

Mechanisms of Control in Alan Moore's "V for Vendetta" and George Orwell's "1984"

Prtenjača, Zvonimir

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2018

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:668248>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-06**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni preddiplomski studij engleskoga jezika i
književnosti i povijesti

Zvonimir Prtenjača

**Mehanizmi kontrole u romanima "O za osvetu" Alana Moorea i
"1984." Georgea Orwella**

Završni rad

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Ljubica Matek

Osijek, 2018.

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni preddiplomski studij engleskoga jezika i
književnosti i povijesti

Zvonimir Prtenjača

**Mehanizmi kontrole u romanima "O za osvetu" Alana Moorea i
"1984." Georgea Orwella**

Završni rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Ljubica Matek

Osijek, 2018.

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Study Programme: Double Major BA Study Programme in English Language
and Literature and History

Zvonimir Prtenjača

**Mechanisms of Control in Alan Moore's *V for Vendetta* and
George Orwell's *1984***

Bachelor's Thesis

Supervisor: Ljubica Matek, Ph.D. Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2018

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Study Programme: Double Major BA Study Programme in English Language
and Literature and History

Zvonimir Prtenjača

**Mechanisms of Control in Alan Moore's *V for Vendetta* and
George Orwell's *1984***

Bachelor's Thesis

Scientific area: humanities

Scientific field: philology

Scientific branch: English studies

Supervisor: Ljubica Matek, Ph.D. Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2018

Abstract

V for Vendetta is a British dystopian graphic novel scripted by Alan Moore and pencilled and illustrated by David Lloyd which was originally published as an ongoing black-and-white series in *Warrior*, the British comics anthology edited from 1982 to 1985, and later collected as a ten-issue limited series re-published in colorized form by DC Comics and its respective imprint, Vertigo, from 1988 to 1989. As a near-future historical depiction of the United Kingdom in the 1990s which was annihilated by a nuclear war and thus embroidered in a post-apocalyptic fabric woven and exploited by a supremacist political party, *V for Vendetta* echoes not only the period of the Cold War, but also alludes to the fascist period of the 1940s as the inceptive years of the Second World War. This ties it to the thematic framework of *1984*, a seminal dystopian science-fiction novel authored by George Orwell, published in 1949 and set in the fictional United Kingdom during the year of 1984. Orwell's *1984* largely draws upon and delineates the totalitarian milieu established during the Stalinist era of the Soviet Union. Both novels are nowadays considered to be classics in their respective genres. As political fiction, the novels are largely perceived as critiques of the periods they directly echo, but also of the entirety of regimes built upon mechanisms of control such as manipulation of the masses, perpetuity of war, the omnipresence of government surveillance, and the existence of police states.

Keywords: Alan Moore, George Orwell, dystopian novel, mechanisms of control, totalitarianism.

Contents

Introduction 7

1. Totalitarianism: The Historical and Theoretical Framework..... 9

 1.1. The Concept of Power 10

 1.2. The Concept of Ideology 11

2. Physical Mechanisms of Control 12

 2.1. *V for Vendetta*: The Interior Ministries 13

 2.2. *1984*: The Interior Ministries..... 15

 2.3. Correctional Camps: Institutional Mechanisms 17

 2.4. Sex and Sexual Orientation: Biological Mechanisms 20

3. Psychological Mechanisms of Control 23

 3.1. Language Abuse and Crypticism..... 23

 3.2. Mass Media and Propaganda 28

4. Into the Protagonists and Authors 34

 4.1. The Protagonists: Idealization and Indoctrination..... 34

 4.2. The Authors: Motivation 39

Conclusion..... 41

Works Cited..... 43

Introduction

As dystopian novels, both *V for Vendetta* and *1984* remain situated within the frame of a post-apocalyptic world in which people are usually exploited by a self-proclaimed supremacist political party governing and controlling the masses in the form of a totalitarian police state helmed and shaped by a single leader. To achieve this monopoly over political power and radically influence, change, and constantly oversee every aspect of public life, such regimes use a plethora of devices moulded especially for the subdual of masses, namely all forms of political repression, mass surveillance of speech and thought, regulation of rations, control over the state's economy, personality cultism used to enliven the image of the aforementioned single leader as the harbinger of better tomorrow, and all the institutions used to mechanize and fully utilize physical terror. Therefore, what this paper aims to do is to shed light on such toxic constructs by gradually delineating their mechanisms of control, primarily through sourcing their origins and illustrating how they were established and used in the titular novels, while also contextualising these fictional accounts by juxtaposing them to their historical counterparts.

The initial chapter of the paper offers an overview of the historical accounts in which these mechanisms were formed. It aims to delineate their theoretical framework by explicating not only historical constructs prevalent during these periods, but also philosophical and sociological ones, primarily the meaning and the background of concepts of power and ideology used by totalitarian states to control the masses.

The following chapter aspires to exemplify the utilization and construction of physical mechanisms of control in the form of terror, namely carried out by bodily torture and elimination of the opponents of Chancellor Adam Susan's or Big Brother's regime in specially designed institutions, such as concentration or forced labour camps. An emphasis will also be put on the Norsefire party's and the INGSOC party's interior ministries and agencies dictating and enforcing both "normal" (prescribed by the ruling government) public order activities, as well as secret police activities. The concept of sex will also be discussed and analysed as a physical mechanism bound to biologically confine individuals and strip them of any feelings which do not adhere to the leader's or the party's will.

The subsequent chapter aims to be a lengthy discussion on several psychological devices used to enforce the party's ideology or to exert the leader's power. It delineates the usage of control devices on a global scale, such as cryptic language and language abuse via

the construct of "doublethink", media influence via massive "telescreens", and propaganda via enormous public outings with "doublethink" speeches carried out by Chancellor Adam Susan or Big Brother.

The paper's final chapter traces the voice of the individual by peering into the novels' protagonists, V (and Evey Hammond) and Winston Smith, as well as analysing their torture and brainwashing which resulted in the creation or destruction of a particular idea. With the former battling Adam Susan and the Norsefire oppression and the latter brutally forced to adhere to INGSOC's machinations and "to love" Big Brother, this chapter also includes a brief comment about the authors' motivations and why both dystopian novels (content-wise and perception-wise) yield themselves and their endings to be analysed as successful or unsuccessful resolutions of the engaged mechanisms of control.

1. Totalitarianism: The Historical and Theoretical Framework

On a historical note, it is important to emphasize that the periods echoed by both *V for Vendetta* and *1984* date back to the interim of the First World War and the inceptive years of the Second World War. In what Eric Hobsbawm defines as "the Age of Catastrophe", the world frayed and the warring were not only political powers of the soon-to-be Axis and Allied Forces, but also the ideologies they derived from their political outputs, the economies they constructed, and the societies they have or have not nurtured. All belligerents were, prior to the Second World War, largely influenced by the Great Depression of 1930 and it led, as Hobsbawm states, to the "old-fashioned liberalism dying or seeming doomed" (107), with only "three options competing for the intellectual-political hegemony" (107).

These three options were transmogrified into totalitarian systems – *communism*, later advocated and negatively coloured during the Stalinist Era of the Soviet Union, *fascism*, a political stand built upon nationalist intellectual tradition evoked by the Italian dictatorship of Benito Mussolini and, as a German version derived from Italian fascism, Adolf Hitler's *national socialism*. Occurring from a process which Hobsbawm himself best summarized as "the retreat or collapse of not only peace, social stability, and the economy, but also the political institutions and intellectual values" (Hobsbawm 108), they all led to what Orwell and Moore would use as a fundamental background for their respective and well-paced critiques of regimes woven with a common thread, "militant nationalism which ran through Germany, Italy and Japan" (Pinker 170).

The process of dissipation explicated by Hobsbawm may have mobilized the birth of totalitarianism and its gradual modulations, but, even if it had not, the fact that they historically co-occur is a well-entrenched one. Therefore, to initiate the inquiry into what mechanisms of control are and how they are established and realized throughout the titular novels, one firstly has to explicate several important terms to understand the writers' motivations behind creating certain passages or, in the case of *V for Vendetta* and *1984*, entire pages meant to critique the negativity of a totalitarian state. To try to explicate it briefly, totalitarianism can be defined as a political concept constructed by regimes which stay in political power while ruled by a single leader who advocates a certain ideology, further championed by his political party as the only one in power. This ideology is subsequently disseminated through the mass media regulated by the party and the state which initiates an all-encompassing propaganda campaign, subduing entire masses of people along the way. A state which nurtures the outlined concepts thus becomes a totalitarian one, whereas the sum of

totalitarianism is fabricated by its immediate constituents to be explored in the following chapters on power and ideology.

1.1. The Concept of Power

As a sociological and a political construct, power can be defined as the ability to outright control the people's behaviour and as such, it falls under the category of the fundamentals of some of the previously mentioned regimes. The fictional regimes of *V for Vendetta* and *1984* are, as already described, allegories of their historical counterparts embodied within fascism and communism, and one directory which links both of them is a singular, focused point of power. In *1984*, this power is situated in the hands of the INGSOC party's Big Brother as an omnipotent figure who may not be a real person, but he fulfils his purpose in gluing the image to the bearer of such dominant position. In *V for Vendetta*, this power is portrayed more realistically, placed in the hands of the Norsefire party's Chancellor Adam Susan, a sanguine dictator who obsessively monitors the state via his omniscient and omnipresent computer, symbolically named "Fate". Herein one can begin to draw a parallel to a nineteenth-century sociological paradigm created and defined by Jeremy Bentham.

