

Role Relations in George Orwell's 1984: Agency-Goal Analysis

Prakash Paudel, M.Phil.

Assistant Lecturer, Nepal Open University

Email: prpaudel2004@gmail.com

Abstract

This research paper concentrates on George Orwell's novel 1984, published in 1949. The novel explicates the ugly lifestyle of citizens under the rule of a powerful totalitarian ruler Big Brother. Being a ruler, the Big Brother has ultimate political power, and that is, in the narrative, linguistically asserted. This research paper examines how such political and social power of a character/person is imposed in the linguistic territory of a narrative in the light of Critical Discourse Analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis evaluates how the social and political agency of any person in any given discourse works in the linguistic form, theorists like Anthony Giddens elaborate on the role of agency in shaping the social structure. For the purpose of examining the agency in the narrative, with a particular focus on agency-patient role relation, this research brings in the role relations as the trope and, thus, concludes that totalitarian rulers drain out the agency of the citizens even in linguistic form, along with socio-political agency.

Keywords: agency, power, role-relations, surveillance

Introduction

“Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing.” (1984, 247).

George Orwell's 1984 is a narrative of a middle-aged Winston Smith's wrestling against the totalitarian government of Oceania, ruled by a god-like ruler Big Brother. Despite written in 1949, the novel projects the future political world of 1984, the then 40 years later, London in particular and Oceania in general. Spatially, the novel is set in London where the different ministries are functional as they are named in Newspeak, a newly invented language in Oceania. “Doublethink” is the specialty of Newspeak because the Ministry of Truth distorts the facts and creates the new versions of truths as per the requirements of the political system. Ministry of Love, unlike its name, is famous for the physical punishment and torture. O'Brien, one of the members of the Inner Party, the suspicious trustee of Winston, works in the Ministry of Love as a party member. The ambiguous role O'Brien plays marks the true nature of the Party or the State in general. Winston attempts of avoiding the government's surveillance, yet he miserably fails.

Despite this, he falls in love with Julia and is finally reported to the government. Like Ampleforth, he is finally imprisoned.

Critics took the novel as the criticism of the possible communist era, the time of totalitarian regime. Isaac Asimov, a notable writer, describes the novel as the critic of any sort of government, which might turn into a despotic one not only a totalitarian communist government. For him, “1984, therefore, came to stand not for Stalinism, or even for dictatorship in general - but merely for government” (1). He believes that the description of the use of advanced technology as something great to achieve. He, thus, evaluates it as an achievement that “came to mean everything that was too big for the individual to control. It was not only big government and big business that was a symptom of 1984 but big science, big labour, big anything” (1). The scientific and technological advancement mentioned in 1984 was beyond the use during the time of the forties and fifties. So, it was a big achievement.

Practically government restrictions push the life of the common people into the state of powerlessness. The bright hope of life crushes under the weight of civil rights abolition. Denizens suffer and suffocate with the pessimism around. Faint expectation and attempt of crusading the revolution by a common person disappear in the dark alley. David Lowenthal rightly puts, “it is the work of a disappointed political revolutionary for whom moral rather than political solutions have become supremely important” (163). Social revolution is subjected to the social and economic structures. Mostly, the revolution is associated with the leftists, who believe that capitalism helps to create a totalitarian state, where the proletarians have to engage in protesting against the bourgeoisie, which in a way or next mistreats the proletariats. Relating the condition of Winston as the unsuccessful revolutionary, critic Robert Paul Resh evaluates the novel as the narrative of unattainable hope. He posits:

In short, the relevance of Nineteen Eighty-Four remains surprisingly undiminished by the victory of capitalism over peasant-based revolutions in the so-called developing nations. Orwell demonstrates that, as long as capitalism dominates the world system, totalitarianism remains a real possibility, and the notion of a progressive alliance of the middle and working classes a chimera. (140)

Restriction and curtailing the civil rights have been two major measures so as to control the citizens. The possible revolution failed because of the heavy restrictions. Ban is even put on sexual behavior. Silencing the male sexual desires equals the silencing of the political desire of protesting against the rulers. Critics Jennifer Storey, Catriona Mulholland, William Simpson and Matthew Hammer, in “Zamyatin and Orwell: A

Comparative Analysis of *We* and 1984”, take it as the restriction on the sexual drive itself. Defining sexual desire as the dangerous force, they observe it as “inherently dangerous to the Party and Big Brother. Julia was acutely aware of this; she subverted the sexual repression of the Party through deviant sexual activity, and was fully cognizant of the personal political ramifications of her actions. Sexual desire felt for another individual is shown to be, in and of itself, subversive (4)”.

