Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

A Nightmarish Tomorrow: Orwellian Methods of Social Control in Contemporary Dystopian Literature

Pablo Peláez Galán

Tutora: Tamara Pérez Fernández

2014/2015

ABSTRACT

Dystopian literature is considered a branch of science fiction which writers use to portray a futuristic dark vision of the world, generally dominated by technology and a totalitarian ruling government that makes use of whatever means it finds necessary to exert a complete control over its citizens. George Orwell's 1984 (1949) is considered a landmark of the dystopian genre by portraying a futuristic London ruled by a totalitarian, fascist party whose main aim is the complete control over its citizens. This paper will analyze two examples of contemporary dystopian literature, Philip K. Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers" (1967) and Alan Moore's V for Vendetta (1982-1985), to see the influence that Orwell's dystopia played in their construction. It will focus on how these two works took Orwell's depiction of a totalitarian state and the different methods of control it employs to keep citizens under complete control and submission, and how they apply them into their stories.

KEYWORDS: Orwell, *V for Vendetta*, Faith of Our Fathers, social control, manipulation, submission.

La literatura distópica es considerada una rama de la ciencia ficción, usada por los escritores para retratar una visión oscura y futurista del mundo, normalmente dominado por la tecnología y por un gobierno totalitario que hace uso de todos los medios que sean necesarios para ejercer un control total sobre sus ciudadanos. La novela de George Orwell 1984 (1949) es considerada un hito del género distópico: en ella, Orwell retrata un Londres futurista gobernado por un partido fascista y totalitario, cuyo objetivo principal es el control total sobre sus ciudadanos. En este trabajo se analizarán dos ejemplos de la literatura distópica contemporánea, "La Fe de Nuestros Padres" (1967) de Philip K. Dick y *V de Vendetta* (1982-1985) de Alan Moore, con el objetivo de estudiar la influencia que la distopía de Orwell jugó en su construcción. El trabajo se centrará en cómo estas dos obras tomaron la representación de Orwell de un estado totalitario y los diferentes métodos de control que éste emplea para mantener a los ciudadanos bajo un estado de absoluta sumisión y control, y cómo los aplicaron en sus obras.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Orwell, *V de Vendetta*, La Fe de Nuestros Padres, control social, manipulación, sometimiento.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Dystopian literature is characterized by a blending of fantasy and reality that creates a futuristic world based on features of the author's present world. The main aim of dystopian writers is to create a piece of literature that allows them to criticize certain political, social and economic aspects of their present, as a warning for its readers about the dangers of following these ideologies. It is due to this amalgam of reality and fiction that dystopian literature is regarded as a subgenre of science fiction, a broad genre characterized by a futuristic setting, typically in newly discovered planets and where the latest technological developments play an important role. Although Yevgeny Zamyatin and Aldous Huxley had already inaugurated the dystopian genre with their novels *We* (1924) and *Brave New World* (1932) respectively, it was George Orwell who gave the genre its definitive push with his novel *1984* (1949). Orwell depicted a futuristic world divided into three super-states, governed by totalitarian parties whose main aim is to exercise absolute control over their citizens whatever means they find mandatory, which has influenced the writing of subsequent dystopias.

Acknowledging the power of Orwell's novel influencing future dystopias, this paper will analyze the features of the Orwellian model of a totalitarian government, as well as identifying and describing the different methods it uses to keep citizens under strict control and manipulation. This analysis is intended to provide the basis for a further analysis of two contemporary dystopias, Philip K. Dick's short story "Faith of Our Fathers" (1967) and Alan Moore's graphic novel *V for Vendetta* (1982-1985). The aim of this paper is to compare the similarities and differences between these two dystopias, focusing on the ruling governments they portray and the methods for social control they make use of, as well as drawing their similarities and/or differences compared those depicted in the Orwellian model.

For that purpose, the methodology I follow in this paper consists of a study of the Orwellian ideas of totalitarianism and social repression as the basis for an analysis of

Dick's and Moore's works, exploring their plots, characters and methods for social repression these works represent in order to see how they have adapted Orwell's ideas.
I have selected two dystopias, Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers" and Moore's *V for Vendetta*, a short story and a graphic novel respectively, because these are literary forms that are neither as widely read as novels nor there are many critical analysis on these literary forms. Moreover, Dick is one of the most important science fiction readers of the twentieth century and his short story was published in the anthology *Dangerous Visions*, one of the most important anthologies of science fiction as it set the course of the twentieth-century science fiction offers readers a different perspective over dystopias, set in Vietnam and depicting a world ruled by a Communist Party. On the other hand, Moore's graphic novel shares the setting with Orwell`s *1984*, although the main reason why I selected this work is because it has become the symbol of social protest.

Thus, this paper expects to find a clear relation between the two dystopias that will be analyzed and Orwell's *1984*, as well as some similitudes between Dick's short story and Moore's graphic novel in their depiction of a futuristic world, ruled by a totalitarian government that uses not only technology but whatever means and methods it finds necessary to control its citizens

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: SCIENCE FICTION, UTOPIAS AND DYSTOPIAS

This paper will start its analysis of dystopian literature by discussing its origin. To begin with, this paper will try to provide a definition for the genre of science fiction, as well as giving an overview of its history. In this manner, this section will lay the groundwork for a discussion about utopias and dystopias, what they are and when they emerged, to conclude this first part with a survey of the history of dystopias, focusing of the two major periods and the discussion around different notions of dystopias.

It is difficult to provide a definition for science fiction because, as Peter Fitting claims, "there is still no single accepted definition for the genre" (135). For Chris McKitterick, "Science fiction is the literature of the human species encountering change, whether it arrives via scientific discoveries, technological innovations, natural events, or societal shifts" (n. pag.) whereas Darko Suvin defines it as "a literary genre whose necessary and sufficient conditions are the presence and interaction of estrangement and cognition, and whose main formal device is an imaginative framework alternative to authors empirical environment" (qtd. in Fitting 136). These two definitions of the genre are based upon the elements around which science fiction works are built: science and fiction blended in a depiction of futuristic worlds which are characterized by scientific and technological developments, which help humanity to reach and construct these worlds, and ultimately dominate them. These futuristic worlds in which science fiction stories are placed are commonly set in the outer space, or even in different universes.

The plot of these stories is built around a human element who suffers the effects of those scientific and technological developments, in an attempt to illustrate the effects that these developments may cause to humankind in the near future. This is one of the main reasons why this genre is also known as "the literature of ideas and philosophy" and also "the literature of the Other" (McKitterick n. pag.).

2.1 HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF SCIENCE FICTION: AN OVERVIEW

The history of the science fiction genre is short as compared to other genres such as romance literature. However as complex as the definition of the genre is, the attempt to place the origin of science fiction. Fitting dated science fiction with "at best 200 years old," and establishes that "modern science fiction [is] a response to the effects of scientific transformation of the world beginning around the end of the eighteenth century, [although] many critics set the birth of modern science fiction in the nineteenth century" (137).
Andrew Milner acknowledges that science fiction "established initially in nineteenth century Europe through a radical redistribution of interests towards science and technology within the novel and short story genres of the narrative mode (830). However, Milner also states that although "many of its key figures … were by origin European, it occurred mainly in North America" (829).

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus* (1818), considered by many as the first scientific romance in England, contains several themes that would become common in the science fiction genre. But Shelley was not the only important figure to incorporate features from this genre: in the first half of the nineteenth century, authors such as Washington Irving ("The Men of the Moon", 1809), Nathaniel Hawthorne ("The Birthmark", 1843) or Edgar Allan Poe ("The Facts in the Case of Mr. Valdemar," 1845) explore the advantages, disadvantages and/or possible dangers of scientific and technological developments. These elements would feature heavily in the science fiction tradition (Stableford 18-20).