"Bentham's Panopticon is the architectural figure of a composition" (Foucault 200) in which all inmates (*pan*) are constantly observed by a single beholder or a guard (*opticon*). This paradigm, then, is obviously applicable to the worlds of *V for Vendetta* and *1984* – with Big Brother and Chancellor Susan set as the key figures and the bearers of power firmly rooted in their positions, and the people over which they loom in forms yet to be undisclosed as their inmates, the novels delineate the basic constituents of a totalitarian state. "The Panopticon is a machine for dissociating the see/being seen dyad", states Foucault, emphasizing that "in the peripheric ring, one is totally seen, without ever seeing", whereas "in the central tower, one sees everything without ever being seen" (Foucault 201-202), which very precisely reflects the power structure in the two novels where Big Brother and Chancellor Susan represent the fixed point of power which sees everything, that is the whole people. Foucault deems such construct a grave, but dangerous one; he maintains that "it is an important mechanism, for it automatizes and disindividualizes power" (Foucault 202), and, sequential to this paper's topic of exploration of mechanisms of control, he offers an illuminating illustration of how the concept of power is utilized by the ruling parties in creating a totalitarian apparatus of mass surveillance:

This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead - all this constitutes a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism. (Foucault 197)

1.2. The Concept of Ideology

When it comes to the total sum of totalitarianism as a political concept based on intricate devices of mass control, the concept of power alone is redundant if not adhered to another addend. When a leader or a party has acquired a position of sorts and initiated the usage of power, the concept of ideology is called upon to sustain his or its mind-set. "There is also a common denominator of counter-Enlightenment utopianism behind the ideologies of Nazism and communism" (Pinker 170); in *V for Vendetta*, Moore echoes the far-right, radical, authoritarian nationalism and dictatorial power of the fascist Italy led by Benito Mussolini by resurging the fascist ideology as a neo-fascist one, advocated by the Norsefire party and its dictator-leader, Chancellor Adam Susan. Contrary to this, Orwell places the spectrum of *1984* and its world of Oceania onto the far-left, using the ideology of Stalinism as a class conflict-inspiring, collectivizing mechanism and the theory of *socialism in one country* extremely near to the theory of English Socialism as Oceania's predominant ideology and pseudo-philosophy. What is derivative from these allegories is "that ideology has to do with legitimating the power of a dominant social group or class" (Eagleton 5), and basically that "to study ideology, one is to study the ways in which meaning (or signification) serves to sustain relations of domination" (Eagleton 5).

Furthermore, much like what Foucault did with the systematic utilization of the power acquired to exert dominance, Eagleton delineates the ways in which the concept of ideology gradually follows the previous dominant concept and disseminates its ideas onto the masses which, after all, it is meant to subdue:

A dominant power may legitimate itself by *promoting* beliefs and values congenial to it; *naturalizing* and *universalizing* such beliefs so as to render them self-evident and apparently inevitable; *denigrating* ideas which might challenge it; *excluding* rival

forms of thought, perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic; and *obscuring* social reality in ways convenient to itself. (Eagleton 5-6)

Following Eagleton's definition of ideology as a mobile concept used to legitimate the power of a dominant social group, Ridgewell states that ideology can be "seen as a force for change or as supportive of the status quo" (23) and that "whether the emphasis is on the dynamic or not depends upon the groups and its activities" (23). These dynamics are abused by the parties and the leaders of the novels analysed, namely because they are constructed in a downward, vertical display of power: the leader (Chancellor Susan or Big Brother) extends the branches of his dictatorial power to his confidants and ministries (the secret agencies in Big Brother's Oceania and Susan's neo-fascist England), which in turn manipulate the mechanisms of control (both physical and psychological) to secure the (enforced) unity of the people. However, they do so in covert campaigns helmed by structures which usually fit the idea of an "open secret": their activities are (officially) unknown to the public, but are (in reality) well-known to the masses which results in a prevailing sense of fear and terror. This finalizes the amalgamation of ideology and devices of mass control further analysed on the case of the regimes echoed by *V for Vendetta* and *1984* – they are used secretly, but are encouraged by the party and its "ideology, overt and concerned with changing the status quo" (Ridgewell 23) to adhere it to its will.

2. Physical Mechanisms of Control

To render the totalitarian framework reinforced by its main concepts of power and ideology practical, the first mechanisms which will be explored are those of physical nature, primarily the constitution of interior ministries and agencies bound to oppress and suppress the people into conforming to the party leader's demands. Arendt states that "the topmost layer in the organization of totalitarian movements is the intimate circle around the Leader" (Arendt 385) which largely draws its inspiration from the authoritarian rulers highly dependent on their bureaucratic apparatus. Such circle "can be a formal institution, like the Bolshevik Politburo, or a changing clique of men who do not necessarily hold office, like the entourage of Hitler" (Arendt 385), and what characterizes this group of the leader's confidants is their opinion that "ideological clichés are mere devices to organize the masses, and they feel no compunction about changing them according to the needs of circumstances if only the organizing principle is kept intact" (Arendt 385).

2.1. *V for Vendetta: The Interior Ministries*

From early on in *V for Vendetta*, Moore concocts the idea of the dualism of power between the leader and the party as a singular figure and mind which must work coherently to sustain power in the world annihilated by atomic catastrophe and perpetuity of war. Having been democratically chosen to reconstruct England and reintegrate its society into a peaceful life, Moore's Norsefire party and its output largely fall in line with the conventions of a dystopian construct – the party begins to monitor the populace in recurring cycle of societal terror. He introduces Chancellor Susan's bureaucratic apparatus in *Book 1: Europe After the Reign*, starting with law enforcement officers known as "the Fingermen" (Moore and Lloyd 11) who are confronted by the novel's protagonist, V, whom Moore describes as "the king of twentieth century, the boogeyman, the villain, the black sheep of the family" (Moore and Lloyd 13). The basic idea realized here is that the *status quo* is usurped by someone whom the party now deems a terrorist, yet he seems to slip from the agencies' grasp as totalitarian power is immediately challenged and tested.

The fable-like utopia enjoyed thus far is now endangered and the cogs of a larger mechanism start to turn as all agencies begin to produce their reports on the perpetrator on the initiative of "the Head" (Moore and Lloyd 13) and the party's leader, Chancellor Adam Susan, who is overseeing the situation from his control room. "Mr. Heyer speaks for the Eye" (Moore and Lloyd 15), a surveillance agency whose "video recordings were damaged in the explosion" (Moore and Lloyd 15), but the remainder of the footage reveals the criminal masked, rendering his full identification incomprehensible. Following this, "Mr. Etheridge now speaks for the Ear" (Moore and Lloyd 15), an eavesdropping agency which mainly deals with phone surveillance and is closely connected to "Mr. Finch and the Nose" (Moore and Lloyd 15), a regular detective-police force which seems to find no plausible evidence except for "the sophisticated device which caused the explosion", "a certainly hand-made one, and thus untraceable" (Moore and Lloyd 15). The Head now turns to "Mr. Almond" (Moore and Lloyd 15) whose Fingermen were previously attacked by V, leaving them ashamed and denigrating their position among "The Finger" (Moore and Lloyd 16), the party's secret police now depicted blatantly useless.

Moore purposefully uses and carefully constructs this well-stratified skeleton as he constitutes the Norsefire party along the rim of Hobbesian *Leviathan*, a theory according to which "we must enter into a social contract in which we transfer our only natural right to a mutually agreed-upon Sovereign" (Sage 6) in order to preserve "a meaningful and lasting

stability of cooperative living" (Sage 6) and, having transferred this individual right, "we entrust The State to enforce the agreement of peace between individuals" (Sage 6). Moore evokes this Hobbesian construct by allowing the character of Chancellor Susan to become the Sovereign and Leviathan's head, while his dominions, over which he either has control or enforces control, seem to be the agencies and the people as Leviathan's body. According to the previously explicated theoretical framework of totalitarianism, Hobbes' theory of state control initiates a proto-totalitarian understanding of power abuse as it becomes fully-pledged in *V for Vendetta*.

From a historical standpoint, such a political construct tips into the fundamental output of fascism and the very symbol of *fascio* which, in the brevity of its much layered definition, advocates that an individual is fragile, whereas the collective remains untouchable. V's supposed terrorist attack thus erodes the stable position of the Norsefire party and, in lieu of a neo-fascist ideology, the party retaliates and tightens all of its agencies' activities. Moore derived this important sequence from an attempted assassination of Benito Mussolini, after which the fascist secret police and the precursor to the German Gestapo, the OVRA, was structured, belligerently eradicating all political parties, associations and organizations which opposed the fascist regime.

Thus putting its physical mechanisms into practice, the government of the Norsefire regime controls its citizens through fear, intimidation, and conformity and brutalizes the society as it delves into "torturing and disposing of problematic individuals" (Sage 8). The Norsefire regime is no opponent of "roughing up and intimidating citizens" (Sage 8) if it means that such acts will sustain its position and durability; it is, on the contrary, a proponent of acquiring more power as a political construct which not only cements the Party as the dominant power, but also furthers the practical utilization of the ideology it is based upon:

Consequently, citizens are fearful of the government, but the Norsefire regime is fearful of internal corruption and loss of control over society. The basic organizational "agenda" of the Norsefire party is to assert itself as having more and more control over society, while simultaneously appearing to be interested in protecting the stability of society and the safety of its citizens. Thus, the Norsefire regime seeks to maintain control through fear, propaganda, and intimidation. (Sage 9)

However, it is exactly this absolutism that V is motivated to rip apart and, as such, he becomes more of an idea than a character, an idea which Moore will use throughout the novel to critique fascism, but totalitarianism in its full rapture, as well.

2.2. 1984: The Interior Ministries

Much like Moore's *V for Vendetta*, George Orwell's *1984* energetically initiates obvious allusions to a particular totalitarian regime, but, contrary to the popular belief, "*1984* is far more than a simple condemnation of Stalinist Russia" (Booker 69) and, even though it "gains its power not so much from its predictions of the future as from its bitter satire of the very real horrors of the Stalinist Russia upon which the book was principally based" (Booker 69), Orwell does not refrain from ironically critiquing both fascism and national socialism. The power of Orwell's dystopian construct, much like Moore's, has to do with the certainty of the vivid representation of repression primarily advocated by Big Brother and his extensions, physically embodied in the shape of four interior ministries through which the dictator's power is disseminated.