Likewise, in a recent reading of the novel from skepticism’s perspective into totalitarian regime, Ingeborg Lofgren, in “Nineteen Eighty-Four, totalitarian lived skepticism, and unlearning how to love”, considering the magnitude of exploitation argues that “Nineteen Eighty-Four offers a vision in which lived meaning skepticism and lived other-minds skepticism go hand in hand: it is a world where you cannot love, and you can no longer understand what love is or means. It is a world in which you can only survive as “dead” (14). For her, in such a totalitarian regime, skepticism works the best. Both the citizens like Winston and Julia and the rulers like the Big Brother live in suspicion and the sense of love fades away as the living ones live like dead. As the critics argue, Julia, being not so obedient to the party rule of repressing sexual activities, lets her desire express through deviant ways. She even encourages Winston to be around her and make her feel his presence. Her deviant sexual approaches expose her spirit of resistance.

In a linear fashion, conjuring Foucault, a critic, Roger Paden, in “Surveillance and Torture: Foucault and Orwell on the Methods of Discipline”, presents punishment as the vehicle to assert power on the people. In the name of discipline, “torture” and “disappearance” are exercised. They are oriented to tame “local-upper class” to which Winston belongs. He summarizes with Orwell’s intention. He concludes:

In 1984 Orwell envisions a world in which torture and disappearances are used as the major methods of discipline. Orwell has all the major powers using these methods, and while he does restrict their use—for example, it is used neither on the proles, the lower classes, nor is it used in the "equatorial zones", the contested Third World—it seems to be the only method of discipline used to control the local upper classes. (261)

Even though the novel is accessed from different political-theoretical assessments along with some pure linguistic approaches, these investigations remain unabridged, and for that a combined socio-politico cum linguistic approach is essential. This article, following the ideas from critical stylistics, covers up that research abyss. The perfect amalgamation of politico cum discursive methodology promisingly penetrates into the essence of the narrative, with new insights.

In fact, the narrative of 1984 maintains the logical tapestry of agency and goal in the novel from the very beginning to the end. Agency is with the agent, which might be grammatically present as well as absent as downplay of the language skips it. Agency is projected in the both ways: socially and grammatically. Most of the times, agent comes clearly in the grammatical form, and is socially realized. But, sometimes the agent is socially felt but grammatically absent. In the novel, Winston is largely devoid of his agency in the social level.

Winston, in the beginning, is shown as the patient in the discourse of the ruler, Big Brother. As a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth, he has to maintain the truth of the government and create and recreate the truths. Being projected under the wide frame of the telescreen, the protagonist becomes a helpless creature. He carries out his everyday chores in a scheduled format under the strict surveillance of the government. The political panopticon, which he lives in, snatches away his social as well as political agentive qualities to a certain degree. As Foucault sums up that “visibility is a trap” (200), he is under the trap of his ruler, who follows everywhere through the use of devices like telescreen and hidden cameras. Such extreme condition of regular monitoring converts Winston into a being without any visible volition. He carries out his activities like a robot that is programmed to function in a certain fashion. The overall power of control is with the ruler, Big Brother. Personal choices and preferences are restricted, procedures to activities are prescribed and the family life is programmed by the law. Wonderfully enough, history is created and recreated as per the new condition of the state and the ruler, erasing the displeasing past and facts. Everywhere spying eyes of the ruler are present.

