



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET
INST FÖR SPRÅK OCH LITTERATURER

ENGLISH

Nineteen Eighty-Four and the Ideology of Hate

Kristoffer Rissanen

BA thesis
Spring 2014

Supervisor:
Chloé Avril
Examiner:
Zlatan Filipovic

Title: *Nineteen Eighty-Four and the Ideology of Hate*

Author: Kristoffer Rissanen

Supervisor: Chloé Avril

Abstract: Hatred and ideology play an important role in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. This essay aims to show that hatred not only is a core tenet of the Party's ideology, but that it also guides the protagonist Winston Smith, motivating his rebellion. The essay also suggests that Winston Smith's resistance is not his own, but instilled in him by the Party. The essay's method is a close reading of the text, with the primary concept of hatred in mind. The essay argues that fear is the origin of hate, and that hate empowers the Party and is used as a tool to keep the Party in control.

Keywords: 1984, Orwell, emotion, hate, love, fear, control, motivation, ideology, power

Table of Contents

Introduction	1-5
-Method and material	5-6
-Theory and concepts	6-9
Chapter 1	10-13
Chapter 2	14-17
Conclusion	18-19
Bibliography	20-21

Introduction

Hatred is a powerful emotion and I believe that it permeates George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1984). I think that it is found in the very core of humanity, as a primal force that is inexorably tied to human nature, bound to us by instinct and necessity (Sternberg, Sternberg 16). Hate is often born from fear, and it is this fear and subsequent hate that is so commonly manipulated by those who would seek to wield it. Fear and hatred have played their part in the darkest chapters of history, from wars to genocides (Sternberg, Sternberg 2). In 1984, fear, hate and the ideology of hate govern the lives of the people of Oceania interminably.

I agree with Robert and Karin Sternberg when they suggest in their book *The Nature of Hate* that “the study of hate does not bring to researchers the same joy as does the study of love” (18). They continue to write that it is “difficult to think of any other problem in the world that is more costly in terms of lives and resources. And so we plow on, despite the fact that from a research point of view, there are many other greener, more serene pastures” (19). While their description of hatred as being costly in terms of lives and material resources is accurate, that is not the only reason that should justify the study of hatred. As mentioned before, hate is found deep within humanity, and acts born out of hatred have shaped the course of history. To help understand hatred, we can turn to literature. That is why *1984* has been selected for analysis in this essay: it offers the reader a vision of a world dominated by hatred, fear and ideology.

I believe that Orwell must have included hatred deliberately in his novel because it is always there as an undercurrent that influences the characters and the society they live in. This is something that is still relevant in our world, and Niza Yanay in her book *The Ideology of Hatred: The Psychic Power of Discourse* argues that the concept of hatred has changed after the 11th September attacks from “a psychological and emotional diagnostic term into a political public discourse. And this shift of status and meaning has convinced me that hatred must be retheorized primarily as an ideology of power and control” (Yanay 2). Both meanings of hatred can be applied to *1984*, as it offers us a vision of a world dominated by hatred as a form of ideology and by hatred that resides in the minds of many Party members.

In *1984*, love and hate share a complex relation, a kind of duality. I mentioned the study of love earlier. Love is also a powerful emotion, equal to hate. Robert Sternberg claims with his duplex theory of hate that “hate is very closely related psychologically to love” and that “[p]eople have always suspected there is some kind of a relation between hate and love. [...]

love can rapidly turn to hate” (51). In *1984*, while the Party wields the power of hate against enemies, it actively encourages feelings of love for Big Brother. The inherent irrationality of hate (Sternberg, Sternberg 46) is in itself a defense against any rational thought that could threaten the Party’s power. Love represents a rational counter-part to irrational hate, and the notion of Winston and Julia resisting out of love for one another is an interesting notion, if they truly are in love. At the same time, love can be argued to be equal to hate in irrationality, and that love and hate are merely two sides of the same coin. The notion of reasonable love as a counter to irrational hate suggests the idea and the hope that love conquers hate, as though love could act in such a manner. Thus, by that argument, Winston’s and Julia’s resistance does not truly offer any real sense of hope for the future. This essay will likely reinforce that hopelessness.

This essay has three concepts in mind when discussing the novel. In order to organize the essay and its argumentation, a structure that could clearly show how these concepts might relate to each other became a necessity. The first step is to discuss the relation between fear and hate, as this essay assumes that fear is the origin of hate in *1984*. The Party’s methods of creating fear and maintaining fear will be examined, as well as how fear leads to hatred.

The second step is the relation between power and hate, with the idea that if you can direct hate, you have power proportional to hate. In effect, this power, born from fear as well as hatred, is wielded by the Party to stay in control and by Winston to empower him in his attempt to resist the regime.

The final step is to discuss the relation between ideology and hate, with the idea that the Party’s ideology is ultimately built up by fear, which in turn lends to hatred, which allows them to shape thought as needed. In effect, these concepts act in a cause-and-effect manner: fear causes hate, hate is used to gain power and power allows for the creation of an ideology.

Hatred will be examined in this essay in two ways, utilizing the structure described previously. I will argue that hate generated through fear is a core tenet of the Party’s ideology, serving a practical function. In effect, hate is wielded much like a tool, and I suggest that the Party uses hate to keep itself in power by mainly controlling the Outer members of the Party, whether it is through emotional manipulation or through use of propaganda. However, the main thrust of the essay will be focused on Winston Smith because his relation to hate is not as clear as the Party’s. I will argue that Winston Smith is motivated by hate. In a practical sense, this means that he uses hate as both a motivation and method of fortifying his resolve to resist the power of the Party.

