



Universitetet
i Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study: MLI HOV

Spring semester, 2010

Open

Author: Anstein Skjørestad

.....
(Author's signature)

Person with academic responsibility:

Supervisor: Brita Strand Rangnes

Thesis title: *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* — a comparative study of how violence affects the main characters with special attention to age and life stage.

Keywords:

- *1984*
- *A Clockwork Orange*
- Violence
- Totalitarianism
- Anthony Burgess
- George Orwell

No. of pages:
+ appendices/other:

Stavanger, 20 May 2010

Table of contents

- Abstractiv**
- 1 Introduction1**
- 2 Background.....8**
 - 2.1.1 1984, A Clockwork Orange and violence8*
 - 2.1.2 Methodology and literature review.....10*
 - 2.1.3 Violence and aggression12*
 - 2.1.4 Innatism versus behaviourism.....14*
 - 2.2 Why violence prevails18**
 - 2.2.1 The reward of violence.....19*
 - 2.2.2 Personal factors and aptness to violence20*
 - 2.2.3 Additional outside factors22*
 - 2.2.4 The attraction of violence.23*
 - 2.3 Different kinds of violence.....25**
 - 2.3.1 Perception of violence: subjective violence versus objective violence25*
 - 2.3.2 Violence on a social level.....27*
 - 2.3.3 Violence in a totalitarian rule and war.....30*
 - 2.3.4 Violence as youth rebellion and the meaninglessness of violence.....36*
 - 2.3.5 Violence and football hooligans39*
- 3 198442**
 - 3.1 A short introduction of the main characters in 198442**
 - 3.1.1 Winston Smith43*
 - 3.1.2 Julia.....46*
 - 3.1.3 O'Brien.....48*
 - 3.2 The society and the government in 1984 — a totalitarian rule.....49**
 - 3.2.1 The onion — the structure of the totalitarian Party in 198451*
 - 3.2.2 A world of distrust54*

3.2.3 <i>The secret police</i>	57
3.3 What kinds of violence — 1984	58
3.3.1 <i>Subjective violence versus objective violence</i>	59
3.3.2 <i>Winston’s struggle</i>	61
3.4 What causes violence and aggression in 1984	65
3.4.1 <i>Frustration and outside factors</i>	65
3.4.2 <i>Us versus them and group mentality</i>	67
3.4.3 <i>Two Minutes Hate, Goldstein and the attraction of violence</i>	69
3.4.4 <i>Public hangings — watching violence</i>	71
4 A Clockwork Orange	73
4.1 What kinds of violence — A Clockwork Orange	73
4.1.1 <i>Subjective versus objective violence</i>	73
4.1.2 <i>Objective violence in a totalitarian rule</i>	76
4.2 What causes violence and aggression in A Clockwork Orange	86
4.2.1 <i>The attraction of violence</i>	86
4.2.2 <i>Biological factors/brain chemistry</i>	87
4.2.3 <i>The reward of violence</i>	90
4.2.4 <i>Power</i>	91
4.2.5 <i>Violence and hooligans — a sense of belonging</i>	94
4.2.6 <i>Frustration and a cry for recognition</i>	100
4.2.7 <i>Additional outside factors that cause frustration</i>	104
5 Conclusion	110
Reading List	116

Abstract

This main aim of this thesis is to review how violence affects the main characters in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*; what kinds of violence affect Winston and Alex respectively, and what causes it. We shall first go into the nature of violence more in general, and find out what violence really is and how violence can be connected to the analyses of the novels. First, we shall provide a definition of violence, second, we will present different perceptions of violence, third, we are interested in finding out whether violence is an inborn human characteristic or a social construct. We shall review certain philosophical notions on violence, along with some historical ones.

When doing a literary analysis of two very distinct characters, it can be useful to also visit some psychological aspects as well. Especially in connection to whether violence is inborn or not, some biological aspects of violence must be reviewed. The third aspect of the background chapter is to review potential outside factors that may affect violence.

During the course of this thesis we shall see that violence affects the main characters in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* to a great extent. Violence seems to function as motif in both novels. *1984* is set in an extremely totalitarian society where the individual is always put second. Winston realises that the *Party* is to blame for all of his hardships. He remembers a time when life was different, he remembers a life that was different from the life *Big Brother* dictates him. Due to the frustration the totalitarian society invokes in him, Winston has no other choice than to revolt. His revolt and willingness to do the most dreadful acts in order to ruin the structure of the Party is a result of that. In that manner, revolt through violence becomes a human characteristic. Winston's violence, on the other hand, is learned.

Winston's age plays a central part in this because of his knowledge of an alternative to life and his awareness that the Party, the totalitarian movement in *1984*, is causing him the hardships he endures. Up until Winston's arrest, violence in *1984* is mostly on the political ideological level. Till then, there are not many examples of physical violence in the novel. It is the clear and present threat of violence that is the underlying oppressive factor in *1984*. That, however, is also violence.

When Winston is arrested, violence changes from being a tacit threat to real violence. Winston is tortured in the most gruesome ways, and the time he spends in prison is the unprecedented record of subjective violence in the totalitarian society in *1984*. The threat of violence now manifests itself when Winston is interrogated. Violence now becomes more real, physical, and brutal. O'Brien is Winston's chief interrogator, and when he gets involved, the violence Winston suffers has a clearly identifiable agent. The system, the society is to blame for both Winston's violence, but also the violence he endures throughout the whole of the novel.

Alex too grows up in a totalitarian society. Although not quite as totalitarian as the society in *1984*, the society in *A Clockwork Orange* is growing towards totalitarianism. Unlike *1984*, the violence in *A Clockwork Orange* is physical from the first page. Alex is part of a youth generation that is extremely violent. This violence may stem from a youth rebellion, but as the novel progresses, and as we shall see in the analysis of the novel in this thesis, violence in *A Clockwork Orange* is not really subjective. Youth violence is part of a system, and part of everyday life, and that makes violence in *A Clockwork Orange* objective. The violence the teens are responsible for is similar to the violence the growing totalitarian government uses in response, thus making only more violence.

Apart from growing up in a totalitarian rule, we shall see that certain outside factors may help facilitate violence. Such factors include group violence, power, crowding, drug abuse, and the nature of adolescence in connection to violence. In addition, by being violent Alex seeks out his free will. Being good is not a choice but an order, being bad is therefore a choice and becomes the manifestation of Alex's humanity and freedom of choice.

The most important factors behind Alex's violence, however, are Alex's need to belong, cry for recognition, and the frustration he suffers because of society's resistance in letting him in. The need to belong overshadows every principle, and Alex succumbs the power of the totalitarian machine. Similar to *1984*, violence in *A Clockwork Orange* is majorly caused by the wrath of totalitarianism; the political direction of society.

1 Introduction

The main aim of this thesis is to investigate how violence affects the main characters Winston in George Orwell's *1984* and Alex in Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, with special attention to age and life stage. The main study question is then: How does violence affect the main characters in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* regarding age and life stage?

The main aim can be divided into two subaims. The first subaim is to explore the nature of violence. The second subaim is to discuss what *kinds* of violence affect Winston in *1984*. The third subaim of this thesis is to review what causes the violence that affects Winston. The fourth subaim is directed at Alex and *A Clockwork Orange*: what kinds of violence affect him? The fifth subaim of this thesis is to discuss what causes the violence that affects Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*.

The first subaim of this thesis is to explore the nature of violence. Violence, as a distinct phenomenon needs to be revised and defined. Chapter two will address violence on a general level. What kinds of violence are there, is a central question in this part of the thesis. The causes for violence are too. We shall address some historical notions on violence and see how they differ from how violence is perceived today. Some philosophical notions on violence will also be discussed in order to go into the depth of the complexity of the subject. Because the main focus of this thesis involves individuals, some psychological aspects of violence will also be reviewed.

Both novels are situated in totalitarian regimes. Therefore, violence in a totalitarian regime, political violence, must also be revised. Social violence and group violence will also be addressed in order to understand the full diversity of violence. Social violence and group violence are also relevant to the analyses of the novels.

A second aspect of chapter two is to investigate whether violence is depicted as a socially constructed concept or a human characteristic in the novels: To what extent are people born violent, and to what extent is it society that makes people violent?

A second aspect of the analyses of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* is to investigate whether violence is different for people of different age and on different stages of life. First, to

what degree does age affect how violence is perceived? Second, to what extent does life stage affect the way violence is perceived?

A priori, violence affects Winston and Alex to a great extent. The most important aspect of this thesis is to find out what *kinds* of violence affect them. Violence, we believe, as a result of the way society is governed in the two novels, affects Winston and Alex the most. We shall go into the nature of totalitarian regimes and discuss the function of violence in such regimes. In addition, other factors that may influence violence will be revised and connected to the novels. Perhaps these factors can help explain how violence affects Winston and Alex, at least, we expect that certain outside factors may help facilitate violence, in general, but also in connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*.

In connection to violence, age, and life stage, violence is probably different; younger people have a different perception of violence than people who are older. This last notion will be put in connection to Winston and Alex in chapters three and four.

The key reasons for doing this research is that violence, as an isolated phenomenon, is often neglected in scientific research, both with regards to historical as well as political studies; violence as a distinct phenomenon needs more attention. Throughout the last century violence has played a very important part. It is likely that violent episodes throughout this century have decreased, but people's awareness of violence most likely has not. The history of the human race has always been violent, but with the introduction of the global press and the expansion of the media machine, violence has gained more and more attention, from the Second World War till present time. In the electronic era of today, the attention violence attracts, is bound to do something with how violence is perceived. No doubt life in the Dark Ages was more violent than today, but people's awareness of violence has increased. The world has gotten smaller, more globalised, more international, which again makes media coverage of violence big business. People now grow up with more media coverage than ever before. People have access to every conflict, every riot, every war through their computers, televisions, newspapers and cellphones.

Violence, however, comes in different forms. People do not always know that they are subjects to violence. The globalisation of the world, and the technological advancements in surveillance represent other threats to the human existence. Today, cellphones can be tapped

and traced, enabling various intelligence agencies to easily get access to people's most private conversations. Credit cards can be traced and give away a person's whereabouts, a person's IP-address can be traced, many cities have surveillance cameras, and satellite surveillance in the twenty-first century has never been more efficient.

The increased globalisation of the world and the technological advancement connected to it can be misused. In connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, we will investigate if surveillance and government control in fact represent violence, and perhaps even oppression of free will and what that do to people who experience them. This aspect is what makes this thesis relevant to society today: How does totalitarian societies work and how does violence relate to such societies? That is where *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* come in. Even though these novel were written shortly after WWII, they seem to discuss similar worries that people of the twenty-first century also share.

Chapter three will deal with how violence affects the main character Winston Smith in Orwell's *1984*. The British writer wrote novels with a political edge. *1984* was first published in 1949 and seeing firsthand the horrors of war, the rise and fall of the Third Reich, and the political situation in Stalin's Soviet Union, Orwell wanted to warn the world about the dangers of totalitarian regimes. The novel became an instant hit when it was published. Some of that popularity has probably got to do with the fact that his previous novel *Animal Farm* (2003), an attack on Soviet communism, became a huge success when it was first published in 1945. Even today, *1984* is possibly the greatest warning against totalitarian regimes found in fiction, at least when considering the vast impact the novel had and still has on the reading public. Today, *1984* is by many literary reviewers considered nothing but a modern classic.

Terms from the novel have even entered the English language and the violence domain, and the novel has been adapted to the big screen in 1984. According to Hampton (2004) of the New York Times, *1984* is still highly relevant to society today:

Orwell began his novel "Nineteen Eighty-Four" just as World War II ended, and the year 1984 seemed far in the future. Today it seems long ago. But in a time when you can't window shop in the mall, walk in Manhattan or drive into London or Rome without possibly being recorded by surveillance cameras, one can ask: Is Orwell's telescreen such a fantasy? When zipper headlines running across the bottom of a television screen are the main source of information, can Newspeak be far behind?

Although democracy outlived the Soviet Union, there are totalitarian regimes still intact today, and as Hampton (2004) points out, the amount of surveillance in the twenty-first

century makes the kind of society Orwell describes in *1984* still a potential reality. The political situations in North-Korea, Burma, and to some degree in China are a bit alarming. Burma in 2007, for instance, found it necessary to shut down all international communication in order to keep their acts of oppression hidden. In other words, *1984* is still highly relevant to today's society.

Today, Orwell's figure *Big Brother* has become a term. It is used when people argue that the state surveil and control too much. In Norway, there are laws against surveillance which are there to ensure a person's right to privacy. People behave differently when they are being watched, therefore, constant surveillance is a way of limiting people's free will. It is oppressing, and, as will be adressed later in this thesis, potentially an act of violence performed by the government on the public.

Newspeak, the official language in *1984*, too, is a word that has entered the English language. Newspeak is developed in order to limit people's concepts and tools for thought making it highly limiting to people's perception of free will. Even Orwell's name has become a term. Orwellian is an adjective in the English language, and according to the *Compact Oxford English Dictionary* (2008) it relates to '...the work of the British novelist George Orwell (1903-50), especially the totalitarian state depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-four*'. Orwellian societies are states where the people are being tyrannised by '...grey and uniformed Orwellian 'totalitarian' bureaucrats... (Žižek 2008: 24)'. As a term, Orwellian societies simply refer to totalitarian states where the governments have too much power.

Orwell's novel is situated in a future totalitarian regime called *Oceania*, somewhere around the year *1984*. The novel's main character Winston Smith lives in the regime's main city called *Airstrip One*, formerly known as London. The world consists of three superpowers with equal strength: *Oceania*, *Eurasia* and *Eastasia*. Oceania is always at war with either Eastasia or Eurasia. When Oceania is fighting Eurasia, Eastasia is an ally, when Oceania is fighting Eastasia, Eurasia is an ally. The three powers have no chance of fully conquering each other.

The society in *1984* is under constant surveillance. Everywhere people are subject to the everlasting gaze of Oceania's omniscient godlike leader Big Brother. Every room has a *Telescreen* by which Big Brother is watching, and almost everywhere there are microphones

designed to detect every spoken word. Apart from the Telescreens and the microphones, Oceania's secret police, the *Thought Police*, are everywhere. There are few places in Oceania where detection can be avoided. The purpose of these features of surveillance is to detect any behaviour deemed threatening to the totalitarian movement. Any behaviour that is considered unorthodox is punished severely. People vanish from the face of the earth based on the wrong facial expression, sleep talking, or keeping a diary. The secret police can do whatever they want whenever they want to, and there is no way of telling who is going to be next. The people of Oceania live in constant fear of being tortured, or perhaps even worse, killed, and there is no way of knowing why and when.

Winston remembers a time when things were different. Although in his mid thirties in the beginning of the novel, in the context of the society in *1984*, Winston is relatively old. He longs for a time when food tastes better, when beautiful things are kept beautiful, when freedom of choice is possible and truth can be objective. That, however, is not remotely possible with the current government which is obsessed with power at any cost. *1984* is about Winston's revolt and society's attempt of holding him down.

Chapter four will deal with *A Clockwork Orange* and how violence affects the main character Alex. *A Clockwork Orange* was first published in 1962 by Burgess. Also a British writer, Burgess was occupied with the importance of moral choice, free will and the dichotomy between good and evil. He too had firsthand experience from the horrors of war. Burgess too, was afraid of the dangers of totalitarian regimes, especially in connection to the rise of the Soviet Union. Burgess's novel, however, did not have such an impact on the public when it was first published. It was not until the American director Stanley Kubrick adapted the novel to the big screen in 1972 that *A Clockwork Orange* fully gained the public's attention, and today, many people only know of Kubrick's version.

The movie caused great stir after its release, and even today Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange* is not available in the United Kingdom. In the aftermath of the movie, various violent cases in Britain were said to have a connection to Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange*. One case, Blackstock of *The Independent* (1999) argues, included a rape where the rapist was singing 'Singing in the Rain' like the protagonist Alex does on several occasions in Kubrick's movie. The general opinion of Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange* was that the movie was a bad

influence on the younger generation in Britain and that it created more violence. Canby (1972) of *The New York Times* agrees that the movie may be a bad influence on younger viewers, but emphasises the importance of the movie:

...[B]ut there may be a very real problem when even such stylized representations are seen by immature audiences. That, however, is another subject entirely, and one for qualified psychiatrists to ponder. In my opinion Kubrick has made a movie that exploits only the mystery and variety of human conduct. And because it refuses to use the emotions conventionally, demanding instead that we keep a constant, intellectual grip on things, it's a most unusual--and disorienting--movie experience.

The movie is missing the final chapter of the novel, something that Burgess was deeply offended by. The final chapter of the novel shows that Alex's physical violence is no longer such a big part of his life. People who watch the movie do not get that aspect of the novel, thus making the movie more of a mere glorification of physical violence than anything else. The final chapter is essential in the novel. This will be addressed in chapter four.

A Clockwork Orange is highly relevant to today's society. For instance, youth violence as seen in street gangs, football hooligans, the dangers of totalitarian rule and government restrictions, are still very much a part of the twenty-first century. Like *1984*, due to the novel or the film, many terms and phrases from *A Clockwork Orange* have entered the English language.

Ultra violence, as Alex refers to it, consists of violence in its most brutal and raw manner. *Ultras*, for instance, have become a term for an extremely violent right-wing group of English football hooligans. Droogs, Alex refers to his gang members as droogs in *A Clockwork Orange*, is the name of Italian side Juventus's most renowned and violent hooligans. A droog has also entered the English language and according to the *Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang* (2005) a droog is:

'...*noun* A young ruffian; an accomplice or henchman of a gang-leader. 1962-. **TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT** How long ago it seems since the *New York Times* referred to the spray-can droogs of the subways as 'little Picassos' (1984). [An adaptation of Russian *drug* friend, introduced by Anthony Burgess in *A Clockwork Orange*.]'

In effect, not only are *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* extremely violent in character, but also elements from both novels have become terms in violence theory and part of the vocabulary of the violence domain as well as in the media domain and the social studies domain.

Burgess's novel is also situated in a totalitarian state in the future. Though not specific regarding time or place, *A Clockwork Orange* takes place in a city in England as well as in a village in the countryside in a not so distant future. The government in *A Clockwork Orange* clings to power at the expense of the individual. As a result of restrictive rule and a complacent public, a violent youth generation emerges. The novel's main character Alex is part of this violent youth generation.

In the beginning of the novel, the fifteen-year-old Alex is leading a small group of criminals who call themselves droogs. An ordinary day of their lives consists of random beatings-up, rapes, and drinking milk at the local bar. Alex is mainly preoccupied with violence and sex, but also has a fondness for classical music and especially Beethoven.

After being betrayed by his companions because of an argument, Alex is imprisoned. After a mugging gone wrong, Alex kills an old woman and is sentenced to fourteen years in prison. After a few years in prison with relatively good behaviour, Alex catches wind of a rumour about a new experimental correctional technique. The *Ludovico Technique* will shorten his sentence to a few weeks of treatment. After Alex finishes his treatment, he is let loose and reenters society, but with one small difference: he is no longer capable of making his own moral choices. Because of the treatment, he is conditioned to get nauseated when sexual and violent thoughts occur. The rest of the novel is about Alex's struggle to regain his free will and become a man. The novel has elements of the *bildungsroman*, because the readers follow Alex in his quest of defining himself and entering the realm of maturity and the obstacles he must master on his way.

One of the aims of this thesis is to investigate what kinds of violence affect the main characters in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. First, however, there is a need to establish a link between these novels and the subject of violence.

2 Background

2.1.1 *1984, A Clockwork Orange and violence*

There are a few common denominators between *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* that need to be addressed. First, they are both situated in totalitarian states. The society in *1984* is probably more extreme in its totalitarian character, but still, there are resemblances to the society in *A Clockwork Orange* too.

Second, both *A Clockwork Orange* and *1984* are situated somewhere in the future. *A Clockwork Orange* is not set in a specific time, but it is likely that the novel is situated sometime at the end of the twentieth century. *1984* is set somewhere around the time the title suggests. To some degree, it can be argued that they are both science fiction novels. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2000) science fiction is '...a type of book film/movie, etc. that is based on imagined scientific discoveries of the future, and often deals with space travel and life on other planets'. Both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* describe imagined futures, but without the space wars, the electric lasers, flying cars, and all other technological enhancements people often associate with the science fiction genre. They describe a time when society does not work, it is dysfunctional, and a time where technological advancements have more or less stopped, and standards of living are decreasing instead of increasing thus giving the novels more of a dystopian character.

A dystopia is, according to the *Compact Oxford English Dictionary* (2008), '...an imaginary place or society in which everything is bad'. Society in both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* is argueably a dystopia and a bad place. Booker (1994) claims dystopian fiction is often considered social critique. The social critique in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, however, is not directed to the current rule, the rule in power at the publication date, but towards totalitarian rules of the era: the Soviet Union, Spain, and to some degree Nazi-Germany. These two novels are warnings of what Britain would be like under a totalitarian rule; a place where the individual has no place, and where there is no pursuit of happiness. Both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* can be included under the umbrella of dystopian fiction alongside texts as Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* (1999), Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (2007) and Golding's *The Lord of the Flies* (1996).

The greatest common denominator between *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, however, is perhaps the reference to violence. Violence seems to function as a motif in both novels, it affects everyday life, it is constant, and it is always there. Winston is always reminded of violence, anger and hate wherever he goes. There is even an obligatory ritual called the *Two Minutes Hate* which Winston is obliged to participate in every day. He is living in a time when random executions are common, and no one can ever be safe from the violent wrath of the dreadful secret police the *Thought Police*. People who are deemed threatening to the state are simply annihilated and never heard of again. There is torture in *1984*, and in *room 101* is where the prisoners are faced with their greatest fear. The room represents the ultimate weapon of horror and intimidation, a place where everyone confesses, guilty or not. It is not enough to kill off unwanted people, before a prisoner is eliminated, he must be brainwashed and announce his pure love of the Party's leader Big Brother.

Alex too is surrounded by violence, but in his case, compared to Winston in *1984*, he is both a perpetrator and a victim of violence. He commits acts that are extremely violent in character, and he does them, at first sight, just for fun. Alex and his droogs, his brothers in arms, beat up an old drunk, they break into a writer's home, beat him and make him watch as they rape his wife, and they fight a rivalling street gang with chains and blades, all before the first night in the novel has ended. As things change in Alex's life, however, when he is physically unable to be violent, to think about violence, to think about sex, Alex is more of a victim of violence than a perpetrator. He then finds himself on the receiving end with the government as the executioner. He realises that one of his former droogs Dim has joined forces with Billyboy, Alex's nemesis from the streets. Dim and Billyboy are no longer violent kids, but police officers, brute and corrupt serving the state. In reality, these two brutes have not changed at all except for their uniforms.

On the other hand, what separates Alex from Winston is that where Alex is young, Winston is old. They are at different stages of life as well as of different age. Is violence then different? Do they perceive violence differently, and is violence experienced differently if a person is old and settled than when he is young and still living with his parents? These questions will be more closely examined in chapters three and four in connection to the analyses of Winston in *1984* and Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*.

2.1.2 Methodology and literature review

The research material will be structured around the close reading of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. The thesis will be focused around the main characters of these novels, Winston and Alex respectively, and how violence affects them with a special attention to age and life stage. Close reading and the use of secondary theoretical texts will be the main tools for conducting the research. The reason for focusing specifically on violence is because there are written numerous papers on both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, but these papers are focused more on language and power than on violence as an isolated phenomenon.

No one engaged in thought about history and politics can remain unaware of the enormous role violence has always played in human affairs, and it is at first glance rather surprising that violence has been singled out so seldom for special consideration (Arendt 1970: 8).

A Clockwork Orange and *1984* are very political, they warn against a specific direction in politics; totalitarianism. There are written numerous papers on the two novels in question, but by focusing especially on violence can contribute to giving a further understanding of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, and, as Arendt (1970: 8) claims above, considering politics, but also history, with a special attention to violence is often neglected.

Out of respect for the authors of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, comments on language, in the various quotes from these two novels in this thesis, will only be provided for when the contexts alone are not enough to understand what the words refer to.

In the analyses of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* certain philosophical texts are valuable resources. Especially Arendt's *The Rise of Totalitarianism* (1951) and *On Violence* (1970) will be important sources to this thesis, especially because both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* are situated in totalitarian societies. Arendt is a German-born American political theorist and philosopher, and her thoughts on totalitarian rules and violence hold great credit in the academic society. These works are relevant to this thesis because they discuss the nature of a totalitarian rule with special attention to violence. When doing a literary investigation on how violence affects the main characters in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, Arendt's works can therefore be very rewarding. Especially Arendt's thoughts on how totalitarian societies use violence to hold its citizens down, are highly relevant to the main aim of this thesis. Particularly when discussing the connection between violence and society, the secret police, and the manipulation of truth in *1984*, Arendt can be useful.

Žižek's *Violence* (2008) is another very important contribution to this thesis. The Slovenian sociologist, continental philosopher, cultural critic and theorist is highly influential to the way violence is reviewed in the twenty-first century. This contemporary thinker's books and two movies are much-debated in the academia in Europe as well as in the world. In connection to this thesis, Žižek is relevant because of his insights in the nature of youth rebellion, government violence and oppression, the nature of violence, generalisation of groups, and the perception of violence.

Žižek will be helpful in the discussion of what kinds of violence influence Winston in *1984* and Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* because of the themes Žižek reviews are similar to the ones in the novels. In addition, the thesis will be structured in relation to the two basic forms of violence identified by Žižek (2008). One is referred to as subjective violence. That means that the act of violence is compared to a state without violence. This state is what Žižek (2008: 2) calls a 'non-violent zero level'. Subjective violence is always performed by a 'clearly identifiable agent' and functions to disrupt what is seen to be the norms of normality (Žižek 2008: 1). The other kind of violence, Žižek (2008: 2) calls objective violence: 'Objective violence is invisible because it sustains the very zero-level standard against which we perceive something as subjectively violent.' When the violence executed on a public does not protrude the normal state of affairs, that 'invisible' violence is objective. Therefore, one of the aims of this thesis is to find out whether the violence that affects Winston and Alex is subjective or objective.

Lawrence & Karim's *On violence: A reader* (2007) is another important work that will be included in this thesis. Lawrence, the Nancy and Jeffrey Marcus Humanities Professor of religion at Duke University, and Karim, an assistant professor of English at St. Xavier University, are the scholars responsible for putting some of the world's most debated texts on violence together in their anthology *On violence: A reader* (2007). This anthology includes works by influential thinkers such as Marx, Hegel, Fanon, Malcolm X, Freud, and Hobbes. In connection to this thesis, Lawrence & Karim will be particularly beneficial when it comes to defining violence, but also throughout the thesis as a whole. Especially Lawrence & Karim's introduction to violence will be particularly helpful in the background chapter of this thesis.

Myers's *Exploring Social Psychology* (2004) will bring relevant thoughts to the field of violence on the psychological level. When discussing violence as a social and cultural phenomenon, it is important to also consider psychological aspects of violence, especially because two individuals are the focal point of this thesis. Therefore, in connection to the definition of violence, and why violence prevails, Myers will be useful in the background chapter, as well as in the analyses of *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. Myers discusses violence on the social level, but with a focus on psychology. In addition, Myers points to a vast array of outside factors that may influence violence. Those factors will be included in the discussion of where violence comes from in connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. We want to see if the violence that affects Winston and Alex can be caused by outside factors. Myers is a highly acclaimed scholar in the domain of social psychology.

Chapter two will provide a definition of violence, what kinds of violence there are, what factors increase violence, and to explore violence as an individual phenomenon and a social phenomenon. The background chapter will discuss violence on a more general level, but will be included in the analyses of the two novels in chapters three and four. Before such an examination may begin, however, it is necessary to address the nature of violence, its various forms and its reasons why, on a more general level.

2.1.3 Violence and aggression

To exactly pin point what violence really is and what it is not, is a very difficult task. Violence can take multiple forms on multiple levels that to provide a limited dictionary definition may almost seem impossible. Lawrence & Karim (2007: 6) claim in *On Violence*, that violence '...is always mediated through individuals, we challenge the notion that violence is intrinsic to the human condition or social structure'. War, for instance, is arguably the ultimate act of violence, but war is both a state of personal crisis as well as for the whole of society involved in that war. War can be mediated through individuals but also through groups. The point is that specific violent incidents are often committed by individuals, but examples of group violence also exist.

A specific violent act most often has a clear source. It is always possible, if all the sufficient evidence and technology are available, to find the agent of a specific violent episode, but the enabling factor of that violent episode may be traced back to shared beliefs

and groups of people. The motivation behind a person's violent act may be traced back to a common ideology. A violent act does not always need to be an expression of an individual, it can also be an expression of a social group or a whole nation. Žižek (2008: 1) claims that: '... the obvious signals are acts of crime and terror, civil unrest, international conflict.' In this thesis we will look for signals of violence. That means that signals of violence such as crime, fear, public uproar, and war, will be included in the wider term violence.

