sees this not in real collective consciousness, but only in the concept of constructed possible consciousness (*zugerechnet*) that makes it possible to understand the former.

Although the novel as a genre is universal, when looking at its history, it should not be forgotten that it is still developing and changing. The novel, which is understood to be very new when compared to genres such as the epic, has, of course, been under the influence of other genres. Bakhtin indicates, “the enormous influence exercised by this realm - in the ancient world as well as the Middle Ages - on the birth and formation of novelistic language. It was equally significant for all other historical factors in the novelistic genre (and) the authentic folkloric roots of the novel are to be sought” (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 20-21).

Both selected novels are allegorical examples, and include fables as genre. In general terms, allegory is a representation of the existence of at least two meanings for the same words, and this double meaning is not related to the reader’s interpretation. According to Hunter, genres such as allegory and fable may represent the same written object/art, but different texts may indicate different reader, author, and writing interactions (Hunter, 1989, p. 132). For example, she claims that fable is the genre coming “closest to pure allegory, in which the first meaning of the words tends to be completely effaced” (Hunter, 1989, p. 136). Todorov connects allegory with fable and fairy tale because they are all involved with morality.

The discussion about modernism and realism started in 1930, between Bertolt Brecht and Georg Lukács. Lukács defines allegory as an aesthetic genre that distances people from objective reality. At the same time, it is a problematic literary tool, because if allegory confronts us with the way modernism handles it, then it is seen as the basic ideological determination of form and content, which is the transformation of abstract particularity into the aesthetic outcome of allegory. This concludes with negation of art, not enrichment, because modernism causes both the destruction of traditional literary forms and literature. It would not be wrong to say that allegorical realism in the two novels is an ambivalent aesthetic style, with complex relations with politics and thought in Britain and Turkey, since allegory, “which is symbolic in method, is realistic in aim and in the content of its perception” (Hunter, 1989, p. 142). Therefore, when allegory is discussed, mediaeval literature or nineteenth century European novels should not come to mind. Allegory is a literary tool existing in works of literature which are “vast of metaphors or similes applied to reality” (Lodge, 1970, p. 365).

One can ask if the results of the research into the selected works can be called pessimistic or optimistic. Orwell reveals the truth only at the end of the work, and does not give a moral lesson. He even has full faith in socialism, despite all these experiences, but the realisation of this depends on certain conditions. “The book itself, Orwell makes clear in his letter, was calling not for the end of revolutionary hopes, but for the beginning of a new kind of personal responsibility on the part of revolutionaries” (Letemendia, 2009, pp. 53-54). Kemal, on the other hand, ends his novel in accordance with the Turkmen tale, by which, I think, he is greatly influenced. Because of the characteristics of fables, these allegories do not necessarily teach us a moral lesson. The difference is that while the ants defeat the elephants, as in doomsday myths, in *Animal Farm*, the situation is more complicated: when everything is managed by the motivation of ballad, and pigs get control of the farm, they forbid the Beasts of England, which is the symbol of rebellion. At this point, it can be thought that there is a sharp contrast between the two novels. However, in my view, this is, in fact, a similar point which seems different. According to Letemendia, Orwell commentators find it easy to conclude from *Animal Farm* that it is despairing and pessimistic on the part of the author or the tale (Letemendia, 2009, p. 46). In this sense, it should be noted that Orwell is playing a two-sided game with his reader

through the allegory. In some ways, the author clearly highlights the similarities between the animals in the farm and the humans they are designed to represent; at other times, he shows with both humour and pity, the profound differences that distinguish the animal from the human. In doing so, he compels the reader to distinguish between the personalities and behaviour of monsters, and those of the human world. Despite their great intellectual abilities, pigs are ultimately the most absurd of all farm animals as they seek to assume a human identity that cannot be their own. Therefore, Orwell is not implying by this the despair of a proletarian revolution; rather, he points to the need for education and self-confidence in any working-class movement if it is to remain democratic in character (Letemendia, 2009, p. 47). For this reason, contrary to general belief, although both authors seem to have different views when these novels are compared on democratic socialism, in fact, they believed the same thing, they do not separate at this point. On the contrary, they unite, because it is only their ways of writing which are different, the differences are encrypted. “The text does indeed stand alone to reveal Orwell’s consistent belief not only in democratic Socialism, but in the possibility of a democratic Socialist revolution” (Letemendia, 2009, p. 45). Another piece of evidence supporting this point is that both Orwell and Kemal sharply criticise the intelligentsia and bureaucracy regarding their beliefs in democratic socialism. Kemal states that, unlike the working class or the bourgeoisie, this group leans towards dictatorship, totalitarianism, or fascism, since the bureaucracy has no basis on which to base its power. Since they do not have an economic and social basis, they have no choice but to resort to violence. Orwell writes, “bourgeois democracy is not enough, but better than fascism. The common people know this, even if the intellectuals do not” (2020a, p. 11). Therefore, *Animal Farm* signals not the end of revolutionary hopes, but the beginning of a new kind of personal responsibility for the revolutionaries. Letemendia suggests that, if he has claimed the opposite, it may even be necessary to accuse him of hypocrisy, because his whole argument is based on the truth that “people had to make and retain control of the revolution themselves if they wanted it to remain true to its goals” (Letemendia, 2009, p. 54).

As is evaluated in the second chapter, Eagleton expresses that the literary text is a dramatic production of ideology. It is the representation of reality rather than reality itself. For both writers, their fiction is fictitious because it reveals a certain

ideological experience of real history. Orwell works in broader allegorical terms, discussing the interaction between personal and party politics, and the communication upon which this interaction depends (Hunter, 1989, p29). Furthermore, there is a close resemblance between the characters and events in the book and the Soviet Union and its sources: Major speaks for Marx, Napoleon represents Stalin, Snowball typifies Trotsky, and the windmill symbolises the First Five-Year Plan. Finally, the meeting of pigs and humans stands for the Tehran Conference, which was the meeting between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill (Fowler, 1995, pp. 162-163). In this case, because allegory is a rhetorical stance, it is a common assumption that if a meaning can be identified, as in *Animal Farm*'s point-to-point correspondence with events in the early Soviet Union, then it is allegorical (Hunter, 1989, p. 137).

In the selected novels, the worlds of the exploiters and the exploited are handled allegorically. In Kemal's novel, industrious ants have been chosen as the symbol of working and labouring people. Elephants, who can be thought of as having power with their big trunks, are chosen as the exploiters with strong backs who oppress them. Kemal's elephants, like Orwell's pigs, represent people who do not respect the worker's labour and rights, and who can operate all kinds of injustice for their own interests. This reminds us of the Aghas and men who oppress the people in many of Yaşar Kemal's novels. All the elephants lie on their sides just like the Aghas, rubbing their butts against the trees, enjoying themselves. Relying on their physical powers, they make the ants do whatever they want. However, like Orwell, Kemal is playing a two-sided game with his reader through this allegory. The mind of the Sultan, who is very confident in his physical strength, does not work very well. Rather, Ulukepez, the head of the *hudhud*, directs him. With physical superiority and propaganda, while thousands of ants are working, the minority with big bodies take everything, and the helpless majority starve. In the end, elephants, who are not as smart as Orwell's pigs, cannot escape from the tiny ants taking them down, because the ants are united. On the other hand, there is no common assumption in research of Kemal's novel that it is allegorical in terms of its rhetorical stance, as in *Animal Farm*'s point-to-point correspondence with events in the early Soviet Union.