This Oceanic concept of power thus occurs not only in the form of Big Brother or the INGSOC party, but also in its core components obsessed by a powerful tool realized by the concept of "certain mechanical applications of technology which lend themselves directly to political oppression" (Booker 70). Upon the very inception of his bleak dystopian world, Orwell states that the ministries completely dwarfed Oceania's remaining architecture, protruding simultaneously and exuding a certain ominous feeling for the beholder of such scenery:

The Ministry of Truth, which concerned itself with news, entertainment, education, and the fine arts. The Ministry of Peace, which concerned itself with war. The Ministry of Love, which maintained law and order. And the Ministry of Plenty, which was responsible for economic affairs. Their names, in Newspeak: Minitrue, Minipax, Miniluv, and Miniplenty. (Orwell 6)

Orwell's original approach to irony and creating the sense of illusion is herein thoroughly emphasized – the INGSOC party names its ministries after the feelings and securities it superficially wishes to induce in and secure for the people. Such concepts are falsified and far from being realized because the ministries serve to realize the complete

opposite of its original intention: The Ministry of Love harasses all those who oppose the party and Big Brother, namely political prisoners and those of a certain rank or in a particular position. The Ministry of Peace is the one to induce warring activities, smothering the peace it "represents" and keeping the motion of warfare in constant loop. The Ministry of Plenty supervises the rations of the food and drives the people to near starvation, validating Big Brother's dominance over even the most fundamental necessities of life. The Ministry of Truth is the agency where the protagonist of *1984*, Winston Smith, works and slowly begins to realize that within it, there is no truth at all. This psyche-oriented agency censures media and erases the pre-party and pre-Big Brother history, revising it so as to fit the norms constituted by the party. It manipulates the primary sources of information for the people and brainwashes them via Newspeak, a dialect designed to introduce people into believing that they are learning of and living in a secure, utopian world of prosperity.

The reality for the people, however, is not related to pleasantries, but to the feeling of public menace and intoxication of the society's health by leaving them devoid of privacy, free thought, bare necessities, individual freedom, and basic human rights. Within this process, the INGSOC party becomes a poltergeist, whereas the persona of Big Brother becomes its image. Much like Moore when creating the Norsefire regime and its Fingermen highly influenced by the radical spirit of fascism, Orwell operates on and throughout the novel re-stitches the child agencies of the former Soviet secret police known as the NKVD (the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs). He consolidates the Main Directorates for State Security, Camps (Gulag), Militiya, and Border and Internal Security within Oceanic ministries as the eyes ever-looming over the people, following "the gigantic increase of the bureaucratic apparatus, inherent in this method, which is checked by repeated liquidation through purges" (Arendt 402).

Consequently, the spinal cord of Oceania's "state apparatus, party apparatus, and secret police apparatus (the NKVD), each of which has its own independent department of economy, a political department, a ministry of education and culture, a military department, etc." (Arendt 403), becomes so intricately interwoven and spiralled into a web that an individual like Winston Smith, who begins to realize the oppression and dehumanization enforced upon him and the entirety of the society he is a part of, simply cannot escape. His revolt bears no fruit as his every step is monitored and ultimately punished by Big Brother and, unlike V in *V for Vendetta* who continues to battle the regime, his resistance remains futile and encapsulates the idea of a prevailing loss, not the idea of battling a superior force.

2.3. Correctional Camps: Institutional Mechanisms

Alongside state control and elimination of those who deprecate the leader and the party, a useful tool for these agencies to physically exert the power obtained or coerce "non-believers" into "believing" in the "righteousness" and "mirth" nurtured by the party and its dictator is undoubtedly bodily torture. In the context of dystopian novels such as *V for Vendetta* and *1984*, torture is to be understood not only as a "judicial ritual, but also political ritual which belongs, even in minor cases, to the ceremonies by which power is manifested" (Foucault 47). As such, bodily torture becomes a mechanism itself "by which a momentarily injured sovereignty is reconstituted" (Foucault 48).

Moreover, if the person who risks opposing the totalitarian power of the leader and the party gets apprehended and tortured, the absolute power becomes obsolete as it draws inspiration from medieval executions and "corrections" via torture used as a public spectacle. One generalization which is derivative from this is that the leader and the party, in order to "correct" his or its opponent, has to follow a strict code based upon a particular ideology. Booker states that "the Party enforces its ideology with all the zeal of the medieval Inquisition, but with a considerably more sophisticated understanding of psychology and power" (Booker 73), briefly summing up the mechanisation of correction camps and the party's motivation behind it. Luoma-aho, highly referencing Arendt's definition of totalitarianism, maintains that

The hard core of totalitarian ideology is the "firm and sincere belief in human omnipotence": that everything is permitted, everything is possible. Totalitarianism is not only an attempt to transmutate society, but to transform human nature itself, and the concentration camps are the laboratories where these changes are tested. What these experiments will always prove is that human beings cannot be changed, but they can be destroyed. (Luoma-aho 252)

In the case of *V for Vendetta*, correctional facilities are truly experimental institutions in which military trials were conducted on human beings, resulting in many of them dead and inapt to sustain the consequences of this experimental treatment. This is where V's story begins to unfold as he remains the only surviving experiment of the infamous Larkhill "resettlement camp" which he set on fire to initiate his getaway. "The Party tried to toughen nationalist fanaticism by celebrating racial and spiritual purity" (Di Liddo 114), echoing the *Übermensch* and *Untermensch* theories which, when mixed with the prevalent totalitarian

ideology, gave birth to an idea of white superiority. Moore clearly illustrates this through Evey Hammond's reminiscences of her childhood, offering the initial description and the use of "resettlement" camps as devices of mass control:

It was all the fascist groups, the right-wingers. They soon got things under control. But then they started taking people away... All the black people and the Pakistanis... White people, too. All the radicals and the men who, you know, liked other men. The homosexuals. I don't know what they did with them all. (Moore and Lloyd 28)

Much like with the use and abuse of racial ideologies realized through various dehumanizing and mass-murdering devices of the Second World War, the Norsefire party refrained not from ethnical cleansing of its territories, falling in line with the ideas of racism as seen in the doings of fascism and national socialism. What is more, the ruthlessness of the party's zealous ideology to construe a clean, subservient, mindless mass of people easily manipulated and, should the need arise, "corrected", spreads its tentacles onto the party's political opponents and children, as well:

Dad had been in a socialist group when he was younger. They came for him one September morning in 1993... It was my birthday. I was twelve. I never saw him again. They made me go and work in a factory with a lot of other kids. I lived in a hostel. It was cold and dirty and I just used to cry all the time. (Moore and Lloyd 28)

Moore now brings forth the reality of "resettlement camps" in a rather unconventional manner as he introduces the composition which V names *This Vicious Cabaret*, bearing the same name as the title of the novel's *Book II*. Moore and Lloyd "detach themselves for a few panels from the apocalyptic atmosphere of V" (Di Liddo 15) as they use "the powerful weapons of parody to criticize the exaggeration of nationalism" (Di Liddo 115) and argument the fact that the Norsefire regime completely obliterated all those who were not "usable" as pieces for their white supremacist, racist, mass-subduing, totalitarian puzzle-regime: "There's mischiefs and malarkies / but no queers / or Yids / or darkies / within this bastard's carnival" (Moore and Lloyd 92 - 93).

Following the idea of correction camps which served to "correct" the Norsefire society by adhering to its supremacist ideology, Big Brother and the INGSOC party remain rather close to such approach to radically "re-construct" their citizens in correction camps. Orwell only briefly mentions "joycamps (forced-labour camps)" (Orwell 319) as exploitative

facilities supervised by the authorities in the Ministry of Peace (in reality, the Ministry of War), which actually serve as prison-like structures meant to detain political prisoners and dissidents of the ruling party. These prisoners are then exploited in the severest forms of physical work, a punishment which echoes the penalties introduced in the former Soviet public labour camp known as the *katorga* or as its contemporary successor, the *gulag*.

The INGSOC party uses this mechanism of control not only to provide an economic background based on the exploitation of its opponents and eventually reap benefit from it, but also to create a *tabula rasa* of sort in its citizens; it eradicates the humanity from the prisoners in joycamps and the previously established mind-set of the prisoners in the joycamps' mother agency, the Ministry of Peace. What (or who) remains after this "treatment" is "the standing army, and the militia, jailers, constables, *posse comitatus*" (Thoreau) easily manipulated by the party and devoid of "free exercise of the judgment or of the moral sense" (Thoreau). The Party members and the citizens (of middle or upper-class) are thus considered to be Eliotesque "hollow men" or "wooden men which can perhaps be manufactured to serve the purpose (of the government) as well" (Thoreau). Winston fully acknowledges this instance and, in a sort of a reverie, contemplates about the lowest Oceanic social class, the proles (abbreviated from the proletarian class), whom he largely perceives as the truly free individuals of Oceania. Orwell's innate belief in the working class protrudes in Winston's realization that the *bourgeoisie* is alienated, dehumanized, and embroidered in plastic, inauthentic lives, whereas the proles nurture "the basic moral goodness of the working class" (White 88) and "the possibility of authentic forms of human encounter that were not mediated and hence distorted by ideological forms" (White 88):

What mattered were individual relationships, and a completely helpless gesture, an embrace, a tear, a word spoken to a dying man, could have value in itself. The proles, it suddenly occurred to him, had remained in this condition. They were not loyal to a party or a country or an ideal, they were loyal to one another. For the first time in his life he did not despise the proles or think of them merely as an inert force which would one day spring to life and regenerate the world. The proles had stayed human. They had not become hardened inside. They had held on to the primitive emotions which he himself had to learn by conscious effort. (Orwell 172)

What Orwell introduces in this particular passage is somewhat radically expressed by Moore's V – they both allude to the concept of hope, a concept not entirely smothered within these

corrupted, dystopian, and political regimes. However, they achieve the portrayal of this concept differently and, one may even argue so, multidimensionally, *V* stands as the bearer of freedom in a physical, exterior world, whereas Winston's (and therefore Orwell's) belief in the innate freedom of the proles initiates a voice for those who are seemingly uncorrupted by the mechanisms of control and utter and total societal oppression. On the interior and not excessively gentrified or transparent level, Orwell constructs a sequence of "primitive" but truthful emotions not eradicated from the lowest class, granting them their freedom.