It should be stated that the essay has a clear goal in mind which is to find conclusive evidence that Winston's rebellion has been instilled in him, through years of conditioning by the Party. Winston is conditioned to exhibit and feel hatred by certain triggers, with the sounds and images of the Two Minutes Hate offering a clear example of these triggers. These triggers are intended to force individuals to feel and exhibit hate mindlessly. Winston, however, shows that he can consciously re-direct these feelings of hate, that his conscious mind can trump the unconscious. How is he able to do this? Does this mechanism come from the Party as well? I intend to discover the answers to these questions, because they have significant implications on Winston as a character, and on the book itself. If his rebellion and his emotions are not truly his own, then his struggle was for nothing, and it casts doubt on the idea that there can be any escape from the Party's hold on power.

1984 is still a very popular novel within the realm of academia, resulting in a wealth of research that serves as a solid foundation for this essay. Despite the novel's popularity, there are to the best of my knowledge few, if any, studies that have focused primarily on hatred in *1984*. This means that much of the research deals with issues found on the periphery of this essay's focus, which is hate. Some works that have been used can be tied indirectly to the essay's main argument, and the essay also cites previous research that supports the idea that Winston's rebellion is not his own. Studies that discuss and explain the concepts of fear, hate, power and ideology are very important for this essay – to truly understand these concepts they must be defined and theorized.

Sara Ahmed's essay "The Organisation of Hate" (2001) has been selected because she writes about a distinct definition on the concept of hatred, and because it ties hatred with specific concepts like hate groups, crime or violence. Similarly, her research can be adapted to describe the attachment of hate to ideology and vice versa.

Fear is central to this essay's understanding of the origin of hate: to understand hate, we must know where it comes from, and why. Fear can potentially stem from a sense of survival, or fear of death. Fear based on the threat of strangers and enemies is also one possible explanation. Robert Robins and Jerrold Post in their book *Political Paranoia: The Psychopolitics of Hatred* argue that this "fear of the stranger and projection of hatred upon the other are the psychological foundation of the concept of the enemy" (Robins, Post 89). Their work has been very useful for this essay's discussion on fear and how fear – in this case, specified as paranoia – breeds hatred.

Power is a key component of this essay's discussion of the novel, and the way power relates to hatred. While I will not adopt an analysis based on narrative for this essay, Brigid

Rooney's essay "Narrative viewpoint and the Representation of Power in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" (2002), as its title suggests, offers a narratological perspective, which can offer insight to parts of the novel that would have previously been regarded as irrelevant. Since my essay is concerned with power in relation to hate, her analysis will prove useful when discussing that aspect of the novel.

Niza Yanay's work *The Ideology of Hatred: The Psychic Power of Discourse* offers an extensive discussion on various aspects of the ideology of hatred, especially in terms hatred being a political concept of power and control (Yanay 2). Although she does not attempt to explore the meaning of hate "or its various effects", her book is highly relevant to this essay's understanding of ideology and its relation to hate.

Unlike Yanay's book, Robert J. and Karin Sternberg's book *The Nature of Hate* offers a comprehensive and extensive list of the various theories by many different writers on the concept of hatred. The concept is approached from many different perspectives, be it Freud's drive theory (Sternberg, Sternberg 19), Hannah Arendt's 'banality of evil' theory of hate in relation to evil (23) to Bandura's social psychological research on affective and instrumental aggression (38), among many other theories. They also discuss theories that deal entirely with hate, including Allport's work on prejudice in relation to hate (43). The limitations of these theories are also discussed at length.

The Nature of Hate considers Robert J. Sternberg's duplex theory of hate the most comprehensive, as it is applicable to "both individuals and groups" (51). The duplex theory of hate is a useful and relevant theory to use, since this essay is concerned with Winston's individual hate and the hate of a collective body, the Party. This theory will be discussed at length later on in the essay. This book is one of the most important studies in relation to this essay, as without its detailed descriptions of various theories of hate, the essay would be lacking a solid theoretical background to work with in terms of fear and hate.

John Lukacs' book *Democracy and Populism: Fear and Hatred* offers an interesting discussion regarding fear and hatred in relation to the conscious and the unconscious, which this essay also covers. While his book is mostly concerned with, as the title might suggest, political concepts and democracy in general, especially in relation to the United States, Lukacs provides criticism on the relevance of attaching theories of the unconscious to concepts like hatred (47).

Aspects of hate in *1984* have certainly been examined and discussed in previous works. An example of this can be found within the realm of hatred for women, which is discussed in this essay, such as Daphne Patai's *The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology* (1984).

In her essay “Dissent, Assent and the Body in Nineteen Eighty-Four”, Naomi Jacobs discusses the novel from the perspective of the physical, human body, the physical conditions and circumstances of Winston and Oceania’s oppressed population. She argues that the “devastating pessimism” of Orwell’s novel is “based upon an inconsistent and ultimately impoverished model of the body” (Jacobs 1). She states that the physical body is shaped by the social circumstances, and that the Party oppresses, in part, through the manipulation of the body, by keeping it unhealthy and weak, which relates to emotions and the mind as well. This perspective should shed light on the discussion regarding the conscious and unconscious acts of Winston’s rebellion, as well as how Winston’s observations of the inherent “wrongness” (Orwell 68) of his state might fuel feelings of hate and rebellion.