5.2 Language

The literary use of stylistics restricts the work itself to be defined according to their aesthetic function and meaning. “The method here is that of contrast: we observe the deviations and distortions from normal usage and try to discover their aesthetic purpose” (Wellek & Warren, 1956, p. 180). As can be understood from this comment, the deviations and deteriorations from normal usage of the language used in the two works will be shown, and their aesthetic purposes will be explored.

Both Orwell and Kemal explain the importance of using language in almost every regime to ‘have a say’ against those who deceive the people. It can be seen that each of them tries to emphasise the importance of language for free thought and action in the novels discussed in this thesis. Kemal said that he saw himself as a writer because he consciously introduced myth and dream to human reality (Naci, 1993). He had a strong belief that the structure of the language formed the form and content of the novel. Therefore, while writing his novels, he emphasised the importance of language; the forms and contents created by the language will be found when you go deeper. From this point of view, he supported the idea that the language of every novel written by an author should not be the same. In a way, what we tell determines our way of expression. As such, he stated that if an author writes every novel in the same way, nothing rich will come out. Thus, a world of dreams, a world of myths, a world of novels cannot be established, and a novel language, a language of poetry, a proper novel, or poetry cannot be created without creating a new language (Naci, 1993). According to Eagleton, although both ideology and aesthetic mode of production are typically complex formations, Kemal drew attention to the special homogeneity relationship between these elements. On the other hand, Crick underlined Orwell’s “passionate concern with preserving the clarity of the English language” (Crick, 1980, p. 303). In addition, it is a known fact that Orwell disliked unclear and poetic language, because he clarified that language can lead to corrupt thought, so he planned to be plain-spoken, and in *Animal Farm*, he proceeded in the same way. In my opinion, Orwell's idea here may mean ideology. Language should be as ordinary as possible so that what we call ideology, or thought, should not lack any element. It is the most important tool of ideology or thought. According to Meyers, the fairy-tale form not only allows Orwell to convey a complex message in simple terms, but also matches his preference for grammatically simple sentences and

unpretentious vocabulary (Meyers, 2009, p. 31). The main theme of the book is the perversion of the language, which Kemal also focused on, by an oppressive dictatorship. The corruption of language by elephants and pigs is revealed. Orwell analysed the ills of political speech, suggesting that writing those ills results in self-deception and lying, the intellectual prerequisites of totalitarianism. Orwell “had developed a demotic idiolect which, while vernacular in vocabulary, is hardly cool or neutral, rising often to heights of rhetoric and stridence” (Fowler, 1995, p. 164). Like Orwell on this point, Kemal planned to give his message simply, by adapting a folk tale, and unlike Orwell, he prefers to use an epic language. According to Parla:

(...) he compensated for the impoverishment of that language ingeniously by enriching his style with folk vocabulary and idiom from his native district in southern Turkey. His linguistic innovations, therefore, were not perceived as a statement against the language reform; rather, they were welcomed as a skillful employment of local colour... (...) I believe that Kemal was the only novelist who managed to forge a powerful aesthetic idiom out of the standardised language of modern Turkey. (Parla, 2008, p. 32).

Yaşar Kemal enriches his style with Çukurova’s folk dictionary and idioms. For this reason, linguistic innovations are welcomed as a masterful use of local colour. Moreover, Parla emphasises that Kemal is the only novelist who manages to create a strong aesthetic style from the automatic language of modern Turkey. His legendary plea for the fate of the people previously indifferent, offers a refreshing alternative to the standard republican narratives filled with national, ideological clichés of engagement (Parla, 2008, p. 32). The - seemingly different - similarity between Orwell and Kemal is that they both tend to write in the public language. When Orwell begins writing *Animal Farm*, his new focus on the morality of colloquial language is established (Fowler, 1996, p. 164). The simplification, even refinement, of his language in *Animal Farm* undoubtedly reflects his desire for linguistic honesty in political writing.

There are plenty of colloquial idiomatic phrases, such as ‘safely out of the way’, ‘got her figure back’. Understandably, there are many ordinary words relating to farm equipment and procedures, and to animals: ‘hen-houses’, ‘pop-holes’, ‘tushes’, ‘perched’, ‘fluttered’, ‘chew the cud’, ‘harness-room’,

‘stables’, ‘bits’, ‘nose-rings’, ‘dog-chains’, ‘knives’, ‘castrate’, ‘reins’, ‘halters’, ‘blinkers’, etc. (Fowler, 1996, p. 20).

As can be seen from the quote above, there are many everyday idiomatic expressions that Orwell prefers to use in this book, as well as many common words related to farm equipment, procedures, and animals. Fowler writes that, “the prevalence of this type of vocabulary gives the text an old-fashioned pastoral air” that fits so well with Orwell’s atmosphere of an earlier rural England (Fowler, 1995, p. 169). In addition, according to Eagleton, as was discussed before, pre-textual ideology can be found in the work in various forms: in everyday language, in the approved symbol and tradition, in the codes of perceptual habit. It can also find itself in aesthetic, political, ethical, and other formulas that can instantly permeate ordinary language but emerge as different meanings from it. It is out of the question to reduce the textual discourse of both authors to ideological discourses, but it was not just ideology that provided the author with the necessary materials for the formal aesthetic operations of the text. It was the mutual articulation of the two, together with the textual process.

In the end, both authors reflect the literary tradition they come from: Kemal uses Çukurova’s territorial epic language, and Orwell focuses on honest and direct public language that he observes, because the novel “is associated with the eternally living element of unofficial language and unofficial thought (holiday forms, familiar speech, profanation)” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 20). Therefore, “territorial dialects, social and professional dialects and jargons, literary language, generic languages” cannot exist peacefully together (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 12). The language used in different ways in the two works ultimately seems to confirm Bakhtin’s view.

Gerard Genette, the French literary theorist, reveals that, “the novelist’s choice, unlike the narrator’s, is not between two grammatical forms, but between two narrative postures” emerging as grammatical forms that are simply an outcome, “to have the story told by one of its characters, or to have it told by a narrator outside of the story” (Genette, 1980, p. 244). He discusses how the novelist and the narrator exist separately from each other. Thus, the novelist exhibits two narrative stances that emerge as grammatical forms, which are a natural consequence of the story being told by one of its characters or by a third person. That is, the novelist does not stand between two grammatical forms, but between two narrative postures. According to

Saunders, it must be noted that much of *Animal Farm* “is narrated by a limited intermediary, by a voice suggestive of someone acting as a spokesperson for the animals, and someone who wishes to believe in the promises of socialist progress being made to the animals” (Saunders, 2008, p. 51). Saunders states that much of the book is run by a limited narrator, in other words, it should be noted that it is told in a voice that evokes someone who acts as the spokesperson for those who make promises of socialist progress to animals and is hopeful about it. This idea is exemplified by an excerpt as follows:

Somehow it seemed as though the farm had grown richer without making the animals themselves any richer – except, of course, for the pigs and the dogs. Perhaps this was partly because there were so many pigs and so many dogs (*Animal Farm*, 1976, p. 61).