John Rieder establishes two main dates in the development of science fiction pointing to the works by H. G. Wells and Hugo Gernsback. Rieder claims that both 1895 and 1926 "mark monumental events in the history of [science fiction]" (23), as they were the years of publication of Wells' *The Time Machine* and the first number of Hugo Gernsback's magazine *Amazing Stories, The Magazine of Scientification*, the first that was entirely devoted to the publication of science fiction. The popularity and rise of science-fiction were

also possible due to the increasing interest of young readers, who were attracted by the technological and scientific innovations portrayed in works of that kind.

2.2 SCIENCE FICTION AND UTOPIAS

Utopias predate the science fiction genre by several centuries: indeed, the term utopia was first used by Thomas More in his work *Utopia* (1516). At the beginning of utopian writing, the perfect worlds usually portrayed in these kind of works, with their perfect societies, laws and cities, were set in places that humankind had not yet discovered or in invented worlds rather than in the future. In the eighteenth century, humankind was overproud of itself and thought that there were no limits for humans; as a result, many utopian works at that time "offered a mirror where man would not be able to see his reflection but only that of a much distorted image of humanity" (Vieira 15). These stories of perfect societies were set in futuristic worlds, rather than in areas already existing or invented.

However, science fiction works such as Well's *The Time Machine* introduced something else: *The Time Machine* presents a future in which humanity has taken the wrong path and almost faces its own extinction, with two kinds of human races fighting each other for the supremacy of the world. Although in this case it is humankind itself that has reached this critical situation, and technology is not regarded as one of the reasons for humankind's fall, this work helped the consideration of anti-utopias, also referred to as dystopias.

2.3 DYSTOPIAN LITERATURE

When facing the task of studying the history of dystopian literature, it has been often regarded in what is called the dystopian turns, making reference to the different changes that this genre has suffered through decades. This turns has occurred chiefly linked to the appearance of key works of the genre, beginning with H. G. Wells' ones, as it has been already discussed in this paper, and followed by Aldous Huxley and George Orwell's dystopian novels, commonly considered the defining works of the genre.

More's invention of the term utopia resulted in the derivation of this term in several others, such as dystopia, anti-utopia or eutopia. Murphy's Law establishes that if anything can go wrong, it will go wrong; it is the principle of this law that could be considered the basic idea of dystopias. Dystopia comes from the "Greek 'dis topos,' or bad place," (Milner 827), as opposed to the notions of utopia ('no place') and eutopia ('good place') created by Thomas More, The first time the term dystopia was used dated from 1868, when John Stuart Mill used this term "to describe a political proposal rather than a literary genre" (Milner 827).

Benjamin Kunkel acknowledges that dystopian literature is commonly considered a branch of science fiction, but he claimed that

> Dystopian, generally speaking, is a subgenre of the gothic horror novel, in which the hero or heroine discovers a barbaric truth (the nature of society) lurking beneath a civilized façade, and incurs the traditional gothic-novel penalties of madness, isolation, ruin…. Their atmosphere of cleanliness and rationality only serves, as in a hospital, to underline the ambient dread. (96)

The term dystopia has been often associated with other notions such as anti-utopia, to mark its contrast to both utopia and eutopia, and it refers to "[A] fictional portrayal of a society in which evil, or negative social and political developments, have the upper hand" (Claeys 107). Gregory Claeys claimed that with the emergence of totalitarian governments, it was suggested that within the idea of utopia, there is the seed idea of dystopia:

> [T]he utopian impulse was itself inherently dystopia. That is to say, the desire to create a much improved society in which human behavior was dramatically superior to the norm implies an intrinsic drift towards punitive methods of controlling behavior which inexorably results in some form of police state. (108)

Therefore, the idea that dystopia is inside utopia is grounded in the fact that the basic dream of a perfect society that is portrayed in utopias will inevitably result in some kind of over-controlling government which, believing it is protecting and fostering the utopian dream, it is indeed turning it into a dystopian nightmare.

But what was the evolution of dystopian literature? Its first emergence as a genre could be located back to the eighteenth century, to the satirical novel *Gulliver's Travel* (1726) written by Jonathan Swift. Although Swift's novel should be regarded as a satirical piece rather than a dystopian work, the fact that it is a critique towards the utopian literature of perfect societies makes it the perfect ancestor for dystopian literature.

Authors like Baccolini or Claeys have proposed the concept of dystopian turns to refer to the ups and downs of the genre since its inception. Claeys linked the first turn with the French Revolution (1789-1799). The French Revolution started with the intention of ending the absolute monarchy that had been ruling France for years, in pursue of what French people believe would bring them a better society. This utopian dream led to the proliferation of utopias and of works that portrayed where this utopian ideal might lead humans if they take it in the wrong way.

At the end of this period, one of the greatest gothic works of all times appeared: Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus* (1818) is regarded as "the founding text of the genre of science fiction, but also partly a satire on the failed aspirations of the Revolution, heralding one of the key themes of late dystopian writing" (Claeys 110). The second dystopian turn took place in the last decades of the nineteenth century: many works of this period address the struggle of individuals and society to keep going and portray socialism as the best option and form of government (Claeys 111).

With the twentieth century, dystopias became the most popular science fiction works. The Russian Revolution and the aftermath of the Second World War caused a turn towards a much more pessimistic view towards a technologically-based future. Three names must be highlighted in this sense, as they are commonly cited as the forefathers of dystopias and were influenced by the Russian alternative towards the growing capitalism: firstly, Yevgeny Zamyatin and his novel *We* (1921), who influenced the second writer, George Orwell and his masterpiece *1984* (1949), and at last but not least, Aldous Huxley and his magnificent novel *Brave New World* (1932). At this moment, dystopian literature became

the preferred genre of the 1960s, and it could be considered that dystopia and science fiction merged together, as the latter adopted dystopia's pessimistic tendency.

American science fiction of the second half of the twentieth century could be considered as an exception: by the end of the Second World War, America rose as the only country in the Western World that was not devastated and, as a result, America was regarded as a real utopia The American Dream became more credible as the country was probably the richest one at that time. However, the American society was then divided into those enjoying the American Dream and those who had been left behind (mainly women, poor people and African-Americans): this resulted in the appearance of several social movements and struggles claiming for their rights and to a change in American society that would offer opportunities for everyone. As a result, science fiction retook the path of dystopias until the 1970s, when utopias gained popularity once again with the works of important novelists such as Ursula K. Le Guin, who took "the first step in the reawakening of utopian fiction" (Fitting 144). Nowadays, science fiction works have left behind this utopian stage and they "rarely imply or assert a critique of the present" (Fitting 150).

All the changes that dystopian literature has experienced though decades have made of what it is today: a genre whose main aim is to depict a future image of the present world and present it as something attainable, in order to "frighten the reader and to make him realize that things may go either right or wrong, depending on the moral, social and civic responsibility of the citizens" (Vieira 17). One of the main characteristics of nowadays critical dystopias is that they resist closures: dystopian writers prefer open endings in order to "make it very clear to their readers that there is still a chance for humanity to scape, normally offering a glimmer of hope at the very end of the narrative" (Vieira 17).