Agency is much related to the power of decision making that affects the other entities and brings changes in the level of action. *1984* is the narrative of the effect on Winston because of the activities of the despotic ruler, in the political level. The large political discourse of ruler and ruling is controlled and maintained by the ruler who, being at a distance, projects himself through the images, postures and visuals, and because of which, he becomes able to sustain his power to rule. Such a political distancing with the caliber to be vigilant and control positions him in the pedestal of agent, reducing Winston, Julia and others into the shoes of patients or the goals. To be precise, the ruler is the actor and Winston is acted upon. Politically, the agentive property is in the hands of the ruler despite the novel maintains the aesthetic distance since the narration comes from the third person point of view.

The social location is the actual political dimension to affect the role of the participants. In the novel there are primarily two participants: Winston and Big Brother. Big Brother makes a constant observation on the people like Winston. The monitoring becomes the disciplinary mechanism, and shrinks the existence of Winston, to the larger extent, into the visibility of the ruler. As Foucault believes that “visibility is a trap”, Big Brother is the trapper where Winston is trapped.

Because of the role of the observer and the observed, the ruler stands on the top tier, providing the vertical power relations. That non-horizontal power relation creates the gap between the agent and the goal. Winston is not politically free to do in his own will, rather engages as per the demand of the political system.

In Oceania, the whole political discourse and disciplinary boundaries are the products of Big brother who closely observes the people. Social and political agency, in that large political context, hence, belongs to the discourse restrainer, Big Brother. All the social and political movements are under his direct control. Even the ministries serve his purpose of ascertaining the discourse. Ironically enough, they are named and they function otherwise. The Ministry of Truth creates the truths the way the ruler wants them to be. Winston and his friends are with no choice than following the commands of the ruler. Everywhere prevailing eyes of the ruler ensure whether the people are following the commands of the ruler or not. In fact, Winston, a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth, has to carry out his everyday work being under the trap of the visibility. The penetrating visibility scrapes off his private life for it extends up to his very private room. Winston lives a life of negotiated existence; he is not free anywhere.

Essentially, the political agenda setter and the forerunner of the discourse is the political leader who remains at the distance despite the very proximity established by the telescreen as medium. As being the agenda setter, Big Brother has the complete control over the discourse that is spreading. Anthony Giddens, in *The Constitution of Society*, believes that “[a]ction is a continuous process, a flow in which the reflexive monitoring which the individual maintains is fundamental to the control of the body that actors ordinarily sustain throughout their day to day lives.” (9) The control over the body of own is the fundamental quality of the agent. Their controlling is because of the reflexive monitoring that means the perception and understanding. Agent’s property is to assign the controlled directives and commands over the bodily functions and the rational choices. In most of the cases, controls over the actions are direct but in some of the cases it becomes an indirect approach. In this light of agentive quality, Winston seems to be controlling his body: he gets up, does usual works and daily chores, dragging his torso through the streets of the town. But in the broader sense, he is controlled by Big Brother

who is present almost everywhere. Winston is made to believe that Big Brother is watching from every corner. Such a caution makes him aware of his activities, and performs accordingly. Being conscious of the surveillance, he sincerely concerns on his activities. Telescreens that frequently broadcast the directions and propaganda news are controlling the onlookers like Winston. The most powerful control is of the surveillance mechanisms rather their own will. Certainly, Winston is not acting according to his will. He is acting to the wants of the leader because of which the agentive property belongs to Big Brother.

In a contrast, from the reverse lens, despite the seemingly heavy control, as explained above, the narrative has conferred certain degree of agentive property on Winston which we cannot overlook at the cost of the enveloping power of control of the ruler. The text time and again, in a subtle way, affirms the social and political property on Winston.

Politically, from the aforementioned analysis, it seems that Big Brother holds the complete control but actually the ruler has a huge sense of fear in him that he has to employ and frequently make sure of people's thinking. Winston does not have any considerable amount of trust on the ruler. He regularly doubts even the existence of Big Brother, let alone the political change. Every moment that has been appropriate to him, he resists the regime thereby affirming his will and decisive power, agency.