The adverbs such as ‘somehow’ and ‘perhaps’ point to a narrator who does not have privileged knowledge, is not omniscient, and at the same time tries to justify suspicious behaviour. However, the style used leaves the reader in no doubt about the injustice done to other animals. In Kemal’s novel, a similar idea is shown as follows:

Ama nerede bulacaklardı topal karıncayı? Koca filler sultanı filler sultanıyken bunca zaman aramış da kırmızı sakallardan en küçücük bir ipucu bile elde edememişti (Kemal, 2016, p. 120).

But where would they find the lame ant? The great sultan of the elephants as the sultan of the elephants had searched all this time and could not get even the slightest clue from the red beards.

The quote above points to a narrator who asks a question through the mouth of ants, indicating that the narrator in the novel is not omniscient. “The epic poet tells a story as a professional storyteller, including his own comments within the poem, and giving the narration proper (as distinct from dialogue) in his own style” (Wellek & Austen, 1956, p. 22). In this novel, Kemal conveys the story to the readers as an epic poet. As a professional storyteller, he explores in his own style, as opposed to dialogue, by including his own interpretations or questions in the poem. Even the presence of a narrator, who hopes and expects that the exploitation of elephants will one-day end, draws attention similarly to Orwell’s style, as mentioned above.

On the other hand, just as the perpetrator of the atrocities is not known directly, the reader of *Animal Farm* can never discover who blew up the windmill

first; therefore, we are never quite sure whether the destruction comes from within or from without, which perfectly reflects the complex double-game intrigues of totalitarian governments. Again, the important detail is that Orwell is aware of the narrative approach (Saunders, 2008, p. 52). Since he was aware of the narrative posture, he creates the text to enable the reader to empathise with animals through techniques of focalization¹⁰ on their interests and hopes. “The text secures the reader’s empathy with the animals by techniques of focalization which stick close to their interests and expectations” (Fowler, 1995, p. 162). In his fable, the animals, except for the pigs, express their emotions and thoughts by the technique of primary focalization, especially Boxer and Clover. “Boxer and Clover are to a large extent representatives of the primary focalization of the animals, which is collective: the horses voice the general feeling” (Fowler, 1995, p. 172). In addition, the reader’s participation in interpreting a clear distinction between the oppressors and the oppressed is guided by a language appropriate for the two groups, in the narrator’s style. The first group are the pigs, who have a humanly perverted nature, and they speak in a voice of political rhetoric and hypocrisy, which gradually turns into a grotesque parody of humans as they get used to buying and selling, drinking alcohol, wearing clothes, and walking on their hind legs. The second is the majority group, innocent animals betrayed, such as working horses, oppressed sheep, and poultry. Therefore, Orwell ensures that “the story is told from the viewpoint of the animals” and, “empathy between the narrator and the animals (except pigs) is established” (Fowler, 1995, p. 173). Besides, in both Kemal and Orwell, the narrator knows as much as the animals do, and they do not have a privileged, God-like knowledge through which to distinguish the narrator from the animals or show them as superior to animals. “Yaşar Kemal mi yazıyor, halk mı söylüyor, karışır birbirine: Yaşar Kemal de halkın düşündüğüne inanır gibidir” (Naci, 2004, p.12). “Is Yaşar Kemal writing or the people saying, they get mixed up: Yaşar Kemal also seems to believe what the people think”. However, he presents an example of poetic language from the novel. In this context, it is important to

¹⁰ Gerard Genette coined this term. Focalization “internal focalization means the narrative is focused through the consciousness of a character, whereas external focalization is something altogether different: the narrative is focused on a character, not through him” (Genette, 1980, p. 10-11). Genette focuses specifically on the distinction between heterodiegetic and homodiegetic narrators. Homodiegetic narrators coexist with the characters in the story, while heterodiegetic narrators are not part of this story world. With this term, he discussed how knowledge is constrained in storytelling. He distinguished between internal, external and zero focalization. The internal is the narrative’s focus on thoughts and feelings, while the external only focuses on the characters’ actions, behaviour, environment, etc. Zero focalization means the narrator’s omniscience.

emphasise that the epic language of Yaşar Kemal reveals the tone of his novels, which brings majesty to the fictive reality. Besides, according to Jakobson,

If we reduce the question to a simple grammatical formula, we can say that the point of departure and the main theme are, for the lyric, invariably the first person of the present tense. (...) In the epic, on the contrary, the present refers expressly back to the past, and if the 'I' of the narrator does find expression, it is solely as one of the characters in the action. This objectified 'I' thus appears as a variant of the third person; the poet is, as it were, looking at himself from outside (Jakobson, 1987, p. 304).

Therefore, the lyric is the first-person narrator, present tense, while the epic is third person narrator, past tense. In both novels, there is a third-person narration and the use of the past tense. From this perspective, Jakobson's epic formula can be considered as one of the subtle similarities shared by both writers.

Another important point about the use of language can be given as an example: in Kemal's novel, ants stop working and live like elephants; this does not suit the Sultan, so he says living like elephants is only for those who were elephants at the start, not something for others to aspire to later. In this sense, a very similar approach comes to mind in *Animal Farm*: "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" (Orwell, 1976, p. 63). Doublethink, voiced in the language, has a stylistic shock effect. In this sentence, there is an obvious distortion of the meaning of the key logical and ethical term 'equal', because equality is not a comparative term. As with other orders given by pigs to rule animals, there is a semantic contradiction (Fowler, 1995, p. 179). In this sense, it is necessary to remember Orwell's thoughts on the perversion of language by politicians and its relationship with this fable. "Language is also part of the action of the book, and the way the relationship of language and power is symbolised by linguistic actions is a theme examined by this fable. The theme becomes more specifically focused as the pigs' regime gets indefensibly brutal and selfish: language is used in a perverted way to support a distorted, untruthful, version of reality" (Fowler, 1995, p. 177). In both Kemal and Orwell's work, there is a relationship between language and power, which is symbolised by linguistic actions. Language can be used perversely to support a distorted, unrealistic version of reality. Authorities impose restrictions by making these kinds of speeches, as if equality is something comparable. In Kemal's novel, there is an example of similar linguistic action: "Ol sebepten, kıçlarını ağaçlara

sürerek uyumak yalnız asıl fillere mahsustur, sonra fil olmuş karınca filler için değildir” (Kemal, 2016, p. 97). “For that reason, sleeping with their butts on trees is only for the actual elephants, not for the Eleph-Ants”. Through this sentence, we are forced to make a clear distinction between the ‘born’ elephants and the ‘made’ Eleph-Ants. Just like Orwell, Kemal uses stylistic shock almost to say that all Eleph-ants are equal, but some elephants are more equal than others.

5.3 Theme

Compared thematically, there are similarities and differences between the two novels, which will be the topic of this chapter. To begin with similarities: These are the importance of ballads, constant invention of jobs for the animals, totalitarian rulers, the deterioration and control of language, religious implications, use of propaganda by symbolic ministers, humans as enemies, and animals’ gradual resemblance to humans.