The major themes that have been used in dystopian literature throughout its history have been "totalitarians and the idea of scientific and technological progress which … has sometimes been instrumental in the establishment of dictatorships" (Vieira 18). Most dystopian works show a nightmarish futuristic world that is the result of misuse of scientific and technological developments, commonly as a critique of and a warning against current

ideologies. George Orwell's *1984* (1949) could be considered one of the best examples of this kind of dystopias, in which a totalitarian regime has reached the power and makes use of scientific and technological developments to keep citizens under their control and in complete submission and obedience to it. The following pages are devoted to a brief analysis of Orwell's *1984* and the totalitarianism it portrays in order to compare it and show its influence in other dystopian works, such as Phillip K. Dick's *Faith of our Fathers* (1967), and Alan Moore's *V for Vendetta* (1988-1989).

3. ANALYSIS: ORWELL, DICK AND MOORE

3.1 ORWELL'S *1984*[1]

Before we delve deeper into the analysis of the two different dystopias which are the focus of this paper, it is advisable to provide a brief analysis of Orwell's dystopian novel *1984* in order to understand its influence over contemporary dystopian works, as well as to be able to identify similarities and differences between *1984* and the two dystopias that this paper suggest as representative of contemporary dystopian literature.

George Orwell was born in Bengal in 1903 to a family that had contributed to colonial service. During the Spanish Civil War, he decided to join the left-wing side and fight against Franco's fascist party. He decided to reflect his experiences in that war into a novel, and that is how *Homage to Catalonia* (1938) was born, in which Orwell adopts a firm posture against fascism as well as claiming that it made him "really believe in Socialism" (Claeys 121). The fact that his time in Spain made him sympathize with Socialism is very important and helps understanding his criticism of totalitarian regimes in novels such as *1984* and *Animal Farm* (1945). The Second World War started and Orwell maintained his position against fascism, warning about the dangers of communism too and hoping that the working-class would be the only one that would help fostering socialism (Claeys 122).

1984 is Orwell's most widely recognized novel, as well as his greatest work, in which he presents a dystopian future world, ruled by three totalitarian super-states. Orwell himself almost described his novel as a satirical dystopia, claiming that he wrote it in order to make people aware of the dangers that some fascist and communist politics, some of which had already happened. He claimed that "totalitarian ideas" have already been assumed by certain individuals and that what he tried was to show their "logical consequences;" he "do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily will arrive, but I believe (allowing

[1] This section will analyze George Orwell's *1984*, published by Penguin Books in 2000. From here on, any in-text quotation of this book will only include the page to which it refers.

of course for the fact that the book is a satire) that something resembling it could arrive" (Claeys 123).

Moreover, Orwell himself recognized that many of his works were intended to criticize totalitarian governments: "every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, *against*[2] totalitarianism and *for*[3] democratic Socialism" (qtd. in Milner 832). Orwell fosters Socialism and criticizes totalitarianism because it is the latter's intention is to limit people's freedom by controlling them completely, with a special focus on preventing any kind of individual thought and rights.

In this sense, it is interesting the depiction George Claeys made of totalitarian states, establishing its main features and goals. The first thing Claeys identified about totalitarianisms was that they take the form of a one-party state that comprises the hegemony and monopoly over the different branches in which the state is divided. Fascist totalitarianisms find in this one-party state the source of their spiritual unity, providing them with everything they need. This kind of regimes are also characterized by centralizing their power on the basis of technological developments they combine with the media and surveillance techniques in order to abolish individual freedom and to control their citizens. Totalitarian states are fond of using terror as a mean to intimidate the population and ensure their complete loyalty and submission to their ideology. All these help totalitarianisms to annihilate all boundaries between the individual and the state, "destroying most intermediary organizations and politicizing any which remain." (Claeys 119) The ideology behind totalitarian states is a demand towards their people of absolute loyalty and sacrifice towards the party, as well as the absolute submission of the citizen to it. Therefore, private life is completely suppressed, leading to a highly militarized society. The last, and probably one of the key features of this kind of regimes is their cult of leadership, the figure of a leader among the one-party state that embodies the spirit, will and virtues of the people.

[2] Emphasis in the original

[3] Emphasis in the original.

The leader becomes the symbol of the party and is identified with the nation, something totalitarianisms use to influence and manipulate their citizens' mindset, so that they accommodate to the party's ideology (Claeys 119-120).

Orwell acknowledges the existence of this kind of ideologies at the time, even claiming that totalitarianism not only prevents people from thinking for themselves, but also tells them what to think: "Totalitarianism has abolished freedom of thought … The totalitarian state tries, at any rate, to control the thoughts and emotions of its subjects at least as completely as it controls their actions" (qtd. in Tucker 110).

These features can be easily tracked in Orwell's *1984*, Orwell's dystopian novel in which the ruling party uses terror, bureaucracy and constant surveillance to exercise its complete control over the population. The novel provide readers with a futuristic dystopian vision of the world, divided into three totalitarian super-states, Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia, setting the story in Airstrip One (London), part of Oceania. This super-state is ruled by the Inner Party, headed by its leader, the Big Brother; this minority ruling class imposes a bureaucratic control over its citizens, and it is so obsessed with the idea of individual thinking; that it makes use of whatever means and methods it finds necessary to avoid it and control its citizens.

Bureaucracy is one of the main features in the world of Orwell's *1984*, which is divided into what can be seen as three different classes: the Inner Party is the top class, the one holding the power and enjoying a better life than the rest of the population (they can turn off the two-way telescreens that monitor them for 30 minutes, they live in better houses, have servants, etc.), although it is formed by merely 2% of the population; it is helped by the Outer Party, the other branch of the ruling Party and formed by Oceania's middle class, the bureaucrats and civil servants that follow strictly the orders of the Inner Party; the last class are the Proles, the proletarians who make up 85% of the population and who live in their own neighborhood, with no surveillance, but have no education and live in poverty.

The story follows the steps of Winston Smith and his rebellion against the Party. Smith is an ordinary man who belongs to the middle-class Outer Party and works for the Ministry of Truth, "concerned itself with news, entertainment, education and fine arts" (6). Smith works at the Records Department, where he has to alter history to fit the Party's ideology. One day at the Ministry, a young woman called Julia approaches him and gives him a note in which she declares she loved him. They both work at the Ministry of Truth and reject the Party, so they engage in a secret relationship, meeting in a rented room located within the proletarian neighborhood that seems not to be monitored. At one point, another party member named O'Brien comes into the picture: he is an undercover Thought Police agent who tricks Smith and makes him believe he is a member of the Brotherhood, giving Smith the "Book," supposedly written by Goldstein and showing the lies behind the Party's propaganda and policy. However, both Smith and his lover are finally captured by the Thought Police and imprisoned within the Ministry of Love. After being tortured using electroshocks, Smith finally surrenders to the Big Brother and the Party, something he claims himself once he is reintegrated in society and the TV News announces a victory that makes Oceania control Africa: "But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother" (311).

The presence of this bureaucracy ruling the state is stifling, as the Party's "bureaucratic apparatus totally controls every area of life from labor, to culture, to thought, to language, to sexuality and everyday life" (Kellner n. pag.). It controls and organizes the life of Oceania's citizens through the four different ministries in which the government is divided, each of them named paradoxically with what they disallow and used to control every aspect of the society. The "Ministry of Truth" is in charge of a constant re-writing of history, telling the civil servants of the Outer Party to alter history according to the Party's aim, so that everything the Big Brother says is true, and there is not any other possible view or true for citizens, giving them no chance to remember anything but what the Party and the Big Brother see fit. The "Ministry of Peace" is devoted to support the perpetual war between the three super-states, making people live under a constant threat that induces them fear, avoiding any chance to develop individual opinion or thoughts. The "Ministry of Plenty" is

the one whose function is to control food and good's rations, so that citizens receive only the amount of money and food the government considers appropriate, which allows the Party to control the citizens' needs. Finally, the "Ministry of Love," used to monitor citizens and identify those who are against the party to capture them, imprisons them and converts them to the Party's ideology through torture and a brainwashing process.