Philip G. Zimbardo’s essay titled “Mind Control in Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*” has been selected for a brief discussion on the isolating effect the Party’s mind control techniques might have on the human psyche and spirit (129). Paranoia and hatred are among the results of these various techniques.

Method and Material

The primary text for this essay is George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1984). This essay’s method is in the shape of a qualitative analysis; specifically, it is a close reading of the novel with the concept of hatred in mind. Hatred in this essay is understood to be an emotion and a disposition, born from fear. Hatred also serves a function for the Party as a form of keeping it in power, while controlling the population through propaganda and indoctrination. Through this power, the Party creates an ideology of hate that legitimizes their rule.

Research has been performed mainly through online database searches. Many sources have been retrieved through the University Library database system as e-books, to make sure that they are not only easily accessible to others, but also to ensure a high level of credibility. An effort has been made to gain physical access to print copies of several titles, through the University Library system.

An effort has been made to find sources that not only help with interpreting the book, but to also find potential criticism and counter-arguments to the essay’s main thesis. As mentioned before, since there has not been much previous research on hate in *1984*, criticism and counter-arguments are used to add nuance and perspective to the essay’s assumptions on the concepts of fear, hate, power and ideology.

Theory and concepts

The essay does not approach the novel or the subject with a specific school of thought. This choice has been made because it allows for more flexibility, in terms of analysis and interpretation. The essay approaches hate from several angles, and as previously mentioned, organizes the various aspects related to hate according to a certain, categorical order. This structure assumes that fear leads to hate, hate can be empowering and that the power offered by hate can create ideology. Practically, this means that the chapters dedicated to examining the Party's ideology and Winston's relation to hate will cover a wide range of theoretical ground.

Hate, fear, power and *ideology* are the main concepts discussed in the essay, and they are the most important to define. This essay considers hate to have two dimensions, one being on a psychological level while the other is on a sociological level. In the *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, hate as a concept is defined according to the Oxford English Dictionary as “an EMOTION of extreme dislike or aversion. Cognates include ‘detestation’, ‘abhorrence’, ‘loathing’, ‘malice’, ‘enmity’, and ‘odium’, all of which suggests the low character of this emotion” (Becker, Becker 660). This is a somewhat interesting but ultimately too vague a definition. The cognates in particular are not very helpful when attempting to explain the concept and the definition only serves to describe hate generally. A definition of hate found in a dictionary does not offer the essay much to work with. To deal with these concepts, we must understand them implicitly, how they function and how they can be used to understand the novel in a meaningful way.

Sara Ahmed in her essay “The Organisation of Hate” writes that “hate also names an intense emotion, a feeling of ‘againstness’ that is always, in the phenomenological sense, intentional. Hate is always hatred of something or somebody, although that something or somebody does not necessarily pre-exist the hate” (Ahmed 351). This description is applicable to the novel due to the fact that hatred in *1984* is always deliberate and targeted at someone or something. The thought of hate always being a deliberate, conscious disposition can be applied to the Party's various methods of control, as they tap into human nature and promote hatred on an unconscious level in individuals. Ahmed writes that hate is a “psychological disposition – that it comes from within a psyche and then moves out to others – the paper suggests that hate works to align individual and collective bodies through the very intensity of its attachments” (Ahmed 345). This approach to hatred can be used to discuss the bonds that are created between people like Winston and Julia, or Winston and O'Brien, or

indeed the collective body of the Party's members. The hatred in the Party's ideology offers individuals something to align with, and to eventually become dependent on.

Niza Yanay in her book *The Ideology of Hatred: The Psychic Power of Discourse* writes extensively on ideology. In one interesting section, she discusses Slavoj Žižek's thoughts on ideological desire and the political unconscious (Yanay, 43). Ideology is defined as having

nothing to do with illusion or distorted representation. A political attitude or belief can be completely true and still ideological. [...] Ideology is not defined in relation to the truthfulness or falseness of an idea, but rather in relation to its effect, that is, to the concealed ways in which dominant ideas are legitimized. (44).

This definition is useful in relation to *1984* because the Party's ideology is not concerned with innate facts or truths, but is more interested in shaping its own version of reality. While people like Winston can question the Party's version of reality and ideology, far-removed from any sense of truth as it is, they are unable to dispel the distorted reality that the Party has created. This can also be related to the Party's promotion of doublethink and its wielding of hatred and fear, as it is the impact of the Party's ideas that matters; whether or not the fear they spread is warranted or if the hatred they promote is grounded in reality or truth is inconsequential.