The motif of the ballad is related to the revolution in both novels. Leaders such as Hitler or Mussolini, who tormented and killed most of society during their administrations, were essentially completely blackened, and the writers personally witnessed this during their lives. For example, in *Homage to Catalonia*, Orwell mentions his experience of revolutionary ballads:

At that time revolutionary ballads of the naivest kind, all about proletarian brotherhood and the wickedness of Mussolini, were being sold on the streets for a few centimes each. I have often seen an illiterate militiaman buy one of these ballads, laboriously spell out the words, and then, when he had got the hang of it, begin singing it to an appropriate tune (Orwell, 2016, p. 13).

This real ballad appears as “Beast of England” which is taught by Old Major in *Animal Farm*: “Many years ago, when I was a little pig, my mother and the other sows used to sing an old song of which they knew only the tune and the first three words (...) but when I have taught you the tune, you can sing it better for yourselves. It is called Beasts of England” (Orwell, 1976, p. 27). Orwell is aware of the importance of revolutionary ballads, and uses them as a political instrument of pathway to victory, because they are accepted as one of the biggest sources of motivation for mobilisation. Although the novel as a literary form has this problem, it must be reinvented among different authors in various countries. Moreover, on the

literary level, the content of an entire period must be rediscovered by the authors, without any significant relation between the form and the most important aspects of social life (Goldmann, 1996, p. 209). Like Orwell, Kemal is aware of ballads' effects, and in *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red-Bearded Lane Ant*, he demonstrates it by making the ants forget their ant-ship, with the help of the mass media, in order to prevent a possible rebellion and pacify them for easy control, but the ballad of the ants reminds them their real identity, so it becomes more powerful than the law of the elephants. Another mutual point of ballads in these two novels is that they are archaic and forgotten, but later remembered for rebellion or as a way of salvation.

In Kemal's novel, we see the constant invention of jobs to prevent the working class from uniting and organising:

Karınca da olsa düşünce bir gün bir yolunu bulup fili yener. Onun için bizler karıncaların en küçük bir düşüncesine izin vermeyeceğiz. İzin vermemek için de kafamızı çatlatıp, bütün filler ve hüdhüdler, sarıca karıncalar¹¹, yani tekmil biz sömürücüler, yok yok özgürlükçüler, onlar kıyamete kadar düşünmesin diye yeni icatlar bulacağız (Kemal, 2016, p. 56).

Even if it is an ant, one day the thought will find a way and beat the elephant. That's why we will not allow the ants the slightest thought. In order not to allow it, we will rack our brains and find new inventions so that all elephants and hudhuds, wasps, all of us are exploiters, no, libertarians, so that they don't think about it until the end of the day.

There is an intriguing resemblance between the power-hungry Sultan and Orwell's pigs, who are increasingly oppressing. Yaşar Kemal clearly summarised that bureaucracy in Turkey did not have a solid foundation like the bourgeoisie or the working-class people, in order to provide freedom, so they had to set up a terrible order of repression in order to stay in power (İpekçi, 1971). Just as Kemal criticises bureaucracy here, Orwell criticises intellectuals in *Animal Farm*. An overt critique of

¹¹ Wasps (Saricalar) are the most suitable types to cause discord among ants. Because they are weak and lazy in the structure to sell their ancestry for a small benefit. In fact, here references are made to people who condone and even help the exploitation of their fellow workers for their own petty interests. Indeed, as they calculate, they have no difficulty in running the windmills for their own account. Wasps mingling with the red-bearded ones pit the ants against each other. However, the red-bearded lame ant organises other ants. Red beards kill all the wasps.

intellectuals is evident in the novel's self-proclaimed portrayal of ruthless and power-obsessed pigs (Marks, 2011, p. 140). Pigs, who define themselves as 'brainworkers' in a way, take on the task of thinking, and leave all the work that requires physical strength to other animals; The Sultan of the elephants does the same.

The Sultan of the elephants removes some words from the dictionary, especially the word 'exploitation', forbids them to be said, and constantly invents things to prevent the ants from thinking, to implement his ideology without resorting to physical violence:

İşte bu sözcük sözlüklerden silinecek, hiçbir karınca bu sözcüğü ağzına alamayacak. (...) biz onlara bütün yaratıkların yüz binlerce yıl özleyip de kavuşamadıkları özgürlük düzenini armağan eyledik (Kemal, 2016, p. 40).

This word will be deleted from dictionaries, and no ant will be able to use it. (...) We bestowed upon them the order of freedom that all creatures missed for hundreds of thousands of years but could not attain.

Moreover, the reason why the Sultan is so obsessed with the word 'exploitation' and even declares that anyone who utters the word will be killed immediately, contrary to his domination through ideological devices without using violence, is important. Thus, it is necessary to remember Althusser's views on the word 'exploitation'. According to him,

The base or infrastructure of the class state is thus well and truly, as Lenin said, exploitation. The effect produced by the superstructure is simultaneously to ensure the conditions under which this exploitation is carried out (Repressive State Apparatus) and the reproduction of the relations of production, that is, of exploitation (Ideological State Apparatuses) (Althusser, 2014, p93).

At the root of the class state is 'exploitation'. The Sultan of the elephants declares war because ants are constantly producing. It is the effect of providing the conditions under which exploitation is carried out (State Apparatus of Repression) and the reproduction of relations of production, that is, exploitation (Ideological Devices of the State). In addition, the Sultan constantly invents things to prevent the ants from thinking, to implement his ideology without resorting to physical violence. "Onlara

gece gündüz fil olma düşü kurdurmanın yolunu bulacaksın... Onlara böylelikle karıncalıklarını unutturacaksın” (Kemal, 2016, p. 114). “You will find a way to make them dream of being an elephant day and night... This way, you will make them forget their ant-ship”. Sultan believes that establishing an organization with those who are on their side in ant countries, getting news from the ants every day, and even listening to the ants’ breathing is the most vital task. Hence, Sultan makes Ulukepez, who is a *hudhud* bird, into a propagandist and chief advisor for himself. Not only that, but he also puts the entire *hudhud* nation under ideological pressure. He mentions that if they take this internal organization, refutation, call it brainwashing; if they can make the ants forget their ant-ship, the elephants have won everything. The Sultan’s wish is to live in a paradise on the backs of the ants, and with their production, labor force, and sweat. The reason why the Sultan thinks like this lies in his desire to create an unthinking, unquestioning vassal. As Hunter points out “if a totalitarian state emerges, like the Leviathan predicted by Hobbes, it over-determines the representations allowed to people who count as citizens, so that they, too, become subjected, become subjects” (Hunter, 2004, p232). This is the portrayal of a Leviathan, a totalitarian state with its subjects. He wants to make the ants into automatic workers by keeping them busy, that is, first they must lose their individuality, and then be prevented from unification. According to Althusser, bourgeois politics is generally based on the tactic of dividing the working-class forces, so by this technique, the bourgeoisie effectively rules them and eliminates the presence of proletarian organizations in its ISAs (Althusser, 2014, p97). The tactic of dividing the working-class forces does not allow unified leadership under the red bearded lame ants and their natural allies. Therefore, the Sultan wants the red-bearded ant, alive or dead, and his spies look for him everywhere. On the one hand, he curses the red-bearded ant in an interesting way, “Demek ki demirci kırmızı sakalın soyu insandan gelirmiş. Anladınız mı ne kadar tehlikeli? Bunlar kapılara şapka da asarmış. Bunlar ırz düşmanı imişler” (Kemal, 2016, p. 85), “So the blacksmith red beard is descended from humans. Do you understand how dangerous it is? They also hang hats on the doors. They were rapists”. ‘Hanging a hat on the door’ was a very common claim among the people, especially the right-wing party of the 60s in Turkey. They introduced the hat as a symbol of communists ‘sleeping with each other’ and believed Nizamülmülk’s *Siyasetname* was the source of this claim, because they made the definition of communism, not from the common ownership of property, that is, from

