

Tamila Davitadze

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Batumi, Georgia
[tamila.davitadze@bsu.edu.ge], ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3486-1696

Nana Mazmishvili

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Batumi, Georgia
[nana.mazmishvili@bsu.edu.ge], ORCID ID: 0009-0000-3233-2702

Psychological Portrait of Dystopian Society in a Totalitarian Environment

Abstract: *Dystopian novels represent a hyperbole of evil and violence through the psychological portrait of humanity. Authors, while developing the principle of the supremacy of free choice, literarily mask their message and, through the example of protagonist heroes, demonstrate various methods and means intended to suppress protest. They expose the state where violent means are used to attempt to "correct" people. Often, through antagonists, they also show the relationship and confrontation between the individual and the state. In such cases, a significant place is occupied by the artistic image of the leader, who is one of the leading figures in dystopian novels, such as Mustapha Mond in Huxley's "Brave New World," O'Brien in Orwell's "1984," Colonel Beatty in Bradbury's novel "Fahrenheit 451," and others. In dystopian genre books, authors frequently extrapolate existing problems into the future. This technique enables them to critique various aspects of contemporary society, whether it be totalitarian regimes, control over the individual, ecological catastrophes, or the degradation of social norms. Dystopian fiction compels readers to contemplate the possible consequences of our current actions and choices; to develop critical thinking, social responsibility, and the importance of fighting for a better future. In today's chaotic world, where numerous states control their citizens through censorship, propaganda, intimidation, or indoctrination, dystopian literature and the study of such issues as dystopian politics, totalitarian government, and anti-intellectualism gain even greater significance and relevance, which we illuminate and highlight in comparative perspective through specific works, emphasizing the innovation that individual authors contributed to the development of the dystopian novel through their creativity.*

Keywords: *Dystopian novel; totalitarian government; antagonists; protagonist; state.*

The artistic and psychological analysis of individual characters in dystopian novels reveals how a person loses freedom as a result of a violent regime, while the reader encounters the question/feeling – is this

happening or could it happen around them?! Approximately 400 dystopian works were written in English alone by 1900 and thousands in other languages. Today this number has increased even more, as the world faces greater threats, and from this perspective, the warning-book gains greater significance, which is the fundamental characteristic of dystopian works. As a novelty of the work, we consider the examination of dystopian writers in a comparative perspective.

Dystopia is a genre of fiction that depicts an undesirable, terrible, or frightening societal structure; however, dystopian reality is now our reality, since in the contemporary world "seized by fear," the state already controls its citizens in every way. Unlike utopia, which depicts an ideal society, dystopia serves to present the possible negative consequences of social, political, or technological tendencies. The concept of dystopia is found in ancient philosophy, though it formed as a literary genre later, in the 19th–20th centuries (Ratiani, 2005). Early dystopian novels, such as Thomas More's "Utopia" and Jonathan Swift's "Gulliver's Travels," are characterized by relatively minor dystopian elements, while later dystopian novels are constructed entirely on dystopian elements, including the dystopian novels of interest to us: Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World," George Orwell's "1984," Ray Bradbury's "Fahrenheit 451," Margaret Atwood's "The Handmaid's Tale," which present to us a destructive society existing beyond idealism. Through utopian and anti-utopian worlds, their authors show us how easily harmonious stability can be achieved at the cost of suppressing freedom and eliminating individualism. Often, the governing power of the state, in order to maintain authority, resorts to such methods as the deliberate destruction of history and culture. It is precisely such a political system that requires people to believe the following – living in harmony is possible, however, at the cost of the doctrines listed below:

- There will no longer exist a different opinion;
- There will no longer be history;
- There will no longer be freedom;

Therefore, the goal of such a society is completely clear:

- Create a controllable environment;
- Convince people that the need for change does not exist;
- Offer such harmony that they will never refuse.