2.4. Sex and Sexual Orientation: Biological Mechanisms

Consequent to the previously discussed mechanisms, one can conclude that both the Norsefire party and the INGSOC party aimed to propagate its citizens' sex life as another physical mechanism in close connection to bodily torture. Therefore, members of the society were not controlled only by constant supervision and inhumanely forced labour, but also by the parties' peculiar attitude towards sex, and the dominating framework which they derived from it and imposed upon the masses. Both Evey Hammond and Winston Smith remain closely connected to this particular aspect and the bodily torture which may have followed, but it is highly important to emphasize that Moore and Orwell purposefully chose to delineate the following sequences to portray the totality of victimization experienced by the ones whose voice was eradicated as a result of some abusing mechanism.

In *V for Vendetta*, Moore explicitly tackles the issue of sexuality and homosexuality by having the Norsefire party define it as something perverse, much in lieu of nationalist concentration camps in which many horrifying acts ensued. This is exemplified when *V* psychologically disables the ex-commander of Larkhill camp, Lewis Prothero, who echoes the fundamental output of the Norsefire's party towards sex and "degenerates": "We had to do what we did. All the darkies, the nancy boys and the beatniks... It was us or them. Us or them. Don't you understand?" (Moore and Lloyd 33). Much like the regime, *V* answers perfectly serene by initiating his revenge and violating Prothero's psyche, echoing and defining what the Norsefire regime did to Larkhill inmates by experimenting not only with their psyches, but also on their bodies: "Rita Boyd, the lesbian, died at tea-time. During the autopsy we found four vestigial fingers forming within the calf of her leg" (Moore and Lloyd 80).

However, probably the clearest assault which Moore initiates against the fascist homophobia is the sequence in which Evey Hammond experiences torture and is acquainted with the letter by and the memory of Valerie, a gay woman whom V knew while in Larkhill: "In 1992, after the take-over, they started rounding up the gays. They took Ruth while she was out looking for food. Why are they so frightened of us?" (Moore and Lloyd 159). Completely aware of the fascist ideology which defined "normal" and "subversive", Moore openly critiques the fascist system of representation to which gays and lesbians seem "corrupted" and need to be "corrected" or, even worse, utilized as experimentation platforms, by showing this quite explicitly to the readers. Call explicates Moore's critique and traces this supposed assault on the Norsefire government and its ideology to the concept of sex as a reactionary weapon which, according to the principles of totalitarianism, the ruling power must then disable: "Gay and lesbian identities and systems of signification stand in direct opposition to the homogenous concept of normality which is such a crucial component of fascism's symbolic regime" (Call 164).

In 1984, much like with rations and food as a person's essential need, the Party also controls the citizens of Oceania with biological restrictions: "He knew what was meant by GOODSEX - that is to say, normal intercourse between man and wife, for the sole purpose of begetting children, and without physical pleasure on the part of the woman: all else was SEXCRIME" (Orwell 319). What is derivative from such concept imposed upon the people by Big Brother and the INGSOC party is the desire to control the mind-set of the Oceanians as they are stripped of any pleasure which is usually connoted with sex. It is used merely as a reproductive device and a mechanism of control which aims to populate Oceania with future minions and followers of the party, as well as workers who are exploited in preserving the fundamentals of the ruling regime. Orwell juxtaposes the issue of homosexuality to the way it was portrayed in Moore's *V for Vendetta*:

His sexual life, for example, was entirely regulated by the two Newspeak words: SEXCRIME (sexual immorality) and GOODSEX (chastity). SEXCRIME covered all sexual misdeeds whatever. It covered fornication, adultery, homosexuality, and other perversions, and, in addition, normal intercourse practised for its own sake. (Orwell 319)

In its full display, the very concept of sex and sexual orientation was then regulated by the Party which chastised the citizens who went against the prescribed rules. The upper-class

members of the Party usually did not adhere to these rules, initiating yet another abuse of the power they had and gradually exploited. Historically, one only has to look into the hierarchy of the Nazi or the Stalinist regime to find sexual predators of a certain rank – in Germany, it was Julius Streicher who accused Jews of being violent perpetrators and ritualists entangled in blood-mingling sexual intercourses poisoning the perfect Aryan race, while in the Soviet Union it was Stalin's right hand man, Lavrentiy Beria, who exploited numerous young girls and struck fear into lives of all those who opposed him.

Be that as it may, the INGSOC party manage to instil its doctrine of asexuality, but when it comes to individual reactionary outbursts against it, Winston's girlfriend and the woman he loved (which was a crime by itself as you were only supposed to love Big Brother, who then reciprocated your love by keeping you alive), Julia, clearly outlined that, unlike Winston, she "had grasped the inner meaning of the Party's sexual puritanism" (Orwell 139). Orwell uses her character to finalize how exactly the INGSOC party aimed to sexually disable the society and then subsume it under their mercy or doghouse, adjusting it to the primal motivational mechanism of the Oceanic totalitarian regime – complete control of the person's mind and its reconstruction to offer love only to Big Brother and the party. The party was fearful of the concept of sex as an isolated world of happiness over which they had no control and which they had no chance to extinguish, but they also feared the lack of energy which was namely invested during the event of sexual intercourse. Julia explains this "direct, intimate connection between chastity and political orthodoxy" (Orwell 140) by saying that

Making love uses up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and the Three-Year Plans and the Two Minutes Hate and all the rest of their bloody rot? (Orwell 139)

If someone interfered in such bond, they would be taken into the Ministry of Peace and the Ministry of Love where the party either "re-constituted" the member's mind or, should that be proven a failure, eradicated them from existence as direct opponents of the ruling power. Therefore, the entire concept of sex and sexual orientation was corrupted by the INGSOC party and Big Brother to alienate the people from themselves and their identities, to

leave them devoid of any pleasure other than serving Big Brother, and to confine them biologically by allowing them only to populate Oceania, not enjoy while doing it.

3. Psychological Mechanisms of Control

Having explicated the vast outreach of humanity-crumbling mechanisms of control which literally engrave the despotic power onto the society's skin, the paper now aims to traverse the outer rim of totalitarian apparatus of control by delineating the control devices which are largely used to influence the human psyche. Deemed far worse than those of physical nature because they penetrate into the very essence of a human being, eradicate it and metamorphose it into a clean slate for the dictatorial power to disseminate, these mechanisms include crypticism and language abuse from which mass media influence and subsequent circulation of political propaganda are derived. The sum of these constituents results in pure psychological torture and consequential brainwashing, altering the reality of the individual or the entire society and yielding it to the abuse of totalitarian powers-that-be, as well as the power they possess and the ideology they eventually sprawl via such powerful mechanisms.

3.1. Language Abuse and Crypticism

In order to influence the public opinion and avert it to its will, the totalitarian power uses institutions such as interior ministries and propaganda machinery which namely manipulate the usage of words. By carefully splitting phrases and its usage and meanings by joints, the interior ministries, such as the Mouth in *V for Vendetta* and the Ministry of Truth in *1984*, operate on language itself and sew the meaning back to the word so as to fit the will of the despotic leader and his party.

Both novels deal with terms coined by Orwell, "doublethink" and Newspeak, as iterations of the language used to encapsulate the meaning of the word defined by the ruling power and to annihilate its true meaning. As such, the ruling power reconfigures the words as fundamentals of human (critical and, essentially, knowledge-gaining) thought "by controlling language and information through a complex coercive apparatus" (Ranieri 93), subsequently instigating "a mind control of its subjects that is "total" in both extension and intensity" (Ranieri 93). Both parties are thus considered "Orwellian", a characteristic not (completely)

uniform with terms such as authoritarian or totalitarian. In essence, the term "Orwellian" may be analysed as an extension of totalitarian regime, but it is primarily associated with the deliberate irony conveyed by the concept of "doublethink". Tavlin concludes that "doublethink" conjoins words "not used to convey the meaning, but to undermine it, corrupting the very ideas they refer to" (Tavlin). Furthermore, when it comes to the concept of Newspeak undoubtedly used as a mechanism of control to influence the person's psyche and to corrupt one's language comprehension, it can be defined as "a crudely limited collection of acronyms and simple, concrete nouns, lacking any words complex enough to encourage nuanced critical thought" (Tavlin).

By using these concepts, both the Norsefire party and the INGSOC party assert their dominion over its minions and aim to reconfigure "the machines" and "the wooden men" they had previously constructed and exploited. In *V for Vendetta*, the propaganda machine known as the Mouth is situated at Jordan Tower and helmed by Mr Roger Dascombe, the broadcasting chief executive officer appointed by the Head himself, Chancellor Susan. Dascombe operates the news central by broadcasting the daily occurrences illustrated by the Norsefire regime and uttered by Lewis Prothero, the voice of "Fate", a device controlled by the Leader to constantly supervise the behaviour of the society and to organize the Norsefire machinery of control which is set into motion by the previously explicated surveillance agencies. Via the Mouth, the Norsefire party controls the news they wish to broadcast and it uses the concept of "doublespeak" by revealing a negative information to the society, only to counter it with a positive one to instil "the hope" and "the progress" the party is actively working on for "its people": "Productivity reports from Herefordshire indicate to a possible end to meat rationing starting from mid-February, 1998. This good news follows similar announcements concerning the increased productivity of both eggs and potatoes" (Moore and Lloyd 9). The language used by the party is straightforward and precise and liable to be induced in the minds of the people. Given that this news was reported by the Mouth on 5 November 1997, it is believed that no rationing end is in sight; this is a mere thought used to keep the masses afloat to believe in the Party and its progress. The reality, however, is much different because not only is the Norsefire party feeding people false news of non-existent betterment, but it is also literally not feeding them at all by keeping them confined to the rations they provide, merging the physical mechanism of ration control to the psychological one associated with mind control by language abuse. Another example of language abuse and news falsification is the exposition of an inner terrorist cell: "Police raided seventeen homes in

the Birmingham area early this morning, uncovering what is believed to be a major terrorist ring. Twenty people, eight of them women, are currently in detention awaiting trial" (Moore and Lloyd 9). This "terrorist ring" is but a metaphor used by the Norsefire party to refer to their opponents and any type of dissidents who are forcefully round up and transported to "correction camps" in which they are "reconfigured" and "corrected". The pinnacle of "doublethink" news-feeding, however, is the official report on the state's economy:

In a speech today Mr Adrian Karel, party minister for industry, stated that Britain's industrial prospects are brighter than at any time since the last war. Mr Karel went on to say that is the duty of every man in this country to seize the initiative and make Britain great again. (Moore and Lloyd 10)

What is apparent in this statement is the process of thought-shaping via the concept of introducing fabricated information which has no empirical background whatsoever. Furthermore, there is no way to dispute this doublethink-thought as it bears the insignia of the Party and its prime minister who also advocates the belief that all men should participate in creating a better life for themselves, alluding to the concept of nationalism and even inducing ideas of patriotism in the people's minds. The truth is that there are no "brighter industrial prospects" or "the last war" – all industrial prospects are used to further the perpetual war the Norsefire regime is waging against its people to sustain its position of power. However, by using language and shaping the nation's thought into believing that it is furthering the state's economic progress, the Party controls the masses as its primary working force which they continuously indoctrinate. Henceforth, the mass media become the most powerful ideological weapon used to shape, feed, and control the basic fundamentals of a person's mind – a thought constructed and a language uttered.