collective property, but from women, who exploited the conservatism of society over the concept of chastity. The Sultan of the elephants exploits the red-bearded ant in front of the public, with this very well-known claim of the right in the 60s in Turkey, which Yaşar Kemal obviously criticises. Besides, the red bearded lame ant symbolises the whole community of socialist people, by himself, as the epic hero. “The epic hero is, strictly speaking, never an individual. It is traditionally thought that one of the essential characteristics of the epic is the fact that its theme is not a personal destiny, but the destiny of a community” (Lukács, 1971, p. 66). Kemal’s hero has a heroic destiny that determines the destiny of the community. Getting rid of the oppression of the elephants is not the destiny of a single hero, but the destiny of the entire ant nation. Freedom has been gained by this community, and working-class people have achieved this by uniting and organising together, which Kemal constantly emphasises as his socialist ideal.

In addition, the Sultan of the elephants follows a policy of intimidation of the ants by playing with the meanings of some words and making them repeat them. “Sömürü alçaklıktır. Özgürlük var. Her karınca bir fildir” (Kemal, 2016, p. 41). “Exploitation is cowardice. There is freedom. Every ant is an Eleph-Ant”. The Sultan orders them to say these words a hundred times a day. He promises if they say it like this, maybe they can become Eleph-Ants. After a while, all the Sultan’s tactics work out; the ants cannot come together from the words their God-Sultan says to them, from the joy of the hope that they will become Eleph-Ants one day anyway. The Sultan, who wages war on them to exploit them and wants to enslave them, starts a cold war when the hot war ends. After the Sultan wins the war with physical force, he completely abandons this policy and uses ideological devices to exploit the ants: “Karıncalar bundan böyle bizim gözbebeğimizdir. Biz filler karınca sevgisiyle dolu bir ulusuz” (Kemal, 2016, p. 34), “ants are our apple of the eye from now on. We elephants are a nation full of ant love”. Similarly, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, there are phrases such as ‘War Is Peace’, ‘Freedom Is Slavery’, ‘Ignorance Is Strength’, and the ‘Ministry of Truth’. “All the other Orwellian inventions that are now wearisome clichés, are restored to some force, though little freshness” (Bloom, 2007, p. 2).

By displaying the opposite approach to violence, Kemal’s Sultan behaves like a god who makes sinners’ experience hell, but also forgives his repentant servants

with his endless mercy. Orwell uses religious implications, such as the Seven Commandments of Animal Farm and Sugarcandy Mountain. According to Elbarbary:

(...) A heavenly 'Sugarcandy Mountain' as envisioned by Moses is plentiful of material benefits for all animals: It was situated somewhere up in the sky, a little distance beyond the clouds, Moses said. In Sugarcandy Mountain it was Sunday seven days a week, clover was in season all the year round, and lump sugar and linseed cake grew on the hedges. This evokes the description of Paradise in the Holy Qur'an: [There is] a Parable of the Garden which the righteous are promised: in it are rivers of water incorruptible; rivers of milk of which the taste never changes; rivers of wine, a joy to those who drink; and rivers of honey pure and clear. In it there are for them all kinds of fruits. (...) This contextual echo helps to keep us aware of the religious dimensions of Moses's titillating language (Elbarbary, 2009, pp. 43-44).

A celestial 'Sugar Mountain' envisioned by Moses provides many material benefits for all animals: the fact that there is a Sunday seven days a week on Sugarcandy Mountain indicates that there is no work or study there. In addition, details such as the fact that the favourite food of animals ends up everywhere evokes the definition of Paradise mentioned in the Qur'an: there is a description of paradise with rivers of milk that does not change in taste, rivers of honey and even wine. There are all kinds of fruits for believers. Similarly, in Kemal's novel, a place where obedient ant servants will be rewarded is mentioned. There are religious references. The promises made by the god Sultan to the ants, his acceptance as immortal, his saying 'ants are my servants', the country of tile match, the living water in heaven, the existence of a fairy-tale mountain such as the holy Mount Qaf make us think of this. This mountain is mentioned by the famous historian Tabar, who quotes this Hadith: The Prophet of Islam (SAW) is reported to have said: "Allah created the mountain Qaf all around the Earth". While Yaşar Kemal often refers to the prophet Suleiman or Solomon the King, Orwell makes references to Moses.

In Kemal's novel, the Sultan of the elephants decides to use devices such as school and language, which can be considered as ISAs, instead of using violence to establish dominance and hegemony over the ants:

“En baştaki sorun dil,” dedi sultan. “Bunu unutmayın, ilk önce dillerini unutup karıncalıktan çıkacaklar, fil olmak için can atacaklar. Durmadan fillere öyküneceklerdir. Her karıncanın içinde bir fil padişahı yatacak. Karıncaların kellelerini kesmektense dillerini kesmek daha doğrudur (Kemal, 2016, p. 57).

“The first problem is language,” said the sultan. “Remember this, first they will forget their language and come out of the ant-ship, they will yearn to become Eleph-Ants. They will constantly imitate elephants. Inside each ant will lie an elephant king. It is better to cut off the tongues of ants than to cut off their heads”.

A method by which totalitarian regimes try to establish absolute dominance over their citizens is to search for ways to forget the self. “Size fil rütbesi verdim. Sizin iyi birer fil olmanız için de fil olma okulları açıp sizi fil gibi fil yapacağım” (Kemal, 2016, p. 117). “I gave you the rank of Eleph-Ant. For you to be a good Eleph-Ant, I will open schools to become an Eleph-Ant and make you an Eleph-Ant like an elephant”. Language, which is the most effective of these ways, is one of the most important tools in the formation of society and social thought. Enriching language means enriching the mind. Reducing the number of words and simplifying the sentence structure aims to permanently remove words that make people think, and force them to question their rebellion or current situation in any way possible. Therefore, it is necessary to adopt a new way of thinking to prevent language development. Also, in Kemal’s novel, the media is used as another tool of ISAs. For instance, radio, newspaper, television, and cinema broadcast non-stop propaganda using the words ‘freedom’, ‘equality’ and ‘fraternity’ all day long. In this context, Orwell attributes importance to the totalitarian mind of the control of language. In *Animal Farm*, he uses a simple tool to progressively promote the interests of pigs, adding qualifiers to each of the seven orders. This gradual action eventually leads to the linguistically absurd ‘more equal’ proposition, and the ultimate degeneration of ‘animalist’ ideals (Quinn, 2009, p. x). Orwell “hoped some of the worst inequalities on the social, economic, and educational fronts would be removed after the war” (Kearney, 2006, p. 64). This ideal is related to his understanding of democracy for greater equality. Nevertheless, his interest in the advancement of equality makes him more sensitive to the fact that the concept of equality can be open to cynical manipulation by politicians. In *Politics and the English Language* (1946), Orwell expresses ‘equality’

as one of those words used in varying meanings, in most cases dishonest. Both writers agree that the manipulation of language is an essential part of the political process.