Lawrence & Karim (2007: 1) argue that violence must always be put in a context: 'Context shapes not just the actors or victims but also those who represent them'. This means that the experience of a specific violent episode is not objective. A violent episode's effect on a victim may be completely different from how the perpetrator's mother might experience the incident. Also, different groups of people might experience violence differently. What is experienced as a violent episode for one group, might simply be a part of culture for another group. Violence is culturally conditioned: for instance, to chop off someone's hand for stealing may be experienced as justice in one culture, whereas other cultures would get repulsed by such an act. A violent act is defined as a violent act only when that act differs from the status quo. If the status quo is generally violent in nature, the experience of violence will not be recognised as such, but merely as everyday life for the people involved. If there is a war going on, acts of violence are common and they therefore lose some of their effect on those who experience them.

Aggression too, is a complex term. Where violence is action, aggression is the emotion behind it. In other words: violence is the manifestation of aggression. Myers (2004: 260) defines aggression as '[p]hysical or verbal behavior intended to hurt someone'. When 'intended' behaviour comes to pass, people will experience it as violence. The point is that aggression needs to be intended. Aggression, therefore, Myers (2004: 247) argues, is not 'auto accidents, dental treatments, and sidewalk collisions', but 'slaps', 'direct insults', and 'gossipy digs'.

That excludes Žižek's (2008) notion on 'divine violence' in which natural disasters are also included as a subcategory of violence. Earthquakes, for instance, Žižek claims, can be considered acts of violence. Quakes, tornadoes and landslides are sometimes considered a result of God's wrath where people only got what they deserve because of their hedonistic

lifestyle. The Bible, and especially the *Book of Revelations*, are full of examples of divine violence where God punishes humans because of their wrongdoings. The seven plagues of God are the epitome of God's wrath manifested through violence. They are a result of human's straying from the true word and their lack of devotion to the covenant. In this thesis, however, natural disasters will be treated as natural disasters and not the result of God's wrath, bad Karma or any other religious explanation. The definition of violence that this thesis will support is therefore this: Violence is the manifestation of intended behaviour meant to physically or psychologically hurt someone.

2.1.4 Innatism versus behaviourism

Even more debated than what violence is, is where it comes from. Has Alex, the main character in *A Clockwork Orange*, learned to be violent or is he simply violent in nature? Is Winston, the main character in *1984*, violent or is it simply the workings of society that are violent? Where does violence come from?

It is hard to say what triggers violence. Some scholars argue that humans are born violent. Other scholars claim that violence is merely learned behaviour. The debate on nature versus nurture may help explain why Alex is violent and Winston aggressive. In this thesis, we wish to explore where the violence that affects Winston and Alex comes from. Is it them or society that has made them violent? In order to examine these questions we first need to look into this debate more in general in order to see what triggers violence. The debate on where violence comes from has intrigued thinkers and philosophers for a long time.

According to Myers (2004: 248), the French philosopher Rousseau (1712-1778) thought that society was to blame, whereas his English counterpart Hobbes (1588-1679) considered society and its laws '...necessary to restrain and control the human brute'. According to Lawrence & Karim (2007: 4), the American philosopher and psychologist James (1842-1910) argued that '...violence is constitutive of human nature' and that '...people want war'. Violence as James saw it was an embedded characteristic of human nature and not something people only learn as they grow up. On the other hand, supporting James's claim blindly will not explain why some nations have a higher rate of violence than others.

On the other hand, to bluntly reject the notion of human instinct in connection to violence does also seem difficult. Violence has existed since the very beginning, it has always

been a part of human existence, and throughout history, violence has always survived. The English scientist and philosopher Darwin (1809-1892), the founder of evolutionary theory, supported the belief that humans originate from apes. For instance, apes and especially chimpanzees share almost a hundred percent of the human DNA. Chimpanzees are very aggressive, therefore, humans too, must be aggressive in nature. Still, humans are not apes. At the same time, to totally discard violence as a human instinct is also difficult. Instead of claiming that violence is the very essence that makes people human, like James did, it is perhaps more fruitful to claim that humans are born prone to violence. Given the right circumstances, in the face of danger, and pushed to the limit, humans are at least capable to be violent, even though their entire upbringing has been violent-free. Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* may simply be born violent, Oceanians in *1984* may simply be violent. That, however, does not seem completely right as we shall see in chapters three and four.

The other extreme notion on violence is perhaps *Radical Behaviourism* which dictates that all human behaviour is learned behaviour. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 20-21) , this school of thought traces its origin back to the English philosopher Locke who claimed that the human mind is ‘...white paper void of all characters, without any ideas...’. According to this statement, all human behaviour, including violence, is learned and people simply learn to be violent. Humans are mere machines or sponges to outside stimuli, which implies that all decisions are based on experience. In this perspective, Alex can be seen as someone who has learned to be violent, and Winston has been taught to be aggressive. Alex may simply be a result of outside stimuli, a product of his surroundings, and Winston may too, without any inborn human characteristics.

According to Passer & Smith (2001: 21), one of the founders of behaviourism, the American psychologist Watson, thinks that talent, for instance, is non-existing and everything is learned, implying that everyone could have done what Newton, Einstein, or Michelangelo did, if they only had the same upbringing and opportunities that they had. That is a claim that might be hard to accept. On the other hand, behaviourism can help explain why people are prone to violence, because, if everything is learned, it is learned from the environment. By investigating the environment where violence occurs, outside factors that causes violence can be identified, without consideration to the human psyche, because, according to classical behaviourism, the human psyche is just a result of outside stimuli.

According to Passer & Smith (2001: 532), one experiment that might serve to illustrate this point is when the Canadian psychologist Bandura (1965) discovered with his “Bobo Doll” experiment that violence can be learned by observing others. Bandura’s experiment was based on a film of a person hitting a plastic doll (Passer & Smith 2001: 264). Bandura used young children in his experiment. He divided the children into three groups: One group was showed the movie and the violator being punished for his actions, the second group was showed the film where the violator was rewarded for his actions, and the third group only saw movie with the person hitting the doll. When the children in the various groups had seen the movie, they were put into a room with toys where one of the toys was a doll similar to the one in the film. The group that saw the violator being punished, showed far less aggressive behaviour than the other two groups. This implies that humans can be trained to be violent, especially if they are provided with the right incentive. The children who did not see either consequence merely mirrored the model’s behaviour. They imitated what they had just seen on screen. The children watching the violator being rewarded, wanted the same reward, in other words; they figured out how to benefit from aggressive behaviour. In connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, the reward of violence will be adressed in chapters three and four.

Because of Radical Behaviourism’s strong belief that everything can be learned but also unlearned, it also offers a remedy to violent behaviour. Because people can learn to be violent, they can also learn not to be. Radical Behaviourism favours *classical conditioning*. One of the most famous early studies of classical conditioning was conducted by the Russian physiologist, psychologist and physician Pavlov, in his experiments with dogs and the relationship between dog food and saliva production (1923/1928).

According to Passer & Smith (2001: 232), Pavlov ‘... noticed that with repeated testing, the dogs began to salivate *before* the food was presented, such as when they heard footsteps of the approaching experimenter’. The dogs knew that food was coming based on the footsteps of the person carrying the food, and they knew that the cause (footsteps) would bring an effect (the food). The dogs’ increase in saliva production is proof of dogs’ ability to link two distinct acts. They associated footsteps with food. Later on, Pavlov introduced a flute when the food was being presented. The dogs started associating the flute with food, thus the dogs’ saliva production became conditioned to the flute instead of the footsteps. When the

dogs started salivating to the flute instead of the footsteps, the response was no longer natural but learned behaviour. In addition, the tone of the flute created a stronger response if greater amounts of food followed a specific tone. The dogs' saliva production increased because of a positive reinforcer, the response got strengthened. The dogs were rewarded for their behaviour. Like some of the children in the Bandura experiment, the dogs found a way to benefit from a certain behaviour.

In humans too, classical conditioning may be applied. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 234), humans who have experienced a car crash might perceive the incident as hugely traumatic, and the traumatic incident might lead to 'fear or anxiety' in the aftermath of their accident. The car crash is associated with fear. After the conditioning takes place, Passer & Smith (2001: 234) argue, cars themselves might be the source of fear and anxiety. The cars became a positive reinforcer because the response or conditioning was strengthened. Cars themselves are associated with something bad and traumatic. However, because of classical behaviourism's belief that everything can be unlearned, if cars could become conditioned with something less traumatic, the conditioned fear connected to cars would disappear.

As will be discussed in chapters three and four, the torture Winston is subjected to resembles classical conditioning. The *Ludovico Technique* that Alex receives in prison is also a form of classical conditioning. The only difference is that their conditioning is not made by the use of positive reinforcers, Alex's doctors and Winston's interrogator use *punishers* instead. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 241), punishers are the opposite of reinforcers:

Punishment is the opposite of reinforcement; it occurs when a response is *weakened* by outcomes that follow it. Take our lever-pressing rat. Suppose we change things so that pressing the lever delivers a one-second electric shock, rather than food. If lever-pressing decreases (which it will), then the electric shock represents a *punisher*: a consequence that weakens the behavior. Notice that reinforcers and punishers are defined in terms of their observable effects on behavior. If the food doesn't increase lever pressing, then for this particular rat it is not a reinforcer.

The use of punishers are commonly used in torture. Not responding in the way the interrogator wants will increase pain, and responding satisfactorily will keep pain away. The use of punishers as an interrogative technique, however, is highly unethical and may cause permanent trauma to the person being interrogated. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 245), punishers also says something about the method itself:

Unlike reinforcement, punishment arouses negative emotions, such as fear and anger, that can produce dislike and avoidance of the person delivering the punishment. Aversive physical punishment also may set a bad example. It amounts to control by aggression and can send a message to the recipient that such aggression is appropriate and effective.

Because punishment is so efficient, however, it takes less time, and can be executed by nearly everyone, it is still widely used. Two examples are the torture and humiliation of the Iraqi prisoners in Abu Ghraib in March 2004, but also the various interrogation techniques of alleged terrorists on the American base on Guantanamo. Torture is often classical conditioning with violence as punisher and fear the response.

2.2 Why violence prevails

Throughout history, violence has always played a great part. Violence is still very much a part of the human existence. The twentieth century included a Russian Revolution, a Spanish Civil War, two World Wars, a Cold War and a civil war on Balkan. Why does violence prevail in society? Later, in the analyses of the novels, that information will be used in the investigation of why violence prevails in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*.

Even though the general belief is that violence is everywhere, the twenty-first century, compared to the dark ages, is less violent. It is perhaps people's perception and tolerance for violence that has changed. Violence is no longer accepted in the same way it was before. In well functioning democratic countries it is the state that has the monopoly on violence. When injustice happens, people look to the judicial system for justice and revenge. It is no longer the people's responsibility to avenge and restore justice, but the state's. People are born into a society where the tolerance for violence is much lower than the dark ages where revenge and justice were personal. The media attention that various violent acts attract, also influence the way people perceive violence. The horrors of the Vietnam War, for instance, gave people a more realistic view on violence and war, thus creating massive protests from the people. Today, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, too, create similar reactions.

The twenty-first century was supposed to be calmer, many believed, and in many ways it is, but still today, there are several armed conflicts all around the world. There is fighting in Afghanistan, in Iraq, Tibet, Somalia, the Gaza Strip, Congo and Sudan. Media coverage, the Internet, a globalisation of the world, make people aware of these conflicts. Diplomacy, evidently, is not enough. Humans still resort to violence to solve their conflicts. Even Russia,

unable to learn from former mistakes turns to violence and public executions to hold its men in power. Violence is very much alive on the political level in the twenty-first century, and very much alive in humans' perception of the world. Violent incidents have decreased, but people's perception is the other way around. Because of a stronger focus on violence, a smaller world, less tolerance for violence, the general belief can be that violence incidents only increase. Violence is still, or even more, very much a part of the human existence. Objective violence, violence due to politics, is still very much a part of the twenty-first century.

Street violence, gang violence, muggings, rape, insults, bar fights are still a part of life in the twenty-first century. News reports are filled with episodes of violence every single day. Subjective violence, like the examples above, is still a part of human existence. Why is violence, objective or subjective, such a big part of the twenty-first century?

2.2.1 The reward of violence

Arendt (1970: 14) claims that violence is the only thing that pays:

...[T]he adherents of nonviolence are on the defensive, and it would be futile to say that only the “extremists” are yielding to a glorification of violence and have discovered — like Fanon’s Algerian peasants — that “only violence pays” Arendt 1970: 14).

The third group of Bandura’s experiment strengthens that claim. According to Myers (2004: 253), violence is efficient and it works. Most of the time, Alex gets away with his crimes in *A Clockwork Orange*, and both Winston and Alex live in a society where violence is generally rewarding. The reward of violence can help explain why violence is so present in both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. In order to see that, however, the reasons why violence pays must be addressed on a more general level.

According to Myers (2004: 253), Patterson et.al (1967) claim that children who benefitted from putting fright in other children would more likely continue being violent. By frightening other children, the violent children got their reward and the incentive to continue their violent behaviour. Another example, according to Myers (2004: 253), that violence pays comes from McCarthy & Kelly (1978 a, b), who claim that aggressive and rough hockey-players scored more goals than players who were not as aggressive. Given a context, humans discover what kind of behaviour that works. In a court room, for instance, violence does not

pay. Therefore, court room display of violence seldom occurs. In sports, on the other hand, violence often pays, and the display of violence is much more common.

The rewards of violence, however, do not limit themselves to the personal level. Examples of cases where group violence pays also exist. In 1980, according to Myers (2004: 253), a public riot in Miami's Liberty City neighbourhood forced the American President Carter to personally visit the neighbourhood to assure its inhabitants of aid.

Terrorism is another example of group violence. Terrorism, also cause an effect, if not it would never have existed. According to Myers (2004: 253), terrorism often pays:

The point is not that people consciously plan riots for their instrumental value but that aggression sometimes has payoffs. If nothing more, it gets attention. The same is true for terrorist acts, which enable powerless people to garner widespread attention.

In the aftermath of Nine-eleven, as Myers (2004: 253) points out, Americans spent tens of billions on security. Nine-eleven made a massive impact on the American public. Suddenly, everyone knew who Osama Bin Laden was, what Al Qaeda was, and what they wanted. However meaningless violence may seem, there is usually a reward of violence; terrorism, often considered one of the most meaningless acts of violence, does pay. If nothing else, acts of terrorism get people's attention.

Attention is one reward of violence, power is another. Arendt (1970: 52) argues that '[p]ower and violence, though they are distinct phenomena, usually appear together. Wherever they are combined, power, we have found, is the primary and predominant factor'. Being in control of something, to rule over someone through violence gives power to the person in control. Power may become intoxicating and a reward on its own. Power, in connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, will be addressed in chapters three and four.

2.2.2 Personal factors and aptness to violence

That an entire youth generation in *A Clockwork Orange* is simply born violent seems difficult, but this thesis will not totally discard the notion that some people may be born with an aptness to violence. This aptness to violence may help explain whether Alex is born violent or if it is society that has made him violent. In connection to *1984*, is Winston's aggression something

he is born with or is it society that has made him that way? What factors are in play behind Alex's violence and Winston's aggression? Are some people simply more violent than others?

Several theorists claim that some people are more prone to violence than others no matter where and how they grow up. Passer & Smith (2001: 530) argue that '...heredity partly determines why some people are more aggressive than others'. Biology matters in connection to violence. One way of finding out whether a certain behaviour is due to heredity or outside influences is to conduct a twin-study.

Twins share a 100 percent of their DNA. It is therefore believed that when twins are raised apart, the difference between them is due to outside factors alone. Studies conducted on twins raised apart is a source of measuring this outside influence. In a radical behaviourist point of view, every difference between twins raised apart is due to outside influence. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 530), however, Bouchard et al. (1990), Coccaro et al. (1997) and Plomin & Rende (1991) claim that '[i]dential twins are more similar in their aggressive behaviour patterns than are fraternal twins, even when the identical twins are raised in different homes with presumably different social environments'. This implies that outside factors alone cannot explain why some people are more prone to be violent than others. Biological factors must also be recognised and addressed.

Tracing biological factors often involve brain studies. There are especially two chemicals in the brain that affect aggression, Passer & Smith (2001: 531) argue: 'serotonin' and 'testosterone'. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 531), Siegel et al. (1999) and Siever et al. (1999) found that '...atypically low levels of *serotonin* activity may play a role in impulsive aggression, as when people lash out from emotional rage'. Serotonin activity probably affects aggressive behaviour, but mainly when people are in an emotionally unstable state of mind.

Testosterone, on the other hand, may also help explain biological differences in violence aptness. In animals, Passer & Smith (2001: 531) argue, testosterone and higher levels thereof seem to cause higher 'social aggression'. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 531), Pineda (1997) and Tremblay et al. (1997), however, argue that the link between aggression and testosterone is 'weaker' and 'less consistent' among humans and primates. Brain chemistry and biological factors that affect violence are not as straightforward in regards to humans. If

violence could have been traced back to certain levels of testosterone and serotonin in the human brain, substances that would help increase the levels of serotonin and lower the levels of testosterone could have been administered and the unwanted violent aptness would be decreased or removed. That, however, is not possible. The aptness of violence is much more complex. In connection to *A Clockwork Orange*, Alex is an adolescent, and in a stage of life where his hormones are probably running wild. Testosterone is the male hormone, perhaps then, Alex's young age and unsettled hormones may help explain why he so often resorts to violence. This last notion will be discussed more in detail in chapter four in connection to Alex and *A Clockwork Orange*.

2.2.3 Additional outside factors

Certain outside factors may also influence violence. When Alex is imprisoned, he ends up in an overpopulated cell, violence thus erupts. The secret police use light to deprive their prisoners of sleep in *1984*. It seems true that certain outside factors may increase violent behaviour. This section will present a list of outside factors that, potentially, show why violence is so evident in both *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. It is possible that certain outside factors facilitate violence in the novels. This will be more closely discussed in chapters three and four. In order to do that, however, these factors need to be identified.

According to Myers (2004: 254-255) being in pain induces violent behaviour. The torment after falling off a bike, or knocking a foot in the stairs, is often followed by a violent outburst of obscenities. The source of the pain, however, does not need to be just physical. Myers (2004: 255) argues that '... the torment of a depressed state increases the likelihood of hostile aggressive behavior'. That implies that a person suffering from a deep personal crisis is more prone to be violent than a person who is happy.

According to Passer & Smith (2001: 536), frustration often leads to violence. As for the example of hitting the foot in the stairs above, the person doing the act might get frustrated or angry with himself and the violent outburst of obscenities might be a consequence of that instead of the physical pain alone. Not fitting in on the work place may also lead to frustration and therefore violence susceptibility. To not achieve goals, or having obstacles on the way of reaching them, might also lead to frustration and possibly violent

behaviour. Frustration may help explain Winston's aggression and Alex's constant resort to violence. This will be more closely reviewed in chapters three and four.

Another outside factor that may facilitate an increase in violent behaviour is heat. According to Myers (2004: 255-256), an experiment from 1970 substantiates this claim:

William Griffitt (1970; Griffitt & Veitch, 1971) found that compared to students who answered questionnaires in a room with a normal temperature, those who did so in an uncomfortably hot room (over 90 ° F) reported feeling more tired and aggressive and expressed more hostility toward a stranger.

Heat, for instance, may provide a healthy breeding environment for violent behaviour, heat certainly may create an uncomfortable environment.

A third outside factor that may create an increase in violent behaviour, Myers (2004: 256) argues, is being attacked. Being attacked threatens the very core of human self-preservation. As Myers (2004: 256) points out, it is not only physical attacks but also verbal attacks or 'insults' that may cause violent retaliation. Violence breeds violence. 'He started it' is a very common phrase in the playground of devoted kindergardeners.

A fourth outside factor that may affect violence and aggression is crowding. Overpopulation and getting the feeling of not having enough space can be experienced as a very stressful event, Myers (2004: 257) argues. According to Myers (2004: 257), Fleming et.al (1987), and Kirmeyer (1978) argue that crowding increases violence: 'Nevertheless, it's true that dense urban areas do experience higher rates of crime and emotional distress'. Considering these notions on crowding, the rate of violence will increase proportionally with the world's overall population growth, especially in cities where space is sparse. Humans being crammed together on a limited space is likely to provoke violence.

Myers (2004: 255) lists other factors that may affect violence and they include 'offensive odors', 'cigarette smoke', and 'air pollution'. In other words, all outside influences that help create an 'uncomfortable environment' affect violence, Myers (2004) argues. When people get frustrated because of an uncomfortable environment, violence is always a threat and a possibility.

2.2.4 The attraction of violence.

Is violence attractive? Perhaps the display of violence alone can make more violence. Violent displays are not uncommon in neither *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. Public hangings of

political prisoners, for instance, are very popular among the citizens of Airstrip One in *1984*. Propaganda movies of innocent Eurasian women and children makes the Oceanians go wild with applause and cheering in the same novel. Street fights between rivalling gangs in *A Clockwork Orange* is not an uncommon sight. Can the exposure rate of violence in society itself help explain why violence is such an important aspect of everyday life in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*? This notion will be discussed in chapters three and four. First, the attraction and exposure of violence will be adressed on a more general level.

Violence is complex, another factor that may help shed some light why violence prevails is the fact that violence sells, and violent exposure increases violent behaviour. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 533-534), the National Television Study (1998) depicts the amount of violence on American television programmes from 1994 to 1997, the results shows that ‘...60 percent of shows contained acts of violence’, and on ‘premium cable channels’ it was as high as ‘92 percent’ of all shows. To some degree, TV programmes reflect what people want to see. A high level of violence in American TV shows indicate that people want to see violent behaviour. In other words, TV violence is attractive, it sells, and people cannot get enough of it.

This interest and exposure of violence, however, are likely to have an effect on the viewing public itself. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 534), Huesman (1997) and the National Television Study (1998) points to the effects of TV violence:

Viewers learn new aggressive behaviors through modelling. Viewers come to believe that aggression usually is rewarded, or at least, rarely punished. Viewers become desensitized to the sight and thought of violence, and to the suffering of victims. Viewers’ fears of becoming a target of crime or violence increases (Passer & Smith 2001: 534).

Viewing high amounts of violent display do something to people’s perception of violence. Similar to the two of groups in the Bandura experiment, violence on TV is seldom punished, but in fact rewarded. Viewers learn from what they see, and they end up having a misconception of violence, what it is and what it leads to. That misconception is bound to have an effect on their behaviour in everyday life, similar to Bandura’s experiment, either as a result of modelling violent behaviour, or with the incentive of a reward in mind. Observing violent behaviour and being surrounded by violence are likely to increase violent behaviour. Violence is conditioned by the consequences, and if the consequences are beneficial, violence will increase. The exposure of violence probably, does not limit itself to television. Being in a

state of war, living in a violent society, the mere exposure of violent behaviour may cause an increase of violence in the lives of everyone surrounded by it.

It is highly unlikely that violence functions as a catharsis. Frustration does not likely disappear by going to a boxing fight, watching someone get mugged on the street or watching *No Country for Old Men* (2007). It is more likely that people learn how to benefit from violence by watching violent episodes.

2.3 Different kinds of violence

2.3.1 Perception of violence: subjective violence versus objective violence

Violence is perhaps not just one kind, violence seems to depend on the context. Is there a difference between the violence that Alex uses and the violence the government uses on him in *A Clockwork Orange*? Is O'Brien's torture of Winston in *1984* different from the violence the Party uses on its people? In this section we will review how violence can be perceived and discuss whether or not there is a difference in violence itself. Is violence, for instance, different when it is executed by a burglar than by a government? That information will be applied in the discussion of what kinds of violence affect Winston in *1984* and Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*. First, however, the perception of violence will be addressed on a general level.

These questions depend on the situation and the status quo. If violent acts happen on a daily basis, both the person conducting the violent behaviour and the person receiving it might not, over time, experience the incidents as violence. When displays of violence get common, the impact of violence may fatigue. This chapter will serve as background for detecting what kinds of violence are at play in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*.

Subjective violence is the violence most people in democratic well functioning countries are familiar with. It is violence that clearly breaks with normal everyday life experiences. Muggings, rape, bar fights and racketeering are all examples of incidents that in a well functioning state will be experienced as violence. Such incidents clearly stand out from the status quo of normal life and are often extremely traumatic to the victims. They are traumatic because they threaten people's sense of homeostasis. Homeostasis, or the mind's urge for maintaining balance is properly challenged after such violent episodes because they

clearly break a person's sense of equilibrium. That means that the act of violence is compared to a condition without violence.

This mode of being is what Žižek (2008: 2) calls a 'non-violent zero level'. Subjective violence is always performed by a 'clearly identifiable agent', and functions to disrupt what is seen to be the standards of normality (Žižek 2008: 1). That means that the victim, to some extent, knows who the violator is. The victim of a subjectively violent act can often give a characteristic of the violator and when the incident happened. In addition, the reason such incidents are subjective is because the act of violence may be experienced differently by both the victim and the violator, but also by bystanders, family and friends of both the victim and of the violator. One act of violence may have numerous perceptions, that is what makes it subjective and not objective. Especially, in such incidents where the victim is traumatised, the victim's mind might go into a state of denial. That denial may contribute to painting an altered version of the objective truth.

The point is that people might perceive violence differently. People are culturally biased, and they often get biased by group mentality. Consider the 'final solution' to the 'Jew problem', the nazi version of Holocaust was slightly different from the Jews' and the allied forces'. Being on different sides of a conflict is often conditioned by other factors, therefore, people who are caught up in violence or armed conflicts, depending on which side they are on, might experience the incidents differently and subjectively.

The other kind of violence, Žižek (2008: 2) terms objective violence: 'Objective violence is invisible because it sustains the very zero-level standard against which we perceive something as subjectively violent.' When the violence executed on a public does not protrude the normal state of affairs, that 'invisible' violence is objective. This kind of violence does not have such an 'clearly identifiable agent'.

Following Žižek further down the ladder, he divides objective violence into two subcategories. The first subcategory Žižek (2008: 1) terms 'symbolic violence'. Symbolic violence is represented by speech and 'the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms' (Žižek 2008:1).

The second subcategory that Žižek advocates is ‘systematic violence’ where systematic violence being ‘...the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems’ (Žižek 2008: 1). This type of violence is not easily identified. The people who experience this kind of violence. They do not always realise that they are subjects to violence. ‘Our blindness to the results of systematic violence is perhaps most clearly perceptible in debates about communist crimes’, Žižek (2008: 12) claims. For instance, the West’s identification of crimes committed by Stalin and communist China is often traced back to ideology; Stalin’s purges were wrong and the West could easily say why, and where it came from. On the other hand, according to Žižek (2008: 12-13), crimes committed by the West onto Third World Countries are not:

But when one draws attention to the millions who died as the result of capitalist globalisation, from the tragedy of Mexico in the sixteenth century through to the Belgian Congo holocaust a century ago, responsibility is largely denied. All this seems just to have happened as the result of an ‘objective’ process, which nobody planned and executed and for which there was no ‘Capitalist Manifesto’.

The perception of objective violence is culturally biased. Objective violence is only objective with limitations and with the right perspective of its observer, meaning that whatever form of violence is being conducted, it is never completely universal, and never truly objective. Even today, Venkatesh (2008) claims, gang crime in America in the twenty-first century has connections to slavery. Violence must, and always needs to be put in a context. Unless, violence remains a mystery, unfathomable and pointless. Gang crime in America needs to be put in a historical context in order to fully understand the nature of it, and the workings behind it.

2.3.2 Violence on a social level

Violence may be affected by group mentality. Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* does not act on his own, he is part of group and later a system. The Thought Police in *1984* are also a group. Winston, in his mistrust of the government is not entirely alone. The point is that humans need to belong and often act in groups. Groups, however, often get to represent a larger portion of society as time goes by. Group mentality affects the group members. People often behave differently when they are in groups. Is Alex violent because of peer pressure and group integrity? Do Alex and his droogs get to represent a larger portion of the population in *A Clockwork Orange* than they really deserve? Is violence different when it is executed by a system or a group than by individuals?

Violence on the social level is manifested through individual violence, but the fuel behind the aggressive behaviour manifested by the individual is often represented by the notion of a common enemy. In war, for instance, the specific act of violence is carried out by a certain soldier, but the motivation for that soldier's aggressive behaviour is often the result of heavy motivation on the social level. Much of that motivation, probably, lies within the fear of what is different and the threat of someone's way of life. There is a frustration when someone or something threatens a person's goal.

Nine-eleven shook the core of the American way. Except for the attack on Pearl Harbour in WWII, the United States did not have fight on their own turf in neither WWI or WWII. War, then, caused by an outside enemy to the heart of America, its biggest city, became an obstacle for the American dream. Therefore, this frustration resulted in heavy warmongering. The American public based its war mongering on the people's fear of what is different. It advocated democracy, the American dream and that terrorist attacks like Nine-eleven was devastating to democracy, and therefore also the American way of life.

In connection to *1984*, the fear of what is different is an important part how the Party motivates its members to believe and participate in the war against Eurasia/Eastasia. This will be more closely examined in chapter three.