What is more, from a teleprompter especially designed for the institution represented by the Mouth, the "Voice of Fate", Lewis Prothero, blindly utters what is dictated by Chancellor Susan and the Norsefire party to keep the citizens of Britain (namely Londoners) "aware" that they are arriving at a prosperous landmark in their history, while in reality these resources are being used to stabilize the state's control apparatus, to increase the army and to conduct gruesome experiments on marginalized groups with the belief of "correcting" them and turning them into super-soldiers as zealous supporters of the better tomorrow, a (rather bleak) future prophesized and construed by Chancellor Susan and the Norsefire party.

Language abuse is apparent in *1984*, as well, and it is actually represented and welcomed by the Party as it indoctrinates the people of Oceania with language constructs fabricated in an assembly line of mass production situated in the Ministry of Truth. The INGSOC party furthers and utilizes the concept of "doublethink" in a very explicit manner (to the point that the people of Oceania may realize that they are being fed with lies, but have no concrete proof for it, except for their consciousness) emphasized by Orwell from early on and, to exemplify it, one only needs to peer into the names of Big Brother's interior ministries. The Minipax, therefore, does not represent "peace", but "war"; the Miniluv induces "hate" and "harassment" to all those who dare to oppose Big Brother's "love"; the Miniplenty symbolizes the "few" resources or the "missing" ones, whereas the Minitrue introduces "fiction", "lies", "falsifications" and "refabrications" of truths once apparent. The protagonist of the novel, Winston Smith, is undoubtedly aware of the historical, economical, and political figments he is fed to and even defines the concept of "doublethink" in a lengthy manner:

To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. (Orwell 37)

As a practical victim of doublethink, Winston reminisces of the warring past in Oceania and, even though the INGSOC party promotes that Oceania has never conducted a war against its neighbouring country, Eurasia, and declined any form of mutual alliance, Winston clearly remembers that the war had been waged approximately four years ago, resulting in Oceania-Eurasia alliance. However, such conception exists only in his consciousness and there is no proper way to prove it. On the contrary, even thinking against the past and the present introduced by the party is a crime punishable by annihilation of consciousness in the Ministry of Love. This "ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed" (Orwell 37) only proves the power of language in shaping human thought, whereas Winston's realization that the INGSOC party discovered such power and transformed

it into a fundamental device of psychological control only intensifies the dictum: "Thoughtcrime does not entail death: thoughtcrime IS death" (Orwell 30).

An immediate constituent of "doublethink" when it comes to enforced, yet subtle thought-shaping, is the dialect of Newspeak as the official language apparatus advocated by the party which nurtures it in the Ministry of Truth, where the true history of Oceania as an allegory to Great Britain is dislocated, re-created, fabricated, and then disseminated. Semantic abuse thus follows a syntactic one – the dialect of Newspeak opposes all vagueness and false and pretentious diction of a political speech. Orwell analysed the inflation of language in political speeches, calling it a euphemism consisting of "a mass of Latin words which fall upon the facts like soft snow, blurring the outline and covering up all the details" (Orwell, "Politics and the English Language"). He also outlined insincerity as the great enemy of language, describing an instance "when there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, in which one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms, like a cuttlefish spurting out ink" (Orwell, "Politics and the English Language"). He introduced his conclusions and interweaved them in the Oceanic language and, having been aware of the inefficiency of modern political language, he empowered the INGSOC party by positioning it as the manufacturer of Newspeak.

From physical totalitarianism and exertion of dominance onto the realm of linguistic totalitarianism, Newspeak's crude simplification had proven to be extremely useful in subduing the masses to the leader's and the party's will. With all the characteristics of a non-politically construed utterance prevalently used politically (and thus also echoing the concept of "doublethink"), Newspeak-words remain stripped of synonyms and a plethora of adjectives which results in eradication of possible critical thought, thoroughly welcomed by Big Brother as it bears no threats from growing intellectuals brought up on words and ideas. This control of words as "the most powerful feature of language, vital for a totalitarian will, consists not only in its destructive, but also constructive, power over thoughts" (Ranieri 94). Some of the most common Newspeak constructs, such as *bellyfeel*, meaning a blind, enthusiastic acceptance of an idea, and *unperson*, a person completely annihilated from existence, are therefore not only melts of Oldspeak, but also its re-forgings, resulting in the party "not only destroying terms, but also modifying their use" (Ranieri 94) and "altering the significance of a concept, especially if abstract" (Ranieri 94). In an appendix on *The Principles of Newspeak*, Orwell clearly contextualizes the usage Big Brother preferred to control the minds of the people, over which he exerted psychological power:

Consider, for example, such a typical sentence from a *Times* leading article as *Oldthinkers unbellyfeel INGSOC*. The shortest rendering that one could make of this in Oldspeak would be: "Those whose ideas were formed before the Revolution cannot have a full emotional understanding of the principles of English Socialism. (Orwell 317-318)

Now, to contextualize the Oldspeak-Newspeak dyad historically and politically, one only has to peer into an example provided by Orwell in his seminal essay, "Politics and the English Language", in which he ordains the usage of one over the other, that is the usage of simpler, direct structuring over the vague, intricately built one. From a rudimentary sentence with a clear trajectory such as "I believe in killing off your opponents when you can get good results by doing so" (Orwell, "Politics and the English Language") into an inflated one ornamented with unclear output and ambiguity such as

While freely conceding that the Soviet regime exhibits certain features which the humanitarian may be inclined to deplore, we must, I think, agree that a certain curtailment of the right to political opposition is an unavoidable concomitant of transitional periods, and that the rigors which the Russian people have been called upon to undergo have been amply justified in the sphere of concrete achievement. (Orwell, "Politics and the English Language"),

Orwell's parody aims to provide a conclusion on the power of language as a mechanism of psychological control. It was this conclusion that helped many of the dictators (whose personas these novels allegorize explicitly and implicitly) to rally the masses and address the public, and it is largely constituted not upon the complex syntax of the language or its subsequent indecipherable semantics, but rather straightforward sentential structures disseminating the meaning and the ideology advocated by these leaders and their parties, used primarily to subsume these masses under their control and secure their support (if not peacefully, then by violent mechanisms of control).

3.2. Mass Media and Propaganda

Another medium of psychological control and an extension of language abuse, or, to be more precise, its practical realization, is undoubtedly of technical nature which yields itself to political repression. The mass media serve as powerful control devices for the despotic

power because they provide fertile land for eradication of propaganda, but also for the hierarchisation between those who are in power and who shape the information, and those who are under the power and who are fed the previously constructed news.

This dichotomy between the ruler and the ruled fits Chomskian definition of state-controlled media as "generally kept in line by the forces that have the power to dominate the state, and by an apparatus of cultural managers who cannot stray far from the bounds these forces set" (Chomsky 36). In *V for Vendetta*, Moore follows the Chomskian mass media by constituting the Mouth of the Hobbesian *Leviathan* that is Britain under the Norsefire regime. With closed-circuit television cameras dispersed around the streets of London and labelled "for your protection", used to monitor every single step of public movement and initiate a reactionary mechanism should one oppose the dictatorial power, the Norsefire regime furthers its omnipresence and leaves the society in fear of constant supervision. However, these cameras are but cogs in a larger mechanism of oppressive technological structure. Massive screens situated at town squares are used to transmit Chancellor Susan's ideas and the state's eventual "progression", resulting in mass public meetings organized to consolidate the Norsefire ideology. However, the totality of technological supervision is helmed by a super-computer operated by the Head himself, Chancellor Adam Susan, over which he decides his next moves and bolsters his despotic power – "Fate".

"Fate" is perceived by the society of the Norsefire Britain as its literal fate and it feeds of the servitude imposed upon the society. On a very particular example of precisely timed weather forecasts, one can conclude that these are undeniable and empirically proven. Therefore, as a technological Panopticon, "Fate" is "either omniscient, because it knows what the weather will be, or omnipotent, because it causes the changes in the weather" (Loy 37). This "lends even greater credence to its authority on resource management" (Loy 37) and fits another norm defined within Chomskian framework, that of *the resource constraint* and *the demand constraint*. The resource constraint is rather self-explanatory as it includes "control over resources which is narrowly concentrated, with predictable effects for every aspect of social and political life" (Chomsky 37) organized and monitored by the Norsefire party. In cases of deviation, the party controls the rations for the society and physically eradicates them in correction camps, but it is largely focused on the latter concept of the demand constraint, "where the political system sometimes permits a broader range of policy options, including programs of social reform" (Chomsky 37). The Norsefire regime does not support its presence

and punishes all those who wish to reform the current system or introduce addendums, and this is best summarized by Chancellor Susan's definition of freedom:

Fascism... Strength in unity. I believe in strength. I believe in unity. And if that strength, that unity of purpose, demands a uniformity of thought, word and deed then so be it. I will not hear talk of freedom. I will not hear talk of individual liberty. They are luxuries. I do not believe in luxuries. The war put paid to luxury. The war put paid to freedom. The only freedom left to my people is the freedom to starve. The freedom to die, the freedom to live in a world of chaos. Should I allow them that freedom? I think not. I think not. (Moore and Lloyd 37-38)

It is this supremacist ideology that Susan disseminates via all the mass media available, centred in a focused point of surveillance that is Fate. However, it is also this exact ideology that V aims to usurp, not because it made him into what he is, but because it will produce many more adorned with the word "what", and not "whom". This clash of ideologies initiates an individualized war between Susan's neo-fascism and V's anarchism, a war which spreads onto the masses which are exposed to both mind-sets at a certain point in the novel. V's theory in disrupting this well-entrenched despotic power is a vertical upward one, opposing the vertical downward display of power nurtured by Chancellor Susan. Therefore, "V sees his origins as an inevitable response to the inhuman violence perpetrated against him, a genesis that follows Newton's third law: For every actions there is an equal and opposite reaction" (Keller 40). V initiates an arguably terrorist attack by slowly eradicating the operational staff of the Larkhill institution, only to move onto the most powerful Norsefire agency, the Mouth.