Ideology and propaganda are important when we think of the similarity between Ulukepez, who is an advisor to a hoopoe bird, and the pig, Squealer, who is keeping on the right side of the pig Napoleon. Propagandism includes pre-planned activities which have the aim of influencing and manipulating most people's thinking and actions. Moreover, as the members of the bourgeoisie, the pigs and the Sultan, with their overseers, use surveillance as a way of enslaving the other animals. The function of propagandists in both novels has great significance, because it also leads to brainwashing. In *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red-Bearded Lane Ant*, Ulukepez tries to spread the belief that being an elephant is a superior thing. It meant having the grade, degree, honour of being an elephant. This relationship also exists in *Animal Farm*: pigs as the exploiters and the other animals as the exploited ones. The elephants exploit ants by war at first; the pigs with revolution.

In *Animal Farm*, the social structures are determined by the pigs, who claim that they should be at the head of the farm because of their intelligence and abilities, so they should take place hierarchically at the top, and the others' responsibility is determined as work. In Kemal's novel, the elephants lounge about all day because of their superiority in the social structure, and the ants work, but later the situation becomes more complicated, compared to the relationship in *Animal Farm* between the pigs and the others, because the pigs only give importance to their own congeneric. While the Sultan is transforming the ants into elephants, he also labels different types of ants as enemy units, to establish 'we-feeling' with the help of his head propagandist. Umberto Eco clarifies this situation in *Inventing the Enemy*, as follows: "Having an enemy is important not only to define your identity but also to provide us with an obstacle against which to measure our system of values, and in seeking to overcome it, to demonstrate your own worth. So, when there is no enemy, we must invent one" (Eco, 2012, p. 2).

Interestingly, towards the end of the novel, phrases such as 'elephant-man' and 'ant-man' draw attention. Under the dictatorship, ants are exploited for their work, and they are forced to leave behind their language and traditions. Similarly, in *Animal Farm*, animals are exploited for their work, but only pigs and dogs get

education from Napoleon. “The thematic similarity between Kemal’s novel and Orwell’s novella is constituted by the common strategies that the dictators in both works follow to facilitate the other animals’ subjugation. First, in both works people are declared the common enemy of animals” (Ayyıldız, 2021, p. 213). Since admiration brings similitude, Orwell’s pigs do business with humans and gradually resemble them in looks. Kemal’s animals are mentioned as ‘elephant-man’ and ‘ant-man’ over time. “The ants have started walking like elephants, they are trying to talk like elephants” (Kemal, 2016, p. 90). Although they often denigrate human beings and their doings, after some time, pigs elaborate on them, and elephants play the tricks of human beings in accordance with Ulukepez’s spying. Moreover, we can see feasts in the style of carnivalesque celebrations, borrowed from the human world. Due to the celebration of fellowship between ants and elephants, the Sultan opens a storehouse for ants’ drinking and eating over seven days and nights, including their traditional folk plays. Thus, the existing hierarchies and power of the Sultan disappear for a while. On the contrary, in *Animal Farm*, feasts and celebrations do mean the existence of hierarchies; only pigs can eat and drink as they want. However, this is another point which seems to be similar between two selected novels, but is very different indeed. According to Ingle:

The final scene in the story shows the pigs and the local farmers drinking and playing cards together, an allusion to the Teheran Conference towards the end of World War Two. Although from the animals’ perspective their leadership was indistinguishable from the leadership of the other farms, we should not be lulled into imagining that pigs and humans were reconciled. Far from it. All that had happened was that an experiment in democratic farming, encapsulated in the theory of animalism, had failed, and Manor Farm had become like other farms (only more efficient) and would jostle with them in the world of competitive agriculture (Ingle, 2006, p. 88).

Ingle’s views are very important in interpreting the final scene of the story well. It has been suggested that the final scene is a reference to the Tehran Conference towards the end of the Second World War. Therefore, it shows not the reconciliation of pigs and humans, but the failure of an experiment in democratic farming encapsulated in livestock theory. “This is exactly the kind of fractious triumvirate existing among Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia, the ruling states in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, previously

satirised in *Animal Farm* through the pigs' unnatural alliance with the humans" (Saunders, 2008, p. 132).

To conclude this chapter, there are both apparent and subtle thematic similarities and differences in both works. As discussed before, these include themes such as the importance of ballads, the constant invention of jobs, totalitarian rulers, deterioration and control of language, religious implications, use of propaganda by a representative, the human as the enemy, and animals' gradual resemblance to humans. Thus, the reason for sensing Orwellian resemblances in Kemal's work may be the clear thematic similarities and motifs. However, especially in the chapters on Allegory as a Literary Tool, and Language, more complex aspects of both novels can be revealed.



6. CONCLUSION

With the development of technology, the face of war, and the struggles that took place on the world stage at the beginning of the 20th century also changed radically. In particular, 1917 was the year that started a century-long storm of war and revolution around the world. The famine, hunger and deaths brought on by the First World War were on the public agenda. Long working hours, low wages, and the abuse of power caused by the war, heralded a major crisis in Russia. Solving the crisis by creating another crisis would bring irreversible destruction to the Tsar. The victory of the revolution in the Tsarist capital was completed towards the evening of February 27.

The February Revolution brought two leading parties to the stage of history: the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. However, this merger only lasted a few months. The Bolsheviks came to power in the October Revolution. With the death of Lenin, and the rise of Stalin, time passed, and the Second World War was at the door. America and the Soviet Union had developed a forced alliance against their common enemy, Hitler. When this war also ended, the Cold War began, which caused great cultural change. The atmosphere of peace between America and the Soviet Union, whose mandatory alliance ended, did not last long. The culture war between the two countries, involving the manipulation of intelligence and the media, had begun.

As in America and the Soviet Union, the Cold War between modernism and realism had begun. Modern art had been used as a cultural weapon of war, a propaganda tool with its abstract aesthetic understanding. Films adapted from the books of some authors, including Orwell, were distributed around the world as among the greatest cultural operations of the Cold War. The non-communist left, including Orwell, did not hesitate to support the ideas of intellectuals who were heartbroken about communism but remained committed to the ideals of socialism. Orwell's roots were in lower-middle class culture, and he was known to like to think and write about them. For this reason, he did not write in accordance with the dominant narrative aesthetics of the West or modernism, especially in his early writings in the 1930s. Similarly, Yaşar Kemal's writings and works were predominantly on social issues. The social topics that made up the content of his works were social justice, education, health, and social security. Yaşar Kemal, who can be regarded as the author of a novel

of the Second Period in Turkish Literature, touched upon the unjust order problems arising from the social structure. It also explains the social and economic change in Turkey and the changing subjects in his novels after 1950. The policy followed in the Republican period brought with it classification and class conflict over time. Kemal wrote novels questioning the dominant ideology, not novels that look at the dominant ideology from the outside and reproduce the order.

The comparison of these two novels was primarily based on the production relations of the writers' class and the society they lived in. Although the reality of what is described in the selected works can be referred to historical facts, the fictitious features of both literary examples were finally revealed. Literary techniques were researched and the basic similarities and differences in the two works were discussed. The works subject to comparison were examined in terms of theme and style, so their literary values were revealed.