This total control is constantly reminded to citizens in Oceania through the Party's propaganda. This is illustrated not only in the posters located all over the city - which show the slogan "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU," - but also in the use of the media, broadcasting the Big Brother's speeches all day long and forcing people to watch them through telescreens placed all over the city and also in each Party member's apartment. In this way, the Party and the Big Brother make sure that every citizen pays attention to what they say, making people believe in the reality they say and disallowing any other possible reality.

In this world of *1984*, there is another important tool to control its population: a "perpetual war" between the super-states allows them to make sure that citizens are in a constant state of fear, and therefore they do not have time to think beyond that. The constant fear of being attacked blocks the citizens' minds, and it not only makes them feel that fear and explore not their emotions, their own thought and opinions, but it also allows the Party to prevent any rebellion against the state. The Party's slogan "War is Peace" exemplifies the Party's ideology that through war. They can "maintain the ruling structures of the three regimes" (Claeys 123).

Surveillance is another key feature o1f *1984* government: the oppressive Party establishes a continuous surveillance over its citizens through the latest technological developments, using *telescreens* and hidden microphones placed both around the city and inside every house, so that the government's *Thought Police* can monitor what citizens are doing at any time. This allows the government to abolish any kind of privacy, and so any attempt of individual thought or dislike towards the Party can be detected and punished.

History and language are also targets of the government's desire of total control: the "Newspeak," the language the Party creates to substitute English, is another way the government has to limit people's mindset, to control what they think and hat they say, and to prevent them from committing crimes by erasing the words that refer to them. One of the main features of the Newspeak is the reduction of words, always according to the Party's orders, which allows the Party to control the main mean of communication, limiting the vocabulary and the language they use so that citizens could only speak about what the party wants. This is clearly stated in the novel, confessed by Syme to Smith when they are talking about the Newspeak: "'Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it" (55).

The Ministry of Truth, "Minitrue" as it is named in Newspeak, is the ultimate tool the government has to control and limit not only what citizens think, but also to control citizens' memories. This ministry is in charge of altering history, so that by altering the past, they ensure that people will know only what the Party wants them to know, giving citizens common memories and erasing any individual ones, and so make them follow the Party's ideology and believing the reality they show them. This is illustrated in the novel through Winston Smith's reflections, acknowledging what his job meant according to the Party's slogan:

> And if all others [citizens] accept the lie which the Party imposed – if all records told the same tale – then the lie passed into history and become truth. 'Who controls the past,' ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.' (37)

Once Smith is imprisoned, O'Brien again reinforces this idea of controlling the past trough people's memories: "We, the Party, control all records, and we control all memories. Then we control the past, do we not?" (260).

It is also interesting the fact that the "Brotherhood," the anti-party organization leaded by Goldstein, is another farce. This organization is believed to be trying to destroy the Party

and the existing government, and so to destroy the perfect society they have created; however, this organization does not exist, it is merely a creation of the Party to trick Oceania citizens. Using the Brotherhood, the Party is able to identify those citizens that turn their hate towards the party, tricking them to treason themselves by falling under the search for the Brotherhood to join their cause. The government establishes the "Two Minutes of Hate," a public assembly of Oceania's citizens in which they are forced to watch a short film about the Brotherhood and its Leader, Emmanuel Goldstein, in which citizens have also to show their hatred towards them. This is used to make people focus their rage in the figure of Goldstein, avoiding any kind of thought against the Party by portraying this organization as the enemy of the state. The existence of this organization helps the Party to identify those citizens who start thinking for themselves and against the Party and its ideology, what is called thoughtcrime in Newspeak, in order to brainwash them and make them fall again under the Party's ideology.

Having established the different means by which the Inner Party steadily control its citizens, the following pages will be devoted to an analysis of different contemporary dystopias, in order to determine the similarities and/or differences they present with Orwell's *1984*.

3.2 PHILIP K. DICK'S "FAITH OF OUR FATHERS[4]"

Philip K. Dick was a science fiction writer who was born in 1928 in California and died in 1982, before Ridley Scott released *Blade Runner*, a film adaptation of his novel *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* (1968). He wrote both science fiction novels and short stories, most of the latter in his early career. He was the only son of his family and had a difficult life, suffering from several illnesses, and falling under drug use (Palmer 389). Dick did not limit his literary production to science fiction, although it was the genre he

[4] This section will analyze Dick's "Faith of Our Father," a short story included in Harlan Ellison's anthology *Dangerous Vision*, published by Orion Publishing Group in 2002. From here on, any in-text quotation of this book will only include the page to which it refers.

mastered; he also wrote other kind of novels that are difficult to catalogue within a single genre or category, in which he dealt with the common people from marginal areas (Palmer 389). Although the vast majority of his short stories were written in the 1950s, such as "We Can Remember It for You Wholesale" or "The Minority Report," he continued writing short stories during the following decade, such as "Faith of our Fathers," first published in 1967 within the anthology *Dangerous Visions* and the target of this section's study.

Many science fiction writers use their works to offer readers a new, almost always futuristic world, providing a clear description of it and the different means by which humanity was able to accomplish this world; Philip Dick offers a different kind of science fiction works, both in his novels and short stories, which distinguish from the mainstream science fiction literature by showing an illusory reality (Palmer 391).

One of the main themes Dick made use of in his short stories and novels refers to reality: what reality is and whether what we perceive is real or not. It has been claimed that Dick used to take drugs in order to open his mind and be able to see other kinds of realities that he could applied in his works. This is one of the most controversial issues regarding Dick's writing techniques, which is also claimed by Harlan Ellison in the anthology *Dangerous Visions*. Ellison suggests that Dick's use of LSD could have influenced his writings in a significant way (200). This might explain why in this story drugs are one of the central topics, as well as one of the governments tools to control the citizens of Hanoi, the place where the action is set, altering their perception of reality by both disguising and uncovering the true reality.

As it has already been mentioned, this section intends to analyze "Faith of our Fathers," Dick's dystopian short story in terms of Orwell's *1984*, trying to find similarities and differences in the way these two works present a world in which the ruling government controls its population, focusing on the elements and methods they use for that purpose.

Dick's short story presents readers a future world ruled by the Communist Party, which reached the power after what seems a global war known as the "Colossal Final War of National Liberation ," in which the "People's Democratic United Front" defeated the

"Imperialists" (203). The story then focuses on Tung-Chien, a minor government servant working for the postwar "Ministry of Cultural Artifacts" who on his way to work comes across a "legless peddler" war veteran who offers him all sorts of remedies. Obliged by law, he has to buy the peddler something, so the peddler recommends him "a soothing preparation" that "will rest eyes fatigued by the countenance of meaningless official monologues" (204). Chien continues his course and reaches his office, where he meets his superior, Ssu-Ma Tso-pin, accompanied by Mr. Darius Pethel: they explain Chien that Pethel is going to be the manager of a new ideological and cultural school that will be open soon in San Fernando, California. Chien would be the one correcting the students' essay in order to determine which students follow the Party's ideology and which are just pretending. In this sense, they give Chien a pair of essays so as to illustrate him about the kind of essays he will have to correct. He is told to take them home, examine them and decide the following day which one of the two belongs to a true member of the Party. However, this is a tricky task: actually, it is a test for deciding whether or not Mr. Chien is valid for becoming vice-councilor of the Ministry and meet "His Greatness the Absolute Benefactor of the People," - the supreme leader of the Party.