As mentioned before, *The Nature of Hate* offers a wide array of different theories and definitions of the concept of hatred. Robert Sternberg's duplex theory of hatred is suggested to be the most comprehensive theory, and it is the one that has been highlighted for use in the essay's discussion of the concept of hatred in relation to the Party's ideology and Winston's motivation. Sternberg argues for its comprehensiveness when he writes:

The duplex theory is a very encompassing theory that explains the evocation and development of hate as well as its maintenance because it is a framework consisting of different components. [...] the theory suggests three different components that constitute hate. It further specifies people's stories about their relationships with others. The strength of this framework is that many hate-based situations can be understood and interpreted on the basis of this theory. Events that superficially may seem unrelated at first view, such as a genocide in Africa, a conflict in an interpersonal relationship [...] suddenly are revealed to involve similar components and to feature the same processes. Only the surface characteristics turn out to be different. The theory, therefore, is able to bring order to a seemingly colorful and unrelated set of events that otherwise, for the observer, might seem not to have much in common with each other. (Sternberg, Sternberg 52-53)

It can be applied to both individuals and groups, and that you can "hate a person or you can hate a group: the feelings you experience are largely the same, although the target is different" (Sternberg, Sternberg 51). It should be mentioned that the theory seems to adopt a universal approach to human emotion, without taking into account culture or history and their impact on hatred. The theory's "one-size-fits-all" approach is not applicable to every instance of hate-based situations. The theory still offers a fairly comprehensive theoretical background to work with. Using this theory, one could possibly suggest that Winston's hatred for the Party, for

instance, is not meaningfully different from his hatred of the individuals like Julia – or the group that she is part of.

Sternberg's theory makes five claims, each explained in a concise and easily understood manner. To understand his thesis, I will briefly summarize each claim. The first claim is that hate is psychologically related to love. Love can be replaced and supplemented by feelings of hate. He also states that "in general, it is not actions that produce hatred, but, rather, perceptions of those actions" (51). To use an example from *1984*, one can consider Winston's assumption that Julia is nothing more than a Party zealot, and thus deserving of his hatred (Orwell 12).

The second claim is that "hate is neither the opposite nor the absence of love" (Sternberg, Sternberg 51), and that they have three interrelated components. One component is that hate and love can be inverses; the other components suggest that love and hate can be the same, though experienced differently, by different people (52). This could possibly be applied to the Party's doctrine of *doublethink*, especially in regards to the worship of Big Brother, where it seems a sort of love-hate contradiction is required. This is made evident by O'Brien's assertion to Winston – who states that he hates Big Brother - that he must also "love" Big Brother (Orwell 323-324).

The third claim is that hate and love encompass a triangular relation of "intimacy, passion and commitment", with hate being a negation or intensification of these components (Sternberg, Sternberg 52). The Party's alienation of the sexes and destruction of the familial bonds ensures that hatred and isolation force individuals to depend on the Party. As a result, the overall objective of the exclusion of positive emotions and familial bonds is that the Party becomes the only source of any kind of solidarity or positive emotions stemming from the Party's nurturing collective.

The fourth claim argues that hate and love have their origins in stories that identify the origins of these emotions (52). These origins might be found in passion, born from anger or fear (62), or the 'Stranger story' (85), which could be applied to identify the role Emmanuel Goldstein plays in the Party's propaganda (Orwell 15).

Finally, the fifth claim states that "hate is one major precursor, although certainly not the only precursor" of certain instances of genocide and terrorism (Sternberg, Sternberg 52). If we consider this claim in relation to Winston's rebellion, it offers some insight regarding his willingness to commit atrocities for his and the Brotherhood's cause (Orwell 199).

The creation of an enemy is core to the Party's grasp on power, and it is Winston's view of the Party as an intolerable enemy that drives his hate and leads him to rebellion. Fear is

exploited by the Party in the form of paranoia, which is “hardwired” in us when dealing with an enemy (74). It is an intense fear and distrust of strangers, which results in clinging to the familiar, something Robins and Post argue stems from childhood (76). The Party’s destruction of the familiar bonds between parents and children or between men and women, I would argue, leads to heightened paranoia in *1984*, as there is nothing familiar left to cling to aside from the Party and Big Brother. Fear in the form of paranoia relates closely to hatred, and this offers a useful and specific understanding of fear that is highly relevant to include in the essay.

Chapter 1

This chapter will discuss the Party and its ideology of hate. I will discuss how and why it is that hate is part of the Party's ideology to begin with, by discussing the origin of hate, focusing on fear as the originating factor. Hate empowers the Party, and the Party uses the power of hate to keep itself in control. The Party keeps itself in control by emotionally controlling the population through the use of the Two Minutes Hate, and by instilling a sense of comfort and protection, something that only the Party can offer. I will examine how power leads to the construction of hate as an ideology, and how this ideology in turn legitimizes the Party's continuous rule. Wherever it is relevant, the chapter will detail how these concepts relate to one another.

An initial, obvious picture of how the Party utilizes hate, born from fear of an enemy, as a form of control is first seen in the Two Minutes Hate session that Winston attends, along with Julia and O'Brien. "As usual", we are told, "the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the People, had flashed onto the screen" (14). Goldstein is the supposed leader of the Brotherhood, not only a rebel but traitor to the Party and the people of Oceania. He serves as the ultimate enemy, the one towards whom all of the Party members' pent-up hatred can be directed against, an ideologically and politically convenient outlet. He represents the first example of what we can call an Enemy, an object used to create fear and dependency on the protection of the Party and the Thought Police, while creating an object to hate. He is a stranger, an external threat, as described in *The Nature of Hate* (Sternberg, Sternberg 100). He is conveniently always out of reach of the Party, and this allows him to permanently remain – along with Eastasia or Eurasia – in the consciousness of the public.