Authors such as George Orwell and Yaşar Kemal made it interesting to do a genetic comparison of novels. When people read these two novels, they expressed, in various ways, that they immediately noticed an Orwellian atmosphere in Kemal's works. To find out why this similarity was established at first glance, the two works were examined allegorically, stylistically, and thematically.

In this thesis, a genetic comparison between an English and a Turkish novelist was made. George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Yaşar Kemal's novel *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lame Ant* were analysed comparatively through Marxist literary theory, mainly benefiting from the ideas of Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton, and Lucien Goldmann. Starting from the understanding of social integrity, Lukács emphasised that historical and social changes should be reflected in literary work. Goldmann, on the other hand, brought a different approach to the sociology of literature with the theory of genetic structuralism, and tried to reveal the relationship between literature and society through structure. Eagleton discussed that a text may deal with real history, but it must be remembered that in the end, it would always remain a work of literature, that is, a fiction.

To conclude, there are both obvious and subtle thematic similarities and differences in both works. Clear thematic similarities and motifs might be the reason for the Orwellian flavour in Kemal's works. However, more complex aspects of both

novels are revealed. Since it was looked at from a comparative perspective, a brief history of comparative literature was brought to the forefront in the Introduction. In the second part, information about Soviet history and Marxism was given. Then, the relationship between modern art and the cultural Cold War was touched on. In addition, the meaning of ideology, and its reflections in the novels, were discussed from a critical point of view. In the third and fourth chapters, the characteristics of the works were examined through the lives of the authors. In the fifth chapter, both authors' works were analysed through Marxist literary theory from thematic and stylistic perspectives.



REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. (Trans. G. M. Goshgarian). Verso London.
- Atwood, M. (2014). *Başka Dünyalar: Bilimkurgu ve Hayal Gücü* [In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination]. (Trans. S. Sıral). İstanbul: Kolektif Kitap.
- Aytaç, G. (2016). *Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bilimi* [The Science of Comparative Literature]. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Ayyıldız, N. E. (2021). Revisiting George Orwell's Animal Farm, Yaşar Kemal's The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red-Bearded Lame Ant within the Context of Socialist Realism. *Forum for World Literature Studies* (Vol.13 No.2), (pp. 208-221).
- Bahadır, H. (2015). *Oğuznamelerde Hayvan Kültü ve İşlevleri* [Animal Cult and Its Functions in Oghuznames]. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Epic and Novel. In Michael Holquist (eds.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. BAKHTIN*. (Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist). University of Texas Press: Austin.
- Batum, O. (1981). İngiliz Yazınında Yeni Gerçekçilik Akımı (1930-40) ve George Orwell [New Realism in British Literature (1930-40) and George Orwell]. *Türk Dili Aylık Dil ve Yazın Dergisi*. (Cilt Xlın Sayı. 355).
- Birus, H. (2000). *The Goethean Concept of World Literature and Comparative Literature, Comparative Literature and Culture: A WWWeb Journal 2.4*: <http://clcwebjournal.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb00-4/birus00.html>
- Bloom, H. (2007). Introduction. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: George Orwell* (pp. 1-7).
- Bluemel, K. (2004). *George Orwell and the Radical Eccentrics: Intermodernism in Literary London*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boratav, P. N. (2012). *Türk Mitolojisi Oğuzların - Anadolu, Azerbaycan ve Türkmenistan Türklerinin Mitolojisi* [Turkish Mythology Oghuzs - Mythology of Anatolian, Azerbaijani and Turkmenistan Turks]. (Trans. Recep Özbay). Bilgesu Yayınları, Ankara.
- Bounds, P. (2009). *Orwell and Marxism: The Political and Cultural Thinking of George Orwell*. I.B. Tauris: London.
- Brennan, M. G. (2017). *George Orwell and Religion*. Bloomsbury Academic, London.

- Çiftlikçi, R. (1993). *Yaşar Kemal Yazar-Eser-Üslup* [Yaşar Kemal Author-Work-Style]. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.
- Colls, R. (2013). *George Orwell: English Rebel*. Oxford University Press.
- Crick, B. (1980). *Orwell - A Life*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Damrosch, D. (2003). Introduction: Goethe Coins a Phrase From the book What Is World Literature? *World Literature Today*, Vol. 77, No. 1. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma (pp. 9-14):
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691188645-003>
- Davison, P. (1996). *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Douglas, C. (2009). Marie-Louise von Franz and the Conference of the Birds: A Peregrination. *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche*. (Vol. 3, No. 4), 19-27.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). Towards a Science of the Text. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 296-327).
- Eco, U. (2012). *Inventing the Enemy: And Other Occasional Writings*. (Trans. R. Dixon), London: Vintage Books.
- Elbarbary, S. (2009). Language as Theme in *Animal Farm*. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 35-44).
- Evin, A. Ö. (1984). Ideology and Violence in Modern Turkish Literature. *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 6-13. Indiana University Press.
- Faulkner, N. (2017). *A People's History of the Russian Revolution*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fowler, R. (1995). *The Language of George Orwell*. UK: Macmillan Education.
- Furr, G. (2014). *Blood Lies: The Evidence that Every Accusation against Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union in Timothy Snyder's Bloodlands Is False*. New York: Red Star Publishers.
- Furr, G. (2019). *STALIN. Waiting For ... The Truth! Exposing the Falsehoods in Stephen Kotkin's Stalin. Waiting for Hitler, 1929-1941*. New York: Red Star Publishers.
- Galik, M. (2000). Comparative Literature and Culture: Concepts of World Literature, Comparative Literature, and a Proposal. *Comparative Literature and Culture* Vol. 2 Issue 4. CLCWeb: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss4/8>.
- Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. (Lewin, J., E. Trans.) New York: Cornell University Press.

- Gluck, M. (1986). Toward a Historical Definition of Modernism: Georg Lukács and the Avant-Garde Source. *The Journal of Modern History* (Vol. 58, No. 4), pp. 845-882. The University of Chicago Press
- Göbenli, M. (2006). *Direnmenin Estetiği'ne Güven: Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bağlamında Peter Weiss ve Vedat Türkali* [Trust in the Aesthetics of Resistance: Peter Weiss and Vedat Türkali in the Context of Comparative Literature]. Donkişot Yayınları.
- Gökçimen, A. (2000). *Türkmen Masalları Üzerine Motif İncelemesi (Hayvan Masalları)* [Motif Analysis on Turkmen Tales (Animal Tales)]. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Goldmann, L. (1996). Introduction to the Problems of a Sociology of the Novel. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 204-220).
- Hammond, J. R. (2000). *A George Orwell Chronology*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Herder, J. G. (1797). *Results of a Comparison of Different Peoples' Poetry in Ancient and Modern Times*. <http://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/s9031.pdf>
- Hobbes, T. (1997). *A Norton Critical Edition Leviathan: Authoritative Text Backgrounds Interpretations*. In Richard E. Flatman and David Johnston (eds.). London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hunter, L. (1989). *Modern Allegory and Fantasy: Rhetorical Stances of Contemporary Writing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hunter, L. (2004). Prescience and Resilience in George Orwell's Political Aesthetics. In T. Cushman and J. Rodden (eds.), *George Orwell into The Twenty-First Century* (pp. 229-243).
- Hyppolite, J. (2016). *Marx ve Hegel Üzerine Çalışmalar* [Studies on Marx and Hegel]. (Trans. D. Barış Kılınç). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Ingle, S. (2006). *The Social and Political Thought of George Orwell: A Reassessment*. Routledge, London.
- İpekçi, A. (1971). *Edebiyat ve Politika* [Literature and Politics]: <https://web.archive.org/web/20150306062344/http://www.yasarkemal.net/soyl esi/docs/abdiipekci.html>
- Jakobson, R. (1987). *Language in Literature*. In K. Pomorska and S. Rudy (eds.), Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kearney, A. (2006). On the Meaning of Equality. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *George Orwell's Animal Farm*. (pp. 63-65).