He "breaks into Jordan Tower, holds Dascombe and his crew at detonator point and makes them broadcast his video" (Moore and Lloyd 120), a message meant to reach the entirety of London and Britain in which he openly exposes the Norsefire party as oppressors appointed by the exact same society he is now addressing and urging not to remain passive, while simultaneously illuminating the reality behind the façade of the "benevolent" Chancellor Susan. This gives him momentum and arguments the power of mass media in delivering a message – he carefully disposes of Chancellor Susan's bureaucratic apparatus and then reveals his plan to the masses. With his agenda relayed publicly during the BTN news, V advertises and embodies freedom from the Norsefire regime which is revealed to be "controlling and manufacturing the news, and act no doubt calculated to undermine its credibility with the

populace" (Keller 42). In a single and sequential blow, V begins to crumble the dictating hierarchy of the Norsefire regime by blowing up the Mouth and Jordan Tower, as well as the Old Post Office, while also neutralizing the Eye and the Ear. With Chancellor Susan rendered helpless and left with no mouth to voice cries for help, eyes to see or ears to hear, V allows the citizens of Britain to taste freedom: "For three days, your movements will not be watched. Your conversations will not be listened to... And 'do what thou wilt' shall be the whole of the law" (Moore and Lloyd 186-187).

Mass media propaganda is featured prominently in the world of Oceania, as well, and the equivalent to Chancellor Susan's Fate and the overarching amount of street cameras would in *1984* be the image of Big Brother and the meticulously placed "telescreens". However, whereas the Norsefire regime relies on subtly imposing its neo-fascist ideology under the moniker that "England prevails", the ministries of Oceania construct a more grandiose scheme in relaying Big Brother's message. They do not simply supervise the Oceanic society – they trace the people's footsteps within the confines of their walls and annihilate their privacy out of fear of retaliation, but also under the axiom that to rule over a subservient, forcibly obedient society, one must constantly feed it information about the ongoing "progress" and the better tomorrow advocated by Big Brother and the INGSOC party. The usage of such small devices is highly symbolic – despite their size, they seem to amass the highest amount of concentration and attention of its listeners. The INGSOC party is well-versed in building an oppressive apparatus of control from its earnest foundations, and this technological infrastructure is no exception to the rule. Having been set, the "telescreens" are immediately used to relay Big Brother's words and ideas, a constant occurrence described by Winston:

Day and night the telescreens bruised your ears with statistics proving that people today had more food, more clothes, better houses, better recreations—that they lived longer, worked shorter hours, were bigger, healthier, stronger, happier, more intelligent, better educated, than the people of fifty years ago. Not a word of it could ever be proved or disproved. (Orwell 77)

This psychological penetration into the listener's mind is characteristic of a totalitarian apparatus of control, but it can only be furthered if a negative is offered to the positive, which is herein embodied within Big Brother and the INGSOC party (as enforced upon the Oceanians). The human psyche is relatively based upon images, as well, and not only words; the "telescreens" are precisely situated and timed to infiltrate the society's visualizing

cognitive machinery, as well as its thought-rendering apparatus. Hence, if the positive image is glued to Big Brother, his well-known adversary is Emmanuel Goldstein. Thus initiating a historical allegory of the two Leninist successors, Stalin and Trotsky, and even delineating the same fates they experienced, Orwell turns to another powerful instance of the INGSOC party's technological power, the Two Minutes Hate speech, broadcast daily to the entire populace, followed by the images of "the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the People" (Orwell 13). Having glued the image to the derelict oppressor of Big Brother's regime, the party engages in a meticulous witch-hunt for the man who may as well be a myth or not even exist, but the very idea of him existing and being branded "the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party's purity" (Orwell 14) from whose teachings "all subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out" (Orwell 14), seems to be a fruitful thought to implement in the clean-slated minds of the mindless masses.

Unless absolutely necessary, the INGSOC machinery of control will not tap into the physical mechanism of control and use violence to sustain power of its leader or itself, unlike the Norsefire regime of *V for Vendetta* whose primary goal is to exert power by violently manipulating all those who oppose their system. However, a linking device between the Norsefire regime and the INGSOC regime is derived from:

The modern-day weaponry of the mass media which has revealed an expected, well-known method of achieving victory without instigating a war and conquest without spilling blood. Mass media are the most powerful weapons invented thus far, seamlessly exerting its violence through the interconnection of entertainment and education – generating in people a sense of consent without the awareness of the consequences. (Alić 291, my translation)¹

This is exactly what both regimes aim for, the former focusing less on the technological prowess of mass media as powerful tools to scatter propaganda, but the latter adhering completely to the rim of dystopian nation constituted on the craze for technological institutions which yield themselves to political oppression of the party, while also being utilized as tools of societal oppression and terror. However, *V for Vendetta* and *1984* boldly

¹ U izvorniku: "Doba suvremenih mas-medija otkrilo je tisućama godina očekivanu metodu kojom se do pobjede dolazi bez rata, do osvajanja bez krvi. Mas-mediji su najsnažnije, do sada izumljeno oružje koje element nasilnog provodi kroz povezivanje zabave, odgoja – proizvođači na taj način u narodima osjećaj pristanka bez svijesti o posljedicama" (Alić 291).

contradict each other ideologically in the treatment of the protagonist's revolutionary reaction towards the totality of the regime in power, but also in their close connection to the concept of mass media. It has already been delineated that V manages to crumble the Hobbesian stratification of the Norsefire party by addressing the masses from one of the most powerful Norsefire agencies, the Mouth. However, Winston has no chance to oppose the despotic power because he was in reality monitored from the very inception of his party-opposing reaction. He may have thought that the "telescreens" had been shut down, but the agencies have been thoroughly keeping track on Winston's movements and activities, only to apprehend him and bring him into the Ministry of Love for "reconfiguration".

It is within the Ministry of Love where the climactic ideological fray ensues – a clash between O'Brien, the INGSOC party's high-positioned officer who pretended to organize the *coup d'état* in which Big Brother was to be dethroned, and Winston Smith, a clerk in the Ministry of Truth who believed that he can go rogue and oppose Big Brother. Unlike V who obtains victory, the reality is bleak for Winston – his bodily torture is yet to be discussed, but it is his "reconfiguration" that is associated with the party's prevailing propaganda, now being exerted upon him in its full atrocity:

We control matter because we control the mind. Reality is inside the skull. You will learn by degrees, Winston. There is nothing that we could not do. Invisibility, levitation - anything. I could float off this floor like a soap bubble if I wish to. I do not wish to, because the Party does not wish it. You must get rid of those nineteenth-century ideas about the laws of Nature. We make the laws of Nature. (Orwell 277)

Winston realizes the ominous future looming over him by discoursing with O'Brien, who also happens to be displaying the approach which the INGSOC party attains when disseminating propaganda, concluding with all the fundamentals used by mass media to exert a certain ideology. It was O'Brien who monitored Winston's revolt, took him into imprisonment and eradicated all the revolutionary ideas from his mind, implementing all the presupposed ones by Big Brother and the INGSOC party. The concept of "doublethink" also plays a prominent role in Winston's reconfiguration because, on an individualized level, he becomes a painting of everything that happens to those who oppose the well-stratified and omnipresent INGSOC regime: "War is Peace" (Orwell 6) indeed, and, given that Winston's war bore no fruit whatsoever, he was indoctrinated into being an Eliotesque "hollow man" or a "wooden man" whose peace is to blindly obey his leader. "Freedom is Slavery" (Orwell 6), states

another party slogan, advocating that the slaves of the system enjoy freedom, but the freedom provided by and defined by Big Brother, and this freedom is not much different from Chancellor Susan's definition of following the ruling powers-that-be. "Ignorance is Strength" (Orwell 6), exclaim the members of the party, because the lesser you wrap yourself into journeying to the real truth smothered by Big Brother, the stronger you will get in front of him, receiving the prize of being alive.

Finally, to conclude this chapter on ideology dissemination and propaganda, one may say that "every instance of history of the twentieth century is a history of propaganda, methods of seduction and manipulation, a historical era of shifting the importance from classical weapons in favour of those associated with mass media" (Alić 292, my translation).² Much like the parties in *V for Vendetta* and *1984*, the twentieth century seems to have proven that advertisement became a weapon itself, a weapon of "large corporations which used to simultaneously finance both Hitler and Stalin, as well as the Americans and the Vietnamese, now managing the 'production of consent'" (Alić 292, my translation).³

4. Into the Protagonists and Authors

Having mastered the amalgamation of language abuse, mass media control, and thought-shaping to penetrate into the human psyche and fashion it to their will, both parties led by its despots construct the final and the most intense psychological mechanism of control whose violent nature seems to be exposed by the end of the novels analysed – brainwashing. O'Donnell states that "both pieces of work include the theme of human spirit, although one focuses on how it can be broken and the other on how it can prevail" (O'Donnell), and it is exactly within this limit of a human body that Moore and Orwell now aim to individualize the totality of the oppression fertilized by the ruling regimes.

4.1. The Protagonists: Idealization and Indoctrination

Moore turns to motivational mechanism behind V's reactionary output thoroughly explicated to and inherited by Evey Hammond who attains this knowledge in rather radical

² U izvorniku: "Svaka povijest 20. stoljeća jest povijest propagande, metoda zavođenja i manipuliranja, povijesno doba smjene važnosti klasičnog naoružanja u odnosu na medijsko" (Alić 292).