The Two Minutes Hate serves both to destroy the credibility of democratic ideas, and to inspire the audience in defending Big Brother. Goldstein was "abusing Big Brother, he was denouncing the dictatorship of the Party, he was demanding the immediate conclusion of peace with Eurasia, he was advocating freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought" (15). The Two Minutes Hate demonizes these freedoms. Democracy cannot exist as we know it without these fundamental principles. If people have freedom of speech and freedom of thought, they have the ability to dissent. If they have freedom of press and freedom of assembly, they can share their ideas with others. Much like the concept of family, this fosters alternatives to the Party, which in turn lowers dependence on the Party. *The Nature of Hate* suggests that

[t]he third potential component of hate is characterized by cognitions of devaluation and diminution through contempt for the targeted group. The hater is likely to feel contempt toward the target individual or group. [...] The goal of propaganda that seeks to create commitment in hate is to change the thought processes of the preferred population so that its members will conceive of the targeted group(s) in a devalued way. (Sternberg, Sternberg 138)

By applying this to the discussion on democratic ideas, it can be concluded that it is clearly the Party's goal to devalue both the proponents and their ideas. The population's commitment to hate is bolstered by the Party constantly. By removing democratic ideas out of the equation, and by asserting that the Party is the protector of Oceania, the Party remains in control, while the population refuses, willingly, to resist the status quo, primarily out of fear of the enemy. The ideology of hate has become a matter of identity, something that must be defended. The very concept of an idea sprung from an individually formed thought is a threat to the Party's grasp on power. Consequently, these democratic concepts of freedom and liberty must be destroyed before they can ever take root in any individual's mind. The solution to ending the Party's grasp on power is hidden in plain sight of the audience, but since these dangerous ideas are associated with the enemy, they are never considered to be valid.

Ultimately, this reveals how powerful the Party's methods of control are. The Party and its ideology are empowered, by appearance willingly, by the hateful and mindless collective of Outer Party members. Niza Yanay writes that the "relations between ideology and the unconscious are formed at the moment in which ideology is denounced, at the moment of its denial, when ideology becomes not a believed experience but the truth itself (when claims for security are uncritically taken for granted)" (Yanay 44). By tying this to the essay's discussion on the Party's need to de-legitimize democratic ideas, we can understand why it is so important that the Party in its propaganda mentions freedom of speech and thought so explicitly. By allowing Goldstein to denounce the Party, and by allowing his promotion of democratic ideas, the audience in turn willingly denies his truth in favor of defending the Party's own ideology and truth. The Party is the protector of the people, and the security of the people is at stake, which in turn creates the need for the continued rule of Big Brother and the Party. The ideology of hatred lives on, and the Party rules without any real resistance.

Zimbardo writes that "[e]ach of *Nineteen Eighty-Four's* technologies of mind control is aimed at either undermining or overwhelming some personal attribute central to the human spirit" (Zimbardo 129). The Party uses networks of undercover spies to inspire paranoia, spreading fear and distrust. With the creation of Newspeak they make it impossible to vocalize any thought counter to their desires. The Party isolates every individual, destroying all social bonds, so as to foment paranoia and hatred. These insidious and subtle methods of

coercion and control consistently erode individuality and free thought, which in turn cultivates “pro-war, hateful emotions” (129). These emotions are manufactured and exploited during the Two Minutes Hate, where they are at their most potent.

Sternberg argues that “[s]uspicion of misbehavior can be just as powerful in generating feelings of hate” (51). Hatred is found in the Party’s mechanism of discovering Thought criminals and traitors. The Party actively encourages all members, including children, to report suspected Thought criminals, and has instilled in its members a severe hatred for traitors. This hatred is possibly grown in childhood, as children are sent away to become Spies, where they likely receive political education and indoctrination by the Party (Orwell 29). The rooting out of traitors is rewarded, even if they are parental figures. The destruction of the familial ties between child and parent is evidenced in the case of Parson’s arrest (Orwell 263). I do not believe that it is loyalty to the Party that decides how Party members react to suspected traitors: it is a conditioned and well-honed hatred and distrust. No one is safe from that hatred born from suspicion, whether they are innocent or not. This mechanism of hate and fear empowers the Party, in terms of resources – they can depend on their citizens to root out treachery and dissent, from an early age, which in turns creates an ideology that rewards and fosters the rooting out of traitors and Thought criminals.

Considering the sheer, unrelenting intensity of the audience’s reaction during the Two Minutes Hate, perhaps hate offers a twisted form of pleasure, too addictive not to indulge in. Naomi Jacobs in her essay “Dissent, Assent and the Body In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*” (Jacobs 4) argues that the Two Minutes Hate has as its purpose to deny a “satisfying bodily existence to its members”, and that the “Party intensifies the importance and effectiveness of Party-designed experiences such as the group ecstasy of the Two Minutes’ Hate. The only love allowed, that for Big Brother, is also the only pleasure allowed, other than the sadistic pleasures of hatred” (4).

This supports the idea that The Two Minutes Hate is intentionally designed to satisfy the bodily urges of the crowd, which would explain why when the crowd engages in this sadistic, orgiastic hate, even Winston must relent, as “[t]he horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was not that one was obliged to act as a part, but that it was impossible to avoid joining in” (17). The Two Minutes Hate offer Party members one of their few ways of acting out at all, since, most of the time, Party members must not risk the attention of the Thought Police. Thus, even pleasure is tapped by the Party, and twisted to suit its needs, emotionally manipulating the audience on several levels. No other pleasure is allowed to them, physical or mental, than the love for Big Brother, and hate for the enemy.