Once at home, at his *conapt*[5] after work, Chien sits to analyze the essays; however, the TV set turns on to broadcast the Leader's speech, which is of mandatory watching for everybody. The Leader addresses Chien specifically in his speech, although Chien finds it unconvincing, believing that it must be some sort of beamed transmission that is being transmitted only to his apartment building, or some kind of manipulated transmission done at Hanoi TV, Incorporated instead. As a result, bored by the speech, Chien decides to take the peddler's remedy, which turns out to be snuff with side effects: the drug makes the usual Leader's fear disappear, and becomes "not a human figure at all …, a dead mechanical construct, made of solid state circuits, of swiveling pseudopodia, lenses and a squawk-box" (210-213).

[5] The term "conapt" refers to the condominium apartments in Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers," the specific, small apartments where the members of the Communist Party live.

Terrified by the "electric, sputtering, swiveling, metal and plastic monstrosity yammering away" (213) on the screen, and believing it a hallucination caused by the snuff, he decides to use the *vidphone* to call the Secpol (the government's Security Police in Dick's story) and report that he has been drugged with a psychedelic toxin. However, soon after the police left his apartment, he is called by the Secpol via *vidphone* again to be informed that what he took was in fact an anti-hallucinogenic called "selazine." In this context Tanya Lee comes into the picture, a young woman who belongs to a group of people within the Party who want to find out who or what is really ruling them. She reveals Chien that this selazine counteracts the effects of "Datrox-3," a synthetic hallucinogen that the Party pours in the water from a central, common source, and so anyone who drinks water is drugged without their knowledge.

Tanya Lee helps Chien with the essays-test, telling him which paper is orthodox and so Chien tells Mr. Tso-pin and Mr. Pethel the following morning; they confirm he is right and assure him that he will dine with the Absolute Benefactor and his wife in a few days. The day comes and he attends the dinner with the Absolute Benefactor: before Chien is taken to His Greatness' Villa, he runs into the peddler again, who begs him to take again the selazine in order to discover at last who or what is really ruling them. Once in the dinner, His Greatness appears, and what Chien saw was nothing he could have even imagined:

> It had no shape, nor pseudopodia, either flesh or metal. … It was terrible … As it moved, it drained the life from each person in turn; it ate the people who had assembled, passed on, ate again, ate more with an endless appetite (229).

When they encounter face to face, His Greatness talks to him, in his mind: once it prevents Chien from killing himself, it tells Chien that "[it] founded everything. [It] founded the anti-Party and the Party that isn't a Party … [it] founded it all. As if they were blades of grass" (231). Finally, the Absolute Benefactor tells Chien to trust him, go on with his life telling no one what it actually is, and not to question what he is doing. Afterwards, Chien is sent out of the dinner, accused of being drunk: he realizes that their leader is their only possible God, although it is at the same their enemy. He realizes that the Absolute

Benefactor is everywhere, and so there is no way of escaping it, probably not even by committing suicide (as he had previously attempted at). Once he reaches his home and Tanya Lees arrives, Chien confess her what he saw, what the real form of His Greatness is, admitting that they cannot defeat it and that the only thing left for them is to believe in it. Dick ended the story with a sex scene between Chien and Tanya, after which we find that Chien is bleeding badly of the stigma that His Greatness left in his shoulder when it prevented him from killing himself. His wound is so serious that he will probably die.

If we take Orwell's *1984* as a model, some similarities can be drawn between the former and "Faith of Our Fathers:" First of all, the political atmosphere in *1984* is similar to the one in Dick's story, although of a different political ideology: Dick's short story is set in Hanoi, Vietnam, in a world where Chinese Communism has defeated the U.S.A in the Colossal Final War of National Liberation, and so the Communist Party rules the whole world. On the other hand, the story in Orwell's *1984* is set in London, a city ruled by the high-class, totalitarian Inner Party and that belongs to Oceania, one of the three super-states in which the world is divided.

Moreover, both protagonists, Smith in *1984* and Tung-Chien in Dick's story are government servants. As it has already been mentioned, Smith works for the Ministry of Truth, both altering and accommodating history to the Party's purposes, as well as working for propaganda purposes; on the other hand, Tung Chien works for the Ministry of Cultural Artifacts. He is tested by the Party regarding a future job for a "new ideological and cultural establishment of didactic character soon to open in San Fernando." Similarly to Smith, Tung-Chien is also connected to the Party's control over the population, spreading the Party's ideological propaganda to find the students that are just pretending to fit the ideology of the Party, but who are indeed part of the anti-party American youth, formed by young dissidents who do not follow the Communist Party ideology.

There is another parallelism between Smiths' situation and that of Chien: Smith is also approached by an undercover member of the Inner Party, O' Brien, disguised as an anti-

party member in order to find out Winston's and his lover's treason to the Party. In Dick's story, Chien is approached by another undercover party member, the legless-peddler war veteran: like Tanya Lee, the peddler is a member of the Party who also wants to finds out who or what is ruling their world. Therefore, both the peddler and Tanya Lee can be regarded as the anti-party individuals of the story, belonging to an anti-leader group within the ruling Communist Party. Therefore, they have opposed intentions compared to O'Brien's in Orwell's novel, whose main target is locating and prosecuting dissidents to imprison them and subject them to a brainwashing process. In this sense, it could be argued that Dick's story offers reader some sort of hope, as there is a true, real group of people, even within the Communist Party, who do not follow completely the Party's ideology and is fighting for its purposes. This kind of hope is not offered in Orwell's *1984*, as the Brotherhood, the assumed anti-party, is merely an invention of the ruling Inner Party to identify those citizens who start thinking for themselves, in order to imprison them and brainwash them to make them puppets of the Party again.

Another point of comparison between Orwell's and Dick's works is the figure of the leader: Dick's "His Greatness the Absolute Benefactor of the People" is similar to the figure of the Big Brother in Orwell's dystopia. The two names of the leaders paradoxically reflect certain positive attitudes towards their people: the "Big Brother" implies some protective and familiar connotations, giving the impression of a familiar figure that would ensure his citizens happiness. On the other hand, the epithet Absolute Benefactor of the People implies an analogous connotation through the idea of the Absolute Benefactor, implying that the leader is some sort of patron of his people, someone who would supports or helps his citizens by providing them with money and protection. However, the role each leader performs in its corresponding story is different: Dick's Absolute Benefactor of the People is a true God-like figure, as it has created everything: "[the Absolute Benefactor] go[es] anywhere, appear[s] at any time, devour[s] anything; [it] engineer[s] life and then guzzle[s] it, and [it] enjoy[s] that. [Chien] thought, [It] is God" (228). This Absolute Benefactor has the divine power of creating and destroying life, it is even able of bringing back to life to what is already dead, which might be explained in the fact that this leader seems to be

extraterrestrial, some kind of shape-shifting alien. This reality of the leader in Dick's story is far from that of the Big Brother in *1984*: Orwell's Big Brother is a true human being, who appears in television giving propaganda speeches for the Party's sake and is the trusted figure and symbol of the Party, someone everybody is supposed to believe in and love (as opposed to the Benefactor of the People). However, the novel left readers with a sense of uncertainty, as it is not clearly stated whether or not the Big Brother is real. Once Smith is imprisoned and is being tortured by O'Brien, the latter implies that the Big Broder is nobody but the Party:

> 'Does Big Brother exist?'
> 'Of course he exists. The Party exists. Big Brother is the embodiment of the Party.'
> 'Does he exist in the same way as I exist?'
> 'You do not exist,' said O'Brien. (Orwell 271-272)

Therefore, it can be seen that the representation of both leaders is very similar, a human figure that is used to spread the Party's ideology through daily speeches that are televised and which citizens are forced to see, ensuring the influence of these speeches over the citizens' mindset. Both the Absolute Benefactor and the Big Brother do not fit to what citizens expect they are, although it is in what they really are in what they differ: Orwell leaves readers with the uncertainty of whether or not the Big Brother is a real man or just the symbol used by the Inner Party to embody and spread its ideology. On the contrary, the Absolute Benefactor has no shape; it seems to be a God-like alien whose power is inexorable, even beyond the Communist Party to which it seems to belong.