³ U izvorniku: " 'Velike korporacije koje su nekada istovremeno financirale i Hitlera i Staljina, kao i Amerikance i Vijetnamce - danas upravljaju 'proizvodnjom pristanka' " (Alić 292).

manner, whereas Orwell emphasizes the ideological clash between the INGSOC party's oppression and Winston Smith as the party's product of indoctrination.

Firstly, Moore introduces two very particular sequences – Evey Hammond's torture and the grave motif of a letter authored by a former Larkhill prisoner, Valerie. Having unearthed Valerie's letter which contains a plea "that the world turns and that things get better, and that one day people have roses again" (Moore and Lloyd 160), it is exactly within these words that Evey finds the courage to face her torture. She is terrorized, sexually abused and incarcerated for unknown reasons, but the turning point seems to be V's entrance, revealing himself to be Evey's executioner. He executes the "prison in which she was all her life" (Moore and Lloyd 168) and sets her free from the choice which was imposed upon her, "a choice between the death of her principles and the death of her body" (Moore and Lloyd 170). With the doors of the cage now open and all the previously tied blindfolds lifted from her eyes, Evey's shackles are unrestrained and V allows her to seize her freedom: "Encircle it within your arms. Bury it in your heart up to the hilt... Become transfixed... Become transfigured... Forever" (Moore and Lloyd 172). The concept which is rather questionable in V's approach is his radical discourse with Evey – he simulates a scenario which he had to live through so as to make her understand the extremes behind attaining true freedom and to eradicate the notion of dictatorial oppression from her mind. Call argues V's liberating apparatus by stating that to overthrow an oppressive power, one has to demean it with a dramatic tool such as exposing the world of illusions by constituting another world of illusions, one highly explosive and flammable:

The oppressive power of the fascist state (and the modern state more generally) does not lie in the ability of these states to deploy conventional forms of political and economic power. Rather, the truly terrifying power of fascist states (and of all modern states) lies in the ability of these states to enforce a certain perception of the world. The only effective way to challenge fascism, V argues, is to attack that perception. (Call 164)

Herein Moore purposefully individualizes V as the proprietor of a better tomorrow and the wielder of freedom for Evey – he becomes more than just a man behind the mask; he becomes the mask donned by another man or, in the case of *V for Vendetta*, woman. V becomes an idea and he states so himself in his final fray against Mr Finch, the leader of the Nose: "There, did you think to kill me? There's no flesh or blood within this cloak to kill.

There's only an idea. Ideas are bulletproof. Farewell" (Moore and Lloyd 236). What is more, in order to convince Evey (and the reader) "of the reality of the social, of the gravity of the economy and the finalities of production" (Baudrillard 179), V instigates and realizes his plan to blow up the Old Bailey in order to advertise his endeavours to leave the Norsefire party devoid not only of the entirety of its inner ministries and the former propaganda machinery, but also of the seat of its judicial power. V therefore manages to simulate and fully breathe into life a true historical account of Robert Catesby's and Guy Fawkes' failed Gunpowder Plot – the 1605 attempt to blow up the Parliament and King James I as means of radical opposition to a prevalent tyranny.

This revolutionary account sees the populace combating the ruling power, and it is exactly this scenario that V wishes to recreate. As "the only weapon of power, the only strategy against this deflection that is" (Baudrillard 179) the Norsefire regime and its subsequent mechanisms of control, be them physical or psychological, V "reinjects realness and referentiality everywhere, in order to convince us" (Baudrillard 179) of the despotic power nurtured by Chancellor Susan and his Norsefire party, exploited within the masses and exerted over the same by force and violence. V perpetuates tradition only to become tradition himself – by the end of the novel, the man behind the mask is dead, but the mask itself, the idea advocated, is not. Following her "liberating torture" and illumination, Evey is pronounced V's successor as she dons the Fawkesian mask in a rather powerful sequence of Moore's Hemingwayesque writing merged with Lloyd's powerful art as the fundamental constituent of "the ninth art", that is comic books. Evey utters that "at last she knows" (Moore and Lloyd 250), "she knows who V must be" (Moore and Lloyd 250), facing herself in the mirror while donning the iconic grin.

However, what one must consider here is also the challenge illustrated by the character of V – if he is the true embodiment of anarchism eager to overrun the neo-fascist regime embodied by Chancellor Susan, his actions also entail violence and eradication of human beings. Human beings responsible for annihilation of those who opposed the Norsefire party and those whom the party declared "unfit" and "marginalized" in a gruesome manner, indeed, yet the question of justifying such actions remains bafflingly complex and hard to answer. Nevertheless, one clear conclusion which can be delineated is that V is, as Luoma-aho maintains, both "the Mephistopheles of *V for Vendetta*" (Luoma-aho 258) and "a king - that of "the Twentieth Century" - and a warrior, who fought and died holding onto his principles" (Luoma-aho 259). This is consequent to a generally unwritten law when it comes to producing

a quality dystopian work – the open-end closure is realized best when the protagonist of the novel dwells within "the grey zone", meaning that his actions are morally ambiguous, and not clear cut in a black-and-white manner.

Conversely to the outcome of *V for Vendetta*, 1984 sees a different turn of events. "The human spirit suffers when pressured, especially when constrained by those important to us" (O'Donnell), and it is Winston's spirit that is broken by an over-arching oppressive apparatus used by O'Brien during Winston's initial interrogation and final "re-configuration". Unlike the spirit of V which seems to live on within Evey, Winston is brought to the face of the INGSOC party and Big Brother. He is then subjected to a bodily torture reminiscent of that used by the Soviet Union – he is first starved, then suffers brain electrocution, has his teeth plucked out, is verbally assaulted and physically violated – all in the name of Big Brother. Once again, the INGSOC party relies on physical mechanisms of control to construct a *tabula rasa* in a man. He is not only stripped of his physical prowess, but also of dignity and, gradually, the thought-processes which he once nurtured. This exposition of violation of the human body eerily resembles the one described by Foucault in minute detail, that of Robert-François Damiens, a domestic servant whose attempted murder of King Louis XIV was pronounced act of treason and punished by a brutal ritual of body dismemberment. In lieu of a medieval torture, Winston becomes the modern Damiens, a product of the mechanism of bodily torture which leaves him on the path to become an *unperson*. His shocking appearance is observed by O'Brien:

Look at that disgusting running sore on your leg. Do you know that you stink like a goat? Probably you have ceased to notice it. Look at your emaciation. Do you see? I can make my thumb and forefinger meet round your bicep. I could snap your neck like a carrot. Do you know that you have lost twenty-five kilograms since you have been in our hands? Even your hair is coming out in handfuls. (...) Open your mouth. Nine, ten, eleven teeth left. (Orwell 285)

Winston's treatment in the Ministry of Love is best summarized by him falling apart and rotting, being stripped away of the last few remnants of humanity which constituted his human being. However, this is only where the real torture is initiated. The INGSOC party is an advocate of the concept of pain as a temporary punishment, one able to be suffered through. The punishment which the party aims to exert is one of psychological nature – they split the body by joints to use the mind as a blank canvas upon which they can paint. Echoing

ideological devices and mechanisms of propaganda, O'Brien violates Winston's psyche and brainwashes him into believing that all his reactionary thoughts were products of self-deception. Winston eventually "accepted everything" and noted his confession on a thin piece of paper produced by the party: "He began to write down the thoughts that came into his head. He wrote first in large clumsy capitals: FREEDOM IS SLAVERY. Then almost without a pause he wrote beneath it: TWO AND TWO MAKE FIVE" (Orwell 290). Herein a reader follows the pinnacle of Winston's psychological torture – his consciousness is reconfigured, his thought-process restarted, his mind restructured, his very physical and psychological being reinvented to fit the norm of Big Brother's follower, one adorned with his reciprocating love advocated by the INGSOC party.

With his body mutilated and his mind electrocuted, Winston still possesses something which is, at a first glance, perceived seemingly inalienable, something still constituting him as a human being with thought-rendering apparatus unfit for Big Brother's love. This something is exactly the concept of love as an emotion tying him to Julia, the only person left in the world whom he wishes not to betray. He is then led into "room 101" (Orwell 295), a torture chamber designed especially for individual prisoners who require "re-configuration". This is where Winston's threshold of pain surpasses its climax – O'Brien creates his portfolio in order to unearth his major fear and is successful in his endeavours. Now literally shoved into a cage in which his face is assaulted by rats, meaning that the party is literally feeding him his biggest fear to eradicate even the last, minimal remnants of the concept of principles apparent in human beings, Winston's body, psyche, and will eventually crack and shatter as he betrays the

ONE person to whom he could transfer his punishment - ONE body that he could thrust between himself and the rats. And he was shouting frantically, over and over. 'Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don't care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me!' (Orwell 299-300)

This confession brands him as profoundly changed and he realizes that he traded the life of the one person whom he truly loved to save his own. With "Big Brother watching him" (Orwell 4) and penetrating Winston's brain "with his dark eyes" (Orwell 4), Winston is declared fit for Big Brother's love, whereas his confession adheres to another Hobbesian construct, structured upon the axiom that the "[f]ear of death is universal, and that we will do anything to preserve ourselves (including selling out our lovers, or honestly believing that two

plus two equal five). Our desire for self-preservation overrides our commitment to love and our attempt to live an authentic, meaningful life" (Sage 20-21).