The Two Minutes Hate is a necessary component of the Party's grasp on power. It also shows how terrible their wielding of hate is. They control an entire populace on a psychological and sociological level: forming individuals into hive minds, incapable of displays of independent thought, strengthens the Party. If individuality is virtually eradicated by the Party, and only a collective hive mind exists, then *groupthink* should theoretically keep individuality from taking shape. The formation of individual emotions and thoughts is impossible. Hatred unites everyone's minds, and the fear of the Party, of the Thought Police, of the Enemy, keeps people bound together.

Alongside hate, fear and love of Big Brother are key emotions that the Party encourages. This is exemplified by one of O'Brien's speeches during Winston's interrogation, when he says that "[t]he old civilizations claimed that they were founded on love or justice. Ours is founded upon hatred. In our world there will be no emotions except fear, rage, triumph and self-abasement. [...] There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother" (Orwell 306). O'Brien is fully committed to the orthodoxy of the Party, so much so that he acts like a physical embodiment of the Party. He offers Winston, in plain, the official doctrine of the Party, and it reveals how important hatred is in *1984*. Not a single individual thought or emotion is to be allowed, and individuality itself is to be purged, if the Party and Big Brother are to be immortal. Individuality offers resistance to the Party's ideology of hate, because it leaves room for subversive emotions and thoughts. If Winston and Julia were truly in love in *1984*, perhaps their love would act as a form of resistance as well. Any such resistance is undesirable to the Party, as it suggests that there is anything else beyond the Party, beyond Oceania, beyond hate and fear.

Chapter 2

This chapter will deal with Winston in terms of how the Party's ideology of hate has influenced Winston. Additionally, I will argue that Winston's rebellion has been planted in his mind by the Party, and that his thoughts and emotions have been manipulated and controlled before and throughout the novel. His feelings of hatred are triggered, in part, by fears instilled in him by the Party, and that the tools of his rebellion are given to him by the Party. Facets of Winston's personality, mental capacity, and self-discipline will also be discussed as it pertains to the essay's emphasis on the importance of creating and directing hate. The chapter will also explore the possibility that the seeds of rebellion were planted in Winston by the Party, and that his rebellion is motivated by hatred.

Does hate stem from an unconscious or conscious level? It is likely that hate in *1984* is not always found in the conscious mind. When Winston attends the Two Minutes Hate, it appears as though he is triggered by the Party to react to the sounds and images of the screen, unable to resist (Orwell 17). On the other hand, we also learn that this hatred can be controlled consciously, as Winston notes, it "was even possible, at moments, to switch one's hatred this way or that way by a voluntary act [...] Winston succeeded in transferring his hatred from the face on the screen to the dark-haired girl behind him" (18). Where does this mechanism come from? Why is Winston able to, on a conscious level, transfer his hatred from one subject to another? The answer seems fairly clear. The Party uses this mechanism constantly, influencing Party members on an unconscious level. Winston is molded, on a social and psychological level, by his environment, which in turn has taught him how to use this mechanism of hate. How else could members of the Party effortlessly switch the hate and rage they project on to the screen when the enemy changes mid-sentence? During his interrogation, the idea of controlling memory is brought up, and O'Brien chides Winston by suggesting that he has "not controlled it. You are here because you have failed in humility, in self discipline" (285), and he continues to say that "[o]nly the disciplined mind can see reality", which suggests that Winston's ability to switch his hate seemingly unconsciously is key to the Party's grasp on power. By directing unconscious emotions of hate against any object, it ensures that the Party can always find new enemies, new threats, to sustain itself, and to sustain the feelings of hatred it promotes in the population.

Lukacs rejects the notion of the unconscious in regards to hatred and fear. He argues that "unconsciousness exists, it is always there in our minds, it is part of human life throughout.

But our concern must be with the conscious mind: with what and how we, and other human beings, choose to think” (Lukacs 47). He continues by arguing that

[h]atreds and fears are not subconscious phenomena. They exist within every human being. The difference between them is that there are people whose hatreds are more conscious than their fears, and others whose fears are more conscious than their hatreds. And both hatred and fear are inclinations and results not of the subconscious but of consciousness. (47)

It is then potentially important to consider if Winston’s hate is conscious, or if his feelings of hate come from within. If hate is a core tenet of Party ideology, then hate could be a core emotion and motivation for Winston, given to him by the very Party he seeks to undermine.

Winston harbors deep distrust and contempt for women. In particular, he fears and hates Julia:

She was a bold-looking girl, of about twenty-seven, with thick dark hair, a freckled face and swift, athletic movements. A narrow scarlet sash, emblem of the Junior Anti-Sex League, was wound several times round the waist of her overalls, just tightly enough to bring out the shapeliness of her hips. Winston had disliked her from the very first moment of seeing her. He knew the reason. It was because of the atmosphere of hockey-fields and cold baths and community hikes and general clean-mindedness which she managed to carry about with her. He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones. It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy. But this particular girl gave him the impression of being more dangerous than most. (Orwell 12)

He resents Julia for her attractiveness and youth. He seems to resent the fact that he desires her as well, and that she is “sexless” (Orwell 18). This might exacerbate Winston’s hatred for Julia or for the fact that he even desires her in the first place, as his desire will likely not only be unsatisfied, but will also endanger him. Winston felt a “peculiar uneasiness, which had fear mixed up in it as well as hostility, whenever she was around him” (Orwell 13). Fear and hate are connected here. He fears her because he desires her, and he hates her because he fears her.