An analysis must be drawn regarding Chien's *conapt,* the condominium apartment where he lives. This building is portrayed as the specific building in which the Party's minor workers live, connected directly with the Secpol (the government's Security Police in Dick's story) through *vidphones* and guarded by the building wardens. Moreover, these *conapts* are all equipped with TV-sets that record them during the Leader's speech to make sure everybody pays attention to it and punishing those who do not do it. This is very similar to the one-room apartments in which Smith and the members of the Outer Party

(Oceania's middle class) live, also equipped with telescreens and hidden microphones that monitor and record everything they do. There is a clear similarity between the kind of control that the Thought Police applies to Oceania's citizens in Orwell's novel and that performed over Hanoi citizens by the Secpol in Dick's short story, being both intended to erase any kind of privacy and monitor their citizens.

Another important analysis should be made around the drug issue. In Orwell's *1984*, it was through the Ministry of Truth that the Inner Party makes sure its control over the population, erasing the past and transforming to better suit its purposes. In other words, it is one branch of the government who is in charge of and makes sure that nobody can find any clue, evidence, or anything that might lead them think there is something wrong with the government. However, in Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers" it is through a drug that the Communist Party controls its citizens, making them take a drug without their knowledge and so making them believe in a reality that is not such, a reality that it is just a hallucination. It is important to highlight, however, that the Secpol warns Chien that what the snuff he has taken is rather an anti-hallucinogen rather than a hallucinogen. Consequently, it is one branch of the government that gives Chien the definitive clue not only to start questioning what is real and what not, but also to believe Tanya Lee when she tells him that it is in fact the Party who is drugging its citizens. Tanya tells Chien that she and the group of people she belongs to have discovered the drug after running some tests on the water, and also explains that this issue is something that only the highest members of the Party are aware of. Thus, it might be deduced that this crucial mistake made by the Secpol is due to their ignorance: they do not hold a high position within the Party, and so they do not know that the Party is poisoning their citizens with a drug that causes hallucinations.

The endings of both works also show some crucial similarities: in Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers" the story ends with Chien and Tanya in his apartment, where after having sex, Chien confess her that "[they] can't win," and that the only thing left for them is to "Believe in it [His Greatness]" (233-234). Chien yields to the Absolute Benefactor,

admitting that there is nothing they can do against this God-like leader except believing in it, although it does not mean they will overcome it. However, despite the fact that readers are left with the idea that Chien will die, he is free, keeping his own mindset and enjoying freedom. This open-ended closure shows some differences with Orwell's: both protagonists succumb to the authoritarian regime, Mr. Tung Chien on the one hand, Winston Smith on the other hand, admitting that there is nothing to do against it, and so the only thing left to them is to believe in the system and carry on with their lives, subjected to the Party. This is also portrayed by Smith in *1984*: Smith is freed from his imprisonment in Room 101 at the Ministry of Love, where he was tortured and brainwashed so that he would fit again within Oceania's society. He acknowledges it himself when he is at the Chestnut Tree Café: the TV-news reports that Oceania had achieved an important victory that granted them the control over the whole Africa. At this point, people start celebrating the victory, and in his mind Smith recognizes his failure: "But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother" (Orwell 311).

3.3 ALAN MOORE'S *V FOR VENDETTA*[6]

Alan Moore and David Lloyd are the creators of this influential graphic novel, published in 1988 under DC Comics ownership, although it appeared for the first time in 1982 serialized in the comic magazine *Warrior*. Moore was born in Northampton, England, in 1953, beginning his career as a writer in the 1970s, with works such as *2000AD* or his collaboration to *Doctor Who Weekly*. His greatest successes were *V for Vendetta* (1982-1985) and primarily *Watchmen*[7] (1986) which illustrates perfectly why Moore has "distinguished himself as a darkly philosophical voice in the medium of comic books" (Itzkoff n. pag.), something he also shows in *V for Vendetta*.

---

[6] For the purpose of this paper, this section will use the edition of Alan Moore's *V for Vendetta* published by Titan Books in 2005. From here on, any in-text citation referring to this book will only include its corresponding page.

[7] *Watchmen* is the only comic appearing among TIME's list of the 100 best English-language novels published since 1923.

V for Vendetta can be regarded as a dystopian (graphic) novel: set in a near-future London that has suffered the effects of a Nuclear World War, the novel presents a city in which its citizens have given the ruling power to a totalitarian, fascist party known as "Norsefire," led by a man called Adam Susan. In this futuristic London, citizens are constantly controlled and monitored by the totalitarian dictatorship of the government's different branches, each of them matching a human sense: "the Nose," led by Mr. Finch and in charge of the country's security and investigation. It is closely linked to "the Finger," the country's police force constituted by the "Fingermen" (i.e. the Party's policeman) and led by Mr. Almond; "the Eye," in charge of continuing video surveillance trough "vi-recorders" installed all around the city; "the Ears," which is devoted to citizens' "phone surveillance;" and finally "the Mouth," which is in charge of media manipulation and propaganda dissemination. All these branches are ultimately ruled ultimately by Fate, a super-computer which is the true leader of the Party and the one ruling in London. Further along in the novel, we discover the Party's ideology in the figure of the Leader, through his reflections while he is on his way to his office:

> My name is Adam Susan. I am the Leader. … I lead the country that I love out of the wilderness of the twentieth century. I believe in survival, in the destiny of the Nordic race. I believe in fascism. Oh yes, I am a fascist. … 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. (37)

In this atmosphere "V" bursts into the scene: he is a man who had been an inmate at Larkhill Resettlement Camp, a concentration camp where experiments with humans were taken, as they did with V. Some of the most important members of the Norsefire Party were in charge of this camp, and once V escaped from it, he decided to plan his vengeance over them. However, his main purpose is not vengeance but to end with the totalitarian regime that the Norsefire has installed in London. V's first terrorist act is the bombing of the Houses of Parliament, something he achieved after saving Evey Hammond from being raped and killed by some Fingermen, the police force of the Norsefire. He decides to take

her to his home, the Shadow Gallery, and take her under his protection while he follows his plan to end the Norsefire's government and get his vengeance over the people that experimented with him. At the same time, V decides to open Evey's eyes to the true reality, making her experience V's suffering at the concentration camp to make her understand and believe V's aim. Finally, the Leader is murdered (not by V himself but by Rosemary, the wife of a party member V had killed before) and after the process V used to change Evey, he decides to show her his entire house and tells her his ultimate purpose: to destroy Downing Street, the ultimate symbol of the British power. Yet, V is shot by Mr. Finch, but he apparently survives: "Did you think to kill me? There is no flesh or blood within this cloak to kill. There is only an idea. Ideas are bullet-proof" (236). Nevertheless, Evey finds V dying on the ground of his mansion, who before dying tells her that it is now time for people to build a new, prosperous country:

> This country is not saved… Do not think that… But all its old beliefs have come to rubble, and from rubble may we build… That is their task: to rule themselves; their lives and loves and land… With this achieved, *then* [8]let them talk of salvation. Without it, they are surely *carrion*[9]. By turn of century they'll know their fate: either a rose midst rubble blooms, or else has bloomed too late[10]. (245)

V is a terrorist who believes in anarchy because "she [anarchy] has taught me that justice is meaningless without freedom. She is honest. She makes no promises and breaks none. Unlike you [justice]" (41). This is the reason why he destroys the Old Bailey and the Houses of Parliament, believing they have been corrupted by the totalitarian government. He claims that the government ruling London is terrible, but emphasizes the fact that it is also the people's fault to have reached such catastrophic atmosphere: "We've had a string of embezzlers, frauds, liars and lunatics making a string of catastrophic decisions. … You who appointed these people! You who gave them the power to make your decisions for you" (116-117). V believes that "with anarchy comes an age of *ordnung*[11], of true order,

[8] Emphasis in the original.
[9] Emphasis in the original.
[10] Emphasis in the original.

[11] Emphasis in the original.

which is to say voluntary order" (195), an anarchy that will follow the chaos he has orchestrated.

As in the case of Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers," Moore's graphic novel can also be compared to Orwell's *1984* in terms of the dystopian features it exhibits and the different methods of social control Moore portrays in his graphic novel. It seems perfectly clear that both works share the same setting, a futuristic world in which war plays or has played an important role in the rise to power of a totalitarian party. Moreover, they both place their totalitarian-ruled futuristic world in London, which might be due to the influence that Orwell had in Moore's work. Moore himself recognizes this influence when building the narrative for his comic, as well as others:

> One night, in desperation, I made a long list of concepts that I wanted to reflect in V, moving from one to another with a rapid free-association that would make any good psychiatrist reach for the emergency cord. The list was something as follows: 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. (272)

Moore also recognizes the influence of Harlan Ellison, the editor of the science fiction anthology in which Dick's "Faith of our Fathers" is included. This might imply that Moore was also influenced by pop literature, which at that time was illustrated by science fiction works and mainly those published in Hugo Gernsback's science fiction magazine *Amazing Stories*.

The figure of the leader appears again in Moore's *V for Vendetta*. In this graphic novel, the Leader's ideology resembles that of the Big Brother, head of the Inner Party in Orwell's novel: Adam Susan believes in what he is doing because he believes he is doing the right thing for his people, or at least it is what he keeps saying to himself in order to justify the excessive control and manipulation over his citizens. However, there some crucial differences between Orwell's Big Brother and Moore's Adam Susan: the Leader in Moore's novel is a mere puppet: the true leader in Moore's dystopia is "Fate", a computer

machine that tells everyone what to do, reason why it is regarded as a goddess: "She has no eyes to flirt or promise, but sees all. Sees and understands with a wisdom that is God-like in its scale. I [the Leader] stand at the gates of her intellect and I am blinded by the light within" (38).

In this sense, Fate is portrayed as a God-like figure that the leader can only admire. In this sense, Fate resembles "His Greatness the Absolute Benefactor of the People" in Dick's short story, being both figures described as holding divine features and powers. Moreover, both the Absolute Benefactor and Fate computer show religious connotations: in the same way that the epithet "Absolute Benefactor of the People" holds some religious connotations in Dick's story, Moore's Fate computer also offers some of these connotations, as Fate refers to the inevitable course of events that are predetermined by God. The difference between them is that the familiar and positive connotations that the epithet "Absolute Benefactor" offers in Dick's story are replaced in *V for Vendetta* by the negative and cold connotations associated to a super computer, a human-made machine that works following the logic binary system and which only functions when it is manipulated by an individual.
However, it is important to highlight that it is the Fate computer that shows similarities with the Absolute Benefactor in Dick's story, but not the Leader. As opposed to Dick's the Absolute Benefactor, Moore's Adam Susan is a true human being, someone he really exists and holds and specific position within the Norsefire hierarchy. This is also different from Orwell's Big Brother, as Moore's Adam Susan is not the merely the symbol of the Party, he is the only man who can manipulate Fate's computer, which has nothing to do with the Big Brother, a creation of the Inner Party as it is implied in Orwell's *1984*.

In the same manner that the Inner Party makes use of technological devices to control its citizens in *1984*, this idea of technology to monitor and control the population is also featured in Moore's novel: apart from the constant video-camera surveillance London citizens are submitted both in their homes and all over the city, the power of technology to control people is ultimately exemplified by Fate. It is a super-computer to which the ruling party bestows the supreme power of controlling everything, each of the government's

branches, and so it is in charge of controlling the whole country. This is the same idea of citizens-control portrayed in both Orwell and Dick's works, although Moore goes even beyond and makes use of an artificial intelligence to become the ultimate ruler of England. In fact, V himself protests against the fact that citizens allowed the Norsefire to control them with such technological improvements: "You have allowed them to fill your workspace with dangerous and unproven machines" (117). It is important to highlight this idea because it neither in Orwell's *1984* nor in Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers" readers can find any reference to who elected the totalitarian Party's that are ruling each world. The only information given to readers is that both the Inner Party in Orwell's novel and the Communist Party in Dick's story have reached the power after a war, but it is not said if citizens were the ones that voted for them or on the contrary they reached the power by force. In *V for Vendetta* citizens are the ones who gave the power to the fascist Norsefire Party, and so V blame them too for that in order to open their eyes and realizes that they need a change and that they are the ones who have to lead this change.

Despite the obvious similarity between the protagonist of Moore's graphic novel and Orwell's Wiston Smith – they share the same key intention of ending with the totalitarian government that is controlling their people - there are several differences between these two figures, as well as regarding Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers," that should be highlighted. In Orwell's *1984*, Smith is a government servant, ordinary man who follows a pacific way when trying to join Goldstein's anti-party rebellion to fight against the Inner Party. On the contrary, V is an anarchist terrorist who follows the violent path, but his purpose is not just to kill everyone that was in charge of Larkhill Resettlement Camp and experimented with him. This is just a smokescreen to make the Finger believe his sole motif is vengeance.

In *V for Vendetta*, Prothero, Lilliman and finally Dr. Delia Surridge (the main people in charge of Larkhill) are murdered in order to help V keeping the Fingermen focus on the murderers while he prepares the bomb attacks to destroy the Ear and the Eye. V destroys these offices of the government's two main branches of citizen control and surveillance in order to give them a taste of freedom. With the destruction of the Eye and the Ear, V

"return[s] the rights of secrecy and privacy to you [Londoners]," and so "for three days, [Londoners] movements will not be watched… [Londoners] conversations will not be listened to" (187), plunging the city into chaos while he prepares his final attack. This in an essential difference compared to both Orwell and Dick's stories: as opposed to Londoners in *V for Vendetta* who recover their freedom for a brief period of three days, the citizens in Dick's Hanoi and in Orwell's Airstrip One have no room for hope. In the latter two works, the protagonists fail their rebellion, and the only thing left for them is to surrender and go back to their previous lives before they rebel, when they were another sheep among the Party's herd.