Analysis of Agency- Goal/ Patient

The system of control in a social-political discourse establishes and, in long run, as a result, sustains the power on one entity or participant over the next. The fictional entirety of 1984 is the power projection of the state, by extension the ruler, upon its people as agent and patient in a discursive framework. The repressive imposition of the social and state institutions as "discipline mechanism" and "discipline blockade" affects the people as patient who are impacted. The state control is revealed mainly in six prongs – Thought Police, rules and restrictions, intervention into private life, linguistic intervention, history and panopticon.

Firstly, Thought Police is the secret security force that is assumed to spy and control people's thought. The state propaganda of Oceania empowers Thought Police as the most dynamic force that is capable of intervening into any private life and scan out any thoughts and ideas against the state. "It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time" (2). Suspicion is in the level that it has created "black terror" (9) in him even if he sees his own office staffs. The completely unpredictable amount of suspicion has encouraged him to doubt on every person as "agent" (14), working for the state.

Even though police are supposed to be able to detect the mental musings, the pervasive discourse of Thought Police scares the people around as in the condition Winston is caught up. “He didn’t do so, however, because he knew that it was useless. Whether he wrote DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER, or whether ... bound to get you” (24). For people like Winston, it is made believe that Thought Police knows what they think about Big Brother.

The narrative furthers that the unrivaled capability of deciphering the human mind by the Thought Police may know what Winston thinks. Winston, as a part of self-awareness, predicts the possible future if he writes what blurs up in his mind as “the diary would be reduced to ashes and himself to vapor. Only the Thought Police would read what he had written before they wiped it out of existence and out of memory” (35). As a result of long-time teaching, Winston believes in the prolific intelligence of the Thought Police that it can even read from the burnt down papers.

Politically, power of the ruler sustains as the repressive force – Thought Police’s treatment becomes scary and coercive. It is supposed that “none who had once fallen into the hands of Thought Police ever escaped into the end. They were corpses waiting to be sent back to the grave” (97). And because of its pervasiveness and malign methodologies, the state as sustained, “nothing is efficient in Oceania except the Thought Police,” the narrator sums up as: “Whenever he may be, sleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected” (265). The access of control or the power is such that there remains no more individual life; every time and everywhere one is watched. These all presences and powerful exercises of the Thought Police along with the surging discourses of their scary discipline blockade, have made the state, or the ruler, be acting upon the people. Big Brother creates that social and political agentive properties as he uses such repressive state apparatuses. The Thought Police is the most sophisticated repressive state institution that functions as per the wish and discourse of the ruler.

Even though such a scary state institution called Thought Police works so as to affirm and assure the political power of the ruler, Winston and Ampleforth are there to challenge it. Winston, even though fears, still does not give up writing in his diary and Ampleforth keeps writing poems. These two activities – keeping a diary and composing poems resist the political interference by the Thought Police. Their resistance affirms the individual agencies against the ruler’s force.

Secondly, the powerful social and political discourse sustains with the disciplinary rules that are implied on the grounds of military enforcement. These rules range from what to do, where to go to what to buy from where. The whole political and social course of code

of conduct is regulated and monitored by the political leader - Big Brother. The effective rules implementation rewards the ruler with power, there by having a control on the activities of the people, and thus, Winston, Parsons and others have to be affected as they live in the constrains.

Party members have to be much aware about what they should do – they are not supposed to buy from any shops they like. Limited options enervate the party members' decisive power on the actions that they perform. Rules are much strictly enforced so as to make people disciplined – or, in other words, control people and their movements. Restriction and banning over particular activity, reducing the value of free will, individual choices and preferences, swipes away the agentive property from the individuals. The imposition on selections and options upon the naïve person confers the decisive quality on Big Brother.

Very unlikely, just in opposition to the government expectation, the party members like Winston, Julia and others have ignored the restrictions. They have secretly traded razors and other items. As the rules are “not strictly kept”, the members have deliberately breached it that ensures their attempt of exercising free will.