On the other hand, why did Al-Qaeda attack America? Yet again, America threatened the Muslim way of life. The American way, or the Western way as a whole, threatened the Muslim way of life because it was something unknown and different. It is the unknown that scares people, and often people they do not know. Because of Nine-eleven, the Western World got convinced that the Muslim world was unconditionally evil. One extremist group got to represent the entire culture. In *1984* Oceania is at war against Eurasia and later Eastasia, but the stream of information between these countries is limited. In chapter three we will see how a small group get to represent a larger entity in connection to the underground movement and the Eurasian soldier when Winston is at the movies.

The same happened to the Western world after the publication of the Mohammed caricatures in 2005. The caricatures, Žižek (2008: 50) argues, were first published in an 'obscure daily in Denmark' and 'caused stir in distant Muslim countries'. The people in Muslim countries were unified in their disapproval. They attacked embassies as a result, but

as time went by, it was not only Denmark or Danish embassies that experienced this frustration firsthand. According to Žižek (2008: 51), Denmark was generalised and included in the entire Western way of living:

What exploded in violence was a web of symbols, images and attitudes, including Western imperialism, godless materialism, hedonism, and the suffering of Palestinians, and which became detached to the Danish cartoons. This is why the hatred expanded from the caricatures to Denmark as a country, to Scandinavia, to Europe and to the West as a whole.

As Žižek (2008) points out, the generalisation of this Danish newspaper to the entire Western world was the result of latent anger and fear and that fear stemmed from the threat that the Western way of life could influence the Muslim way of life. According to Žižek (2008), this fear is based on envy:

The fundamentalist Islamic terror is *not* grounded in the terrorists' conviction of their superiority and in their desire to safeguard their cultural-religious identity from the onslaught of global consumerist civilisation. The problem with fundamentalists is not that we consider them inferior to us, but rather, that *they themselves* secretly consider themselves inferior. This is why our condescending politically correct assurances that we feel no superiority only makes them more furious and feeds their resentment. The problem is not cultural difference (their effort to preserve their identity), but the opposite fact that the fundamentalists are already like us, that, secretly, they have already internalised our standards and measure themselves by them (Žižek 2008: 73).

The Muslim world wants what the Western world has. If the Muslim countries were truly convinced that their way of life was the divine one, the retaliation would not have been so disproportional, setting fire to embassies compared to the printing of a news-article. Žižek (2008: 73) argues that '[o]ne can feel that, in fighting the sinful Other, they are fighting their own temptation. These so-called Christian or Muslim fundamentalist are a disgrace to true fundamentalism'. Fundamentalists transcend their insecurity in their own way of life towards an external enemy. If not, they would not have cared about the Danish caricatures. The Danish caricatures are only an excuse for a violent outlet of more latent feelings of insecurity about their own way of life and the fear of wanting another more Western way of life, Žižek (2008) argues. It is this fear, the fear of the unknown, fear of change, fear of ideology, that perhaps are the underlying motivational factors behind aggressive outburst like the attacks on various Western embassies in the aftermath of the Danish caricatures. This notion will be discussed in connection to Winston's time in prison in chapter three.

The same fear of what is different can also be seen in connection to the Cold War. During the 60s, when the cold war was at its coldest, and public surveillance and interrogations were administered heavily on both sides. It was ideology versus ideology,

capitalism versus communism. Communism represented a threat to the Western way of life with free market forces, and capitalism, on the other hand, the West represented a fear to the Soviet way of life and their five-year-plans. This war happened on the ideological level, but manifested itself in the beliefs of the respective inhabitants. Purges of people suspected of espionage was heavily carried out by both sides in the Cold War.

2.3.3 Violence in a totalitarian rule and war

Violence seems to be an important element in a totalitarian rule. In war too, violence seems important. *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* are situated in totalitarian states. The totalitarian regimes in these novels are desperate to keep individualism at a safe distance. Arendt, a German-born American political theorist and philosopher, describes totalitarian rules in general, how they function, but with special attention to violence. Arendt's thoughts on violence in totalitarian states will be discussed in connection to *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange* in chapters three and four. Arendt's thoughts will help to illustrate why the governments in the novels are in fact totalitarian, and how these totalitarian governments use violence to keep their people down, but first, some of Arendt's points need to be addressed on a more general level.

The totalitarian state is defined as a state without democracy, a state where the people no longer have their say, and the people do no longer have the privilege to vote for whom they would like to see in power: it is a one-party state without free elections. According to the *Compact Oxford English Dictionary* (2008) it is a government '...centralized, dictatorial, and requiring complete subservience to the state'.

According to Arendt (1951: 417), a totalitarian government relies heavily on two distinct features:

To a totalitarian movement, both dangers are equally deadly: a development toward absolutism would put an end to the movement's interior drive, and a development toward nationalism and frustrate its exterior expansion, without which the movement cannot survive.

Nationalism would kill the totalitarian rule's need to expand. Universalism, on the other hand, would kill the party members' 'interior' drive. In order to keep a totalitarian movement going it is essential to expand its borders, but at the same time, keeping a sense of nationalism within its public ranks. '...[I]f they do not pursue global rule as their ultimate goal, they are

only too likely to lose what power they have already seized', Arendt (1951: 419) argues. That implies that a totalitarian rule that does not expand geographically is doomed.

For a totalitarian ruler, it is essential that no alternative to way of life is offered. If there is an alternative, then people have a choice, and a normal life could become possible. That is, as Arendt (1951:418) points out, the greatest fear for a totalitarian rule.

Also, Arendt (1951: 418) argues, the totalitarian ruler must create his own world and the people must believe in him:

...[H]e must establish the fictitious world of the movement as a tangible working reality of everyday life, and he must, on the other hand, prevent this new world from developing a new stability; for stabilization of its laws and institutions would surely liquidate the movement itself and with it the hope of eventual world conquest (Arendt 1951: 418).

This implies total control of the media, a dictation of a liquid truth, and the totalitarian ruler must have his people believing him. If not, the rule will stabilize and become weak. Universal facts or neutral truth are concepts deadly to a totalitarian rule. According to Arendt (1951: 418), it is not 'counterpropaganda' that is the most threatening factor to a totalitarian rule, but objective truth and facts. If the reality the totalitarian regime offers is not accepted by the public, the rule's total domination will eventually fade.

The main goal is to keep the state in a constant flux. 'Systematic lying to the whole world can be safely carried out only under the conditions of totalitarian rule, where the fictitious quality of everyday reality makes propaganda largely superfluous', Arendt (1951: 423) argues. When a totalitarian state needs to rely on propaganda in order to survive, it has already lost some of its power. For Hitler, Arendt (1951: 422) claims, '... it was more important to demonstrate that it was possible to fabricate a race by annihilating other "races" than to win a war with limited aims'.

According to Arendt (1951: 417), purges of individual also offer another opportunity for keeping the rule destabilised: 'In the Soviet Union, at any rate, revolutions, in the form of general purges, became a permanent institution of the Stalin regime after 1934'. These purges were a way for Stalin to keeping the state unstable. Arendt (1951: 417) argues that the purges against Jews, homosexuals, intellectuals and mentally and physically challenged people in Nazi-Germany functioned in the same way as the Stalinist purges. They kept the movement unstable. They kept the state in a constant revolution.

Žižek (2008: 135) points out that another strategy for keeping the movement going is to have unprecedented severe laws:

One of the strategies of totalitarian regimes is to have legal regulations (criminal laws) so severe that, if taken literally, *everyone* is guilty of something. But then their full enforcement is withdrawn. In this way, the regime can appear merciful.

In this way, the totalitarian movement is in complete control. Because everyone is guilty of something, the movement does not have to explain to the public why someone is arrested or executed. Also, as Žižek (2008: 135) argues, the movement can be merciful whenever it wants. But perhaps most importantly, rigid laws with variations in punishment keeps the state unstable:

This acts as further proof that totalitarian regimes are by definition regimes of mercy: they tolerate violations of the law, since, in the way they frame social life, violating the law, bribing and cheating, are conditions of survival (Žižek 2008: 135-136).

Rigid laws with irregular punishment is essential to the survival of the totalitarian state. Laws with matching execution of punishment is predictable. Predictability, for instance, leads to stability, stability must be avoided at any cost in a totalitarian state.

In addition, as Arendt (1951: 419) points out, the survival of the totalitarian state relies heavily on the relationship between the party and the state. Arendt (1951: 419) claims that ‘...the government machine is usually pictured as the powerless facade which hides and protects the real power of the party’. In that way, the real power is concealed to the public. If they were to protest against the way they are ruled, they would in practice be fighting a machine of bureaucracy. The real source of power is hidden behind a dehumanized shell with infinite layers and dead ends.

In order to keep the rule unstable, the very structure of the government itself needs to be unstable. According to Arendt (1951: 421), that includes a duplication of all public offices so that no one really knows where the true power comes from, and by wrapping power in endless layers of bureaucracy, causes confusion and instability. Arendt (1951) argues that destabilization is the key to a totalitarian government, but also emphasises another important element: the secret police.

The secret police hold the true power of the totalitarian state. The secret police are the epitome of public fear. It is this fear that truly holds the population down.

Above the state and behind the facades of ostensible power, in a maze of multiplied offices, underlying all shifts of authority and in a chaos of inefficiency, lies the power nucleus of the country, the superefficient and super-competent services of the secret police (Arendt 1951: 427).

Without the secret police a totalitarian power can simply not exist. The power base of the rule would simply have been too vulnerable. Therefore, it came as no surprise that Hitler took great care of his SS and did not accept defeat in WWII before the secret police were no longer 'reliable', even though numerous German cities had been taken or destroyed, Arendt (1951: 426) argues. Another example is Stalin's Soviet Union in which Stalin saw the continuous construction of 'police cadres' more important than 'the oil in Baku, the coal and ore in the Urals, the granaries in the Ukraine, or the potential treasures of Siberia', Arendt (1951: 426) argues.

According to Arendt (1951: 426) the 'structurelessness of the totalitarian state' and 'its neglect of material interests' serves the ultimate goal of a totalitarian state extremely well: it destabilizes the rule and makes 'politics well-nigh predictable'. In addition, a too focused interest in the development of material goods may increase the public's sense of welfare, to make them contempt with the way of life they currently lead. This could lead to a lack of interest in global conquer on which a totalitarian state is completely relying.

Furthermore, as Arendt (1951: 427) points out, the secret police serve even a higher purpose. Instead of using military forces in annexed countries, totalitarian movements use the secret police in maintaining law, order and fear. According to Arendt (1951: 427) this transforms the status of unwanted people from Prisoners of War into criminals who are 'rebels, guilty of high treason'. Mere criminals do not have the same rights as Prisoners of War, and the police can dispose of them and treat them in any way they would like. The effect is fear from protesting, fear of not conforming, fear of getting annihilated. The power of the secret police grow stronger with time, and after a while, Arendt (1951: 427) argues, '...its agents receive more money and authority than the regular military intelligence service and are frequently the secret chiefs of embassies and consulates abroad'. In other words, Arendt (1951: 427) claims, the secret police '...constitutes the true executive branch of the government through which all orders are transmitted'. This technique, this policy further protects the power sustenance of the totalitarian rule from both interior and exterior attacks.

Compared to the ‘onion-like structure of the ostensible hierarchy’, the secret police are ‘completely severed and isolated from all other institutions’ and is the ‘...only openly ruling class in totalitarian countries and their scale of values permeate the entire texture of totalitarian society’, Arendt (1951: 428) argues. Trying to locate the power in the official departments of the totalitarian rule will only lead to a core that does not exist. The real power goes from the top ruler of the totalitarian government in a direct line to the secret police. This link is strong and hidden, but is still there and protects the direct execution of the ruler’s wishes, and because of the fear the secret police invoke in the public, the chances of a direct confrontation is highly unlikely.

The direct line of power, the unrelenting focus on surveillance of the secret police also have an influence in the general public in a totalitarian regime as well, Arendt (1951: 428) argues: ‘Simply because of their capacity to think, human beings are suspects by definition, and this suspicion cannot be diverted by exemplary behavior, for the human capacity to think is also a capacity to change one’s mind’. This means that no one can ever be trusted, there is always that microscopic chance that even the most devout believer in the current regime might have a change of heart. When humans are involved, there is always that possibility. This possibility, however, can be devastating to a totalitarian rule. Even the secret police agents themselves may be subjects under suspicion.

This rule of distrust probably rubs off on the public themselves, and they question their neighbours, their colleagues, their sisters, their brothers, their bosses. No one is above suspicion, and that does something to the mentality of a people. This mentality serves the totalitarian organism well, however. This mentality offers an opportunity to further destabilize the totalitarian movement. As Arendt (1951: 429) points out, it is a way for avoiding ‘...seniority and merit, it prevents the development of the loyalties that usually tie younger staff members to their elders, upon whose opinion and good will their advancements depends; it eliminates once and for all the dangers of unemployment and assures everyone of a job compatible with his education’.

Purges within the government itself causes a ‘regular violent turnover of the whole gigantic administrative machine’. If fear is the fuel, distrust is the oil with which the totalitarian machine greases itself. It ensures further development, it inhibits stagnation, and

keeps the movement unstable. These three features create a healthy growing environment for any totalitarian organism.

As for the individual in a totalitarian regime, Arendt (1951: 429) claims, ‘...every individual of any consequence owes his whole existence to the political regime; and when this factual identity of interest is broken and the next purge has swept him out of office, the regime makes sure that he disappears from the world of living’. This is in a way how the totalitarian regime maintain its movement. Based on its structure, the rigid laws, and the power of the secret police, every person that is no longer purposeful to the totalitarian movement can easily be disposed of with no questions asked. The annihilation of unwanted employees is simply a job promotion for someone else; it is how things work. To oppose or object to such a policy will in practice be nothing else than suicide: ‘...it makes every jobholder a conscious accomplice in the crimes of government’, Arendt (1951: 429) argues. Also, because of the rigid laws, every person is always guilty of something. Every single one is basically a criminal. The secret police may simply single a person out if they want him gone:

Criminals are punished; undesirables disappear from the face of the earth; the only trace which they leave behind is the memory of those who knew and loved them, and one of the most difficult tasks of the secret police is to make sure that even such traces will disappear together with the condemned man (Arendt 1951: 431).

This last notion can only be done with the partys’ dictation of the truth:

This common-sense disinclination to believe the monstrous is constantly strengthened by the totalitarian ruler himself, who makes sure that no reliable statistics, no controllable facts and figures are ever published, so that there are only subjective, uncontrollable, and unreliable reports about the places of the living dead (Arendt 1951: 432).

Every upheaval, every revolt, every act that goes against the party’s will in a well functioning totalitarian regime can easily be discarded as insanity, untrustworthy behaviour, coming from a person without the right to exist or to call himself human and living.

Suicide then, seems to be the only logical option left if one does not want to conform to the rule of the party. Totalitarian regimes in their final developmental stage, Arendt (1951: 430) argues, survives on random killings: ‘Only in its last and fully totalitarian stage are the concepts of the objective enemy and the logically possible crime abandoned, the victims chosen completely at random and, even without being accused, declared unfit to live’. This

possibility, to kill arbitrarily does something to human's perception of freedom. 'This consistent arbitrariness negates human freedom more efficiently than any tyranny ever could', Arendt (1951: 430) claims. This notion would lead humans away from the possibility to commit suicide simply because they would not perceive it as an option when their freedom to do so does not occur to them. But, if the totalitarian power is not absolute, and suicide might be considered by someone, the retaliation, as Arendt (1951: 430) points out, would involve punishment to others.

Revolt too, Arendt (1951: 430) argues, would inflict pain unto others, and is therefore not an option. The state of distrust keeps the movement going. But when distrust does no longer suffice on its own, and acts of torture are found necessary, Arendt (1951) argues, then the state has already a large portion of its totalitarian character. The sustenance of the totalitarian regime relies more or less only on itself and its capability to keep a strong secret police.

Violence on a social level is not only violence in a totalitarian movement. Group violence, social violence, can also be seen in relation to youth violence.

2.3.4 Violence as youth rebellion and the meaninglessness of violence

Being a youth alone may facilitate violence. Growing up and finding one's place in society may also cause violent behaviour, which will be discussed in connection to *A Clockwork Orange* in chapter four. Youth violence, however, must be addressed on a general level. Youth violence, according to Arendt (1970: 15), has a universal character:

Their behavior has been blamed on all kinds of social and psychological factors — on too much permissiveness in their upbringing in America and on an explosive reaction to too much authority in Germany and Japan, on the lack of freedom in Eastern Europe and too much freedom in the West, on the disastrous lack of jobs for sociology students in France and the superabundance of careers in nearly all fields in the United States — all of which appear locally plausible enough but are clearly contradicted by the fact that the student rebellion is a global phenomenon.

Alex, the novel's protagonist, is having troubles finding his place in society. He does not conform to the norms society has laid out for him. In this part of the thesis, we shall explore the nature of youth violence, what causes it, and why violence is such an important element in youth rebellion. Later, in chapter four, these notions on youth violence will be connected to Alex and *A Clockwork Orange*, and will be used in discussing Alex's violence; what causes it, on a personal level as well as on a social level.

Youth violence, is nothing new, ever since time immemorial has youth violence been part of the human existence; from Cain and Abel's dreadful struggle to The Black Panthers to the Protests of 68 to present time. Due to frustration of either not belonging or being ignored may lead to violent upheaval. In 2005 in Paris, for instance, what seemed to be a meaningless violent riot shook the core of Europe. According to Žižek (2008: 63): 'The French suburban riots of autumn 2005 saw thousands of cars burning and a major outburst of public violence'.

It is difficult to see why this happened. The violent outburst happened in a democratic well functioning society where there were no outspoken claims of material benefits from the protesters. Žižek (2008: 63) argues that '[t]here was only and insistence on *recognition*, based on a vague, unarticulated *ressentiment*'. The violent outburst, according to Žižek (2008), was simply a cry of recognition, their only wish was to be seen and fully accepted as true French citizens.

The context of the suburban riots in Paris of 2005 needs to be considered. The outburst itself happened in a rather poor district. The material damage the riot caused was directed at their own society and not meant as a protest targeted on the more affluent districts of Paris because the protesters attacked cars and schools in their own neighbourhood: 'They were part of the hard-won acquisitions of the very strata from which the protesters originated', Žižek (2008: 65) argues. In other words, the violent outburst of 2005 cannot be blamed on envy, they did not want what other districts had.

What is most difficult to accept is the riot's meaninglessness: more than a form of protest, they are what Lacan called a *passage l'acte* — an impulsive movement into action which can't be translated into speech or thought and carries with it an intolerable weight of frustration (Žižek 2008: 65).

Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue that frustration can be a catalyst to violence. As time went by, Žižek (2008: 64) argues, the former interior minister, now president of France, Nicolas Sarkozy went public and called these protesters 'scum'. As a result, the violent outbursts increased. In a way the protesters were reacting to the reaction of the protest, the violent outburst gained credence after Sarkozy's statement.

Sarkozy's statement is rather offensive in character. Verbal offence, being attacked, may alone cause further violent retaliation, Myers (2004: 260, 256) argues. Verbal offence is also an act of violence on its own and the protesters themselves could possibly have perceived Sarkozy's insult as a violent attack. Violent attacks do not need to be just physical, and to call

someone crying for recognition and belonging ‘scum’ is in many ways a direct insult intended to hurt someone, and is bound to cause further reactions. In many ways, it seems that Sarkozy was putting out fire with gasoline. The escalation of violence in the suburban riots of 2005 could, to a large degree, have been avoided simply by recognising the protesters. Žižek (2008: 65) argues: ‘The riots were simply a direct effort to gain *visibility*’.

The group of protesters must also be addressed. The Paris riots of 2005 did not have a religious agenda. One of the first sites to be attacked was a mosque and the Muslim community ‘...immediately condemned the violence’, Žižek (2008: 65) argues. According to Žižek (2008: 65) this was simply ‘[a] social group which, although part of France and composed of French citizens, saw itself as excluded from the political and social space proper wanted to render its presence palpable to the general public’. Not only had they failed to be recognised, they were in effect ignored by the people to which they wanted to belong. Social and political castration, like the protesters in France 2005 were subjects to, may cause heap loads of frustration. The only outlet for their frustration they found, and the only possibility for gaining recognition were by setting fire to their own schools and cars. The effect was to be called ‘scum’ by their own interior minister. This led to recognition, however, but for all the wrong reasons As Žižek (2008: 66) points out, a non-violent protest march would have gotten them ‘...a small note on the bottom of a page...’.

What they did get and what they wanted to do, Žižek (2008: 66) argues, ‘...was to create a problem, to signal that they were a problem that could no longer be ignored’. This combined with great amounts of frustration, violence was the only option they really had: ‘Alain Badiou has reflected that we live in a social space which is progressively experienced as ‘wordless’. In such a space, the only form protest can take is ‘meaningless’ violence’ (Žižek 2008: 67). In addition, the group of protesters in France 2005 were largely of foreign origin, and they were young, and as Žižek (2008: 68) argues, violence was the only tool they had:

Meanwhile leftist liberals, no less predictably, stick to their mantra about neglected social programmes and integration efforts, which have deprived the younger generation of immigrants of any clear economic and social prospects: violent outbursts are their only way to articulate their dissatisfaction.

Youth rebellion is in its essence a violent outburst for recognition fuelled by immense amounts of frustration when no other opportunities are present. Violence in this context was

more or less the only human characteristic still intact and the only measure which is still efficient. Also, group violence as seen in the Paris outbursts of 2005 has a uniting character. The protesters were united in frustration. It created an *us* versus *them* mentality. Perhaps the reasons why the Paris protesters turned to violence can help explain the violent youth generation in *A Clockwork Orange*. That notion, however, will be revisited in chapter four.

2.3.5 Violence and football hooligans

That *us* versus *them* mentality can be seen among football hooligans all over the world. The need to belong somewhere may influence violence. Violence can be uniting and dividing at the same time. As Armstrong (1998) points out, football hooligans do not see any reason why club rivalry should limit itself to the football pitch. In connection to *A Clockwork Orange*, the structure and organisation of Alex and his droogs are very similar to the organisation of a hooligan firm. A hooligan firm is a group of people associated with one specific club. Aston Villa's hooligan firm is called Villa Youth, Everton's is called County Road Cutters, Oldham's is called Fine Young Casuals.

In addition, the way Alex and his droogs dress is similar to the dress code of modern football hooligans, they are always dressed in the 'height of fashion' (Burgess 2000) In fact, the Juventus's firm of hooligans call themselves droogs despite their loathing for anything British. The nature of hooligan firms may help explain Alex and his droog's violence. This will be discussed in chapter four.

Football supporters often follow the club everywhere, home-games as well as away-games, but during the early 50s a new way of supporting emerged. It was no longer enough to chant the team forward, real supporters should go into battle for their team. There was a war going on where physical violence between rivalling groups were and are not uncommon. Violence was and still is rather common in the football sphere and with it the term football hooligans emerged. Hooligans use bats, steel pipes, rocks, bottles, as their weapons. Their goal is violence and defeat of their rival firm. The match itself is somehow forgotten, and in fact, many of these hooligans care more about their fight than the fight of their team.

Stadium violence is also not uncommon, but because the police have tightened security on football matches and mapped, identified and banned known hooligans from football matches, it is no longer as easy for them to get into matches at all. Therefore, a fight

between rivalling firms is often planned on advance at a different location than the actual football match in order to avoid police attention.

In England, hooligans are still an active part of the youth generation and they are mostly male. During the 60s, hooligans in England found a new way of avoiding police attention. By wearing the team's colours publicly drew police attention resulting that the fight would get cancelled, that was in neither firm's interest. Their goal was to fight and to fight freely. Instead they starting wearing expensive Italian and French clothing to blend in with their own supporters, but also with their rivals'. *Casuals* became a new term for these supporters and they still exist today.

Rivalry between local clubs is perhaps the most vicious and most important aspect for the hooligans. According to Armstrong (1998), Sheffield United supporters' most hated enemy are the Sheffield Wednesday supporters. When abroad, though, the English hooligans unite and goes to war against other countries' supporters.

Although sometimes political in nature, either of leftist or rightist conviction, hooligan firm members does not always share political views. Their hate against a rivalling firm is often enough and the most important uniting feature.

Various explanations of why hooligans still exist include a need for masculinity or a war instinct. The hooligan firm offer a chance to be male, to be violent, to find an outlet for their frustration. In that manner, the firms offer a chance of catharsis. Their members have found a potential outlet for their frustration stemming from other strata of life. A failed academic career, misfortune in the job marked, a failed relationship, either way, the firms may offer a chance of taking out build-up feelings of aggression and frustration and channeling them away in the battle for their football team.

The most important reason why hooligans still exist, however, is perhaps the sense of belonging somewhere and to be part of something bigger than themselves. The only reason necessary for joining a firm is the support of a certain football team. A member does not have to be Protestant to join, a member does not have to be upper class to join, and a member does not have to drive the right car to join. A hooligan firm is not restrictive when it comes to its members, and there, possibly, lies the true reason behind its survival. The firm gives their

members a sense of belonging and fighting for something bigger than themselves. Brothers in arms defenders of their Club's honour are their game and sole purpose in life. Many of the firm's members have failed to belong anywhere else. School dropouts on the dole with a steel bar in their hand get a chance of belonging and to be appraised.

In this chapter we have adressed the various forms of violence and their reasons why on a general level. The next two chapters will deal with what kinds of violence affect Winston in *1984* and Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*, and the causes for violence in these novels.

3 1984

1984 can in many ways be considered a warning against the dangers of a totalitarian rule. Seeing firsthand the horrors of totalitarian rule in Spain, the Soviet Union and the rise and fall of the Third Reich, Orwell found the growing movement of communism threatening. As a result, *1984* came out and the nature of the totalitarian rule is one of the novel's main themes.

Everything about the society in *1984* is restrictive, both physical as well as psychological. There are restrictions on food, sex, friendship, family, recreational activities, travel, movies, work, language, media, facial expressions, body language, and even thought. The reach of the totalitarian movement is endless.

If the dangers of a totalitarian movement is one of the novel's themes, the recurring structure to exemplify that is violence. Violence is everywhere in *1984*, but on different levels. There is the overall structure of violence on the macro level of society, that includes the restriction of the totalitarian movement and how it works to keep the people down. Winston is a part of this totalitarian movement. He is a member of the Party, an accomplice, because he contributes in the manipulation of truth. If society is the macro study, Winston is the case study. Until Winston's arrest, the macro study is the most important and most elaborated focus; violence happens systematically and mainly on the political level, but as the novel progresses, when Winston is arrested, violence as a motif changes from the society as a whole to violence to individuals. Violence also changes from being more psychological in character to involving specific acts of physical violence directed at individuals. Violence becomes more vivid, raw, and brutal.

3.1 A short introduction of the main characters in 1984

There are especially three important characters in *1984*: Winston Smith, Julia and O'Brien. They all hold different positions within the Party. Every description of these characters are based on Winston's reflections. Their descriptions, therefore, are based on how they are described through Winston's viewpoint, their acts, their speech and how Winston thinks of them. They all offer different perspectives on violence.

3.1.1 Winston Smith

The novel's protagonist is Winston Smith. He is the perspective the readers see through. Even though the novel's narrator is third person limited, Winston is the looking glass, he is the one through which the readers observe the plot, and it is Winston's thoughts the readers get some admission to.

At first sight, however, it is not clear why Winston is the novel's main character. He is seemingly ordinary, he is a member of the middle class, he holds a medium position in the Party, he is in his mid-thirties, he lives in a mediocre home, he has bad health, he does as he is told, he is not particularly handsome, in fact, everything about him is mediocre. Winston is not hero-material and no great leader with universal appeal. However, as the novel progresses, Winston becomes more complex. The first proof of that is when he purchases the diary from Mr. Charrington's shop in the beginning of the novel (Orwell 2008: 8). This is Winston's first act of rebellion.

Buying a diary does not seem like a very rebellious act, however, but Winston lives in a society where no written records are kept. In order for the Party to remain in power, a constant manipulation of data is paramount.

...[H]e must establish the fictitious world of the movement as a tangible working reality of everyday life, and he must, on the other hand, prevent this new world from developing a new stability; for stabilization of its laws and institutions would surely liquidate the movement itself and with it the hope of eventual world conquest (Arendt 1951: 418).

Without a constant manipulation of data, as Arendt (1951: 418) argues above, the totalitarian rule will fail. If records are kept, if objective truth can be looked up in the local public library, the written records of the past will bring stability to the rule. Stability is the greatest threat to any totalitarian rule. In connection to Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union, Arendt (1951: 418) argues that:

To a totalitarian movement, both dangers are equally deadly: a development toward absolutism would put an end to the movement's interior drive, and a development toward nationalism and frustrate its exterior expansion, without which the movement cannot survive

Stability stops the totalitarian movement, it offers a chance of a normal life, and there is no reason for global expansion. Any totalitarian movement is dependent upon global expansion, Arendt (1951: 418) argues.

In addition, if written records were made available to the public, the position of the totalitarian ruler would be weakened. Without the ruler's dictation of the truth, the rule itself would lose a great deal of its power. Written records of historical facts have a permanent feature, people can go back and look something up and say how things were, Big Brother was wrong when he predicted chocolate rations to go up when they in fact went down. Keeping a diary, then, is extremely threatening to the Party in *1984*, and when Winston buys the diary, he is consciously rebelling against it.