4.2. The Authors: Motivation

Regarding the very genre of *V for Vendetta* and the idea presented by V as a product of critique of the totalitarian system and its branches, meaning the mechanisms of control, Moore's list when constructing this dystopian world reveals much about the manner in which this novel should be approached. It is not just a dark futuristic portrayal of a state eaten by its mechanisms, but also one influenced by:

Orwell. Huxley. Thomas Disch. Judge Dredd. Harlan Ellison's " 'Repent, Harlequin!' Said the Ticktockman." "Catman" and "Prowler in the City at the Edge of the World" by the same author. Vincent Price's Doctor Phibes and Theatre of Blood. David Bowie. The Shadow. Nightraven. Batman. Fahrenheit 451. The writings of the New Worlds school of science fiction. Max Ernst's painting "Europe After the Rains." Thomas Pynchon. The atmosphere of British Second World War films. The Prisoner. Robin Hood. Dick Turpin... (Moore 272)

From dystopian classics and comic book anti-heroes, horror tales and bleak post-war imagery, to science-fiction and cinematography depicting mayhem and annihilation, hoodlums, vagabonds, outlaws and social bandits, *V for Vendetta* seamlessly blends these motifs together along a fabric called mechanisms of control. Consequent to such approach, Orwell delineates a case of an individual whose eyes shed light on a bleak dystopian world as an allegory of an apparent, ruling totalitarian system built upon all the mechanisms explicated. However, Orwell's endeavour to critique totalitarianism transcends mere political boundaries. In creating *1984* as a sociological, political, moral, philosophical, and literary manifesto, Orwell explains that his

(...) starting point is always a feeling of partisanship, a sense of injustice. When I sit down to write a book, I do not say to myself, 'I am going to produce a work of art'. I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing. But I could not do the work of writing a book, or even a long magazine article, if it were not also an aesthetic experience. (Orwell, "Why I Write")

By aiming to draw attention to a particular falsehood and by exposing an unhealthy political system and its hierarchy, both authors construct their novels as warnings against someone or something toxic. What is more, both Moore and Orwell engage in illustrating the past to delineate everything which was nurtured prior to the rise of the totalitarian party, but they do not simply dwell on "something that was"; rather, they turn to the construct of future and "something that will be". One final reminder offered and clearly perpetuated by both authors throughout their novels transcends social stratification as it relates to all people – they utilize a simple mechanism of folk and traditional rhyming to blend the past with the future.

Therefore, Moore clearly alludes to the failed Gunpowder Plot of 1605 instigated by Robert Catesby and Guy Fawkes who sought to overthrow King James I of England and VI of Scotland because of his religious intolerance and continuous oppression of English Catholics. What is more, V gazes into the history of oppressive power and, having been clad in Guy Fawkes' revolutionary attire, he blows up the Parliament to illustrate that people do not necessarily have to adhere to Chancellor Susan's authoritarian reign like they were forced to do in the Jacobean era. V's motivation is clearly illustrated in the traditional rhyme sung to honour the legacy of Guy Fawkes, herein used as a wake-up call for the people who have the power to shape their own future:

Remember, remember! The fifth of November,
 The Gunpowder treason and plot;
 I know of no reason, why the Gunpowder treason
 Should ever be forgot! (Moore and Lloyd 14)

Similarly to Moore, Orwell introduces both Winston and the readers to a folk rhyme which contains names of several churches bombed and annihilated after Big Brother and the INGSOC party had seized power. Orwell explains that such actions were conducted to alienate the residents of Oceania from "the dim period called the Middle Ages" (Orwell 102), only to indoctrinate them into adhering to the future they will have under Big Brother's reign: "Statues, inscriptions, memorial stones, the names of streets - anything that might throw light upon the past had been systematically altered" (Orwell 102). The construct of the ubiquitous past is mentioned again and it undoubtedly serves a purpose. Unlike V, who personally utters the rhyme and clearly memorises every line, Winston cannot even remember the opening line, and every subsequent line is uttered by someone else in his life. By using this simple construct and by taking away Winston's voice, Orwell indicates that, under Big Brother's reign, an

individual's life is entirely constituted and moulded by others. In Winston's case, the two opening lines of the poem are uttered by an old barkeeper named Charrington who introduces Winston to "the past" unaltered by the INGSOC party. The second part of the poem is uttered by Julia, who ignites a spark of hope in Winston, furthering their deeply-rooted connection. O'Brien is the one to finalize the poem and, just as Winston begins to clearly understand his "present", O'Brien is revealed to be working for Big Brother and he crushes all hope in Winston. With his mind and body completely annihilated, Winston becomes an *unperson*, whereas his reactionary deeds are not even remembered, much like the traditional rhyme:

Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St Clement's,
 You owe me three farthings, say the bells of St Martin's,
 When will you pay me? say the bells of Old Bailey,
 When I grow rich, say the bells of Shoreditch. (Orwell 186)

Therefore, Orwell uses a rhyme from the past to foreshadow Winston's future, but also the future of every individual smothered by authoritarian power and system, clearly illustrated by the line they all seem to vividly remember: "Here comes a candle to light you to bed, / And here comes a chopper to chop off your head" (Orwell 102).

Finally, by tracing the authors' motivations to construct works transcending myopic boundaries, one traces the realization of the effect these novels induce. The authors' motivations largely dwell upon exposing a lie, indeed, yet they also aim to illustrate how power and ideology, if abused, can subdue masses and strip the humans of their humanity. In doing so and in perpetuating the authors' affinities to expose lies in both historical and historically fictional manner, the novels stand more political than ever as well-versed critiques of regimes past, but also as warnings for the political systems of the future which is yet to come. However, the novels also remain highly praised in literary circles, and this intermixture of socio-political and artistic aesthetic does not only bolster the novels' timeless nature, but also the styles in which they were concocted, resulting in contents which are ever relevant.

Conclusion

As seminal works in the dystopian genre, both *V for Vendetta* and *1984* remain constructed upon several links apparent in both novels, namely the despotic abuse of power

by an omnipotent leader whose dominance arises from terror induced in the masses by his interior ministries and agencies. These secret agencies, primarily built on and echoing the activities of its real-life, historical counterparts, exert the leader's or the party's power via several mechanisms of control liable to be analysed on the basis of exterior-interior dichotomy.

The exterior or physical mechanisms of control are undoubtedly apparent in both novels and largely deal with the usage of several precisely facilitated institutions used to reconfigure the person's identity should it not adhere to the party's will. In *V for Vendetta*, these acts are carried out in Larkhill resettlement camps, while in *1984* they remain within the walls of joycamps and the Ministry of Love. These institutions also further the leader's biological restrictions imposed upon people by alienating sex and sexual orientation and the very emotion of joy and love from its citizens' mind-sets.

However, the truly terrifying mechanisms of control are those of interior and psychological nature because they are not characteristic of a particular time or nation. The universality of how the language is shaped and abused, in both novels namely apparent within the concepts of "doublethink" and "newspeak", only furthers the omnipresence of mass media as modern weaponry used to promulgate fear and shape human thought-processing channels. Finally, the way in which all the physical mechanisms are amalgamated with language abuse and propaganda via mass media serves to pave the path for brainwashing and being reconfiguration: in *V for Vendetta*, the mechanisms prove to be inapt because the idealization of V lives on, but the true atrocity and its fully utilized terror are best exemplified on *1984*'s Winston Smith, indoctrinated and devoid of his body, mind, psyche, principles, and love.

To synthesize, what Moore and Orwell aimed to do was to explicitly portray how these mechanisms were used to intoxicate a healthy society via totalitarian constructs which they openly reprobated. This paper aspires to be a brief reminder of a time past which introduced a sense of injustice, alienation, dehumanization, and general eradication of human lives and as such, it calls upon these seminal novels whose authors managed to portray their critiques of systems which used, abused, accused, and bruised.

Works Cited

- Alić, Sead. "(Mas)medijski korijeni totalitarizma." *Zapisi o totalitarizmu*, edited by Marijan Krivak and Željko Senković, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences: Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, 2014, pp. 283 – 305.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace & Company: A Harvest Book, 1968.
- Baudrillard, Jean. "Simulacra and Simulation." *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, edited by Mark Poster, Stanford University Press, 1988, pp. 166 – 184.
- Booker, M. Keith. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Call, Lewis. "A is For Anarchy, V is for Vendetta." *Anarchist Studies*, Volume 16, Issue 2, 1 Jan 2008, pp. 154 - 172.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies*. Pluto Press, 1989.
- Di Liddo, Annalisa. *Alan Moore: Comics as Performance, Fiction as Scalpel*. University Press of Mississippi, 2009.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. Verso, 1991.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Random House, Inc., Vintage Books, 1995.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. Abacus, 1994.
- Keller, James R. *V for Vendetta as Cultural Pastiche: A Critical Study of the Graphic Novel and Film*. McFarland, 2008. *Google Books*. Web. Accessed 29 May 2018.
- Loy, Taylor Andrew. *Anarchy in Critical Dystopias: An Anatomy of Rebellion*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2008.
- Luoma-aho, Mika Tapio. "'Become Transfigured Forever': Political Transcendence in Alan Moore and David Lloyd's *V for Vendetta*." *Radical Orthodoxy: Theology, Philosophy, Politics*, Volume 2, Issue 2, June 2014, pp. 244 – 271.

- Moore, Alan and David Lloyd. *V for Vendetta*. DC Comics, 2005.
- Moore, Alan. "Behind the Painted Smile." *V for Vendetta*, DC Comics, 2005, pp. 267 – 278.
- O'Donnell, Beth. " *V for Vendetta* vs 1984." *www.academia.edu*,
https://www.academia.edu/9779490/V_for_Vendetta_vs_1984. Accessed 30 May 2018.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. Penguin Books, 2008.
- . "Politics and the English Language." *orwell.ru*,
http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/politics/english/e_polit. Accessed 29 May 2018.
- . "Why I Write." *orwell.ru*, http://orwell.ru/library/essays/wiw/english/e_wiw. Accessed 29 May 2018.
- Pinker, Steven. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. Penguin Group Inc.: Viking Penguin, 2011.
- Ranieri, Roberto. "Language and power: George Orwell's *1984* and Cormac McCarthy's *The Road* as sources for a critical study on ecclesial discursivity and hermeneutic." *Disputatio philosophica: International journal on philosophy and religion*, Volume 18, Issue 1, Jan 2017, pp. 95 – 102.
- Ridgewell, Colin Anthony. *The "Popular" Concept of Totalitarianism*. University of Southampton, 1968.
- Sage, James. "V for Vendetta and Political Philosophy: A Critique of Thomas Hobbes." University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.
- Tavlin, Noah. "What "Orwellian" really means." *Youtube*, uploaded by TED-Ed, 1 Nov 2015,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oe64p-QzhNE>. Accessed 29 May 2018.
- Thoreau, Henry David. "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience (1849, original title: Resistance to Civil Government)." *www.gutenberg.org*, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/71/71-h/71-h.htm>. Accessed 29 May 2018.
- White, Richard. "George Orwell: Socialism and Utopia." *Utopian Studies*, Volume 19, Issue 1, 2008, pp. 73 – 95.