Thirdly, these restrictions and limitations of choices are not only intended for public spaces like parks, shops, towns, streets, but they also encroach the very private life of individuals. The ruler's rules reflect who determines truly personal life such as marriage, sex, children, and so on. The compulsive restriction on sexual behavior and number of children very much shrinks the domain of private life. The instincts, from sexual to living, which are natural, have been falsified, and, are, thus, converted into adoptive and cultural. That forceful enactment of converting natural into disciplinary boundary of cultural exemplifies the control on human beings. It is as if the sexual urge is sucked up by the cultural practice. “The terrible thing that the party had done was to persuade you that mere impulses, mere feelings, were of no account” (150). Party comrades are supposed to wither any sort of feelings so as to convert into docile bodies.

Along with sexual impulse, romance, hatred and affection all are eroded off. Every emotion as a binding force of intimacy is readily exempt from daily practices. The narrator comments that:

In old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl's body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was blow struck against the party. It was a political act. (115)

Having certain emotion of love affection and romance has been described as the serious crime against the whole political system. “Desire was a thought crime” (62). It is an extreme form of control where individual wishes and desires are thoroughly scrutinized and denied.

In practice, regarding sexual behavior and instinct, the strictest prohibition was done with the formation of Anti-Sex league. The party’s “real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from sexual act” with the “permission” that “was refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another” (60). Restricting the physical intercourse completely, “all children were to be begotten by artificial insemination (artsem, it was called in Newspeak) and brought up in public institution” (60). Such a control on human instinct and human nature of creating progeny brings the individual choice of creating a family to an end. The power of controlling this large social institution affects Winston and other party members, whom they have to obey without any public protest; they’re in helpless situation.

Though the rule exists as a heavy restriction, Julia and Winston frequently meet and do love making. No matter if there is such bondage on sexual and romantic activities; they are in life of romance. Julia’s dress up and her love for cosmetics prove their rebellion against the regime. She believes that “[she] is going to be a woman, not a Party comrade” (130). Her celebration of her body and the desire to decorate it portray the importance of impulses, and there by their agency of creating it. The assertion of her depicts the latent will and desire. She reveals that “I am going to get hold of a real woman’s fork from somewhere and wear it instead of these bloody trousers. I’ll wear stockings and high-heeled shoes” (Ibid.). These remarks are the assertions of choices and the promotions of individuality, underscoring the government’s restrictions and impositions. So, they still hold the agency with aggression in a certain level.

Fourthly, the extreme form of control and monitoring is the deliberate invention, introduction and implementation of new language – Newspeak, or double think. Instead of promoting the usual spoken language, new sort of language is invented employing party members in enriching it with new vocabularies, having a separate department in a particular Ministry – Ministry of Truth. Syme is one of the members of that political and linguistic project of empowering language as a lexicographer.

Converting language as a means of limiting human experiences to express, the state imposes a huge sense of control on people. Ruler is aware that language shapes our understanding and lexicons or the words are the tools. When the tools are made less available, the people’s understanding becomes limited. As a linguistic project, things, ideas and events are totally renamed in double think – Newspeak. To sustain the

autocratic rule and cloud the people's quest of understanding more with subtle expressions, the Newspeak dictionary does not have any entry of the words like democracy, freedom and so on.

Syme, "a philologist, a specialist in Newspeak" (44) believes that "it is beautiful thing, the destruction of words" in order to "narrow the range of thought" that will "make thought – crime literally impossible because there will be no words in which to express it" (47). And because of "destroying; words – scores of them, hundreds of them, everyday" has cut "the language to the bone" (46). "The range off consciousness always a little smaller" because of heavy curtailing on the number of words – "the reduction in the number of verbs" (144), nouns and adjectives. The reduction in the number of words of these three major categories certainly weakens the language user's understanding and the perception.

American linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf, having the idea from his teacher Edward Shapir, hypothesizes that "the structure of any one's native language strongly influences or fully determines the world view he will acquire as he learns the language" (cited in Kay and Kempton, 66). That is to say, the nature of particular language affects the human thought of its users. In 1984, by inventing and using new language, having the least number of words, avoiding all words that are related to freedom, justice, rebellion, the ruler attempts to limit the thought, consciousness and understanding of the people. That, in turn, secures the power position of the ruler, reducing the language users as the passive users of what is made available to use for expression.