Winston's age is relevant. Winston is in his mid-thirties in the beginning of the novel. This does not only add to his mediocre characteristics, it also serves another purpose. Because of his age, Winston remembers a time when society was different. He remembers a time without Big Brother and the Party. In other words, Winston has a basis for comparison. He knows that there exists an alternative to the life he is suffering in *1984*. That alone makes Winston dangerous to the Party.

In the Party itself there were not many people left whose ideas had been formed before the Revolution. The older generation had mostly been wiped out in the great purges of the 'fifties and sixties, and the few who survived had long ago been terrified into complete intellectual surrender (Orwell 2008: 90).

Although young at the time, Winston is part of a generation that has experienced life without constant surveillance and massive restrictions. Within Winston and his generation lie the hope. For them, life in *1984* is not status quo, it is something different, and something slightly more intolerable. Winston gets to represent a larger group, he does not only represent himself, he represents everything the Party is afraid of, because he can offer an alternative life to the life Big Brother dictates. That would ruin the Party, because an alternative to the truth the totalitarian leader dictates, as Arendt (1951: 418) points out, would ruin any totalitarian movement.

Because of his age, Winston is familiar with Oldspeak. Oldspeak is similar to modern English, the English language of today. The official language of *1984* is Newspeak. Newspeak is an extremely simplified version of modern English. The goal of Newspeak is remove all threatening words to the Party.

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 (Orwell 2008: 55).

Newspeak is designed in order to make humans into machines. A thought cannot exist on its own, and people need words to express and manifest their thoughts. For the Party then, by eradicating certain words and narrowing down vocabulary, the Party believes that unorthodox thoughts do not have a tool for manifesting themselves. Winston has this tool and the readers get access to his thoughts, that too, is highly threatening to the Party. In addition, Winston's age gives him a seasoned and experienced look. He is not young and inexperienced, he has a job and he is established in society, and there is logic in his reasoning. This too gives him greater credibility than if he was younger and less experienced. Winston's ethos makes the reading public believe in him.

Another feature of Winston is his bad health and looks. Winston starts every morning with a coughing spree, he has a bad back, and an ugly varicose ulcer on his leg. He has nothing the readers would characterise as a heroic. In a way, he is every man. Winston represents the public, at least, the majority of the reading public when the novel was first published. If his role in the novel was like the dragonslayer Bard's in Tolkien's *Hobbit* (1937), the majority of the reading public would not relate to Winston in the same way. Rebellion would simply be a task for fitter and more able men and women. The ulcer, the coughing, and the bad back might make the reading public sympathise with Winston. They might pity him. In that manner, Orwell is able to build up his protagonist's ethos. In many ways, Winston is the underdog against the massive machine that is the totalitarian rule. When sympathising with Winston, the readers are ultimately rooting for the underdog: he is David, the Party is Goliath.

Winston is married, but leads a loveless life. He lives on his own with no idea whether his wife is alive or not. Love is deemed dangerous to the society in *1984*. Love, friendship and family bonds fuel individualism, and such ties get more important than the Party. Therefore, such bonds must be avoided. Like Arendt (1951: 429) argues, there is no place for the individual in a totalitarian regime. Marriage is therefore fixed and loveless. The Party decides who should be allowed to marry. One of the main goals of this task is to match two people where love can never exist. The ultimate goal of marriage is offspring, simply because offspring is needed in order to keep the Party strong.

3.1.2 Julia

Julia is the novel's femme fatale. She is young and attractive and keeps an important position in the Party. Compared to Winston, Julia represents the younger generation in *1984*. She is a member of the Junior Anti-Sex League, she works for the Ministry of Love, which in fact is the opposite of its title. Julia is mainly described through Winston, and his opinion of her changes proportionally with the plot. Winston's first encounter with Julia is during to obligatory Two Minutes Hate in the beginning of the novel. Because of her age, Julia does not know an alternative to life than the life Big Brother dictates. She is not threatening to the Party in the same way as Winston.

During the Two Minutes Hate, Winston reflects, a girl sitting behind him flung a dictionary in the face of Goldstein, the leader of the underground movement working against the Party (Orwell 2008: 17). Winston's first thoughts of Julia are not particularly friendly:

He would flog her to death with a rubber truncheon. He would tie her naked to a stake and shoot her full of arrows like Saint Sebastian. He would ravish her and cut her throat at the moment of climax (Orwell 2008: 17).

There are two reasons why Winston dislikes this woman. The first reason has to do with women in general:

He disliked nearly all women, 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 (Orwell 2008: 12).

Winston is afraid that if he engaged in relationships with a young woman, she will at some point deceive him and report him to the dreadful *Thought Police*. The second reason why Winston has directed his anger towards this woman is that he cannot sleep with her. She is young and attractive, but Winston cannot go to bed with her, because the Party has prohibited all romantic behaviour.

It is the Party, society, an outside factor that has made Winston aggressive. In connection to *1984*, the french philosopher Rousseau was right and James was wrong: Humans are not born violent, it is society that makes people aggressive, and biological factors, as Passer & Smith (2001: 530) advocate, has little to do with Winston's aggression. It is the Party and Winston's realisation that the Party is to blame that makes Winston angry and frustrated. Winston is old, which implies that his testosterone levels are fairly stable. Outside factors, therefore, need to be adressed.

Earlier in the novel, when Winston reports on his first encounter with this woman, he feels disgusted at her sight, especially when her look lingers on his face, a quick sidelong gaze which he finds piercing (Orwell: 2008). Winston confuses his emotions. Instead of the boost in self esteem a lingering gaze from an attractive woman normally provokes in a heterosexual man, Winston confuses that emotion with hate and perhaps even fear. He feels that her attention is sinister, that she is searching for some sign in his face so that she can turn him in to the Thought Police.

To some degree, this is the entire goal of Party propaganda. Affection between individuals is not tolerated by the Party, because personal relationships are unhealthy for the greater good, and it is important for the totalitarian movement that the greater good always comes first. Therefore any behaviour that goes against the benefit of the greater good is made conspicuous. Winston is unable to identify the woman's motives for looking at him which makes normal reactions inhibited. It can be questioned, based on the facts Winston possesses, that at this point of the novel Winston has no choice of liking this woman. Winston hates all women because women are a source for something bad and threatening.

However, there seems to be good reasons behind his sense of paranoia. In a way, his paranoia is a self protective tool. By keeping his desires overshadowed by fear and hate, he is keeping himself out of potential danger. This does not, however, have anything to do with a dysfunctional mind. It has more to do with the state of affairs and how reality is in *1984*. Romantic behaviour causes the individual to think for himself or herself and not the Party. Romantic behaviour generates freedom of choice because it can generate a shift in focus from the greater good to the pleasures of the individual. The individual in a totalitarian society Arendt (1951: 429) argues, must be kept down. Acts of romance can therefore not be allowed in *1984*. In reality then, Winston's hatred towards this girl is not towards girls in general, but towards the Party for not letting him engage in the possibility of a romantic relationship with her. Winston's anger towards Julia stems from the Party, society.

Winston's feelings towards this woman are ambivalent, he is attracted to her, but at the same time he fears her. It is the restrictions of the Party, and the way young women are controlled, Winston is angry about. There is a degree of *bildung* of the character from the first

time he sees the woman and the way he feels about her at the end of the first Two Minutes Hate in the novel.

Julia and Winston eventually end up having a romantic affair. They enjoy luxuries such as real coffee, tea, sugar and chocolate together. Winston falls deeply in love with this woman and she is a central figure in the deception and fall of Winston Smith. Julia is the epitome of betrayal that the totalitarian movement is so dependent upon. Julia has no humanity, she is too young. When Winston is released from prison, when he reencounters the love of his life, the woman that was supposed to be in love with him, is in no way surprised or happy to see him, and her first glance at Winston is not very affectionate:

It was only a momentary glance, full of contempt and dislike. He wondered whether it was dislike that came or whether it was inspired also by his bloated face and the water that the wind kept squeezing from his eyes (Orwell 2008: 305).

If there were true love between Julia and Winston, Julia's reaction upon meeting the love of her life would not have been contempt and dislike, but joy. Julia has done her job, she has no affection for Winston, nor any sympathy for the hardships he has endured. She has finished her mission and wants nothing to do with Winston. Julia seems to be a child of behaviourism, everything she does is a result of her training. She is what Locke would call '...white paper void of all characters, without any ideas...' (Passer & Smith 2001: 20-21). She has no other choice; it is how she is trained and what she has learned.

3.1.3 O'Brien

O'Brien is the novel's antagonist who holds a central position in the Party. He too represents to the older generation in *1984*. O'Brien, like Julia, is described through Winston. Based on a glance and an encounter in connection to the Two Minutes Hate, Winston gets the impression that O'Brien is part of the underground movement working against the Party. This notion, however, Winston realises is totally wrong. O'Brien is pure in thought and a member of the Thought Police. His main goal in life is to detect, punish and eradicate unorthodox behaviour at any cost with any means found necessary.

O'Brien holds true power because of his role in the secret police. As Arendt (1970: 14) argues, it is only violence that pays. Power then, becomes intoxicating and rewarding in itself. That, however, makes Winston and what he represents a threat to O'Brien's reward.

In some way or other, O'Brien suspects Winston to rebel against the Party. What triggers his suspicion is not clear. It is possible that Winston's age and his knowledge of an alternative life to the life the totalitarian leader dictates, are considered threatening to the Party. He remembers a time when things were different. Also, the purchase of the diary from the undercover agent Mr. Charrington, would surely have reached O'Brien at some point or another. Winston, however, does not suspect the shopkeeper of anything. As Winston contemplates in the beginning of the novel, buying the diary will lead to his doom. The secret police's awareness of his diary will not become clear to Winston before Mr Charrington reveals his true identity and Winston is arrested. Even then, Winston does not suspect O'Brien of anything, he does not see the connection between O'Brien and the secret police.

O'Brien even invites Winston and Julia to his home, where Winston admits to opposing the Party and will do anything, except giving up Julia, to see to its doom. O'Brien arranges for Goldstein's manifesto to be delivered to Winston a few days later. When Winston is arrested, O'Brien takes on the role as Winston's chief torturer. He is unaffected by the horrors he delivers Winston, and is a true believer and protector of the Party.

3.2 The society and the government in *1984* — a totalitarian rule

Both society and the government in *1984* are extremely totalitarian in their character. Society is a well functioning machine that runs on manipulation and violence.

The ideal set up by the Party was something huge, terrible and glittering – a world of steel and concrete and monstrous machines and terrifying weapons – a nation of warriors and fanatics, marching forward in perfect unity, all thinking the same thoughts and shouting the same slogans, perpetually working, fighting, triumphing, persecuting — three hundred million people all with the same face. The reality was decaying, dingy cities where underfed people shuffled to and fro in leaky shoes, in patched-up nineteenth-century houses that smelt always of cabbage and bad lavatories (Orwell 2008: 77).

The people in *1984* should also be machines which makes individualism unheard of. This is violence in a totalitarian rule in its most efficient way. According to Žižek (2008: 135), it is important for the government to keep very strict laws, but with various executions in order to keep the Party unstable. Stability, Arendt (1951: 417) argues, is every totalitarian movement's Achilles heel. Written laws are more permanent than no laws. The Party in *1984* has no laws, there is only 'unorthodox behaviour'. No one can ever be sure of what kind of behaviour is deemed unorthodox by the Thought Police. That makes the very rule of Oceania highly

unpredictable. Having no laws keeps the movement unstable, which makes the Party truly totalitarian.

Another feature Arendt (1951: 418) argues when it comes to the survival of a totalitarian movement is the importance of the leader and his dictation of the truth:

...[H]e must establish the fictitious world of the movement as a tangible working reality of everyday life, and he must, on the other hand, prevent this new world from developing a new stability; for stabilization of its laws and institutions would surely liquidate the movement itself and with it the hope of eventual world conquest (Arendt 1951: 418).

There are no written records in *1984*. Keeping written records is definitely unorthodox behaviour. The Ministry of Truth manipulates all records to match Big Brother's statements, and the people believe in him. They do not see the contradiction. This ability to accept clear breaks in logic even has a term in *1984*: it is called *doublethink*. Objective and universal truth, Arendt (1951: 418) argues, can be devastating to a totalitarian rule. Objective truth will offer an alternative to the life the Party leader dictates, it would also bring stability. The Ministry of Truth make sure that does not happen in *1984*.

A third feature that indicates that the Party in *1984* is in its final totalitarian stage is the random killings. Throughout the novel, all characters that Winston gets in touch with seem to end up dead. Symes, Winston's colleague, is a devout Party member that is one day simply gone without a trace and with no record whatsoever of his existence save Winston's memory of him. Mr. Parsons, Winston's neighbour, the most unlikely man to be killed is in fact killed by the Thought Police. Arendt (1951: 430) claims that when a totalitarian movement simply keeps the movement unstable by random killings, it is in its final stage. The Party in *1984*, therefore, is in its final stage. The Thought Police kill randomly. Arendt (1951: 430) claims: 'This consistent arbitrariness negates human freedom more efficiently than any tyranny ever could'.

3.2.1 The onion — the structure of the totalitarian Party in 1984

The government in 1984 is build up by several layers. It is an onion like structure described by Arendt (1951: 421):

Duplication of offices and division of authority, the co-existence of real and ostensible power, are sufficient to create confusion but not to explain the “shapelessness” of the whole structure. One should not forget that only a building can have a structure, but that a movement — if the word is to be taken as seriously and as literally as the Nazis meant it — can have only a direction, and that any form of legal or governmental structure can be only a handicap to a movement which is being propelled with increasing speed in a certain direction.

If someone wanted to oppose the Party in 1984, they will be caught in a web of bureaucracy thus shielding the true power. Oceania is one out of three superpowers. The structure of the government consist of four main ministries: *the Ministry of Truth, the Ministry of Peace, the Ministry of Love* and *the Ministry of Plenty*, and they all work for the maintenance of power. The Ministry of truth deals with manipulating data and media.

The building is vast: ‘It was an enormous pyramidal structure of glittering white concrete, soaring up, terrace after terrace, three hundred metres into the air’ and ‘[t]he Ministry of Truth contained, it was said, three thousand rooms above ground level, and corresponding ramifications below’ (Orwell 2008: 5-6). The other ministries are of equal size. The structure of these ministries serves a purpose. The ministries are only a facade, and if someone wanted to opposed the ministries they would be trapped in a maze of bureaucracy. Although they are said to have various and specific tasks, these four ministries’ main goal is to protect the Party and keeping it in power. As Arendt (1951: 421) claims, the duplication of public offices hides the real power. The real power in the totalitarian regime of 1984 lies within the ranks of the secret police, the Thought Police.

The people must believe in the reality the totalitarian ruler offers, Arendt (1951: 418) claims. The manipulation of data is paramount to keeping the Party in power. The ruler in a totalitarian regime, Arendt (1951: 424) argues, keeps the movement unstable by doing the opposite of what he says. Those who control the past also controls the future and the present. ‘Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right’ (Orwell 2008: 162).

The manipulation of data in the Ministry of Truth is done by the use of a speakwrite. It is basically a microphone which records new data and former data is overrun, thus making the

past fit the future. At one point in the novel, Oceania is no longer fighting Eurasia, Eastasia is now the enemy. Eurasia is now an ally, and has always been one. That, however, entails a manipulation of all earlier references to Eurasia and Eastasia, and Winston is part of this manipulation. Anyone who questions the fact that Eurasia has always been an ally has no record of evidence. Their upheaval would simply be considered an act of insanity, and as Arendt (1951: 429) argues, ‘...every individual of any consequence owes his whole existence to the political regime...’. Winston knows what is going on and he is a part of it. The power the Party has over Winston keeps him from revolting. He knows he will be punished, annihilated if he opposes a system he is a part of.

Winston, however, does revolt, fear of violence cannot stop him. There is some human characteristic left in Winston that keeps him from doublethinking. Revolting in this context is a human characteristic. O’Brien asks: ‘If, for example, it would somehow serve our interests to throw sulphuric acid in a child’s face — are you prepared to do that?’, ‘Yes’, answers Winston. (Orwell 2008: 180). Winston is prepared to do anything. In a way Winston resorts to violence as a result of systematic objective violence performed on him over the years. Being attacked, as Myers (2004: 256) claims, facilitates violence. There is a mix of violence as an embedded human characteristic and the sense of being attacked that makes Winston prone to violence.

In addition, one might argue that Winston is extremely frustrated with the current government. Frustration, as Passer & Smith (2001: 536) point out, facilitates violence. All these factors included, it comes as no surprise that Winston is willing to do the worst of atrocities to revolt against the Party. There is no other choice, but the fact that he is willing to do it, to sacrifice everything makes him heroic. When nothing else is left, as Žižek (2008: 67) claims, violence is the only option. Violence in connection to Winston’s revolt in *1984* is the very manifestation of humanity.

The second ministry in *1984* is the Ministry of Peace. The Ministry of Peace also does the opposite of what its title entails. It does not deal with peace at all, but war. It is responsible for keeping the war going. The purpose of war in *1984* is not to conquer lands, it is more a war for workers, for slaves. There is no chance of ever defeating the enemy because the three superpowers are of equal strength.

The reasons for war in *1984* are several. The first reason is that war burns away surplus. Surplus is devastating to a totalitarian rule. Surplus makes the people content, they would lose their interest in the totalitarian movement and, as Arendt (1951: 418) argues, give them hope of an alternative way of life. Another reason for war in *1984* is global expansion, a totalitarian rule that does not expand, Arendt (1951: 417-418) argues, is doomed. Therefore, the Party in *1984* must convince their people that they are really fighting an actual war. If the people in *1984* had found out that war is really nothing else than status quo, they would revolt. Oceania even shells their own people to maintain this illusion. Third, war helps the totalitarian rule in *1984* a way of keeping the state unstable. Four, war creates an us versus them mentality, almost like rivalling hooligan firms. It unites the people and keeps individualism at a safe distance.

The third ministry is the Ministry of Love. The Ministry of Love does exactly the opposite of what its title entails. The main purpose is to avoid any kind of deep relationships between individuals to happen. The individual has no place in a totalitarian rule, Arendt (1951: 429) argues. That is true for the society in *1984* as well. The Party trains children to spy and deceive their parents, the Party teaches girls to not enjoy sex. The Party is responsible for producing dirty magazines to be delivered to the prole area, the poorer district of Airstrip One where non-members of the Party live and are kept. Julia works for this ministry.

As will become evident later in the novel, the Ministry of Love makes traps for people having a romantic and meaningful affair thus contributing in making a world of distrust that a totalitarian government is dependent upon in order to keep the movement unstable, as Arendt (1951) also argues in connection to totalitarian movements in general. Sex as a mechanic act is not considered threatening to the Party, but when Winston realises he loves Julia, their relationship is not simply physical and he no longer work for the benefit of the greater good, but for his own. That is something the Ministry of Love cannot accept.

The fourth ministry in *1984* is the Ministry of Plenty. Winston argues early in the novel that the Ministry of Plenty was ‘...responsible for economic affairs’ (Orwell 2008: 6). The Ministry of Plenty does the opposite of what its title entails. It deals with starvation, but also the manipulation of the truth: ‘Was he, then, alone in the possession of a memory?’ and ‘[h]ad food always tasted like this?’ (Orwell 2008: 62). Winston starts to question whether he

is the insane one. Both Parsons, Winston's neighbour, and Symes, Winston's lunch friend, seem to accept that even though the chocolate rations the day before had been lowered to twenty grams a week, today chocolate rations have been increased to twenty grams per week. Winston does not have the ability to doublethink, he still recognises a paradox when he sees it. He is also old enough to remember a time before the Party's reign, and he knows an alternative to the life the Party offers. He does not believe in the truth the Party leader dictates. Apparently, Winston is the only one able to see the contradiction of doublethink. If word spread and people would know Winston's alternative, that would be devastating to the Party. As Arendt (1951: 418) points out a better alternative to life than the life the totalitarian leader dictates would ruin the movement's interior drive and the people's belief in their leader.

3.2.2 A world of distrust

According to Arendt (1951: 429), the totalitarian government relies heavily on betrayal. No one can ever be trusted. Betrayal is the way to advance in life. One person's downfall is another person's job promotion. Arendt (1951: 429) argues that:

...[E]very individual of any consequence owes his whole existence to the political regime; and when this factual identity of interest is broken and the next purge has swept him out of office, the regime makes sure that he disappears from the world of living.

Because betrayal is so rewarding in a totalitarian movement, everyone would commit it. Aggression, like betrayal really is, as Myers (2004: 260) points out, does not limit itself to physical violence, aggression can also be verbal behaviour intended to hurt someone. Using violence in the form of betrayal help the members of the Party excel in life.

According to Passer & Smith (2001: 532), violence, as Bandura (1965) showed with his "Bobo Doll" experiment, pays. That is perhaps why violence is such a big part of everyday life in *1984*. People in *1984* benefit from turning in their neighbours, their colleagues, and even members of their family. In that way, a person turning in her colleague in a totalitarian movement is what Arendt (1951: 429) would call an accomplice, and that person would be foolish to oppose the system he or she benefitted from. Arendt (1951) also claims that destabilisation is the key to the survival of a totalitarian movement. Such a system with constant distrust destabilises society and thus serving the totalitarian movement in *1984* rather well.

Children in *1984* are not a symbol of innocence. Fear and hate are the main tools for persuasion the Party possesses. In order to control fear and hatred, it is also necessary to control love and affection. The unconditional love between a parent and a child is something the Party must avoid. Like the love between a man and woman causes a shift in focus from society to personal relationships, the love and affection between a parent and a child causes that same shift. The Party resolves this by ruining the ties between family members. As Arendt (1951: 429) claims, the individual has no place in a totalitarian movement. Children in *1984* often turn their parents in based on unorthodox behaviour. What is even more surprising is that parents often share a sense of pride when a child does that. The pride when a child does something good is still intact, but the logic behind that pride is totally absurd in the totalitarian society in *1984*. Winston's neighbour is the Parsons family. The Parsons family consists of Mr. Parsons, Mrs. Parsons and their two children, a boy and a girl. As discussed earlier, the love between a man and a woman is something the Party wishes to avoid, and marriage between two people is arranged by the Party.

According to the Party, a good marriage consists of two people without the slightest romantic attraction between them, and without the potential of ever creating that affection. The only reason marriage exists is for reproduction purposes only. It is for keeping the population growth pointing in a positive direction. If the population growth went down, it would weaken the Party. But in order to maintain a positive population growth without the risk of creating personal relationships between children and parents, the Party must take action. Close relationships fuels individualism, the individual in a totalitarian movement, Arendt (1951: 429) argues, has no place.

By schooling the children at an early age in detecting and reporting thoughtcrime, would prevent such ties to ever be made. Therefore, all Party members' children are educated in the art of espionage and made members to the Junior Spies. The Junior Spies are trained to report all unorthodox behaviour to the Thought Police, especially all unorthodox behaviour exhibited by their parents. By doing that, every relationship between a parent and a child is thus corrupted, and what is more important, the family itself is corrupted. This is all in service of the greater good, or in other terms, in the service of the protection of the Party. The children's innocence has vanished in the traditional way. A parent, therefore, can never feel

safe, even in his or her own home. There is always that constant fear of pain. Not even in the confinements of the family can a Party member feel safe.

Perhaps, what is even more troubling, is that the Party members themselves are at terms with this existence. They reproduce anyway. They think they are doing their duty for the Party, and they are proud of it. It is not only the children who are brainwashed but the parents too. As Winston contemplates: 'It was almost normal for people over thirty to be scared of their own children' (Orwell 2008: 26-27). No one sees the absurdity of this condition save for Winston. Winston, however, has no children, but he is a married man. Winston recollects with disgust his and his wife's attempts of doing their Party duty though they never conceived a child. Winston does not have any experience with the feeling of being a father. He only knows the dangers of manipulated spy-children. In some way, Winston cannot fathom the feeling of being proud of a child's deception. He is both biased and unbiased at the same time. In some absurd way, this feeling of pride when a child deceives you is still human.

Unconditional love still exists, but the context in which this pride is produced is utterly ludicrous. There is still some core of love that the Party cannot eradicate. This sense of unconditional love still exists even when a parent is deceived by his own children, and even in the face of the greatest torture imaginable. Winston however, is not capable of recognising this because he has no children.

Later in the novel, Mr. Parsons is sent to prison. He is being interrogated, he is tortured in the most gruesome ways, but he still has a sense of pride for the person who turns him in. Mr. Parsons is imprisoned on the grounds of thoughtcrime. His child caught him saying '[d]own with Big Brother' in his sleep (Orwell 2008: 245).

Julia is perhaps Winston's biggest betrayer. She seduces Winston, tells him that she loves him. She provides for him and she sleeps with him, but eventually, she gives him up. There are a few indicators of why Julia has been part of Winston's set-up all along. First, she tells Winston that she has slept with hundreds of people in the same way she sleeps with Winston. Second, Julia has access to luxuries such as real sugar and coffee. Third, Julia survives prison. Fourth, Julia is young and completely uninterested in Goldstein's book. It is like she has heard it all before. She is a member of the Anti-Sex League and the Junior Spies.

Five, Winston is hardly an attractive man. Six, Julia, unlike Winston, is too young to remember an alternative to the life Big Brother dictates.

O'Brien too is a betrayer. He lures Winston into believing that he is a member of the underground movement working against the Party. O'Brien, as it later turns out, is a secret agent. Mr. Charrington is one too. It is probable that O'Brien has known of Winston's disloyalty to the Party ever since Winston bought his diary.

As Arendt (1951: 428) argues, betrayal and distrust keep the totalitarian movement unstable. That is true for the totalitarian movement in *1984* too. The distrust in *1984* is violence in its most conspicuous form, but it is how life in *1984* is, it is how society functions, and without it, the Party and the society it has created, would fail.

3.2.3 The secret police

As Arendt (1951: 428) argues, the secret police of the totalitarian government holds the real power. That is true for *1984* as well. The secret police in *1984* are the Thought Police. There are no laws in *1984*, there is only unorthodox behaviour. Unorthodox behaviour in *1984* relies heavily on tacit knowledge. The people of *1984* have a concept of the term, but the secret police do not need any kind of objective grounds for arresting and eliminating people. The Thought Police need no excuse. The totalitarian movement in *1984* is in its final step, and perhaps over its final step, in its totalitarian movement. Arendt (1951: 430) argues that a totalitarian movement that relies on random killings in order to keep the movement unstable is in its final phase.

Random killings and executions in *1984* are tools for keeping the society unstable. Keeping a judicial system based on tacit knowledge and unorthodox behaviour make every person guilty of something, like Arendt (1951: 429) argues in connection to totalitarian regimes in chapter two. This is what the Party in *1984* does, and a complete control of the truth also helps the secret police in removing unwanted people. No records are kept of people annihilated by the secret police. The Ministry of Truth makes sure of that. The totalitarian movement is kept unstable, the totalitarian rule dictates the truth, and there are no martyrs.

To detect threatening behaviour and thoughts, the secret police rely on constant surveillance. Arendt (1951: 428) claims that people can always change one's mind, and that is

why surveillance is so important in totalitarian regimes. In addition, surveillance limits freedom of the individual. No place is ever safe from the reach of the Thought Police in *1984*. When Julia and Winston travels to the countryside, they must pass several checkpoints and take alternate return routes. They must always travel individually. When Winston discovers the extra room in Mr. Charrington's shop he is thrilled to find it without a telescreen. As the novel progresses, and Winston is found out, there is a telescreen in this room as well. It is all about betrayal and a world of distrust.

According to Arendt (1951: 428) the secret police hold the real power, and those who control the police control everything. There are no civil rights once the secret police have found a person guilty of unorthodox behaviour in *1984*. The only weakness the Party in *1984* is faced with is the charade of the wars. If the true nature of the wars would become known to the public, they would realise that they have been manipulated and thus lose their belief in the system. War is not really violence as such in *1984*, and there are few casualties. It is more a way to burn off surplus and thus keeping the people down and their fighting spirit up. War in *1984* is really a way for the Party to keep power in check.

3.3 What kinds of violence — *1984*

Because of the novel is situated in a totalitarian state, much of the violence in *1984* happens on a psychological level and a political level. It is the government and the way the people are kept down by a constant threat of being arrested and killed, that violence manifests itself in *1984*. Violence, as Myers (2004: 260) points out, does not need to be simply physical. The people of Oceania are always watched, they are always suspected. There is always a clear and present danger that, one way or another, sleep talking, the wrong facial expression, a joke that was misunderstood, could lead to arrest and annihilation. The people are always in danger and always scrutinised. The threat of violence becomes oppression, oppression and the threat of violence are forms of psychological violence.

There is no detailed description of what the secret police do to people who do not conform to the rule's tacit norms. At least in the first part of the novel, but with Winston's arrest, the readers get an inside viewpoint of the real manifestation of physical and psychological violence. Violence in *1984* goes from being what Žižek (2008:1-2) would call objective violence to subjective violence. There are rumours about what happens when the

secret police come to catch an unwanted person, but they are still only rumours, and rumours in a totalitarian society cannot be trusted. The fall of Winston is the unprecedented written record of what is really going on once a person is guilty of unorthodox behaviour in the totalitarian rule in *1984*.