Robins and Post write:

The more “different” the stranger in our midst, the more readily available he is as a target for externalization. An important aspect of the development of group identity is symbols of difference shared by the other – symbols on which to project hatred. But because it is representations of the self that are being projected, there must be a kinship recognized at an unconscious level. We are bound to those we hate. [...] A “good enough enemy” is an object that is available to serve as a reservoir for all the negated aspects of the self. (Robins, Post 92).

Winston projects his hatred and fear onto Julia, as he sees her as a symbol of the rejection of relations between men and women, of the familial bonds. She becomes an enemy, a threat, to Winston. At the same time, contradictory to this projected hate, he recognizes her as a fellow rebel against the Party, even if it is on an unconscious level, as Robins and Post suggest. If he sees himself in her, then he realizes the danger he could be in: he has already committed thought crime. She becomes a symbolic object of the Party that he can direct his hatred against.

As discussed previously, the Party alienates the sexes from each other, in an effort to destroy the familial bonds even further. This has the possible consequence of breeding what

appears to be misogyny in Winston. Daphne Patai, however, appears to believe that Orwell has bled into the character of Winston, and she suggests in her book *The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology* that “Orwell reveals Winston’s reaction to sexual frustration” and that “Orwell here dislodges the general comments about Party women so that they are no longer attached to Winston’s point of view but instead take on the form of reliable ‘facts’” (Patai 240-241). Patai seems to deride this point of view, and suggests that Winston’s hate only stems from sexual frustration. I disagree with this on the basis that he is conditioned to view women in this way. Women become external threats, and strangers, that must be feared and hated. His mindset is tainted by the subtle coercions of ideology, and he cannot break free from what he does not know, or cannot know. His distrust and hatred for women, along with his rebellion, are all the result of the Party’s manipulative and invasive methods of control.

Patai goes on to write that Winston does not analyze this fanaticism and that it is not an “indication of what the Party has done to women but only as a negative comment about women themselves, presumably by “nature” susceptible to such fanaticism” (241). It seems to me that Patai is more concerned with Orwell’s misogyny than she is with Winston’s. I disagree with her characterization of Winston, because her argument that Winston does not analyze the fanaticism displayed by Party women does not consider the process of normalization that has taken place in Winston’s mind. Women are fanatic, by default, and women are inherently hostile, because they are intended to be, by the Party. Imagine the reverse, if Julia was the protagonist of *1984*. Because it is the goal of the Party to alienate the sexes, she would also view men as hostile, hateful and untrustworthy – that is the image the Party wants its members to have. Is Winston justified in disliking and distrusting nearly all women, for their fanaticism and their bigotry? This very question is answered by O’Brien, and it appears that fear and hatred are meant to go both ways. Men as well as women are desexualized and de-familiarized, as O’Brien notes:

We have cut the links between man and woman, No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer. But in the future there will be no wives and no friends. [...] The sex instinct will be eradicated. Procreation will be an annual formality like the renewal of a ration card. (Orwell 306)

However, a more important reason for him disliking Julia might be because she appeared to project a “general clean-mindedness”, the sort of Party purity which we come to learn that he hates. It is the same purity of will and body that the Party idealizes. This is the same purity and “goodness” that Winston professes to hate in Julia (144). The purity is exhibited in what Winston – and Orwell, if we are to include Orwell in his own novel as Patai does – calls fanaticism.

The Party has taught him much of what he knows, and he may be unaware of how much of his rebellion is expressed through the means given to him by the Party. Brigit Rooney seems to agree with this notion, as she discusses this in her essay “Narrative Viewpoint and the Representation of Power in George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*” (2002):

The iron-voiced repetition of Winston’s and Julia’s words suggests that there is something inhumanly robotic about the Party’s invisible agents. [...] [W]henver O’Brien and Winston converse, a verbal echo recurs, at first suggesting sympathy but later acquiring a mechanical, sinister character. The increasingly mocking repetition of Winston’s privately uttered words (and of his inner thoughts) conveys the idea that, rather than being a safe haven for the autonomous self, an individual’s mind can be breached and controlled by the Party. An even darker possibility emerges—that Winston’s dream of rebellion is neither original nor voluntary but has been planted there all along by the Party. (Rooney 73).

Rooney’s narratological perspective highlights the possibility that Winston’s rebellion is false, by analyzing the “iron voice” of the telescreen as Winston and Julia are finally caught. Here, her perspective changes our perception of the scene. The mockery, seemingly knowing each and every one of Winston’s thoughts, implies a devastating conclusion: that his mind was breached a long time ago, despite Winston’s belief that the Party could never hear or see a person’s innermost thoughts, or indeed truly change them.

If his mind has been breached, it is equally possible that his emotions have also been influenced and controlled a long time ago. While his rebellion is possibly not his own, what does that say about his emotions? If hatred is found in all of us, then surely Winston was capable of feeling hate long before the Party breached his mind. The question then lies in how this hatred is used by the Party. I would argue that they not only amplify his feelings of hate, but they also direct them through emotional triggers when necessary. It is also possible that the Party has not only developed Winston’s resistance to their rule, but also cultivated a hate for the Party. The hate he feels for the Party and its doctrine has been deliberately grown in him, which in turn leads him to rebel – to commit thoughtcrime – willingly.

Conclusion

This essay has provided a general overview of how hatred, fear, power and ideology play a part in *1984*. To begin with, a brief summary of the essay's findings will be offered, before moving on to the essay's conclusion.