Moreover, the cog of control is also on history – manipulation, deletion and addition is done in the existing history, so as to create new history. Ministry of Truth is employed solely for the same reason, where Syme and his cohorts engage into. In this same ministry Winston does rewriting of the history, in the records department. The department abolishes, annihilates and, in their own words, "vaporizes" the people and their history.

Under the demand and directives of Big Brother, the historical events are rewritten for own comfortable locations, and manipulated in such a way that facts are altered. Winston evaluates that "everything had been different then. Even the names of countries, and their shapes on the map had been different" (29). Politically everything is renamed and changed under the desire and dream of the ruler. People have to accept the altered history – at least altered in documents. The matter is not about just replacing one by the next content. Winston even believes:

And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed – if all the records told the same tale – then the lie passed in to history and became truth. “Who controls the past” ran the party slogan “controls the future: who controls the present controls the past”. (31)

The changes – addition and deletion – that are made in the history are all oriented and intended to prize the ruler with the firm grip on disseminated reality. Newly established history restores the power of ruler to control the history as per the wish. “Reality control”, they call it in Newspeak, “double think” (31). Winston avers “the past, he reflected, had not merely been altered, it had been actually destroyed” (32), and “everything melted into mist” (33). The narrative version of the ruler has made everything changed.

When the history is completely destroyed, everything goes into “mist” and the past episodes only remain in the form of memory. Repressive strategies and methods even shake off that fragile memory. Thus, the erasing blurs the history as Winston remarks “[f]or how could you establish even the most obvious fact when there existed no record outside your own memory?”(32). The “memory holes” are used to scrape down the uneasy past, and the Ministry of Truth documents the required past events. So, the narrator believes that “[a]ll history was a scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary” (36). In fact, Big Brother extends his agency by creating the history.

Regarding language use and manipulation of history, the noticeable amount of reservation and resistance is found in Winston and Julia’s activities. No matter Winston practices the Newspeak in public and writing articles, he never has any kind of attachment to it. He, as a part of self-assertion against the detrimental government control, chooses old language to write in his diaries and in day-to-day communication with others. With Julia, he uses Oldspeak and even with Syme he prefers to talk in old language. That is to say, he still resists the government orders and enforcements.

As far as history is concerned, Winston doubts many a times about the new invention. Since he knows the whole political functioning, he profoundly doubts on the new version of history. So, on his part, he tries to fill up that missed historical events with his memory. His memorization of his mother, sister and previous wife are evidences of it. Despite the warnings, he remembers the past events, and it serves as the resistance in an individual level that simultaneously dismisses the government’s project and invigorates the individual agency.

Finally, the surveillance has been the “discipline mechanism” to sustain the power of the ruler thereby constantly monitoring the life - events and activities – of every person.

Telescreens are fit in almost everywhere that have two functions – receiving the information about the vicinity that it occupies and sending the information – Big Brother's message and state news. To an extreme, telescreens even dictate when to sleep, when to work and what to be done to the common people. This kind of encroachment, with compulsive directions, into the very private life subdues the role of people, and strengthens the role and power of the ruler. Ruler is, hence, able to dictate the very private activities, control them and do changes as per the wish – people have been passive followers, being impacted by the incidents in a social-political discourse – it makes the ruler an agent and the people like Winston a patient.

Michael Yeo, in "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Two Sides of the Same Coin", referring to Bentham, divides the surveillance into two kinds: Panoptical surveillance and surreptitious surveillance. Panoptical surveillance is to keep some one under the "visual trap" (Foucault, 200) because of which "the occupant avoids the behavior the detection of which would have penalty" (Yeo, 53). Citing Bentham, Yeo contends that panoptical surveillance is different from "the inspection principle" (Ibid. 54). It is direct observation and makes the participant realize that one is under the observation. Winston's dwelling the Victory Mansion, his office, and streets and almost everywhere there are either the posters of Big Brother's eyes with scary slogan or the telescreen to observe the people's activities are put.