3.3.1 Subjective violence versus objective violence

The majority of violence in *1984* is manifested as what Žižek (2008: 2) would call objective violence. Objective violence is violence that does not protrude the status quo of daily life. There is no clearly identifiable agent behind the violence in *1984*. It is as a systematic political violence coming from the top of the government, executed by a secret police, happening every day. People vanish from the face of the earth every day in *1984*. Almost every person Winston encounters is at some point either vaporised or arrested. Symes, Winston's lunch friend, is one day simply gone. There is no records of his arrest that he has ever existed.

Mr. Parsons is imprisoned on the grounds of thoughtcrime. Winston's neighbour, whose only crime is to talk in his sleep, is subjected to gruesome interrogation tactics and probably even death. The secret police do not need an excuse. Mr. Parson's talk in his sleep would probably not hurt the Party considerably. Mr. Parson's, however, has reproduced. There is not really any reason why he should still be a part of this life. He, too, is no youngster. As Arendt (1951: 417) argues, purges, like the random killings in *1984*, help keeping a totalitarian state of constant revolution and keeping the movement unstable. Mr. Parsons is a small piece in a larger scale. His death is how others excel. His death is what Arendt (1951: 429) would call someone else's job promotion in a totalitarian regime.

Violence in *1984* shifts with the arrest of Winston. When Winston realises that O'Brien is a secret agent of the Thought Police, O'Brien becomes what Žižek (2008: 1) would identify as the 'clearly identifiable agent'. He is the one causing Winston pain. The prison guards are in many ways pawns, they do as they are told with no affection whatsoever. O'Brien, on the other hand, knows why he is doing the terrible things that he does. Violence is no longer objective in the same manner, violence is more subjective. It is Winston, his reports about the horrors that happen in the prison and his thoughts of torture the readers get access to. It is his subjective story that is being told. Therefore, violence itself goes from being

objective and systematic to subjective. In addition, violence goes from being psychological to physical.

There is particularly three violent incidents before O'Brien reveals his true identity that needs to be addressed. The violence seen in connection to Ampleforth is mostly objective violence. Ampleforth is arrested because he did not omit God from a Kipling translation. He is sent to room 101, but there is no record of what happens to him. A woman too is sent to room 101, Winston reports that she '...seemed to shrivel and turn a different colour when she heard the words' (Orwell 2008: 246). Room 101 is feared and dreaded, but no one really knows what goes on in there.

The third incident is the most important one. A skull-faced man is brought into Winston's prison cell. Winston pities him, and realises that the skull-faced man is dying of starvation. Therefore, a chinless man in Winston's cell tries to give the skull-faced man a piece of his hidden away bread. Suddenly the loudspeaker tells the chinless man to drop the bread. The skull-faced man locks his arms around his head to show that he did not accept the bread. Then the guards charge the room:

He took his stand against opposite the chinless man, and then, at a signal from the officer, let free a frightful blow, with all weight of his body behind it, full in the chinless man's mouth. The force of it seemed almost to knock him clear of the floor. His body was flung across the cell and fetched up against the base of the lavatory seat. For a moment he lay as though stunned, with dark blood oozing from his mouth and nose. A very faint whimpering or squeaking, which seemed unconscious came out of him. The he rolled over and raised himself unsteadily on hands and knees. Amid a stream of blood and saliva, the two halves of a dental plate fell out of his mouth (Orwell 2008: 247-248).

This is the first time the readers get to know firsthand the real horrors of prison in *1984*. Until then, violence in *1984* executed by the government has been rumours. This is the first real description of subjective physical violence in the novel. Winston is there to report, although he is very scared, has eaten very little, and is deprived of sleep, the readers can trust him. Winston's torture has not yet begun. The quote above says something about violence in a totalitarian rule. There can be no empathy, and everyone is an accomplice. The chinless man's act of mercy is punished severely. As Arendt (1951: 430) argues, any revolt against the Party causes pain to others, not just the one person revolting. The chinless man is merely trying to help a man dying of starvation. He is following his instincts. He is compassionate even though he knows he will be punished if the police found out what he is doing, his hesitation and stealth when delivering the piece of bread bears proof of that.

The incident with the bread shows that the totalitarian rule has not removed the core of humans. There are still people that have a heart in *1984* and Winston is one of them. Winston loathed Julia in the beginning of the novel. He wanted to kill her, but when he meets her in the hall and she trips on her bandaged arm, Winston instinctively comes to her aid. Arendt (1951: 430) claims that there is no use to revolt against a totalitarian rule because there is always that danger that one person's acts would inflict pain unto others. The incident with the chinless man, however, is more of a personal sacrifice to help another person. It is an act of revolt against society, but it is no conscious revolt. The chinless man's action is first and foremost an act of mercy. He is the good Samaritan, he is Jesus, devout and resolute, willing to sacrifice his own well being to save someone he most likely does not know and will never meet again. The chinless man is later sent to room 101 and no record of what happens to him there is accounted for. Still, after over 30 years of totalitarian rule, people have an instinct to be compassionate towards people when they are down, and in the face of the worst danger and pain they can ever imagine. Humans are still humans in *1984*.

3.3.2 Winston's struggle

Both Winston and O'Brien can be said to have an aptness to violence. Contrary to Passer & Smith (2001: 531), biological factors have little to do with it. Outside factors seem more important. O'Brien and Winston are children of a very violent society. O'Brien enjoys a few luxuries, he lives well and eats well. He knows the paradox of how society functions, but he does not want to lose his position in the Party. O'Brien is subject to the systematic violence of the Party, but he does not want to lose his privileges and his position. He is what Arendt (1951: 429) would call an accomplice in a totalitarian rule. O'Brien is in too deep, there is no way out for him, he is too guilty. O'Brien must therefore work for the benefit of the Party. He must protect the illusion of the wars, he must maintain doublethink, and he must work to remove dangerous people like Winston. Winston's knowledge about how society works in *1984* is extremely threatening to the Party, but also to O'Brien's lifestyle and sense of power.

Winston, on the other hand, does not have the same privileges as O'Brien. He lives a terrible life. He has no joys, no personal relationships, no real friends, bad health, bad food, bad living conditions, and he remembers a time when things were different. He knows that the wars are a charade. All these notions would make any man frustrated and angry. Especially because Winston knows that the Party is the reason behind his frustration and

aggression. Winston aggressive thoughts about Julia in the beginning of the novel bears proof of a violent person. He also admits to doing terrible acts of violence at the benefit of the underground movement in O'Brien's flat. Winston's anger, however, is due to society and not himself.

Violence affects Winston in every part of his existence. When he is arrested, however, violence in Winston's life becomes more physical and more subjective. Torture and physical pain is inflicted upon him in prison.

One question at any rate was answered. Never, for any reason on earth, could you wish for an increase in pain. Of pain you could wish only one thing: that it would stop. Nothing in the world was so bad as physical pain. In the face of pain there are no heroes, no heroes, he thought over and over as he writhed on the floor, clutching uselessly at his disabled arm Orwell (2008: 251).

Violence is excessive. Winston endures the most dreadful forms of physical violence. There is no rest for people guilty of unorthodox behaviour. Winston's initial sessions of torture are mostly physical. He has confessed, everyone confesses, but the violence does not stop. Violence goes on and on, and there are no Geneva Conventions. Winston is a criminal and treated like one in the most horrible way, the secret police can do whatever they want with him. Arendt (1951: 427) claims that the secret police hold the true power in a totalitarian movement. The Thought Police's power in *1984* shows this in detail with the torture of Winston. The goal of this torture is to break Winston's body.

After a while, the thought of pain and violence get even less endurable than the actual violence itself.

They slapped his face, wrung his ears, pulled his hair, made him stand on one leg, refused him leave to urinate, shone glaring lights in his face until his eyes ran with water; but the aim of this was simply to humiliate him and destroy his power of arguing and reasoning (Orwell 2008: 253-254).

This display of violence resembles the torture and humiliation of the Prisoners of War of Abu Ghraib in 2004. Violence itself, pain itself, and torture go well beyond mere physical pain. Winston has already confessed, yet violence and pain goes on. The goal now is something else. The torture is almost torture for torture's sake, making it meaningless. Winston is wrong, there is something worse than physical pain: the humiliation and the fear of pain is perhaps worse. The humiliation is perhaps worse than physical pain because it breaks down the mind.

It is when O'Brien takes over the physical and psychological violence are linked. Winston is brought to room 101.

Without any warning except a slight movement of O'Brien's hand, a wave of pain flooded his body. It was a frightening pain, because he could not see what was happening, and he had the feeling that some mortal injury was being done to him. He did not know whether the thing was really happening, or whether the effect was electrically produced; but his body was being wrenched out of shape, the joints were being slowly torn apart. Although the pain had brought the sweat on his forehead, the worst of all was the fear that his backbone was about to snap (Orwell 2008: 257).

Winston's does not get any warning on beforehand, there is not something he says or does that causes his pain. As argued in chapter two, torture is classical conditioning. If the prisoner does not give the right response, pain will be inflicted upon him. This first electric torrent is not conditioned to anything Winston says. It is natural conditioning where the current is meant to cause pain. It is not until O'Brien starts questioning and Winston is unable to doublethink, when he is unable to say that two plus two equals five, that the response becomes learned. The pain of the electric shock, however traumatic, is now conditioned to Winston's responses.

The wave of electric current resembles the way dogs learn not to bark because of the electric current they will receive if they do. This technique, horrible in itself, also says something of how humans are treated in *1984*. Prisoners are not humans. They have never been human, they are machines and animals, they are guilty of high treason and have no rights, like Arendt (1951 427) claims in connection to violence in totalitarian regimes in general in chapter two. 'O'Brien held up his left hand, its back towards Winston, with the thumb hidden and the four fingers extended' (Orwell 2008: 261). O'Brien tells Winston that the Party says that he is holding up five fingers, and he asks Winston how many fingers he is holding up, Winston cannot see five, but four. The response is dreadful:

The word ended in a gasp of pain. The needle of the dial had shot up to fifty-five. The sweat had sprung out all over Winston's body. The air tore into his lungs and issued again in deep groans which even by clenching his teeth he could not stop (Orwell 2008: 262).

After a few sessions with increased pain Winston tries to say five. The pain goes on. Later, when he is completely beat, Winston says he sees whatever O'Brien would like him to see. The pain then stops and he is given a sedative.

The point of this excessive use of pain is not only to get people to confess. It is also a way of brainwashing people and to make them give up their grievance about the Party and truly love the totalitarian leader. The body and mind must both be broken. Unwanted people

do not simply vanish from the face of the earth. By simply terminating people, like they never existed, even though no records of their existence was kept, there are always the memories of them. There is always that chance that they could become martyrs, but by brainwashing them and sending them back to the streets broken and criminal, would decrease that possibility. These techniques seem like lobotomy:

Also something had happened inside his head. As his eyes regained focus he remembered who he was, and where he was, and recognised the face that was gazing into his own; but somewhere or other there was a large patch of emptiness, as though a piece had been taken out of his brain' (Orwell 2008: 269).

Violence gives O'Brien power over Winston. Power, like Arendt (1951) argues, can be reward enough. The excess violence that O'Brien uses on Winston is there to achieve a goal. When the obstacle (Winston) is not conquered. O'Brien gets frustrated and increases Winston's pain. Also, the disproportion between Winston's crime and punishment has got to do with who Winston represents. The excess use of violence is taken out on Winston because he represents an entire group. Just like Žižek (2008: 51) argues that the Danish newspaper printing the Mohammed caricatures got to represent the entire Western World. Winston represents a group of people who, because of their age, is devastating to the Party and O'Brien's way of life.

Winston's final torture session is taking place in room 101. He will then face his greatest threat: rats. How O'Brien knows this, however, is a further indication that Julia is O'Brien's accomplice. Only Julia knows of Winston's fear of rats from a night in Mr. Charrington's shop. Winston then surrenders and gives up Julia. Put the rats loose on Julia instead of him, he says. Torture finally consumes Winston, he cannot resist any longer. This is the true reason why violence prevail: it works. O'Brien finally gets what he wants. There is nothing left of Winston, one should think.

Rule by sheer violence comes into play where power is being lost; it is precisely the shrinking power of the Russian government, internally and externally, that became manifest in its "solution" of the Czechoslovak problem — just as it was the shrinking power of European imperialism that became manifest in the alternative between decolonization and massacre (Arendt 1970: 53).

It is when power alone does not sustain itself, when power needs to be manifested through violence, the rule finds itself in a difficult position. When excess violence is necessary to keep power in check, the holders of power have lost a great deal of their strength. In the case of *1984* then, the excess use of violence that O'Brien uses to get Winston to give

up the one thing he never said he would give up, Julia, is when O'Brien and the party have lost their power over Winston. It may seem like the Party wins, but before Winston goes to prison, the readers are unfamiliar with the materialising of violence. Until then, people simply disappear. If violence is found necessary in prison, physical violence will soon find its way to the streets as well.

3.4 What causes violence and aggression in *1984*

3.4.1 Frustration and outside factors

There is a need to keep the people frustrated, and get them to channel their frustration to a common enemy. Why is the use of violence necessary for the survival of the Party and the revolt against it? How to keep a public frustrated? How to keep them prone to violence and how to channel that frustration and aggression away from the Party that is causing it towards the Party's enemies? How to keep up the interior drive of the Party members? These are important issues to any totalitarian rule. Without it, as Arendt (1951: 417) claims, the rule fails. The Party's goal in *1984* is to keep the people of Oceania frustrated.

As Myers (2004: 254-257) points out in chapter two, certain outside factors may facilitate violent behaviour. At least, certain outside factors might lead to frustration and furthermore an aptness to violence, Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue. The totalitarian movement in *1984* cannot have their people content with their living conditions. According to Arendt (1951: 418) if the people in a totalitarian rule were content, there would be an opportunity of a normal life, and an opportunity of a life alternate to the life the totalitarian ruler dictates.

In addition, contented people would lose some of their drive and need to support the Party in *1984* in its charade war against Eurasia and later Eastasia. Joys of life, like food, sex, travel, love and friendship are restricted. When this is done deliberately, when the reason behind these limitations are to keep the public down, to keep them frustrated, to deprive them of a regular life, such actions is behaviour intended to hurt someone. It is the very definition of violence and in its most conspicuous form. It is as if Denmark were to bomb Norway and blame Sweden, and get Norway to attack Sweden because it would be beneficial to the Danish government. The government of Oceania even shells their own people to keep this illusion

intact. There are a few notions on how the Party keeps the people frustrated based on outside factors, apart from those already listed above.

Constant surveillance is one. Constant surveillance makes people worry and scared. They become extremely self-conscious about what they say and what they do. They can never be safe from the reach of the Thought Police. Living under constant surveillance will surely increase the level of stress among the people being watched. Stressed-out people get frustrated. Frustrated people are prone to violence, Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue.

Food is another tool the Party uses. There is never enough food in *1984*, and the quality of the food the people receive is of very poor quality. 'From the grille at the counter the steam of stew came pouring forth, with a sour metallic smell which did not quite overcome the fumes of victory gin' (Orwell 2008: 51). Not only do they get malnourished and weak by the diet in *1984*, they also get frustrated and angry because of their poor nutrition. Who is to blame for this? The Party blames its enemies, but the real truth is the Party itself. The Party is responsible for the malnourishment of their people. The people, on the other hand, are not aware of this. They believe that their victory gin and victory cigarettes, their bad food, are due to the dreadful Eurasian army. They are united in their belief, save Winston. 'Onto each was dumped swiftly the regulation lunch – a metal pannikin of pinkish-grey stew, a hunk of bread, a cube of cheese, a mug of milkless Victory Coffee, and one saccharine tablet' (Orwell 2008: 52-53).

Winston is old enough to have tasted real chocolate. He knows that food has not always tasted like this. Winston knows that chocolate rations are lowered when they say they are increased, he remembers real food, and he knows who is responsible for their poor food. Winston is in many ways between a rock and a hard place. He is terrified of the Thought Police, but at the same time, he knows that the Party is causing many of his problems. He is, because of his position in the totalitarian movement, what Arendt (1951: 429) calls an accomplice: 'It makes every jobholder a conscious accomplice in the crimes of the government...'. Winston is frustrated with the society he belongs to. By opposing the society Winston is a part of, at the same time, he excludes himself from that society thus increasing his frustration proportionately. To revolt against society takes courage, and it is extremely hard.

Winston has very bad health. He does not receive the medical need his unhealthy way of life would normally bring about in a democratic society. The Party, on the other hand, does have the means necessary to help Winston. That becomes clear when Winston is rapidly recovering from his trip to room 101 in the third part of the novel. The Party has the means for bettering health care, but that would only cause an increase in living conditions. That would bring stability and loss in the Party's interior drive. That, as Arendt (1951: 417) points out in connection to totalitarian regimes in general, would destroy the totalitarian movement. People in a well functioning country where welfare is functioning properly, might become content and lose their fighting spirit.

Winston lives in a beat down housing facility. He starts every morning with a heavy coughing spree. There is a lack of heat. There is never enough of anything. This only adds to more frustration. This frustration is bound to make people more aggressive. At least for Winston's case, because he knows the reasons of his poor living conditions, must get extremely frustrated and angry about the current government.

3.4.2 Us versus them and group mentality

The first date that Winston makes a record of in his diary is the 4 of April *1984*. Winston has been to the movies and every movie shown is a war movie. Winston refers to a movie which he considers particularly good where they show a scene of a thickly laden man trying to swim away from the horrors of war, he is unsuccessful and the crowd goes wild. The second scene that Winston refers to is about a Jewess and a child sitting in a boat full of children (Orwell 2008: 10). The woman tries desperately to keep her child away from harm's way. She unsuccessfully tries to shield her child from the rain of bullets. At the end of the movie a helicopter drops a twenty kilo bomb in the boat and everything goes to pieces. One shot, which Winston finds wonderful, shows the arm of the little child flying through the air. Again, the crowd goes wild with excitement, except a prole woman. A prole is a person at the lowest level of society's hierarchy. The prole woman's outburst against killing children is therefore easily discarded as typical prole behaviour.

The correct response to the killing of enemy children is to cheer. Children in literature and in poetry especially are often considered a symbol of innocence, but in *1984* that symbol is not a common connotation. The killing of innocent children should generate sadness and

pity among the spectators, and not joy and thrill. Human response is in many ways backwards and out of place. However, if a member of the Party had responded with compassion and outrage against such a violent act, that outburst would have been considered unorthodox behaviour. Unorthodox behaviour among Party members is punished. Violence and aggression cause applause. Winston's approval of the movie in the beginning of the novel shows that he is not totally unbiased from Party propaganda. He responds in the way he is supposed to respond. The fact that he contemplates this particular scene and the outburst of the prole woman, shows that he is at least capable to consider the absurdity of the public reaction. In a way, he questions his reactions, he is capable of questioning proper Party behaviour. The proles are able to be empathetic, but they do not matter.

Violence as seen in connection to the movie above, functions as a catalyst to violence. Instead of getting more violence within their own ranks, the Party wishes for their members to channel their rage and aggression against the enemy. It is the enemy who are responsible for the lack of food, the killings of innocent people, and not the Party. The fact that Winston contemplates why he found the movie so thrilling means that there is something inside him that tells him that this is wrong. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 533-534), the National Television Study of 1998 shows that people who are exposed to great amounts of violence lose some of their empathy with the victim. The Party in *1984* does not want their members to pity their enemy. By pitying the enemy, the movement and the fighting spirit would go down. Pity is unorthodox behaviour because it threatens the Party.

This movie also manifests the fear of what is different. In many ways, Eurasia, Oceania's enemy at the time, represents Žižek's (2008) notion on fear of what is different. The people of Oceania do not know what kind of way of life their Eurasian counterparts are living. It is the Party's goal that they never find out. If living conditions in Eurasia are better than in Oceania, Oceanians would lose their belief in the Party. The movement would lose much of what Arendt (1951: 417) calls its interior drive, the drive that the totalitarian movement is so dependent upon. Instead, the Jewess in the movie gets to represent everything that is bad in Oceania. As the same way as the Mohammed caricatures got to represent the entire Western world and not just the Danish newspaper that first published them. That is why the crowd cheers.

3.4.3 Two Minutes Hate, Goldstein and the attraction of violence

Another purpose of the violent images shown on big screen can be seen in connection to the Two Minutes Hate. The Two Minutes Hate is classical conditioning in the same way as Pavlov and his dogs (1923/1928). When the Two Minutes Hate starts, the picture of *Emmanuel Goldstein* appears on the screen.

Goldstein is the leader of the underground opposition of the Party. When Goldstein's face appears on the screen, the crowd goes wild with outbursts of hatred. The whole event resembles an act of *catharsis* where the workers' aggression get triggered and let out. In many ways the workers are conditioned to cry out against Goldstein whenever he appears on the screen. According to Party propaganda, Goldstein is the most dangerous person on the planet. He is the traitor of all traitors. Later the picture of a Eurasian soldier appears on the screen. This too makes the crowd go wild. The Two Minutes Hate is designed to make the Party workers filled with hate and aggression towards all foreign powers. This on the other hand, is to make the workers turn their affection to the constituted leader of Oceania, the all-seeing eye and the ever-watching gaze of *Big Brother*.

The purpose of the Two Minutes Hate is to control two of the most basic human emotions, namely hate and love. Hate for everything foreign, love for Big Brother.

Before the Hate had proceeded for thirty seconds, uncontrollable exclamations of rage were breaking out from half the people in the room. The self-satisfied sheeplike face on the screen, and the terrifying power of the Eurasian army behind it, were too much to be borne: besides, the sight or even the thought of Goldstein produced fear and anger automatically (Orwell 2008: 15).

The automatic response of fear and anger from the crowd is an act of aggression. In *1984*, the mere sight of Goldstein causes fear and anger. It is not something Goldstein says or does that causes the reaction, but the mere sight of him. The collective mind of the audience is conditioned to feel this way about Goldstein. They cannot help it. It is an automated response on the same terms as Pavlov's dogs. In that way, one might claim that automated aggressive response takes away some of the watcher's ability to think for themselves.

Aggressive emotions are provoked from the Party and directed towards Goldstein and the Eurasian army. Then, aggressive emotions towards the Party can be avoided. The Two Minutes Hate is a way for the Party to steer free from any Party member critique. In this way, the Two Minutes Hate functions as a catharsis for the workers. It is an activity in which all

aggressive behaviour can be cleansed and released, and most importantly, be directed away from the Party itself. On the other hand, the Two Minutes Hate is an automated act of anger release. The outburst from the crowd is not a choice or an expression of free will. The response is machinelike, automated, and animalistic. There is no choice to withdraw from participating.

In a lucid moment Winston found that he was shouting with the others and kicking his heel violently against the rung of his chair. The horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was not that one was obliged to act a part, but that it was impossible to avoid joining in (Orwell 2008: 16).

In addition, Goldstein functions as a common enemy, much like a rivalling hooligan firm. He is a source of hatred that everyone can unite against. Everyone is forced to watch. This unified cry of fear is boosting the Party and killing the individual. All unwanted behaviour springs out of Goldstein's teachings. He is the most dangerous man alive because he advocates freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly and freedom of thought. Freedom of choice, then, is associated with the most dangerous man on the planet. No one in their right mind wants to associate themselves with that. This link between Goldstein and freedom of choice serves the Party policy.

The Party conditions its members to relate freedom to something terrible. It strengthens the Party, but at the same time it weakens the opposition, and perhaps most importantly, this link inhibits freedom of choice. Without freedom of choice, the Party is protected.

Throughout the novel, the existence of Goldstein is questioned; also, the origin of Goldstein's book is questioned. Goldstein's thoughts are gathered in his book called *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*. Later in the novel it is established that this book has been written by various Party members. Also, Goldstein uses more Newspeak words than anyone. These two facts combined insinuate that the existence of Goldstein is more a figment of imagination than a real person. He is invented by the Party to serve a purpose. Goldstein's face itself is conditioned to cause fear and anger among his spectators. The sight of Goldstein causes pain and that pain is automatically linked with his theories. Thus his theories are the main object his spectators should respond to, and they are disgusted by them. The Party's politic is to demolish every attempt of uprising and going against the Party, and

Goldstein serves that purpose. The crowd is filled with hate when Goldstein appears, and they are not even aware that they react that way.

A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces with a sledgehammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current, turning one even against one's will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic (Orwell 2008: 16)

This response is more or less automated. Apart from that, to not scream out against Goldstein could possibly attract the attention of the Thought Police. To not scream against the most dangerous man in the world would be considered highly unorthodox.

3.4.4 Public hangings — watching violence

In 1984 public hangings are a common sight. When Winston helps Mrs. Parsons fixing her sink, her children calls Winston: 'You're a traitor!' 'You're a thoughtcriminal!' 'You're a Eurasian spy!', 'I'll shoot you, I'll vaporize you, I'll send you to the salt mines!' (Orwell 2008: 25). Mrs. Parsons tells Winston that their aggressive behaviour is due to their not seeing the hanging:

Some Eurasian prisoners, guilty of war crimes, were to be hanged in the Park that evening, Winston remembered. This happened about once a month, and was a popular spectacle. Children always clamoured to be taken to see it (Orwell 2008: 25-26).

Children, at a very early stage, are brought up to be spies fuelled by hate. Hangings intrigue them. Hangings are the fuel with which the children function. They are bloodthirsty, the Party has taught them that. Winston's fear of children does not only spring from the fact that they can turn him in to the Thought Police. He also fears for his own life.

There was a sort of calculating ferocity in the boy's eye, a quite evident desire to kick Winston and a consciousness of being very nearly big enough to do so. It was a good job it was not a real pistol he was holding, Winston thought (Orwell 2008: 25).

Public displays of violence does something to the people watching it. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 534), the National Television Study of 1998 shows that being exposed to a great deal of violence changes the way people perceive violence. It creates a violence mentality; they get attracted to violence. By viewing violence:

Viewers learn new aggressive behaviors through modelling. Viewers come to believe that aggression usually is rewarded, or at least, rarely punished. Viewers become desensitized to the sight and thought of violence, and to the suffering of victims. Viewer's fears of becoming a target of crime or violence increases.

The people of Oceania suffer the same effects. They do not care about the victims. There are no United Nations or Haag to punish the Party. Instead, violence is attractive, a show. In Oceania, public displays of violence, hence the public hangings, become an attraction and a place where families bring their kids for entertainment. Violence is something people should be repulsed by, real people being hanged is not for general amusement.

Violence is a big part of everyday life in *1984*. The next chapter Alex and *A Clockwork Orange* are the foci of this thesis. What kinds of violence affect Alex, and what causes that violence?

4 *A Clockwork Orange*

One of *A Clockwork Orange's* main themes is the dangers of a totalitarian regime. The government, unlike the Party in *1984*, is in its initial phase of a totalitarian movement. The government in *A Clockwork Orange* wants the people to value work emphasising the collective over the individual.

The glorification of the worker resembles old propaganda posters from the Soviet Union. Like the Soviet Union, government control is an important aspect of society in *A Clockwork Orange*. There are restrictions on many aspects of life, but there is still one thing the government cannot control, and that is the youth generation.

The youth generation in *A Clockwork Orange* is violent. The government's attempt of removing that violence through violence is how the totalitarian movement in *A Clockwork Orange* really catches fire. Another important theme of *A Clockwork Orange* is therefore youth violence; what causes it and how it can be avoided. A third important theme in *A Clockwork Orange* is the relationship between freedom of choice and the essence of humans. A fourth important theme in *A Clockwork Orange* is the dichotomy between good and evil. All these themes will be touched upon as the analysis of *A Clockwork Orange* commences.

4.1 What kinds of violence — *A Clockwork Orange*

4.1.1 Subjective versus objective violence

Alex is the novel's main character. He is part of a youth generation which does not, at first sight, conform to society's norms. Alex has been in and out of various correctional programs since he was eleven, and therefore, Alex's violence is nothing new and neither is the problem that his generation represents. The various correctional programs of the government do not work, and as long as Alex does not get caught, the government seems oblivious to his crimes. Alex even has a correctional adviser, a man whose only wish is that Alex stays out of prison, but he has no real concern for Alex. In the beginning of the novel Alex almost has a romantic relationship to violence. He thinks it beautiful when blood comes streaming from his victims' mouths (Burgess 2000: 7)

Alex is only fifteen years old in the beginning of the novel. The first night Alex and his droogs are out several violent episodes occur. They beat up a man coming from the library,

they rob a shop, they beat up an old drunk, they fight a rivalling street gang, they steal a car, they beat up an author and rapes his wife, and before they go home, Alex hits his droog and comrade Dim. This is a normal night in Alex's life in which violence plays an important part.

The violence Alex uses, at first sight, seems meaningless, but, violence has many reasons. The Slovenian sociologist, continental philosopher, cultural critic and theorist Žižek (2008) argues that violence takes different forms. It all depends on how violence is perceived by the public. Subjective violence, as Žižek (2008: 2) argues, is when a violent episode protrudes the status quo: '...subjective violence is experienced as such against the beackground of a non-violent zero level'. That means that an episode is only perceived as a violence when it differs from everyday life. If life is generally violent-free, the people involved will perceive the violent episode as violence. If life is violent in general, when street muggings and beatings-up are normal and part of everday life, violence is not always perceived as violence, but simply as a part of life. Thereof comes the question: how does violence affect Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*?