- Kemal, Y. (2015). *Ağacın Çürüğü* [The Rot of the Tree]. İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Kemal, Y. (2016). *Filler Sultanı ile Kırmızı Sakallı Topal Karınca* [The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lame Ant]. İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Letemendia, V. C. (2009). Revolution on Animal Farm: Orwell's Neglected Commentary. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 45-58).
- Lodge, D. (1970). Realism, Allegory and Symbolism: Some Speculation about the Novel. *New Blackfriars*, Vol. 51, No. 603 pp. 361-373
- Lukács, G. (1969). *The Ideology of Modernism. The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. (Trans. John and Necke Mander) London: Merlin Press.
- Lukács, G. (1971). *The Theory of the Novel. A Historico-Philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature*. (Trans. Anna Bostock). MIT Press.
- Lukács, G. (1996). The Ideology of Modernism. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 141-162).
- Marcus, L. (2009). The Creative Treatment of Actuality: John Grierson, Documentary Cinema And 'Fact' In The 1930s. In K. Bluemel (eds.), *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth Century Britain* (pp. 189-207).
- Martins, A. R. (2019). The zoon politikon: Medieval Aristotelian Interpretations. *Teorias Políticas Medievais / Medieval Political Theories*, Vol. 75 (3) 1539-1574. Doi: 10.17990/RPF/2019_75_3_1539
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2016). *Komunist Manifesto* [The Communist Manifesto]. Celal Üster & Nur Deriş çev. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Maslen, E. (2009). A Cassandra with Clout: Storm Jameson, Little Englander and Good European. In K. Bluemel (eds.), *Intermodernism: Literary Culture in Mid-Twentieth Century Britain* (pp. 21-37).
- Meyers, V. (2009). Animal Farm: An Allegory of Revolution. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 23-34).
- Moran, B. (2001). *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış 2* [A Critical Approach to Turkish Novel 2]. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Naci, F. (1993). *Yaşar Kemal'le Edebiyat ve Politika* [Literature and Politics with Yaşar Kemal]:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20150306062349/http://www.yasarkemal.net/soyl esi/docs/fethinaci.html>

- Naci, F. (2004). *Yaşar Kemal'in Romancılığı* [The Novelism of Yaşar Kemal]. İstanbul: YKY.
- Orwell, G. (1940). *The Review of Mein Kampf by Adolf Hitler*:
https://carnegiecouncil-media.storage.googleapis.com/files/v18_i007-008_a010.pdf
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Why I Write*:
<https://srjcstaff.santarosa.edu/~mheydon/whywriteD.pdf>
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Preface to Kolghosp Tvaryn*:
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/orwell/1947/kolghosp-tvaryn.htm>
- Orwell, G. (1968). *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell Volume IV in Front of Your Nose 1945-1950*. Ed. by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Orwell, G. (1976). *George Orwell: Animal Farm, Burmese Days, A Clergyman's Daughter, Coming Up for Air, Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker & Warburg/Octopus.
- Orwell, G. (2016). *Katalonya'ya Selam* [Homage to Catalonia]. (Trans. J. Ergüder) İstanbul: BGS.
- Orwell, G. (2020a). *Fascism and Democracy*. UK: Penguin Random House.
- Orwell, G. (2020b). *Literature and Totalitarianism*. UK: Penguin Random House.
- Parla, J. (2008). The Wounded Tongue: Turkey's Language Reform and the Canonicity of the Novel. PMLA, Jan., Vol. 123, No. 1, pp. 27-40 Published by: Modern Language Association.
- Quinn, E. (2009). *Critical Companion to George Orwell: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. US: Facts on File.
- Roberts, J. (2006). Arnold Hauser, Adorno, Lukács and the Ideal Spectator. In A. Hemingway (eds.), *Marxism and The History of Art from William Morris to the New Left*. (pp. 161-174).
- Saunders, F. S. (1995). *Modern art was CIA 'weapon'*:
<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/modern-art-was-cia-weapon-1578808.html>
- Saunders, F. S. (2000). *Who Paid the Piper?: CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta Books.
- Saunders, L. (2008). *The Unsung Artistry of George Orwell the Novels from Burmese Days to Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Ashgate, England.

- Sönmez, T. (1978). *Yaşar Kemal'le Uzun Bir Söyleşi* [A Long Conversation with Yaşar Kemal]:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20150305213351/http://www.yasarkemal.net/soyl esi/docs/tekinsonmez.html>
- Sümer, F. (1972). *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler) Tarihleri-Boy Teşkilatı-Destanları* [Oghuz (Turkmen) Histories-Organization-Epics]. Ankara.
- Tan, H. (1997). H. Böll-A. Nesin, S. Lenz-Y. Kemal, M. Frisch-A. Ağaoğlu, W. Koeppen-D. Ceyhun'un Romanlarında Aydın Tutumlar Karşılaştırmalı Bir Çalışma [A Comparative Study of Intellectual Attitudes in H. Böll-A. Nesin, S. Lenz-Y. Kemal, M. Frisch-A. Ağaoğlu, W. Koeppen-D. Ceyhun]. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi, Mersin.
- Tharaud, B. (2012). Yaşar Kemal, Son of Homer. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, (Vol. 54, No. 4), (pp. 563-590) DOI: 10.7560/TSSL54410.
- Türkdoğan, M. G. (2010). Klâsik Türk Edebiyatında Kur'an Kıssalarını Konu Alan Mesneviler [Masnavi Subjects of Qur'anic Stories in Classical Turkish Literature]. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. (Vol. 3 Issue: 15).
- Varela, J., M., B. and Eagleton, T. (2001). A Conversation with Terry Eagleton. *Atlantis*, Vol. 23, No. 2, (pp. 169-185).
- Wellek, R. & Warren, A. (1956). *The Theory of Literature*. New York: A Harvest Book Harcourt, Brace & World, INC.
- Wellek, R. (1964). *Concepts of Criticism*. In S., G. Nichols, Jr. (eds), New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Williams, R. (1989). *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*. In Robin Gable (eds.), London: Verso
- Yetkin, G. B. (2022). *Sovyet Edebiyatında İkinci Dünya Savaşının Yansımaları* [Reflections of the Second World War in Soviet Literature]. Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları.
- Zimmerman, M. (1978-1979). Lucien Goldmann: From Dialectical Theory to Genetic Structuralism. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 23, pp. 151-182

*All translations from Turkish are mine unless otherwise indicated.