Likewise, Yeo, conjuring Bentham, argues that the next form of surveillance is surreptitious surveillance – the self censorship. Yeo avers "surreptitious surveillance works not to prevent speech or action, as panopticism does, but to detect what people really think or believe by surveillancing their speech and action when they are disinhibited in the (illusory) belief that they are in a private setting (54)". Thus, this surreptitious surveillance is all about making oneself aware of being snooped despite one is not really under the surveillance.

Winston after getting into his own mansion, the Victory Mansion, the housing for the party members, grabs his recently bought diary, and is about to pour into his feelings and thoughts. Immediately, he withdraws his attempts of writing his feelings because he feels that he is under the snooping of the hypothetical Thought Police. In Big Brother's regime, even, thinking against him – that is to think freely about ruling and regime – is taken seriously.

Controlling has to do with capability. Agents must be capable of controlling their actions and other people's activities. That capability, commonly referred as the power, essentially functions as the agentive quality because without the power to control or that capability one cannot carry out the actions. Individual intervention if affects differently,

it justifies the use of power. Agency lies in the actions that either create the social or political discourse or affect it any ways. If the actions don't affect in either way, that action becomes valueless. Practically, such power is visible. Anthony Giddens, referring to the agent as the perpetrator, concludes:

Agency refers to not to the intentions people have in doing things but to their capability of doing those things in the first place (which is why agency implies: cf the Oxford Dictionary definition of an agent as one who exerts power or produces an effect). Agency concerns events of which an individual is the perpetrator in the sense that the individual could at any phase in a given sequence of conduct have acted differently. (9)

With reference to this definition, we can argue that the role that Big Brother is playing is that of the agent since his actions and decision are at the foundation of all the social changes and reforms. He determines the policies and the roles that one has to perform. He is that person who has the power to decide and bring changes in the lives of the people. It implies his power. His power affects the people like Winston, thus, confirming Winston as the patient or the goal of the whole political discourse.

Conclusion

Hence, socio-politically, Winston remains at the edge of patient, being an obedient person, following every order broadcast from telescreen, as bound to the discourses disseminated by the ruler, the agent. Yet, Winston and Julia do not give up going against the party codes. Their unusual sexual engagements and Winston's attempts to act despite the restrictions set by the authority are the attempts to go against the ruler; acts of asserting agency on their part. Even though they make attempts, they could not gain their agency, rather they are pushed back to the role of patient – the receiver of all the commands and orders of the Big Brother. Their role of passive receiver as the helpless citizen is also reflected through the language used in the narrative.

Works Cited

- Assimov, Isaac. "Review of 1984". *The New Worker*. 14 Aug 2016.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Penguin, 1991.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society*. Polity Press, 1984.
- Kay, Paul and Kempton, Willet. "What is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?." *American Anthropologist*, 86, 65-79. 1984.
- Löfgren, Ingeborg. "Nineteen Eighty-Four, Totalitarian Lived Skepticism, and Unlearning How to Love." *Policy Futures in Education*, July 2021, doi:[10.1177/14782103211031424](https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211031424).

- Lowenthal, David. "Orwell's Political Pessimism in '1984'." *Polity*, 2.2 (1969): 160-75. 04 Jan. 2010.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. Adarsh Books, 2005.
- Paden, Roger. "Surveillance and Torture: Foucault and Orwell on the Methods of Discipline." *Social Theory and Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1984, pp. 261–271. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23556565.
- Resch, Robert Paul. "Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four." *Boundary 2*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1997, pp. 137–176. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/303755.
- Storey, Jeniffer, Catriona Mulholland, William Simpson and, Matthew Hammer. "Zamyatin and Orwell: A Comparative Analysis of *We* and 1984", March 2012, <https://ivcenglishks5.files.wordpress.com/2017/04/comparison-to-zamyatin.pdf>
- Yeo, Michael. "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Two Sides of the Same Coin." *Global Media Journal* 3.2 (2010): 49-66.