In a way *A Clockwork Orange* has two main parts. The first part is about Alex as an adolescent involved in muggings, beatings-up, and rape. The second part Alex is a victim, which means that the reader is given both perspectives of Alex, both as a violator and as a victim. Alex is shown both sides of the violence continuum, and the readers get access to them. With Alex as a violator, the readers would perceive his actions as violence, the older generation in *A Clockwork Orange* would too.

For Alex and his generation, however, it is everyday life, it is what Alex and his droogs do. The readers, on the other hand, will perceive Alex's action as violent, thus, subjective violence is at play. There is the dystopian character of the novel. Readers from well functioning democratic countries will immediately identify Alex's actions subjectively. They will be shocked, because what Alex and his droogs do to other people differ so immensely with what Žižek (2008: 2) calls a 'non-violent zero level', the reality of everyday life in well functioning democratic countries.

Alex and his droogs are violent every day, it is what they do. When Alex and his droogs fight over who is going to be the leader of the group, people pass them by: 'And all the time lewdies passed by and viddied all this but minded their own, it being perhaps a common

street-sight' (Burgess 2000: 41). The first night in *A Clockwork Orange* is a normal night for them, and seemingly, the same for everyone else in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. It is their and their violent subculture's sense of status quo.

When Alex is imprisoned, however, when he is on the receiving end of the violence continuum, Alex's perception of violence changes dramatically. He has never before experienced how it is to be the victim of a violent act. Alex, therefore, will perceive the violent acts done against him subjectively. Alex lacks a general empathy for other people. He cannot see the irony that he should be pitied whereas his victims should not. Violence, for Alex is perceived subjectively only when he can feel violence on his own body. He feels sorry for himself, but does not see that the violence he has afflicted upon others is very similar to the violence he is subjected to. The readers should have no pity for Alex's victims, but for Alex: That is a paradox.

Alex's lack of empathy and egocentrism may be a result of his young age. Passer & Smith (2001: 482) argue that 'David Elkin proposes that **adolescent egocentrism** has two main parts. First, adolescents overestimate the uniqueness of their feelings and experiences, which is called *personal fable*', [s]econd, many adolescents feel that they are always "on stage" and that "[e]verybody's going to notice" how they look and what they do'. When Alex feels sorry for himself when he is the victim of violence, but cannot see that his violence is the same for his victims, that may have to do with what Elkin calls personal fable. Personal fables are typical for adolescents, like Alex is.

The readers too, will probably perceive the violence happening to Alex subjectively. That, however, has more to do with the Alex being the narrator: 'Then they gave me one final tolchock on the litso each and I fell over and just laid there on the grass' (Burgess 2000: 112). It is Alex who tells the story and, therefore, it is his version the readers get admission to. When the narrator is first person, the story will always be told subjectively. The readers too, will therefore experience violence in *A Clockwork Orange* subjectively: when Alex is a perpetrator and when he is a victim.

Unlike *1984* where the narrator is third person, the readers will probably not see that most of the violent episodes in *A Clockwork Orange* are not really subjective in character. Everything about *A Clockwork Orange* has a violent touch. Alex and his droogs are just *one*

street gang. Billyboy and his droogs are another. In the last chapter of the novel, Alex forms yet a new street gang with new members. The street gangs are part of a system, and typical for the youth generation. The systematicness of the street gangs makes their violence different from subjective violence. Youth violence in *A Clockwork Orange* is a recurring phenomenon, a part of everyday life, not episodes.

4.1.2 Objective violence in a totalitarian rule

Alex is the novel's narrator and that everything the readers get access to is through him. Violence is part of the status quo in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. Violence, then, in *A Clockwork Orange* is not quite subjective in character. After all, violence is everywhere.

I had my cut-throat britva [knife] handy in case any of Billyboy's droogs should be around near the flatblock waiting, or for that matter any of the other bandas or gruppas or shaikas that from time to time were at war with one (Burgess 2000: 25).

It is not only Alex and his droogs that are violent. There are many street gangs about, and the government too uses violence. Violence is simply how life is in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*, it is the working reality. The street gangs and the violence associated with them are part of everyday life in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. The youth violence does not protrude any non-violent zero level, because there is no non-violent zero level. According to Žižek (2008:2), violence then is not subjective, but the readers will perceive youth violence as such, especially readers from well functioning democratic countries, because the violence protrudes their non-violent zero level. The violence the government uses is not made clear, however, until Alex is arrested.

Whether the government in *A Clockwork Orange* likes it or not, the violent youth generation is part of society. In addition, society in *A Clockwork Orange* is totalitarian. Violence in a totalitarian society is always objective because it is part of every day life and how the state functions. Žižek (2008: 2) argues that '[o]bjective violence is invisible because it sustains the very zero-level standard against which we perceive something as subjectively violent.' This kind of violence does not have such an 'clearly identifiable agent' (Žižek 2008:1).

Žižek divides objective violence into two subcategories. The first subcategory Žižek (2008: 1) calls 'symbolic violence'. Symbolic violence is represented by speech and 'the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms' (Žižek 2008:1). The

second subcategory Žižek terms 'systematic violence' where systematic violence being '...the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems' (Žižek 2008: 1) From the exploitation of 'Mexico in the sixteenth century' to the massacre in 'Belgian Kongo almost a century later', Žižek (2008: 12) argues, is due to 'capitalist globalisation'. These two incidents are objective in character because they are systematic and happening on a political and an ideological level.

The systematicness makes violence objective, it is not so easy to identify that kind of violence because it is systematic and part of everyday life, it is part of the status quo of society. That is why the violence the youth generation in *A Clockwork Orange* represents is really objective violence. Every victim of Alex and his droog's wrath are anonymous. F. Alexander's identity, for instance, the readers only get to know after Alex's release from prison, and after he is physically unable to commit acts of violence. Every victim until then are nameless and from different social strata of life and of different age. The only exception is Billyboy and his droogs, but they want to fight, and they are a part of Alex's generation, and in many ways, not victims as such. The namelessness of Alex's victims only add to giving youth violence a systematic objective character.

Alex and his droogs are not unique. Their group is one of many street gangs. Alex and his droogs' violence is only one example of youth violence. They are a part of a whole movement of aggressive teens whose mission, whose everyday life, consist of being violent. In that way, violence becomes systematic, and when violence becomes systematic and a part of the status quo of society, that violence is thus objective. There is violence on every level of society in *A Clockwork Orange*. Alex is the case study, youth violence is violence on the micro level whereas government violence is violence on the macro level. On every level, violence is an important part of everyday life. That too makes the violence objective:

We're talking here of violence inherent in a system: not only direct physical violence, but also the more subtle forms of coercion that sustain relations of domination and exploitation, including the threat of violence (Žižek 2008: 8).

The people of the society in *A Clockwork Orange* are always faced with the threat of violence: from the street gangs, but also from the political system.

The German-born American political theorist and philosopher Arendt (1951: 429) argues in connection to totalitarian regimes that ‘...every individual of any consequence owes his whole existence to the political regime; and when this factual identity of interest is broken and the next purge has swept him out of office, the regime makes sure that he disappears from the world of living’. The individual in a totalitarian rule must not get the chance to prosper. The society in *A Clockwork Orange* is nowhere near as totalitarian as Arendt describes above, and not as totalitarian as society in *1984*, but, there are a few indicators that a totalitarian movement is growing in *A Clockwork Orange*. Government control is crucial in order to create a totalitarian rule, Arendt (1951) argues. The government in *A Clockwork Orange* controls many aspects of society.

Another violent incident in *A Clockwork Orange* is when Alex and his droogs steal a car. They end up in a village and a place called ‘Home’(Burgess 2000: 17). Here they pretend to be in distress and in need of an ambulance. The person answering the door is a woman, and after some persuading, she opens the door sufficiently so the droogs may slip in. They beat up the author and then make him watch as they take turns at raping his wife. Later, after Alex’s release from prison and after his encounter with the police, Alex once again finds himself on the doorstep of F. Alexander, the author (Burgess 2000: 112). F. Alexander, unaware of Alex’s true identity, takes mercy on Alex, he gives him a place to rest, food, and writes an article about Alex and his troubles with the government. F. Alexander wants to use Alex’s example in his quest of ruining the government’s chances of reelection. As the novel progresses, when Alex’s ‘nadsat’ jargon reminds him of the people responsible for beating him up, raping his wife, killing his wife, F. Alexander realises that Alex was the one responsible. F. Alexander changes his agenda for Alex. He wants to use him but at the same time seeks revenge for all the things Alex has done to him and his late wife.

F. Alexander, an author who is determined to get rid of the current government claims that Alex will be ‘a very potent weapon ... in ensuring that this present Government is not returned in the forthcoming election’ (Burgess 2000: 118). The reason F. Alexander gives for opposing the government is because it is responsible for ‘[r]ecruiting brutal young roughs for the police, [p]roposing debilitating and will-sapping techniques of conditioning’ and ‘[b]efore we know where we are we shall have the full apparatus of totalitarianism’ (Burgess 2000: 118). He fears the dangers of totalitarianism because it threatens freedom of choice and claims that

‘[t]here are great traditions of liberty to defend’ (Burgess 2000:119). He also claims that Alex, unable to make moral choices, is no longer human because ‘[a] man who cannot choose ceases to be a man’ (Burgess 2000: 115).

The Charles is the prison vicar and during Alex’s stay in prison, the Charles and Alex has conversations about life and religion. The Charles is worried about Alex because he does not think that Alex should be a part of this new correctional technique, but at the same time, he himself wishes to excel in the priesthood. The vicar wants to be on good terms with the prison governor and Alex is a part of that scheme. Alex feeds the Charles with inside information (Burgess 2000: 62). Though a bit corrupted, the Charles is sincerely interested in Alex’s well being and humanity, but fails to take action when the situation calls for it. He too fails Alex, but he concurs with F. Alexander that choice is essential to humans: ‘Goodness is something chosen. When a man cannot choose he ceases to be a man’ (Burgess 2000: 63). As we shall see later in this chapter, Alex too believes in defending freedom of choice, but unlike F. Alexander who uses his ‘sword-pen’ (Burgess 2000: 18), Alex uses physical violence.

The government not only seeks out to control freedom of choice, but also the media. The movies are one example of government control in *A Clockwork Orange*. The media decide what people should be watching. If someone wants to go to the movies, they must choose to see something the government has to offer. Government control is restrictive, it keeps individualism at a safe distance.

Newspapers, an important part of the media, is also controlled by the government.

I kuppeted [bought] a gazetta, my idea being to get ready for plunging back into normal jeezny [life] again by vidying what was ittying on in the world. This gazetta I had seemed to be like a government gazetta, for the only news that was on the front page was about the need for every veck to make sure he put the Government back in again on the next General Election, which seemed to be about two or three weeks off (Burgess 2000: 98).

The government controls almost every aspect of human life in *A Clockwork Orange*. Work too is controlled by the government. ‘Which was true, there being this law for everybody not a child nor with child nor ill to go out rabbiting. My mum worked at one of the Statemarts, as they called them, filling up the shelves with tinned soup and beans and all that cal’ (Burgess 2000: 28). There is no choice not to work. The one thing the government cannot control is the violent youth generation.

But brothers, this biting of their toe-nails over what is the *cause* of badness is what turns me into a fine laughing malchick. They don't go into the cause of *goodness*, so why the other shop? If lewdies are good, that's because they like it, and I wouldn't interfere with their pleasures, and so of the other shop. And I was patronizing the other shop. More, badness is of the self, the one, the you or me on our oddy knockies, and that self is made by old Bog or God and his great pride and radosty. But the not-self cannot have the bad, meaning they of the government and the judges and the schools cannot allow the bad because they cannot allow the self. And is not our modern history, my brothers, the story of brave malenky selves fighting these big machines? I am serious with you, brothers, over this. But what I do I do because I like to do (Burgess 2000: 31).

Alex, choses to be bad because then he seeks out his own freedom. By being bad he fights for his individualism. The government wants the people to function like clockwork oranges (Burgess 2000). An orange is a fruit with no core, it is organic like humans, and when every person is an orange, everyone is basically the same and uniform. A clockwork does as it is told, it has no choice, it is a machine which conforms to the rules of physics within the boundaries of the casing. The people in the society in *A Clockwork Orange* should work for the greater good, without question, like clockwork. They should do as they are told, meet up on time, do their work and go home and sleep, uniform and the same, without choice, and without joy. That is what the government wants, not individual violence.

Violence, then, becomes a problem, but also the generation associated with that violence becomes a problem. Individual violence, manifested by Alex, is a way for him to celebrate his individuality, his freedom of choice, his humanity. Violence seems like the only option for Alex. By being bad, by using violence, Alex opposes the system that tries to keep him down, but, as he contemplates in the quote above, he is violent because he likes to. That, however, might not be entirely true.

When Alex is arrested, the reason why society in *A Clockwork Orange* is a growing totalitarian rule. He is arrested after the mugging of the woman with the cats. Alex believes he has certain rights, even though he is caught on the scene of the crime:

'Righty right, boys, we'll start off by showing him that we know the law too, but that knowing the law isn't everything.' He had a like gentleman's goloss and spoke in a very weary sort of way, and he nodded with a like droogy smile at one very big fat bastard. This big fat bastard took off his tunic and you could viddy he had a real big starry pot on him, then he came up to me not too skorry and I could get the von of the milky chai he'd been peeting when he opened his rot in a like very tired leery grin at me. He was not too well shaved for a rozz [police officer] and you could viddy like patches of dried sweat on his shirt under the arms, and you could get this von of like earwax from him as he came close. Then he clenched his stinking red rooker and let me have it right in the belly... (Burgess 2000: 52).

Alex's first interaction with the police is not a positive one. He is ill-treated, gets beat up, and then forced to sign his full conviction. Similar to the secret police in 1984, the police use

violence in order to get what they want from Alex. The police totally ignore Alex's wish for an attorney, and they do not care about the law. The police in *A Clockwork Orange* can do whatever they want.

When Alex is brought in after he is arrested, some women are singing. They receive the same violent treatment:

But there were the golosses of millicents telling them to shut it and you could even slooshy the zvook of like somebody being tolchoked real horrorshow and going owwwwwww, and it was like the goloss of a drunken starry ptitsa, not a man (Burgess 2000: 51).

Music is important to Alex, he loves music, and especially classical music and Ludwig van Beethoven. Music is often a celebration of individuality, because music is very personal. Singing songs in a prison cell is no crime, and the punishment these women get for singing is unproportional. In a way, they are punished for expressing their individuality. Individualism and expression thereof are something a totalitarian movement cannot accept. Apart from that, the brute force of the police and the neglect for human rights are probably some of the best indicators that the rule in *A Clockwork Orange* is a growing totalitarian movement.

Another indicator that government in *A Clockwork Orange* is growing in its totalitarian character is this new correctional technique called the *Ludovico Technique*. The Ludovico Technique's goal is to physically remove a person's ability to have bad thoughts. The government wants its people to be clockwork oranges, likeable and to do what they are told.

The Russian physiologist, psychologist and physician Pavlov was one of the first to find that behaviour is conditioned. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 232), he '... noticed that with repeated testing, the dogs began to salivate *before* the food was presented, such as when they heard footsteps of the approaching experimenter'. Pavlov saw that a connection between footsteps and food created a response. Later on, a flute was introduced when the food was being presented. That resulted in that the dogs started associating the flute with food. The dogs' saliva production became conditioned to the flute instead of the footsteps. Pavlov built on the dog's natural conditioning, and got them to salivate to a flute instead. That is learned behaviour where food was used as a positive reinforcer.

Dr. Brodsky and Dr. Branom represent the government. They are the ones responsible for treating Alex. Alex gets wind of a new correctional technique that will shorten his sentence from fourteen years to a fortnight. This technique implies that Alex will be physically unable to commit violence. Dr. Brodsky calls the Ludovico Technique ‘...association, the oldest educational method in the world’ (Burgess 2000: 86). The Ludovico Technique is similar to the technique that Pavlov used, but with one small exception: Dr Brodsky and Dr Branom use punishers instead of positive reinforcers.

Passer & Smith (2001: 241) argue in chapter two that rats who were rewarded for pulling a lever that gave them some kind of reward would likely continue that behaviour, but when the rats were given an electrical shock, *a punisher*, when they pulled the lever, they would restrain from pulling the lever.

Alex, however simply have to endure his shocks; there is no way for him to not pull the lever because he receives the punisher anyway. Alex cannot shut his eyes. They give Alex a chemical substance that they tell him must be vitamins. ‘The pains I felt now in my belly and the headache and the thirst were terrible, and they all seemed to be coming out of the screen’ (Burgess 2000: 79). They show Alex films with an extremely violent content, they have strapped him to a chair and have attached instruments designed so that Alex cannot shut his eyes, thus forcing him to watch these movies. Unlike the rats, Alex cannot avoid pain, and that makes the Ludovico Treatment torture.

This technique, this learning method also signals an attitude. Because the method is powered by aggression, Passer & Smith (2001: 245) argue, it ‘...can send a message to the recipient that such aggression is appropriate and effective’. The government reviews youth violence as a problem, but by using methods like the Ludovico, it sends a message to the youth generation, represented by Alex, that that kind of violence, that kind of behaviour, are ‘appropriate and effective’.

The chemicals he has been forced to take is designed to make Alex physically ill whenever he sees or even thinks about violence. This is a form of torture and perhaps one of the main reasons why violence still prevails in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*: it works. Torture like the prisoners on Guantanamo Bay, torture like Winston is subjected to in *1984*,

but torture, as the Ludovico Technique really is, is perhaps even worse: As F. Alexander, Alex, and the prison vicar contemplates, a man without choice is no man at all.

In a way, the government has taken away Alex's humanity. Even Alex's most human character, and one of the most important expressions for his individuality, his love for music, is removed. He will feel sick every time he hears music, he no longer has the chance to listen to music, to choose a certain record and enjoy the reaction music invokes in him. The government has physically removed every feature of Alex's individualism, his violence and his love for music. Violence and music are the only fora Alex can pursue happiness and joy — two very fundamental human characteristics — within the boundaries of society in *A Clockwork Orange*, and by removing those fora, the government, here represented by Brodsky and Branom, have successfully reduced Alex to a clockwork orange that will value work, do as he is told without question, without joy, without choice. They have taken away Alex's humanity, he is no longer human, but a mechanic fruit, without essence.

Alex can tolerate getting sick by watching violent movies, but he does not know the ramifications of his treatment, he still believes he can be violent when he reenters society. Music, however, is perhaps Alex's greatest joy in life, and when that is threatened, it threatens the very core of his existence, his reason for living, and that makes him frantic. Alex says: 'Using Ludwig van like that. He did no harm to anyone. Beethoven just wrote music' (Burgess 2000: 85). Collateral damage is what the doctors think (Burgess 2000: 85).

When his treatment is finished, they put him on display like a caged animal to show the magnificent result that Alex is. 'He is, as you will perceive, fit and well nourished' (Burgess 2000: 92). He is a clockwork orange, a thing that will obey the laws of physics, loveable, without any core. Alex has lost his freedom of choice. He is no longer human, but a constructed machine.

When Alex is released from prison he goes home, but finds his room occupied by Joe the lodger (Burgess 2000: 100). Joe the lodger represents the working class in *A Clockwork Orange*. Joe has a contract in the city and has already paid next month's lease, which means that Alex no longer has a place to live. When Alex is released from prison, Joe is very aggressive towards Alex, and has no sympathy for Alex and the hardships he has endured. He has taken over Alex's room, but also Alex's place in the family. Alex's parents chose Joe over

Alex, and Alex is the one that needs to find another place. Joe feels that Alex's punishment is too mild, fourteen days instead of fourteen years is disproportional to Alex's crime. Joe the lodger represents the general public's sense of justice and an eye for an eye mentality.

Revenge is not fulfilled when Alex is released from prison before he is due. In democratic societies, vengeance is carried out by the state, but when the state fails to carry out that vengeance, the people's perception of justice is corrupted. Alex, however, gets more than he bargained for when he commits to the state's new correctional technique. Joe, however, does not believe that Alex has paid his debt to society.

Alex's parents live in a worn down municipal block, where they share a small flat with their son, and later, Joe the lodger. They have steady jobs, and for that Alex calls them rabbits. Though only fifteen in the beginning of the novel, Alex seems to be the lord of the household. He can do what he wants, he comes and goes as he pleases, he listens to loud music late in the evening, he makes them take sleeping pills, and he refuses to tell his parents what he does in the evenings. His parents are afraid of their own son. There is no discipline in Alex's life, at least not from his parents. They have failed in their upbringing of their son, and the unconditional love one would expect a parent has for his child is not present when they chose Joe over Alex. Alex's parents have failed to take an interest in their son and his chances of succeeding in life.

Dim is Alex's droog and comrade in the beginning of the novel. He is described as a stupid brute, but extremely violent and a person who comes in handy in street fights (Burgess 2000: 42) Dim interrupts Alex in his listening to live music at the Korova milkbar, the bar the droogs frequent rather often. As a result, Alex hits Dim. Dim, unable to see the reason why Alex has attacked him, gets offended by Alex's physical insult. And with that starts the betrayal as we shall see later on. On the second night there is mutiny in Alex's group. The group consists of Alex, Dim, Pete and Georgie. Alex finds it necessary to show who is boss and engages in a fight with both Dim and Georgie.

As a result of the fight, Alex wins. After the droogs' leadership issues have been resolved, they go to the Korova where the night's plans are laid. They are going to rob an old woman. They go to the woman's house, break in, and Alex gets in a fight with the old woman. What Alex and his droogs do not know is that the woman has already called the police when

Alex tries to trick her to open the door. When the police arrives, Dim knocks down Alex and ties him up so he cannot escape. The result of this action is that Alex gets arrested.

After Alex's stay in prison, he reencounters Dim, who has now become a police officer. Billyboy, the leader of the rivalling streetgang Alex and his droogs fight on the first night, is also a member of the police. Dim and Billyboy give Alex a real beating when they find Alex at the library (Burgess 2000: 110). The government has already gotten what they wanted, Alex is a machine, a clockwork orange, but still, the government, represented by Dim and Billyboy, uses excess violence on him.

When Alex ends up in F. Alexander's home, the author takes pity on him (Burgess 2000: 113). He wants to use Alex in his quest to ruin what he calls a growing totalitarian government (Burgess 2000: 118). F. Alexander claims that Alex has sinned but the punishment '...has been all out of proportion' (Burgess 2000: 115). The author, without knowing Alex's true identity, knows that Alex has committed murder, but he still thinks that the government has punished Alex too harshly. 'They have turned you into something other than a human being. You have no power of choice any longer. You are committed to socially acceptable acts, a little machine capable of only good' (Burgess 2000: 115). Alex's violence may be the only way for him to defend his individuality and freedom of choice, being bad is something chosen, being good is not. Now, however, Alex is *physically* unable to do that. He has no choice at all anymore.

But when F. Alexander finds out Alex's true identity, that Alex is responsible for killing his wife, vengeance takes over. Vengeance now becomes more important than any political agenda or ideology. That is a statement about the human character and violence. Human emotion, and the need to see an eye for an eye carried out corrupts F. Alexander's higher motives. His vendetta becomes the most important thing, that is perhaps why F. Alexander does not succeed.

F. Alexander tries to kill Alex by playing music (Burgess 2000: 124), killing Alex with his greatest joy in life, thus making the violence spiral go on and on. Violence simply creates more violence. Alex is forced to jump out the window because of the pain the music invokes in him. This is perhaps the ultimate sacrifice which redeems Alex in the public's eye. Alex sacrifices himself on the alter of freedom. It is the only way he can escape, but to F.

Alexander's great misfortune, Alex does not die. After this incident, the government, afraid that Alex will ruin the government's chances of reelection decide to smooth things over with Alex, and Alex is not only cured, he is given a job, a stereo and is let loose. Eventually, Alex ceases to be violent.

4.2 What causes violence and aggression in *A Clockwork Orange*

4.2.1 The attraction of violence

Young violent street gangs are common sights in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*, but there are more examples of how violence colours society in *A Clockwork Orange*. The way violence is presented in the movies might affect violence in *A Clockwork Orange*.

We could viddy from the poster on the Filmdrome's face, a couple of fly-dirtied spots trained on it, that there was the usual cowboy riot, with the archangels on the side of the US marshal six-shooting at the rustlers out of hell's fighting legions, the kind of hound-and-horny veshch put out by Statefilm in those days (Burgess 2000: 16).

As discussed in chapter two, viewing violence affects how violence is perceived. In the USA, several studies of the effect of viewing violence have been conducted. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 534), Huesman (1997) and the National Television Study (1998) point out that:

Viewers learn new aggressive behaviors through modelling. Viewers come to believe that aggression usually is rewarded, or at least, rarely punished. Viewers become desensitized to the sight and thought of violence, and to the suffering of victims. Viewers' fears of becoming a target of crime or violence increases.

Western movies portray violence where the violator is rarely punished, and violence is rarely personal. The state controls the movie business in *A Clockwork Orange*, and by showing violent movies, the public's perception of violence is altered. Alex and his droogs may learn to be violent from watching those kind of movies. Their violent behaviour may be a result of modelling learnt behaviour, or they come to realise that violence pays and that they themselves can get away with it. Especially this last point is true for Alex and his droogs because they take great care in covering themselves and buying themselves alibi before roaming the streets with violence in mind.

4.2.2 Biological factors/brain chemistry

The first incident of violence in *A Clockwork Orange* happens early in the novel. It is a normal day in Alex and his droogs' life. They meet up and decides to roam the streets. Before they go out they meet up in the 'Korova Milkbar' where everyone has a 'milk-plus' (Burgess 2000: 3).

They had no licence for selling liquor, but there was no law yet against prodding some of the new veshches which they used to put into the old moloko [milk], so you could peet it with vellocet or synthemesc or drenchrom or one or two other veshches which would give you a nice quiet horrorshow fifteen minutes admiring Bog And All His Holy Angels and Saints in your left shoe with lights bursting all over your mozg (Burgess 2000: 3).

The droogs drink milk with various substances in it on a regular basis. The government does not know what is going on in such milkbars as the Korova. Alex reports that many 'nadsats' go into the Korova. Nadsats are teens or adolescents. Alex, however, does not consider himself a nadsat, and even though he is only fifteen, he refers to himself as a malchick.

The reality of *A Clockwork Orange* is different from today. The contemporary society when the novel was published did not have a youth generation in the manner we have today. There was no transitional period between childhood and adulthood. Unlike today, a teen is not a teen in *A Clockwork Orange*. When Alex lures two ten-year-old girls to come to his apartment and have semi-consensual sex with him, he calls them nadsats. When Alex, eighteen at the end of the novel, considers his age, he feels he is old.

In connection to violence, as we saw in chapter two, various substances can have an effect on violence. There are especially two chemicals in the brain that affect aggression: 'serotonin' and 'testosterone', Passer & Smith (2001: 531) points out. Alex is only fifteen and his levels of the male hormone testosterone may be a bit unbalanced. As Passer & Smith (2001: 531) argue, in animals testosterone and higher levels thereof seem to cause higher 'social aggression'.

Although Alex is only a fictional character, there are some indicators based on Alex's actions in the novel that shows that he might have a high level of testosterone. He often gets irritated and frustrated, and when that happens, he almost every time resorts to violence, at least in the first part of the novel where he still has the choice to be violent. On their first night in the Korova Milkbar, a person sitting next to Alex starts annoying him. He is not speaking directly to Alex, but still, Alex gets annoyed with his talk:

...I cracked this veck who was sitting next to me and well away and burbling a horrorshow crack on the ooko or earhole, but he didn't feel it and went on with his 'Telephonic hardware and when the farfarculule rubadubdub'. He'd feel it all right when he came to, out of the land (Burgess 2000: 5-6).

This person does not respond to Alex's strike, however, but he is under the influence, and as Alex contemplates, he will feel Alex's blow when his drugs wear off.

As discussed in chapter two, according to Passer & Smith (2001: 531), uneven levels of certain chemicals in the brain can effect aggression. Drugs can create uneven levels of chemicals in the brain; that is what drugs do. Passer & Smith (2001: 205) argue that:

Like any cell, a neuron essentially is a fragile bag of chemicals, and it takes a delicate chemical balancing act for neurons to function properly. Drugs work their way into the bloodstream and are carried throughout the brain by an extensive network of small blood vessels, called *capillaries*. These capillaries contain a **blood-brain barrier**, a special lining of tightly packed cells that lets vital nutrients pass through so neurons can function. The blood-brain barrier screens out many foreign substances, but some, including a variety of drugs, manage to pass through.

Once drugs hit the main bloodstream, they quickly find their way to the brain where some of them alter consciousness. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 204), Diaz (1997) and Weil (1996) claim that drugs '...alter consciousness by modifying brain chemistry, but drug effects are also influenced by psychological, environmental, and cultural factors'. Drugs are chemicals designed to either increase neural reactions or block them.