In Chapter one, the focus is on the Party's ideology of hatred, and how hatred and fear, as promoted by the Party, empower it and allow it to stay in control. At the center of the chapter's discussion is the Two Minutes Hate. The significance of the Two Minutes Hate lies in its purpose, which is to create dependence on the Party by spreading fear through the threat of an external enemy, be it Eastasia, Eurasia or Emmanuel Goldstein and his Brotherhood. Fear in the shape of paranoia also dominates the thought processes of the Outer Party members, as any aberrant behavior is reported to the Thought Police. Freedom of speech, thought and assembly are associated with the enemy, which in turn delegitimizes these concepts as viable alternatives to Big Brother and the Party's grasp on power. Also, the Party offers the only accepted emotional outlet for Party members, the Two Minutes Hate, which offers a form of pleasure to the audience. The result of these machinations is that the Party creates dependence, as the Party members seek protection from the enemy. The Party also offers comfort, and is the only comfort allowed to its members, as the familial bonds have been eradicated.

In the second chapter, the focus lies on Winston Smith and his resistance to the Party, as well as his relationship to Julia. Winston's misogyny is discussed, and it is found to be related to the Party's deliberate alienation of the sexes, as not only are familial bonds eroded, but also the very concept of romantic or sexual relationships between men and women, as distrust is grown, leading to, in Winston's case, sexual frustration and hatred for women. Additionally, the chapter discusses unconscious and conscious hate in Winston, suggesting that his ability to control and direct his hate on an unconscious level is derived from the Party, which has fostered such an ability in Winston. The unconscious hate can be directed toward any enemy, which is a powerful tool for the Party, as it allows for countless threats and enemies to the Party, all of which can be used to keep it in control, as the population is rallied against whatever opposes the Party. The chapter concludes that Winston's mind has been breached, and that his rebellion and his feelings of hate are manipulated by the Party.

I do believe that this essay has raised some important questions regarding hatred, at least in regard to *1984*. If hatred has guided Winston all along, his rebellion offers little hope for the

future of Oceania. Winston is a man that believes he is truly free, and because of his belief he rebels so that others might free themselves. He is not free, because most of his emotions and his thoughts are manipulated by the Party. His rebellion is ultimately false, and it is not just because it is likely that the Party gave him the tools and the motivation to act, but because it is based on hatred. I do not think that hatred, born from fear, paranoia and distrust, if it is found in the core of a resistance movement against an authority, can ever be considered morally or ethically right. Hatred begets hatred; it is similar to fighting fire with fire. The ends do not justify the means. You would simply trade one authority, tyrannical as it might be, with another, in time. How can we apply these questions when we discuss civil resistance and uprisings in our modern world? Can these questions revolving around fear and hate cast recent conflicts in a different light? The legitimacy of civil uprisings, rebellions and coups can be questioned based on their motivation. If hatred for the enemy, hatred for the regime, can be found at the center of resistance, then the resistance and its ideology are not necessarily as clear-cut as the proponents might believe them to be. If the ends do not justify the means, then we cannot implicitly trust that the rebellion is based on just cause, whatever it might be.

There is the possibility that Winston could have succeeded in his rebellion with Julia, and managed to cause the downfall of the Party. How would this shape the future of their world, if a rebellion based on hatred succeeded in destroying a Party that has instilled hatred and fear in the masses for decades? What else do they know? It is possible that they would establish another authoritarian regime, one that continues to rule with an ideology of hatred and violence, except now based on an illusory form of liberty and democracy. Perhaps this would result in the world Niza Yanay writes about, with hatred dominating political discourse in Western democracies (Yanay 2-3).

This essay might provide a good basis for future research on hatred as an ideology in *1984*. An essay on the same subject could focus on a single aspect of hatred, or dedicate itself to a certain perspective, such as Rooney's narratological discussion of *1984*.

Bibliography

Primary source

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1949. The Annotated Edition, 2013. London. Penguin Books.

Secondary sources

Print

Lukacs, John. *Democracy and Populism: Fear & Hatred*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005. Print.

Patai, Daphne. *The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology*. Amherst, MA. University of Massachusetts Press. 1984. Print.

Robins, Robert S., and Jerrold M. Post. *Political Paranoia: The Psychopolitics of Hatred*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997. Print.

Sternberg, Robert J., and Karin Sternberg. *The Nature of Hate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

Yanay, Niza. *The Ideology of Hatred: The Psychic Power of Discourse*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013. Print.

Zimbardo, G. Philip. *Mind Control*. Found in *On Nineteen Eighty-Four: Orwell And Our Future*. Gleason, Abbott. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005. Print.

Web

Ahmed, Sara. *The Organisation of Hate*. Revised 2006. Dordrecht, the Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

< <http://link.springer.com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1013728103073> >.

Date Accessed 14. May. 2014.

Jacobs, Naomi. Dissent, Assent, and the Body in Nineteen Eighty-Four. *Utopian Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (2007), pp. 3-20. Published by: Penn State University Press. Article Stable URL: < <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stable/20719844> >. Date Accessed 14. May. 2014

Rooney, Brigid. "Narrative Viewpoint and the Representation of Power in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four." *Sydney Studies in English* 28 (2002): > <http://ojs-prod.library.usyd.edu.au/index.php/SSE/article/view/565/534> >. Date Accessed 13. May. 2014.