Another interesting analysis arises with the "Fingermen," the policemen in Moore's work. When compared to Orwell's Thought Police in *1984* and Dick's Secpol in "Faith of Our Fathers," there is something that can be clearly seen: there is no reference to what kind of authority the "Fingermen" occupy. In both Orwell and Dick's works, the governments' police forces are mentioned by themselves. On the other hand, it is through a metaphorical representation that readers realize that the Fingermen are the Norsefire's police force. The government in Moore's novel is referred as the "Head," and its different departments correspond to the human senses (i.e. the Mouth, the Nose, the Ear and the Finger). It is the brain that gives the orders to the different parts of the human body about what they have to do: similar function is that of the Fingermen, who are in charge of capturing any dissident that Fate computers find, the brain of the government's Head.

The ending in Moore's *V for Vendetta* also differs from that in Orwell and Dick's works: Moore offers readers a final hope, as people are given a chance to escape from the totalitarian ruling. However, it would not be easy, and it would be the citizens' task to build their own future out of the ruins of a destroyed totalitarian regime. Readers are left in this pre-change atmosphere, without a final resolution, which is something *V for Vendetta* has in common with Orwell's *1984*: readers are left with Smith's self-reflections about him, about his failure and love to the Big Brother, but refusing any final statement that anticipates readers any kind of closure. On the other hand, Orwell's novel offers no room

for hope, as Smith is brainwashed at the Ministry of Love's cells, yielding to the Inner Party and claiming that there is no other escape, there is no room for rebellion. This is the same kind of ending that readers are offered in Dick's "Faith of Our Fathers," where Chien confesses Tanya Lee that there is nothing they can do to defeat the God-like thing that is ruling Hanoi but to believe in it. There is some sense of closure in Dick's short story, as readers are told that the wound Chien had in his back is bleeding in such a profuse way that he will die; however, Dick does not gives a final statement about Chien deaths, and so readers are left with the uncertainty of whether Chien finally dies.

The idea of the brainwashing process deserves an analysis too: it is the Inner Party in Orwell's *1984* that torture and brainwashed both Smith and his lover Julia to fall again under the Party's ideology, after their attempt at rebellion against it. However, it is V himself, the protagonist of Moore's graphic novel, who torture Evey to open her ayes to the true reality, taking her through a reverse brainwashing process by which Evey is able to distance from the Norsefire propaganda and see the reality behind it. Thus, it seems that Moore offers in his novel a subversion of Orwell's use of torture and brainwashing, being the rebel the one who performs them in the case of *V for Vendetta* and not the ruling Party, as it is the case in Orwell's *1984*. Moreover, V is the only protagonist who dies in the course of the events, as neither Smith nor Chien actually dies in their respective worlds. V's death allows Evey to finally achieve his process of liberation, taking over V's role by becoming V herself, and completing V's original plan of bombing and destroying Downing Street.

The main women characters in Orwell's and Dick's stories is also different from Evey in Moore's story: Julia in Orwell's novel and Tanya in Dick's story are both women who are passive characters,, performing not any meaningful action apart from enhancing and engaging in sex with Smith and Chien respectively. On the contrary, Evey in *V for Vendetta* becomes London's heroine, destroying the ultimate symbol of the country's government to grant Londoners the freedom they had lost long before and allowing them the chance to rebuild the country and to form a new just and equal one.

4. CONCLUSIONS

George Orwell made a name for himself with his novel *1984*: written in the aftermath of WWII and shortly after the Cold War had begun, Orwell used this novel to criticize both fascist and Stalinist ideologies. In addition to its important political critique and warning, it seems beyond doubt the great influence Orwell had had upon future writers: it had been proved in this work that several features of Orwellian dystopian model can be traced in contemporary dystopian works, illustrated by Philip K. Dick's short story "Faith of Our Fathers" and Alan Moore's *V for Vendetta*.

Dick's short story present some of Orwell's common features, such as an over-controlling party holding the power, the use of two-way televisions to force citizens to swallow the party's leader's speech and manipulate them to believe the party's ideology, the attempt to uncover those against it and the figure of a leader. However, Dick also introduce other elements in his story that provides it with his personal style and shows that Dick did not limit himself to Orwell's model but that he used it as the basis for his story and then create his own, personal work.

V for Vendetta shows more similarities with Orwell's model, sharing the same setting in a futuristic London, as well as a fascist-declared totalitarian party that uses its power to the complete manipulation and control of their citizens with the help of the latest technology. Although Moore shares Orwell's political concern and uses his work as a wake-up call, Moore's protagonist wages war on his own, trying to make them join his crusade to bring sown the Norsefire. Moore used Orwell's dystopian model but introduced in his own, personal ideas and hallmarks of his style, similarly to the way Dick constructed his short story. They used the Orwellian model to create their own, original stories, not limiting themselves to the features that Orwell exhibited in his novel and constructing new narratives that allowed them to stand out as great writers.

Thus, it is clear that both Dick and Moore introduced innovative and different elements in their works to make them more appealing to readers and attempting to earn themselves a

place among the widely recognized and awarded writers. However, both works display several hallmarks of Orwell's 1984, the dystopia that revolutionized the world of literature in general, and the world of dystopian literature in particular. These two works illustrated the great influence Orwell had had in future writings, using the writers' own reality and placing it in a near future in order to warn readers about the dangers of their time, opening their eyes to the hidden truths behind current political ideologies that might turn their present into a nightmarish tomorrow.

5. WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Dick, Philip K. “Faith of Our Fathers.” *Dangerous Visions*. Ed. Ellison, Harlan London: Orion Publishing Group, 2012. Print.

Moore, Alan, writer. *V for Vendetta*. Art by David Lloyd. Coloured by David Lloyd, Steve Whitaker and Siobhan Dodds. Lettered by Jenny O’Connor, Steve Craddock and Elitta Fell. London: Titan Books, 2005. Print.

Orwell, George. *1984*. London: Penguin Books, 2000. Print.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Claeys, Gregory. "The origins of dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 107-35. Print.

Ellison, Harlan, ed. Introduction. *Dangerous Visions*. London: Orion Publishing Group, 2012. Print.

Fitting, Peter. "Utopia, dystopia and science fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 135-54. Print.

Itzkoff, Dave. “The Vendetta Behind ‘V for Vendetta.’” *The New York Times* 12 Mar. 2006. n. p. Web. 19 May 2015.

Kellner, Douglas. “From 1984 to One-Dimensional man: Critical Reflections on Orwell and Marcuse.” *Heathwood Institute and Press*. Heathwood Institute and Press. 5 Jan. 2015. n. p. Web. 22 May 2015

Kunkel, Benjamin. “Dystopia and the End of Politics.” *Dissent (00123846)* 55.4 (2008): 89-98. Print.

McKitterick, Chris. "Defining "Science Fiction." What is science fiction... and why study it?" *Sfcenter.ku.edu*. Gunn Center for the study of Science Fiction. 20 Feb. 2015. n. p. Web. 21 March 2015.

Milner, Andrew. “Changing the Climate: The Politics of Dystopia.” *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 23.6 (2009): 827–38. Print.

Palmer, Christopher. “Philip K. Dick.” *A Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. David Seed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 389-98. Print.

Rieder, John. "Fiction, 1895-1926." *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Mark Bould, Andrew M. Butler, Adam Roberts, and Sherryl Vint. New York: Routledge, 2009. 23-32. Print.

Stableford, Brian. “Science fiction before the genre.” *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Ed. Edward James and Farah Mendlesohn. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 15-32. Print.

Tucker, Robert C. “Does Big Brother Really Exist?” *The Wilson Quarterly (1976-)* 8.1 (1984): 106–17. Web. 15 June 2015.

Vieira, Fátima. "The Concept of Utopia." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Claeys. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 3-28. Print.