'Vellocet', 'synthemesc' or 'drencrom' are some of the special ingredients in a milk-plus in the Korova Milkbar (Burgess 2000: 3). According to the Urban Dictionary 'Milk-plus' is '[a] term from the book/movie *A Clockwork Orange*. Milk laced with drugs, such as LSD, synthetic mescaline, or adrenochrome, all are also known as either vellocet synthemesc or drenchrom'. Mescaline and LSD are substances that belong to the group of *hallucinogens*. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 212): 'Hallucinogens are powerful mind-altering drugs that produce hallucinations'. The effects of such substances are diverse, Passer & Smith (2001: 212-213) argue:

Hallucinogens usually distort or intensify sensory experience and can blur the boundaries between reality and fantasy. Users may speak of seeing sounds and hearing colors, of mystical experiences and insights, and of feeling exhilarated. They also may have violent outbursts, experience paranoia and panic, and have flashbacks after the "trip" has ended. The mental effects of hallucinogens are always unpredictable, even if they are taken repeatedly. This unpredictability constitutes their greatest danger.

As stated in the quote above, the substances the teens take in the Korova Milkbar can cause violent behaviour. According to Passer & Smith (2001: 531), Siegel et al. (1999) and Siever et

al. (1999) found that ‘...atypically low levels of *serotonin* activity may play a role in impulsive aggression, as when people lash out from emotional rage’. LSD, which is one of the substance the ‘nadsats’ in *A Clockwork Orange* take with their milk has a connection to serotonin. According to Bloom et.al (2001: 45): ‘The serotonin receptors are the sites at which the hallucinogenic drug LSD acts, as do certain antidepressant drugs’.

The third substance in a milk-plus is called adrenochrome or adrenochrome. Adrenochrome is a variation of adrenaline which again is referred to as epinephrine. Epinephrine also have an effect on violence. According to Bloom et.al (2001: 251), in 1924, an experiment on the effects of epinephrine was carried out by Gregorio Maranon, and he found that those who had been given a shot of epinephrine, given misinformation on what symptoms they might expect, and paired with an emotional partner ‘...began to act like the confederate in the waiting room and reported that they felt very happy or very angry, depending on the confederate with whom they had been paired’.

Being together under the influence of these substances might increase the droogs’ aggression. It is possible then, that the reason Alex, his droogs, and perhaps also his entire generation are violent is because they use these substances. The effect of these substances are very unpredictable, as Passer & Smith (2001: 212-213) argue, and even though Alex and his droogs do these drugs repeatedly, there is no way of knowing how they are going to react to them. Alex resorts to violence not long after he drinks a milk-plus, thus substantiating this claim. The government officials, on the other hand, are oblivious to these drugs and their effects, but also to the entire teenage culture, and there are no laws against these drugs. They do not understand the youth generation, they do not care, and they are unaware of what goes on in these milkbars.

There is a general lack of interest in the youth generation. As discussed earlier, the movies are heavily controlled by the government. There are few sparetime offers for the youths in *A Clockwork Orange* because the government values work and not joy. A clear example of this is when Alex describes the municipal painting in his flatblock where the people’s faces are ‘stern in the dignity of labour’ (Burgess 2000: 25). In addition, like Alex contemplates, the government does not go into the goodness of things (Burgess 2000: 31).

There is a lack of interest, a lack of recreational offers, a glorification of work, restrictions of free will. According to Bloom et.al (2001: 318), the result may be boredom and drug abuse:

Human beings seem to have two compelling but contradictory needs: we like things to stay the same (to be familiar) and we crave novelty. We search for substances that will get us out of our rut — drug abusers often report that they take drugs to relieve boredom — and substances that calm our anxiety when things become too unpredictable.

A neglect and a restriction of free will might create boredom which again make people take drugs, which again increases violence. In many ways the government in *A Clockwork Orange* has thus created the violence problem in the youth generation. Drugs, together with the government's neglect, then, may be the cause for youth violence in *A Clockwork Orange*. But still, there are more elements in *A Clockwork Orange* that cause violence, drugs is not the only reason. Violence, as we saw in chapter two, might be rewarding.

4.2.3 The reward of violence

As Alex contemplates, they have no urgent need of money:

Our pockets were full of deng, so there was no real need from the point of view of crasting any more pretty polly [money] to tolchock some old veck in an alley and viddy him swim in blood while we counted the takings and divided by four, nor to do the ultra-violent on some shivering grey-haired pitsa in a shop and go smeking off with the till's guts. But as they say, money isn't everything (Burgess 2000: 3).

One incident, however, gives credence to the thought that Alex and his droogs' incentive of using violence relates money. First of all, getting money through violence is how the droogs finance their lifestyle. They have no jobs, and therefore need to get their funding elsewhere. The robbery of the 'Slouse's shop' is an example of that. The incentive of this robbery seems to be to get money and cigarettes. That, however, is not entirely true. The robbery is premeditated because they bribe a couple of women in the Duke of New York, a local bar, to give them alibi (Burgess 2000: 9). In fact, they spend all their money on them. They do not need money in the first place. Instead, they create a situation where they would need money and thus construct an opportunity and an excuse to be violent. Violence in this incident, if money was the incentive and the reason to be violent, is meaningless. If the droogs violence was exclusively about money, it would be easier to understand. But as Alex contemplates, money is not really what the violence is about.

As Myers (2004: 253) argues in connection to the third group of Bandura's experiment: violence is efficient, it works, but what does Alex get from being violent? What

does he achieve, what is his motivation if not money? According to Myers (2004: 253), Patterson et.al (1967) claim that children who benefit from putting fright in other children would likely continue the behaviour. People who successfully frighten other people will probably continue doing that. The reward of violence is something different from money for Alex and his droogs. Getting money through violence is not the main incentive for Alex and his droogs' violent behaviour. They are talking about beating up an old guy and robbing a woman shopkeeper. This is, however, how Alex and his droogs can afford their lifestyle, but, as Alex the narrator contemplates, money is not everything, and as the example above shows, the real reason behind Alex and his droogs' violence is much more complex than simply getting paid.

4.2.4 Power

Other means of motivation to find out where Alex's violence stems from need to be considered. The incentive getting money is not the incentive for Alex, therefore, it is possible that the incentive lies somewhere else, and power might be the reason. Arendt (1970: 52) claims: 'Power and violence, though they are distinct phenomena, usually appear together. Wherever they are combined, power, we have found, is the primary and predominant factor'. As argued in chapter three in the analysis of *1984* in connection to O'Brien, power may be an incentive which is rewarding and intoxicating on its own. As Arendt argues above, power and violence are closely linked, but also power is more important than violence. Power or the need for power might also help explain Alex's violence. What follows below are examples that can substantiate this claim.

Alex and his droogs steal a car and lures themselves into the home of what later will be known as the home of the author F. Alexander. They beat him excessively and make him watch as they rape his wife.

Plunging, I could slooshy cries of agony and this writer bleeding veck that Georgie and Pete held on to nearly got loose howling bezoomny with the filthiest of slovos that I already knew and others he was making up. Then after me it was right old Dim should have his turn, which he did in a beastly snorty howly sort of way with his Peebee Shelley maskie taking no notice, while I held on to her. Then there was the changeover, Dim and me grabbing the slobbering writer veck who was past struggling really, only just coming out with slack sort of slovos like he was in the land in a milk-plus bar, and Pete and Georgie had theirs (Burgess 2000: 20).

When Alex forces F. Alexander to watch as he rapes his wife, Alex is the one in power, the one in control. Alex shows that he is the one in charge, he calls the shots, and he is the first in

line. Alex's power manifests itself through violence. In the act of violence, and by being the first person to rape F. Alexander's wife, he becomes the most important person in the room. That power becomes intoxicating in itself. When Dim steals food in the beginning of the incident at F. Alexander's home, Alex says: 'Drop that mounch. I gave no permission' (Burgess 2000: 19). It is important to Alex to show that he is in charge. He needs to show that he is more powerful than F. Alexander, but also he needs to show his droogs that he is more powerful than them. Alex wants power and he gets it through violence.

Rape too, is often about the combination of power and violence. According Myers (2004: 264), Anderson et.al (1997) and Malamuth et.al (1995) argue that 'Men who behave in sexually coercive, aggressive ways typically desire dominance, exhibit hostility toward women, and are sexually promiscuous. Rape is a way for the violator to dominate women, the act of rape gives the rapist power over the victim through sexual violence. Alex gets power through rape. Raping women offers Alex a chance to be dominant. By raping women Alex opposes the system because he is being bad, it gives him power, power over women, he marks his status as the group leader, and it gives him power over F. Alexander, an author and an intellectual. F. Alexander is in many ways superior to Alex, but when Alex beats him and makes him watch as he is the first to rape his wife, Alex is the superior one. For Alex, rape becomes a reward.

Another aspect of rape is that it is normally considered an act of evil and an act of badness in society. Being good is not a choice in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. By being bad, by raping women, Alex is doing something society considers an act of evil, Alex regains his freedom of choice, his humanity, his individualism, because being good is not something chosen, whereas being bad is.

Power is an important aspect of Alex's life, and he tries very hard to keep that power, especially in connection to his droogs. After a small dispute between Alex and Dim in the Korova milkbar, Alex ends up hitting Dim. They sit and enjoy their milk-plus when suddenly a woman starts singing. Alex reports on the impression this song makes on him: 'O my brothers, some great bird had flown into the milkbar, and I felt all the malenky little hairs on my plott standing endwise and the shivers crawling up like slow malenky lizards and then down again' (Burgess 2000: 22). Dim, ignorant of both Alex's love for music and the

impression this song makes on Alex, starts making fun of the singer and the song. To Alex, this is an insult. In a way that Dim cannot comprehend, he has offended Alex.

The social psychologist Myers (2004: 260) points out that violence does not limit itself to physical incidents. Violence can also be verbal. In a way then, Alex feels he is being attacked by Dim. Being attacked, as Myers (2004: 256) also argues, may be a catalyst to violence. Dim, unaware of this, only considers Alex's acts as injustice, and with that, the betrayal and downfall of Alex begins. Dim says: 'Yarbles, said Dim, sneering 'great bolshy yarblockos to you. What you did then you had no right. I'll meet you with chain or nozh or britva any time, not having you aiming tolchocks at me reasonless, it stands to reason I won't have it' (Burgess 2000: 23). The result of Dim's statement is that Alex feels threatened. His position as the group's leader is challenged by Dim. Violence only makes more violence. Alex claims that Dim needs to learn his place, that there needs to be discipline (Burgess 2000: 23-24).

There is great stir among the droogs when they split up and go home after the first night in *A Clockwork Orange*. The following day, Alex knows that something like a mutiny is happening among his ranks. There is not a natural hierarchy among Alex's droogs, Alex being the youngest of the droogs. Georgie is Alex's second in command and hungry for power. He is brutal and fierce and envies Alex's position in the group. Georgie and Dim ends up fighting Alex over the power of the group.

As Passer & Smith (2001: 531) argue there are especially two chemicals in the brain that affect aggression: 'serotonin' and 'testosterone'. Testosterone also have a link to power and social dominance. 'Similarly, in a sample of 13-year-old boys, a strong relation was found between testosterone and social dominance...' (Bloom et.al 2001: 254). Alex's violence may be a result of high levels of testosterone because he has a need to be the leader, he wants power over his own group, and he has an urge for power. Dim and Georgie challenges this by openly opposing Alex's position. Alex feels a threat of losing his power, his reward, which again triggers violence.

Then while he went hauwwwwww hauwww hauwww like a doggie I tried the same style as for Georgie, banking all on one move — up, cross, cut — and I felt the britva go just deep enough in the meat of old Dim's wrist and he dropped his snaking oozy yelping like a little child (Burgess 2000: 41).

In a way, Alex is the dictator of his group. He wants his members to do what he says without question thus reflecting the political structure of *A Clockwork Orange*, although on a much smaller scale. As Arendt (1970: 52) argues: ‘Power and violence, though they are distinct phenomena, usually appear together. Wherever they are combined, power, we have found, is the primary and predominant factor’. When Alex must depend on violence in order to keep his power, his power fades. Solving leadership issues with violence is never healthy because it can create a grudge and a need for vengeance. Alex knows this, and therefore he agrees with Georgie that they should go ahead and rob the old woman with the cats (Burgess 2000: 47), hoping that this will redeem his position as the group’s ranking officer. The events, however, do not turn out the way Alex wants. He ends up killing the old woman, and when the police arrive he is tied up by Dim, and is eventually arrested. Keeping someone down by sheer violence seldom pays, at least not for Alex.

4.2.5 Violence and hooligans — a sense of belonging

Alex and his droogs are a group. There are certain elements of being in a group that may affect violence. Football hooligans were discussed in chapter two. Perhaps there is a connection between football hooligans and being in a group that affects violence. When Alex and his droogs attack an old drunk in the beginning of the novel, the drunk says:

What sort of world is it at all? Men on the moon and men spinning round the earth like it might be midges round a lamp, and there’s not no attention paid to earthly law nor order no more. So your worst you may do, you filthy cowardly hooligans. (Burgess 2000: 13).

The old drunk does not think highly of Alex and his droogs, and he refers to them as ‘filthy hooligans’.

Like the football hooligan firms that were discussed in chapter two, it is not difficult to join the droogs. Dim is ugly, stupid and smelly, but still, what is more important to Alex and his droogs is that Dim can fight, and fight for them against the others: ‘Dim was very very ugly and like his name, but he was a horrorshow filthy fighter and very handy with the boot’ (Burgess 2000: 4). Belonging to a group with shared beliefs is important to all humans. Dim, according to Alex, is not brilliantly clever, nor is he handsome, but Alex needs people like Dim. Dim can be easily swayed and do what he is told, and perhaps most importantly; he cannot challenge Alex’s intellect.

Koestler (1969), cited in Bloom et.al 2001: 255), author of the anti-totalitarian novel *Darkness at Noon* (1966), friend of Orwell, and also worried about the dangers of totalitarianism claims that:

The trouble with our species is not an overdose of self-asserting aggression but an excess of self-transcending devotion, which manifests itself in blind obedience to the king, country, or cause ... One of the central features of the human predicament is this overwhelming capacity and need for identification with a social group and/or system of beliefs, which is indifferent to reason, indifferent to self-interest, and even to the claim of self-preservation.

The droogs, like football hooligan firms, is a place to belong. Belonging is, as Koestler claims, a human trait more important than the self. Dim, Pete, Georgie and Alex have created a place where they can belong. Not many people would have allowed Alex to be their leader, because of his young age. Not many groups would take Dim, Pete, Georgie or Alex in the first place. They are a part of a generation that the general public wants nothing to do with, but within the confinements of the droogs, Dim, Pete, Georgie and Alex are someone, they have a position and a meaning in life.

According to Larsen & Buss (2002: 139): ‘Hogan (1983) argues that the most basic human motivators are status and acceptance by the group’ and ‘[a]ccording to Hogan’s theory, being ostracized from a group would have been extremely damaging’. The reward of violence for Alex, then, can simply be increased status and acceptance within the droogs, but can also be, at the same time, a very frustrating and stressful time because he needs to belong to society as well, which eventually might result in an identity conflict.

Identity, Camillieri & Malewska-Peyre (1997), cited by Passer & Smith (2001: 483), argue consist of ‘multiple components’ which include:

...our gender, ethnicity, and other attributes by which we define ourselves as members of social groups (“daughter,” “student,” “athlete”); how we view our personality and other characteristics (“shy,” “friendly,”); and our goals and values pertaining to areas we view as important, such as family and peer relations, career, religion, and so forth.

When these concept comes into opposition with each other, an identity conflict may be the result. Larsen & Buss (2002: 445) argue that ‘[a]n identity conflict involves an incompatibility between two or more aspects of identity’. The stress that an identity conflict may provoke may lead to violence, because, as Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue, frustration may result in violent outbursts.

To conform to the rules of the group, to be accepted, may be biased by peer pressure.

Peer relationships also play a part in the process of separating from parents and establishing one's own identity. Because they help satisfy the adolescent's need for intimacy, approval, and belonging, peers can strongly influence a teenager's values and behaviors. For some adolescents, peer pressure increases the risk of misconduct, such as cheating, skipping school, damaging property, or disobeying parental rules about smoking and drinking (Passer & Smith 2001: 485).

Alex's violence may simply be motivated by a need to belong to the group under the influence of peer pressure. One small problem with that notion is that Alex regards himself as the group's undebated leader.

The droogs are united through violence. Armstrong (1998) points out that football hooligans do not see any reason why club rivalry should limit itself to the football pitch. Alex and his droogs also go to war, but on behalf of an entire generation, against other generations, but especially the government that wants nothing to do with them. They also mark their difference to other generations and show, through violence, that their identity, their sense of belonging is within their own generation.

Within the group of droogs, every individual is important. Even when Alex forms a new group of droogs, they are only four. One reason for confining the group to only four members is to avoid attention from the police. Another reason might be that the group members lose so much of their own individuality if the group consisted of more members, and being less than four people, would loosen the group's strength in the face of combat. Every individual is thus significant, and like some members of certain football hooligan firms, the droogs have unsuccessful academic careers, no jobs, and no girlfriends. They have failed on so many arenas, and that causes frustration and later violence. To Alex, however, Dim, Pete and Georgie are not important but valued for their fighting skills. At the end of the novel Alex's forms a new group of droogs. Their individual characteristics are not important, it is their function within the group that is important. It is the sense of power over these people that is the main reason why Alex endures them.

The droogs' fighting is an opportunity to blow off steam, a catharsis. That is why Alex and his droogs fight Billyboy and his droogs. 'This was real, this would be proper, this would be the nozh, the oozy, the britva, not just fisties and boots' (Burgess 2000: 13). The violence gets rawer when rivaling droogs fight each other. Violence now is not a fight between generations, but a fight between themselves. Alex and his droogs and Billyboy and his droogs

are similar in many ways, that marking the distance becomes essential. If Alex and his droogs violence is purely a protest against society, they would be more successful if they joined forces with other street gangs. They do not, they fight each other with increased brutality. This paradox can be seen in connection to football hooligans. As Armstrong (1998) argues, Sheffield United supporters' most hated enemy are the Sheffield Wednesday supporters. One might think two teams coming from the same city would have a better relationship, but they do not. Instead, there is rivalry. It is an us versus them construction where it is paramount to be the best of the two. In addition, by beating Billyboy and his droogs, Alex and his droogs get a boost in power, power over a rivalling group.

Identity markers in football are common. When people go to a match they often wear scarves and shirts with their team colours. *Casuals* in Britain came as a result of too much police attention. Football hooligans were not able to fight each other when they wore their team colours, they stood out too much, and they were easy to identify both by the police and by rivalling hooligan firms. Casual clothing and specific brand names thus became the new identity marker. For Alex and his droogs, like football hooligans, clothing as an identity marker is very important.

The four of us were dressed in the height of fashion, which in those days was a pair of black very tight tights with the old jelly mould, as we called it, fitting on the crotch underneath the tights, this being to protect and also a sort of design you could viddy clear enough in a certain light, so that I had one in the shape of a spider. Pete had a rooker (a hand, that is), Georgie had a very fancy one of a flower, and poor old Dim had a very hound-and-horny one of a clown's litso (face, that is) (Burgess 2000: 4).

They are uniform and thus celebrating their identities as group members, but at the same time, celebrating their individuality by having different designs on their 'jelly moulds'.

Apart from the way the droogs dress, they also wear masks when they are out robbing people. They all have different masks: '...I had Disraeli, Pete had Elvis Presley, Georgie had Henry VIII and poor old Dim had a poet veck called Peebee Shelley...' (Burgess 2000: 9). These figures represent different aspects of high society. Benjamin Disraeli was a British prime minister and an important literary figure, Elvis Presley, at the time *A Clockwork Orange* was published, the biggest star in the music industry, Henry VIII, king and reformer and perhaps one of the most infamous kings Britain has ever had, P.B Shelley is one of Britain's most renowned poets. What these figures have in common is that they all belong to the elite of society. They are important, well known figures in either the political sphere or the

cultural sphere. When the droogs dress up like them, they are important members of society too. The way the droogs dress and their masks mark who the droogs wish to belong to. Their dress and their violence show that they want to be identified with their generation, but their masks mark that they want to be a part of society as a whole as well. They want to belong as youths, but on their own terms, and to be recognised as they are.

Another reason for dressing up like important people of high society might be that they are making them the laughing stock; when Disraeli, Elvis, Henry VIII, and Shelley go rapping, mugging and loitering the streets, it is a way for the droogs to poke their noses at high society. Alex, however, has great esteem for Beethoven, Mozart and classical music. Mozart, a genius composer, a prodigy, is who Alex wants to be. He even compares himself to Mozart: 'I was eighteen now, just gone. Eighteen was not a young age. At eighteen old Wolfgang Amadeus had written concertos and symphonies and operas and oratorios and all that cal, no not cal, heavenly music' (Burgess 2000: 139-140). It is possible that Alex considers himself an artist and violence his brush, but it is also possible that Alex wishes to be recognised as an important person in society and his violence is merely a tool for getting that recognition. A cry for recognition may be the reason behind Alex's violence.

A third reason for Alex and his droogs to dress up Disraeli, Henry VIII, Elvis and Shelley is, that when they do, these important people get lowered in stature. They are no longer special, because the droog's violent acts reduce them to mere humans, flawed, imperfect. The ability to make mistakes is a human character, and when the droogs dress up like Disraeli, Elvis, Henry VIII, Elvis and Shelley, and go roaming the streets disguised as them, these people become their equals, just like Beethoven's Ninth Symphony with Friedrich Schiller's lyrics proclaims: 'Alle Menschen werden Brüder'. Everyone is equal, everyone is everyone's brother.

But, to be human, a brother, there needs to be choice. Goodness is something that needs to be chosen and cannot be forced upon someone because then, being good is simply following protocol, doing what one is told. In such a situation, not all humans are brothers. There is a disproportionate relationship between the one giving orders and the one receiving it. By dressing up like important people of high society, and by being bad, by choosing to be bad, the droogs reclaim their humanity. They show the world that they too need to be treated

as equals, that society must start treating them like brothers, not inferiors, and society needs to give them back their choice, their humanity. Until then, violence becomes the only way of expressing their freedom of choice, because choosing to be good is not a choice but an order.

If the droogs want to be identified with their generation, a generation that is generally violent, the droogs too need to be violent. Youth violence, however, is nothing new. It has existed for centuries. It is possible that Alex's violence stems from the fact that he is just a youth. Simply growing up may be a cause for violence.

Their behavior has been blamed on all kinds of social and psychological factors — on too much permissiveness in their upbringing in America and on an explosive reaction to too much authority in Germany and Japan, on the lack of freedom in Eastern Europe and too much freedom in the West, on the disastrous lack of jobs for sociology students in France and the superabundance of careers in nearly all fields in the United States — all of which appear locally plausible enough but are clearly contradicted by the fact that the student rebellion is a global phenomenon (Arendt 1970: 15).

Youth violence, violent adolescents, student violence, Arendt argues, is a global phenomenon. That kind of violence has a universal character. There are several plausible explanations for this. Being a teen may be a frustrating time for many adolescents. A teen must find out who he or she is, and find out what kind of values that are important, but last but not least, he or she must find out to who he or she wishes to belong to. Teens must find their place in society, and that can be a very frustrating and stressful time. That time may result in an identity crisis.

Erikson (1968) coined the phrase **identity crisis**, meaning the feelings of anxiety that accompany efforts to define or redefine one's own individuality and social reputation. For most people, the process of going through an identity crisis is an important and memorable phase of life. Sometimes it happens early, in adolescence; sometimes it happens later, in midlife (Larsen & Buss 2002: 444-445).

It is plausible that Alex, an adolescent, is frustrated because he is in the middle of an identity crisis, especially after he loses his position within the droogs. However, Alex's violence drastically decreases after he is betrayed by his original droogs. There is a change in Alex's aggression pattern, even in prison, after the incident with the woman with the cats. It is more plausible that Alex's frustration may stem from the need to belong to a larger group, society, and that the identity crisis he is enduring has more to do with a need for recognition and belonging to society than a need to belong to any droog group. Another aspect of being an adolescent needs to be addressed.

Young men Alex's age, may have high levels of testosterone. The testosterone level may make them more prone to violence. Male adolescents may have higher levels of

testosterone than adults. Myers (2004: 128) claims that ‘...testosterone levels decline during adulthood’. Alex may simply be a youth that has too high levels of testosterone in his blood. Myers (2004: 128) also claims that ‘...violent male criminals have higher than normal testosterone levels...’.

In connection *A Clockwork Orange*, a high level of testosterone can possibly explain Alex’s violence, but it cannot explain why an entire generation is violent. Not every member of the youth generation in *A Clockwork Orange* can have ‘higher than normal’ levels of testosterone in their blood. ‘And there was a bolshy big article on Modern Youth (meaning me, so I gave the old bow, grinning like bezoomny) by some very clever bald chelloveck’ (Burgess 2000: 32). The Modern Youth that Alex refers to is his generation. In a way, Alex is just an example of the Modern Youth. He, at least, thinks he is Modern Youth. Alex, however, is not the only violent adolescent in *A Clockwork Orange*. The general testosterone level of teens Alex’s age are probably higher than what is considered normal in today’s society.

Biology and heredity alone cannot explain his violence. True, as Arendt argues above, youth rebellions have a universal character, but there are so many potential causes in society why Alex is violent that simply blaming it all on natural development seems a bit too easy. Alex’s violence, however, may be catalysed by his age and a potential identity crisis that often happen to adolescents. This identity crisis, however, has more to do with society in *A Clockwork Orange*, the way youths are treated, and how difficult it is for a youth to be recognised in society. Society and the government must have a great deal to do with not only Alex’s, but his entire generation’s violence.

4.2.6 Frustration and a cry for recognition

The reason for Alex and his droogs’ violence has to be something else than mere development. In the beginning of the novel, Alex and his droogs encounter a man coming from a library. The man coming from the library is one of the first incidents of physical violence in the novel. He is a man of some age and probably a teacher and on his way from the library when Alex and his droogs meet him. After a long list of insults and tearing out pages from the man’s books, Alex and his droogs give him a firm beating. They knock his teeth out. This man is the first real victim of Alex and his droogs’ wrath.

Carrying books is rare in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. The man is no youngster, and it could seem, based on the fact that Alex calls him ‘bourgeois’ that the reason they start bullying him, is because he represents the established in society. The man from the library gets to represent something bigger than himself. He becomes an epitome of an entire group, namely the established in society. A social group in stark contrast to the generation that Alex and his droogs represent.

This situation is similar to the suburban riots in Paris in 2005, where a group of young immigrants started burning cars and attacking shops, and where there were no outspoken claims of material benefits, which made the protest seem meaningless. Alex and his droogs’ violence is also not about material interests, and their violence also seems meaningless. Žižek (2008: 63) argues, in connection to the Paris outburst, that ‘[t]here was only and insistence on *recognition*, based on a vague, unarticulated *ressentiment*’. The violent outburst was simply a cry of recognition, their only wish was to be seen and fully accepted as true French citizens (Žižek 2008). Is it possible then that the reason behind Alex and his droogs’ violence comes from a cry of recognition? What separates Alex and his droogs’ violence and the Paris outbursts of 2005 is that where the French took out their frustration on their own, Alex and his droogs do not. They attack almost randomly and from every strata of society. Their violence is not triggered against any specific group. Recognition, however, probably has something to do with it.

Alex and his droogs start ripping the pages from the books and the man cries out that they are not his but belong to the ‘municipality’. This triggers violence. The man from the library gets a real beating after this:

The old veck began to make sort of chumbling shooms — ‘wuf waf wof’ — so Georgie let go of holding his goobers apart and just let him have one in the toothless rot with his ringy fist, and that made the old veck start moaning a lot then, then out comes the blood, my brothers, real beautiful’ (Burgess 2000: 7).

In a way, the man from the library gets to represent the system, the government, apart from the established and another generation. But, on the other hand, it is likely that this man is subject to blind violence, violence for its own sake, or simply a cry for recognition and belonging. When Alex wants to leave the Milkbar Georgie asks him why, Alex responds: ‘Oh, just to keep walking, I said, and viddy what turns up, O my little brothers’ (Burgess 2000: 6). Alex is sick of the people in the Milkbar, he wants to go out and see what turns up. In a way,

this is premeditated violence. It is likely that the man from the library could have been anyone.

Violence in *A Clockwork Orange* seems meaningless, like the suburban riots in Paris of 2005 (Žižek 2008).

What is most difficult to accept is the riot's meaninglessness: more than a form of protest, they are what Lacan called a *passage à l'acte* — an impulsive movement into action which can't be translated into speech or thought and carries with it an intolerable amount of frustration (Žižek 2008: 65).

As Žižek argues above, frustration was an important factor in the suburban riots in France 2005, and as discussed in chapter two, Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue that frustration can be a catalyst to violence. But how can frustration alone explain Alex's violence? At first sight, Alex does not seem very frustrated.

There are some features in Alex's life, however, that can help explain why Alex is frustrated. At home, Alex does not get any kind of boundaries. There is a general lack of parental control. 'Pee and em in their bedroom next door had learnt now not to knock on the wall with complaints of what they called noise. I had taught them. Now they would take sleep-pills' (Burgess 2000: 26). This would sound like every teens' dream. For Alex, however, his overbearing parents does not do him any good. He does not get a sense of moral. He does not get to learn the norms of society, he is left out and cannot see what society's norms are all about. He does not know what it takes to be a part of society, and he does not know how to interact within the realms of society. In a way, his parents does not provide him with the sufficient tools of how one should interact with society. This can lead to frustration, and as Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue, frustration can lead to aggression. It is like starting a new job without knowing the tacit norms of the workplace. Without this knowledge, people can start to get frustrated and stressed-out, because they feel that they do not fit in.

His parents are not the only people who fail to take an interest in Alex's life. He has a post-correctional officer who does not really care about him. 'It was the goloss of P.R. Deltoid (a real gloopy nazz, that one) what they called my Post-Corrective Adviser, an overworked veck with hundreds on his books' (Burgess 2000: 29). For Deltoid, Alex is just one in many, and as long as Alex does not get into trouble with the police, Deltoid can move on to his next case. The system and the state too has failed to recognise Alex. Where his parents have failed,

the state has too. There is no-one in Alex's life to teach him the norms of society, and it has been that way for many years.

Here was my bed and my stereo, pride of my jeezny, and my discs in their cupboard, and banners and flags on the wall, these being like remembrances of my corrective school life since I was eleven, O my brothers, each one shining and blazoned with my name or number: SOUTH 4; METRO CORSKOL BLUE DIVISION; THE BOYS OF ALPHA (Burgess 2000: 26).

Apart from his position among his droogs, Alex's only sense of belonging somewhere is in his corrective school life. That is probably why he still have his flags and banners on his wall. Everyone needs to belong somewhere, to be important, to have a purpose in life, and reach their goals. In a way, Alex, and possibly many in his generation, have failed to belong anywhere.

The street gangs are the only ones that would take them, but the gangs too want to belong in society. They want to be a part of it, and like the suburban riots in Paris of 2005, violence is a way to be recognised. In connection to the Paris riots, Žižek (2008: 65) argues that the protesters did not feel like a part of society.

A social group which, although part of France and composed of French citizens, saw itself as excluded from the political and social space proper wanted to render its presence palpable to the general public (Žižek 2008: 65).

Alex and his droogs have no place in society. Society in *A Clockwork Orange*, like in France 2005, have failed to recognise Alex and his like. That causes frustration, and frustration is often an expressway to violence. To only way to be recognised is to create a problem that society cannot ignore, and like Paris 2005, a non-violent protest march would have gotten them '...a small note on the bottom of a page...' (Žižek 2008: 66). Violence gets people's attention, it works, it is efficient, but perhaps the most important reason that Alex resorts to violence is the lack of alternatives.

Meanwhile leftist liberals, no less predictably, stick to their mantra about neglected social programmes and integration efforts, which have deprived the younger generation of immigrants of any clear economic and social prospects: violent outbursts are their only way to articulate their dissatisfaction (Žižek 2008: 68).

Similar to Paris 2005, violence is the only way for Alex and his generation to tell society that they exist, that they want to be recognised and be a part of society. What the protesters of France 2005 did get and what they wanted to do '...was to create a problem, to signal that they were a problem that could no longer be ignored' (Žižek 2008: 66). Alex and his droogs show

by the use of violence that they too cannot be ignored. Like the protesters in France, they too have created a problem that cannot be ignored. How does society react to this violent youth generation? In Paris 2005 the public responded to the outbursts by calling the protesters names. The public, represented by the former interior minister, now president of France, Nicolas Sarkozy's reaction to the French protesters was to call them 'scum' (Žižek: 2008: 64).

The violent outbursts thus increased. The protesters, then, were really reacting to the reaction of the protest. Their violence got another excuse. Sarkozy's comment is nothing less than a verbal assault, and that itself may cause further violent retaliation because verbal offence is also an act of violence. The protesters themselves could possibly perceive Sarkozy's insult as a violent attack, and as Myers (2004: 256) points out, it is not only physical attacks but also verbal attacks or 'insults' that may cause violent retaliation. As Myers (2004: 260) points out in chapter two, being attacked often triggers more violence in return.

When Alex is arrested, one of the police officers says: 'Violence makes violence' (Burgess 2000: 53). Similar to the Paris outburst of 2005, Alex and his droogs' cry for attention, is only met with violence, physical violence when the Police arrest Alex: 'But after that they all had a turn, bouncing me from one to the other like some very weary bloody ball, O my brothers, and fisting me in the yarbles and the rot and the belly and dealing out kicks, and then at last I had to sick up on the floor, and like some real bezoomny veck...' (Burgess 2000: 52), and verbal violence, like the Paris outburst, when the woman with the cats calls Alex, a boy in search of belonging and recognition: 'Wretched little slummy bedbug, breaking into *real* people's houses' (Burgess 2000: 47). In the public view, here represented by the woman with cats, Alex and his generation are not real people. That frustrates Alex and he hits the woman with a statue, and to Alex's remorse, ends up killing her. That is the downfall of Alex, that is the incident that gets him arrested. He does not intend to kill this woman, but that does not matter. He is fifteen years old, unable to belong to society, sentenced to fourteen years of prison in the State penitentiary.

4.2.7 Additional outside factors that cause frustration

Alex's living environments may alone contribute to an increase in frustration. According to Alex, he lives in a beat-down municipal flat block where the elevators do not work. This may

also lead to frustration. As Myers (2004) points out, all outside influences that help create an ‘uncomfortable environment’ affect violence. When people get frustrated because of an uncomfortable environment, violence is always a threat and a possibility.

And so in. In the hallway was the good old municipal painting on the walls — vecks on ptitsas very well developed, stern in the dignity of labour, at workbench and and machine with not one stich of platties on their well-developed plotts. But of course some of the malchicks living in 18A had, as was to be expected, embellished and decorated the said big painting with handy pencil and ballpoint, adding hair and stiff rods and dirty ballooning slovos out of the dignified rots of these nagoy (bare, that is) cheenas and vecks. I went to the lift, but there was no need to press the electric knopka to see if it was working or not, because it had been tolchoked real horrorshow this night, the metal doors all buckled, some feat of rare strength indeed, so I had to walk the ten floors up (Burgess 2000: 25).

Crowding, Myers (2004: 257) points out, may also create an increase in frustration. According to Myers (2004: 257), Fleming et.al (1987) and Kirmeyer (1978) claim: ‘Nevertheless, it’s true that dense urban areas do experience higher rates of crime and emotional distress’. Frustration, as Passer & Smith (2001: 536) argue, often leads to violence. Alex lives in a small flat with his parents. That may imply that his living conditions alone may increase his frustration.

When Alex is in prison, his cell is overpopulated. ‘Now that I want you to know is that this cell was intended for only three when it was built, but there were six of us there, all jammed together sweaty and tight’ (Burgess 2000: 64). And when yet another prisoner is crammed into their cell, violence erupts. The new prisoner thinks it unfair that he should be without a bed, especially since Alex is the youngest of the seven. They go to sleep and after a while, Alex wakes up with his new cellmate beside him in his bed. They all have a go at him, and Alex, eventually, steps up to the task:

So they all stood around while I cracked at this prestoopnick in the near dark. I fisted him all over, dancing about with my boots on though unlaced, and then I tripped him and he went crash crash on to the floor. I gave him one real horrorshow kick on the gulliver [head] and he went ohhhhh, then he sort of snorted off to like sleep... (Burgess 2000: 67).

Crowding may cause frustration and violence in the cell, but there is another more aspect of this incident that may explain the violence in the prison cell. As Passer & Smith (2001: 485) argue, peer pressure might influence violence. All eyes are on Alex in the prison cell, it is his sleeping space that is being intruded by the new cellmate. His other cellmates look to Alex to see if he is going to do something about it. Alex, however, hesitates, he believes that the initial beating was enough, but his peers want more. Alex is the youngest of the seven, it is possible that Alex’s excess use of violence is triggered by a need for

acceptance from his fellow prisoners. Frustration may further increase as a result of being in prison where space is limited, where peer pressure and finding one's place, can be rather stressful and frustrating events.

Frustration then, can help explain not only Alex's violence, but his entire generation's violence. Their violence, fuelled by frustration, is the only tool they have for being recognised. The public they want to belong to respond by calling them names and retaliates their violence. The public fails to understand what youth violence is all about in *A Clockwork Orange*. Violence only breeds more violence. The public has alternatives to violence, but there is no alternative for Alex and his droogs, thus the violence spiral goes on and on. For Alex, the only reason why he should stop being violent is when society finally recognises him as an equal. That is exactly what happens.

At the end of the novel, Alex reencounters the interior inferior minister. The 'int inf min' too represents the government. He is a shrewd personage preoccupied with the government looking its best in the eyes of the public. The minister uses every tactic possible in order to keep the government in power. He is essential in the growing totalitarian movement in *A Clockwork Orange*. When Alex has regained his free will, and the public, represented by the interior inferior minister, offers him a job, Alex get a sense of belonging in the world.

But all the ideas came from Your Humble, O my brothers, and also there was this veshch that I had been famous and had my picture and articles and all that cal in the gazettas. Also I had by far the best job of all we four, being in the National Gramodisc Archives on the music side with a real horrorshow carman full of pretty polly at the week's end and a lot of nice free discs for my own malenky self on the side (Burgess 2000: 133).

Alex has a job now in the National Gramodisc Archives, he has found something meaningful in life and he has finally been included in the society that has tried so hard to keep him out.

When Alex and his new-formed group of droogs are in the Duke of New York, Alex does not want to spend his money on bribing women: 'What it is is I don't like just throwing away my hard-earned pretty polly, that's what it is' (Burgess 2000: 135). Money now has real value for Alex, it is no longer an excuse for violence, but an appreciation of honest money through honest work, and the money he has acquired he has earned by doing something meaningful and something he likes. Alex does not engage in violence like he did before, it has lost its appeal. He eventually leaves his new group of droogs and instead goes to a coffee shop

to drink tea where he meets Pete. When Alex restrains from committing physical violence, his taste in music also changes: Alex listens to softer music now.

Pete, a former member of Alex's group, but not involved in the set-up of Alex does not play a big part in the novel. At the end of the novel, however, when some years have passed, Alex meets Pete again in a coffee shop. In a way, Pete and his situation helps Alex realise some important aspects of life. Pete has quit his former droog life, and has found a job and a wife. Pete shows Alex that, even for them, there are alternatives in life. He no longer orders whisky in the Duke of New York. He orders a small beer (Burgess 2000: 135). This is a change in Alex's life.

The final chapter in *A Clockwork Orange* begins exactly the same way as chapter one, but as the story goes on in the final chapter, Alex changes. Alex is no droog anymore, he has other values and he is contemplating the idea of settling down, finding a girl and having a baby. 'Tomorrow is all like sweet flowers and the turning vonny earth and the stars and the old luna up there and your old droog Alex all on his oddy knocky seeking like a mate' (Burgess 2000: 141). Alex is on his own now, but part of society and equipped with society's norms and values. Alex no longer has any need to be violent, he is no longer frustrated, he has found his place, he belongs and he is recognised. He is no longer a problem in society, but an asset.

Frustration and not being recognised are the most important reasons behind Alex's violence. Up until the last chapter, Alex believes that violence is the only way to defend his humanity, to express his free will, but based on this analysis, there are multiple factors that cause Alex's violence. Despite what Alex himself believes, up until the last chapter, he really has no other choice than violence. Now, work and serving society has become something Alex likes and wants to do. He does not have to work, but he choses it because it is meaningful, enjoyable, and something he wants to do.

Violence is still very much a part of society in *A Clockwork Orange*. Street gangs are still a very common feature of society, Alex's new-formed set of droogs are an example of that. The government is still totalitarian and uses violence to oppress its people:

I suppose really that a lot of the old ultra-violence and crasting was dying out now, the rozzes being so brutal with who they caught, though it had become like a fight between naughty nadsats and the rozzes who could be more skorry with the nozh and the britva and the stick and even the gun (Burgess 2000: 137).

As Alex argues, the police have become even more brutal. Violence in the society in *A Clockwork Orange* has in no way decreased, it has perhaps even increased. The only violence that has changed is Alex's. His work in National Gramodisc Archives makes him an accomplice in the growing totalitarian movement. One might even argue that the violent system that Alex is now a part of is even worse than the violent system he used to be a part of earlier in the novel. Alex's violence earlier in the novel might be an expression of free will, a celebration of individuality and humanity. The violence that Alex now is a part of is targeted at restricting free will. One might claim that Alex has sold out, that he is bribed, corrupted.

There is no place for the individual in a totalitarian movemnet '...every individual of any consequence owes his whole existence to the political regime; and when this factual identity of interest is broken and the next purge has swept him out of office, the regime makes sure that he disappears from the world of living' (Arendt 1951: 429). Alex is now an accomplice in the violent acts of the government simply because he has accepted a position in that government, he is in too deep. He is a 'jobholder' and therefore, as Arendt (1951: 429) argues in connection to totalitarian regimes in general '...a conscious accomplice in the crimes of the government...' If Alex were to oppose the system he is a part of, he will lose all his benefits.

The readers, however, will probably say that Alex's change is a good thing, that he has reformed, that he has grown up, that working in the National Gramodisc Archives preserving music is much more constructive than beating people to a pulp. But on the other hand, Alex has sold away his free will, his humanity. Alex now has chosen to be a clockwork orange working for the totalitarian machine, a machine determined on restricting free will and keeping individualism at a safe distance.

On the other hand, to make compromises when entering adulthood is something almost everyone does. In a way, even in well functioning democratic societies, people give up some of their freedom when they take up mortgages and devote themselves to work and paying taxes for fifty years. Making a compromise between individualism and belonging to society is how the world functions. Alex is really no different from most people. He too wants a place of

his own, a wife and child, and to achieve that, he must give up some of his principles. It is a part of growing up. What makes Alex's conforming so depressing, however, is that he sells out to a totalitarian movement, not a democratic one. And that is why the novel's end is a bit depressing because the government threatens so much of the human essence. As the novel ends, the totalitarian movement has won. That is the real danger a totalitarian movement represents. The movement's violence, threat of keeping people down, is the real danger, simply because, as Alex shows, it is so difficult to fight.

Mozart, Beethoven, Disraeli were unique individuals and important figures in society who Alex relates to. At the end of the novel Alex gives up. When he compares himself with Mozart at the end of the novel, he says he has not accomplished anything. His work in National Grammodisc Archives is not an accomplishment, but for him, it has to do. Alex has no other arenas in which he can accomplish anything, because a totalitarian society, like the society in *A Clockwork Orange*, is that restrictive. There is no place for individualism, there is not that choice. Alex's type of violence is the only thing that has changed from the first chapter of the book till the last. The violence Alex is a part of has changed from physical individual violence, to systematic political restrictive oppressive totalitarian violence. Alex is no longer physically a clockwork orange but mentally in the mind-forged manacles of totalitarian society.

If it is true that Alex's violence stems majorly from his frustration connected to his need to belong in society, even a totalitarian one, that says something about violence on a general level. Violence, then, comes as a result between a delicate relationship between human's innate need to belong and the structure of society. Violence is not just biology, nor is it just a byproduct of society, but an interaction between the two where not belonging and frustration function as the main catalysts to violence.

5 Conclusion

The main aim of this thesis is to investigate how violence affects the main characters Winston in Orwell's *1984* and Alex in Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, with special attention to age and life stage.

The first subaim of this thesis is to explore the nature of violence. The second subaim is to identify what kinds of violence affect Winston in *1984*. The third subaim is to discuss what causes that violence. The fourth subaim is to identify what kinds of violence affect Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*. The fifth subaim is to discuss the causes for that violence.

Based on the background chapter, violence, is a very complex term; it is a term which is very difficult to define. Still today, the subject of violence is heavily debated. Some scholars claim that violence is an inborn characteristic, others claim that it is society that causes violence. The definition this thesis supports is that violence is the result of intended physical or verbal aggression meant to hurt someone. People, on the other hand, is probably not born violent, but born prone to violence.

Violence comes in different kinds. Subjective violence is the kind of violence that most people from well functioning democratic societies are familiar with. It is violence that breaks with everyday life. Examples of subjective violence are assault, sexual violence, robberies; in other words, violent incidents that clearly break with the normal state of affairs in a human's life.

Objective violence, on the other hand, is violence that is not as easily detected. It is violence, often on the political level, that does not break with everyday life. The systematicness of violence often makes it objective and not subjective in character.

Objective violence is the kind of violence that most often manifests itself in totalitarian rules. Violence in a totalitarian rule is most often psychological. It is often the threat of violence alone that functions as the oppressive factor in a totalitarian rule.

Social violence is another variation of violence. Social violence is violence performed by groups. In a group, certain factors may influence violence. Peer pressure and the need to

conform to the group may affect violence. Such a group may be a football hooligan firm. People often behave differently in groups.

Age and especially young age may influence violence. Youth violence and youth rebellion seem to have a timeless aspect. Growing up and finding ones place in society may increase the possibility for violence.

Certain outside factor may also have an effect on violence. Especially outside factors that may increase frustration seems to affect violence. When people get frustrated, it appears that violence can always be a threat and a possibility.

When it comes to what kinds of violence that are at play in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*, that is also complex. From the reader's perspective it is not always easy to identify what kinds of violence that affect Winston and Alex, because both novels are situated in totalitarian regimes in the future.

Winston is the main character in *1984*, he leads, what readers from well functioning democratic societies would call, a rather harsh life. The totalitarian regime represented by the Party and its leader Big Brother have very much to do with the hardships of Winston's life. The kind of violence that affects Winston the most must therefore be said to be rather objective: It is the underlying oppressive feature of the government machine that mainly affects Winston. The systematic oppression of the individual by the Party on the political ideological level is a kind of violence that represent the working reality of life in *1984*. Winston is subject to constant sureveillance, restrictions, and he lives under the constant threat of being tortured and murdered. In other words, society and the way life in *1984* is structured, is in reality, the kind of violence that takes its toll on Winston the most.

At the end of the novel, however, with the arrest of Winston, violence in *1984* changes. Violence is no longer ideological, a threat, but a real manifestation of physical subjective violence. When Winston is arrested, the readers get a front row seat to life in prison when someone is found guilty of unorthodox behaviour in a totalitarian regime. Winston's time in prison is the unprecedented written record of how violence, the threat of violence that the people in *1984* constantly live under, looks like in practice. Violence take a more physical

character where Winston becomes the clearly identifiable victim and O'Brien, Winston's chief torturer, the clearly identifiable agent.

Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* is also subject to the wrath of a totalitarian regime. Although not as complete in its totalitarian character as the Party in *1984*, the government in *A Clockwork Orange* shows certain elements that indicate that the political direction is growing towards a totalitarian orientation. The government in *A Clockwork Orange*, in other words, plays an important part in the novel. For the readers, however, at first sight, it can look as if Alex and his generation are the dysfunctional element of society. Alex is a teen whose everyday life consist of random beatings-up, rape, muggings, gang violence, and listening to music. One might claim that the violence Alex and his generation represent is a result of a traditional youth rebellion of a more timeless and universal character. But as the novel progresses, and as we have seen in the analysis of the novel earlier in this thesis, violence in *A Clockwork Orange* is not really subjective, and the cause for that violence lies more on the political level, than on Alex and his generation's level.

There are a few points that indicate that the violence Alex is responsible for is more objective than subjective. First, Alex and his gang of criminals are just one street gang, there are several other street gangs in *A Clockwork Orange* about. Second, Alex and his droog's everyday life consists of being violent, it is what they do, it is how they live. Youth violence in *A Clockwork Orange*, represented by Alex, is simply the working reality, the status quo, of life in the society in *A Clockwork Orange*. A mugging or a rape are in no way uncommon, it is simply how life is. The systematicness of the youth violence, the frequency of it, is what makes Alex's violence in the first part of the novel a part of a greater structure. That is what makes violence in *A Clockwork Orange*, even though that violence is carried out by Alex, more objective in character.

We have now identified what kinds of violence that are at play in *1984* and *A Clockwork Orange*. That, however, is only one element of this study. The causes for violence must also be recognised.

Winston's aggression seems to be fuelled by the Party's restrictions. What makes Winston special in connection to life in *1984*, is his age and his inability to accept the life the Party leader dictates. Because of his age, Winston remembers a time when life was different.

He remembers a time without constant surveillance, Big Brother, telescreens, bad living environments, bad food, bad cigarettes, and most importantly, Winston remembers a life without the constant fear of being beaten up, tortured, and murdered. That aspect, Winston's age, makes him extremely dangerous to the Party. Society, the political agenda of the Party, is the main cause for Winston's anger and frustration. It is because of the Party, and his awareness that the Party is responsible for the miserable life he leads, that make Winston prepared to do the most grotesque actions to see to its doom. Throughout the analysis of *1984*, we have seen that violence is a social construct because of the way the Party is organised, and how the totalitarian movement's craving for power at any cost overshadows every individual's chance of freedom of choice.

Winston's frustration with the Party is what causes his aggression, Winston is not born aggressive or violent, but made aggressive and violent because of the horrible life the Party has to offer him.

Alex on the other hand, is much younger than Winston, and he is also at a different stage of life than Winston. At first glance, it can seem that Alex's violence is motivated by money, because, as argued earlier, violence may be rewarding. By beating up people, mugging them, by breaking into people's homes, by robbing stores, Alex and his droogs can finance their lifestyle. Money, however, is not it. Money is simply an excuse to be violent. The reward of violence is something different, and it is possible that the reward Alex gets from being violent has more to do with power. By being violent Alex gets acceptance from the other droogs, he marks his belonging to his generation, and life becomes meaningful to him.

The need for power alone, however, does not entirely explain Alex's violence. Because of the restrictions of the government in *A Clockwork Orange*, there are few arenas for Alex and his generation to have fun, and being violent is the only thing, besides music, that makes Alex happy. That explanation, however, is not sufficient to explain Alex's violence.

The youth generation's drug abuse may contribute to an increase in violence. People under the influence often have an altered sense of consciousness. The various substances the Alex and his droogs take, can possibly make them more violent. The government, oblivious to what goes on in the milkbars the teens frequent, do not understand the youth generation.

Another explanation for Alex's violence is that Alex is part of a group. People behave differently in groups than when they are on their own. Alex seeks power and acceptance within his own ranks. Peer pressure and the need to be accepted, as have been reviewed earlier, may influence violence.

The need to belong somewhere, and to do something meaningful, are important causes for Alex's violence. Alex wants to belong to his generation, but at the same time, he wants to be recognised by society, to be accepted, and to be an important member of that said society.

Society on the other hand, wants nothing to do with either Alex or his entire generation. For the government, but also for the general public, Alex and his generation only represent a problem. The government and society fail to see the reason behind Alex's violence. For Alex, the only way that he is able to get attention and recognition is through violence. A man who cannot choose is no man at all. Conforming to the society in *A Clockwork Orange* is not a choice but an order. In order for Alex to be a man, he must choose. The only choice he can make, then, is to be violent. Violence becomes the epitome of humanity and freedom of choice. Society and the growing totalitarian movement's failure in accepting humans for what they really are is the main reason for Alex's, but perhaps the entire youth generation's violence. When Alex is finally recognised by society, his physical violence fades away. He has no longer any need to be violent. Now, he can choose to be good.

On the other hand, one might claim that Alex has lost, that he has sold out to a totalitarian movement, but the need to belong becomes such a strong incentive, that selling out for Alex, is a sacrifice he is willing to make. The need to belong overshadows every principle. The violence that Alex now is a part of represents a greater threat to humanity than his physical violence earlier in the novel, which again makes him part of a greater scheme whose agenda is the restriction of free will and humanity. The only thing that changes during the course of the novel is Alex's violence. Instead of fighting for his humanity, he is fighting against it. Therein lies the real threat of a totalitarian movement.

Violence in these novels has much to do with how society is structured, the political agenda of the ruling power, and the restrictions totalitarian movements entail. Apart from that, frustration seems to be the main catalyst to Winston and Alex's violence. For Winston, this frustration is caused by society, his awareness that life does not need to be like this. Winston

does not want to belong to a society whose sole mission is to cling to power at any cost. Alex, on the other hand, is frustrated because he is not allowed to belong, but unlike Winston, he is willing to sacrifice his freedom on the alter of the greater good in order to belong and to be recognised.

Reading List

- Arendt, Hannah. 1970. *On Violence*. Harcourt Publishers, U.S.
- Arendt, Hannah 1951. "The Origins of Totalitarianism" in Bruce B. Lawrence and Aisha Karim's (eds) 2007. *On Violence: A Reader*. Duke University Press
- Armstrong, Gary. 1998. *Football Hooligans Knowing the Score*. Oxford: Berg.
- Blackstock, Colin. "'Clockwork Orange' ban to be challenged" *The Independent*. March 14 1999. Retrieved February 23 2010 from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/clockwork-orange-ban-to-be-challenged-1080491.html>
- Bloom, Floyd, Charles A. Nelson & Arlyne Lazerson. 2001. *Brain, Mind, and Behavior*. USA: Worth Publishers.
- Booker, M. Keith. 1994. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Fiction as Social Criticism*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Burgess, Anthony. 2000. *A Clockwork Orange*. London: Penguin Books. [First published in 1962 by William Heinemann Ltd]
- Busch, Hans-Arnulf. 2003. "Girls wouldn't do it this way": the significance of place in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and Marianne Wiggins' *John Dollar*. Tromsø: H.-A. Busch.
- Carr, William. 2002. *A History of Germany 1815-1990*. London: Arnold
- Camus, Albert. 2000. *The Myth of Sisyphus*. London: Penguin Books. [First published in France 1942 as *Le Mythe de Sisyphe* by Librairie Gallimard]
- Camus, Albert. 2006. *The Stranger*. London: Vintage. [First published in France 1942 as *L'étranger* by Librairie Gallimard]
- Canby, Vincent. "'A Clockwork Orange': Disorienting But Human Comedy" *The New York Times*. January 9 1972. Retrieved May 9 2010 from <http://www.nytimes.com/library/film/010972kubrick-orange.html>
- Cohen, Ethan & Joel Cohen. 2007. *No Country for Old Men*.
- Compact Oxford English Dictionary*. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Conrad, Joseph; edited with introduction and notes by Owen Knowles. 2007. *Heart of Darkness*. London: Penguin. [First published 1902]
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1949. *Le Deuxième Sexe*. Paris: Librairie Gallimard.
- De Grand, Alexander J. 1995. *Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*. London: Routledge.
- Dick, Philip K. 1999. *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep*. London: Millennium. [First published 1968]

- Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gleason, Abott, Jack Goldsmith & Martha C. Nussbaum. 2005. *On Nineteen eighty-four: Orwell and our future*. Princeton N.J. Princeton University Press.
- Golding, William. 1996. *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber and Faber Limited. [First published in 1954]
- Graham, Sarah. 2007. *Salinger's The Catcher in the Rye*. London: Continuum
- Guribye, Maria. 2005. *A Clockwork Orange: fra bok til film*. Oslo: M. Guribye.
- Hampton, Wilborn. "THEATER NOTEBOOK; Orwellian Parables for a World in Disarray" *The New York Times*. March 8 2004. Retrieved May 9 2010 from <http://www.synapseproductions.org/nytorwellreview.htm>
- Heller, Joseph. 2004. *Catch-22*. London: Vintage. [First published in 1961]
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1994. *Age of Extremes: The short Twentieth Century 1914-1991*. London: Abacus.
- Koestler, Arthur. 1966. *Darkness at Noon*. New York: Bantam.
- Larsen, J. Randy & David M. Buss. 2002. *Personality Psychology. Domains of Knowledge about Human Nature*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Lawrence, Bruce B and Aisha Karim. 2007. *On Violence: A Reader*. Duke University Press
- Mazower, Mark. 1998. *Dark Continent*. London: Penguin
- Mitchell, Allan. 1997. *The Nazi Revolution*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Myers, David G. 2004. *Exploring Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill. [Third Edition]
- Orwell, George. 2003. *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*. London: Penguin Books. [First published 1945]
- Orwell, George. 2008. *1984*. London: Penguin Books. [First published in 1949 by Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd]
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2000). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang*. (2005). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, Stanley G. 1995. *A History of Fascism 1914-45*. London: Routledge
- Passer & Smith. 2001. *Psychology. Frontiers and Application*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Salinger, J.D. 1958. *The Catcher in the Rye*. London: Penguin Books. [First published in serial form in the USA 1945-1946]

- Sartre, Jean Paul. 2000. *Nausea*. London: Penguin Books. [First published in 1938]
- Skinner, B.F. 2002. *Beyond Freedom & Dignity*. Hackett Publishing Co, Inc; Revised edition.
- Tolkien, J.R.R. 1937. *The Hobbit*. Great Britain: George Allen & Unwin
- Vonnegut, Kurt. 1991. *Slaughterhouse-Five*. London: Vintage. [First published in 1969 by Dell Publishing]
- Wagner, Geoffrey. 1975. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Cranbury N.J.: Associated University Presses.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 2008. *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections* (Big Ideas/Small Books). Picador USA