From this perspective, the images of the main characters are extremely interesting, their typology, which together with others creates dystopian society, embodies the writer's ideas and reveals those values

whose sacrifice achieves stability and happiness, as we find in O. Huxley's "Brave New World" and not only. Overall, through the satirical portrait of society and the psychological image of individuals, that future world is outlined where there is a danger of establishing totalitarian order, while society is formed according to the will of the controllers. When discussing dystopia, we cannot bypass Sigmund Freud's research, which concerned previously unknown discoveries about human psyche and psychology. It is precisely Freud who considers the 20th century as the stage of transition from utopianism to dystopian pessimism, and in his work "Civilization and its Discontents," his skeptical description of human society reminds us of dystopian literature. Humans are constantly in search of happiness, but Freud is convinced that achieving happiness is impossible because the main desire of civilization and government is to restrict human freedom. There does not exist an ideal state concerned with human well-being, and the attempt to establish a perfect state brings only evil instead of good. Reform of social institutions and rules does not lead us to happiness because civilization opposes human impulses and represents the source not of happiness but of unhappiness (Freud, 2022). Freud's views on "crowd psychology" go even further, directly indicating to us the foundation of 20th-century totalitarianism. The scientist compares humans to helpless infants who need a strong protector like a father. Because of this, the crowd develops fanatical admiration toward leaders like Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin. The totalitarian government described in dystopian literature fulfills the father's role, which protects humans from perceiving painful reality. "Humans are aggressive by nature, and the establishment of totalitarian government helps them free themselves from aggression. The human aggressive instinct finds a scapegoat onto which to transfer aggression. The phenomenon of the scapegoat is frequently visible in dystopian literature, where the government always attacks the distinguished and different individual" (Booker, 1994, 28-29). Thus, the question becomes even more relevant: how do we avoid utopias and how do we return to a non-utopian, less "perfect" and freer society?

The word "dystopia" was first used in history in 1868 by English philosopher John Stuart Mill during parliamentary debates (Amiranashvili, 2022, 208-224), and its emergence may be connected with transitional periods of human development. Before the term dystopia, the term *cacotopia* appeared (Greek *κακός* "bad" + Greek *τόπος* "place," meaning "bad place," *kakotopia* – Oxford Dictionaries, 2012), which translates from Greek as "bad," "evil." Then the term dystopia appears,

along with which cacotopia is also used. It should be noted that dystopian novels are sometimes referred to as "apocalyptic novels," however, American novelist Benjamin Kunkel in his article "Dystopia and the End of Politics" considers that dystopian and apocalyptic novels are absolutely different scenarios. The end of the world, that is, the apocalypse, actually brings the collapse of order, chaos, while almost all dystopian novels represent a perfectly evil order (Kunkel, 2008); however, if we recall Margaret Atwood's "Oryx and Crake," we are dealing with a post-apocalyptic scenario there, and her "The Handmaid's Tale" is no exception, where life changes completely after an apocalypse that has occurred. Also interesting from this perspective is Bradbury's "Fahrenheit 451," at the end of which we encounter the apocalypse itself. On what is the perfect order based according to dystopian novels? "Social stability is unthinkable without individual stability" (Huxley, 2021, 39), says Huxley, and convinces us that human individuality and freedom, religion and culture, art and literature, are sacrificed to technical progress, to the apology of stability and well-being. Family, feelings, and human relationships are victims of modern technologies, new sexual traditions, and artificial fertility. In his "Brave New World," where the new calendar is rejected, history, while society has Ford and Freud identified with God, no one is alone, in this "paradise" everyone is happy through the state-officially encouraged drug "soma." Through this satirical and psychological portrait of society, Huxley highlights the influence of technological progress and science on humans and their values; however, Huxley's dream was to use scientific and technological progress to liberate humans and not to enslave them. Thus, his novel is more a call to sobriety and reflection. Huxley, Orwell, and along with them the authors of other dystopian novels show us two completely different faces of the future industrial world: real and unreal. A book about the future is doubly interesting when it contains a supposed prophecy that comes true. Joseph Adams's definition of dystopian society is interesting: "In a dystopian story, society itself is typically antagonist; it is actively working against the protagonist's aims and desires. This oppression frequently is enacted by a totalitarian or authoritarian government, resulting in the loss of civil liberties and untenable living conditions, caused by any number of circumstances, such as world overpopulation, laws controlling a person's sexual or reproductive freedom, and living under constant surveillance" (Adams, 2011, 12). Only the progressive part of society realizes that the training-formation of newborns

and narco-hypnosis is a more effective weapon in the hands of authorities than handcuffs and prisons. "Community, Identity, Stability" (Huxley, 2021, 9), we read in "Brave New World," the motto sounds effective at first glance; however, stability and community here are achieved through the sacrifice of individuality. As a result of the loss of individuality, society creates a unity of disfigured people: "People are happy, they receive everything they want and never want what they can never receive" (Huxley, 2021, 15), thus, the anti-utopian world seems perfect but is actually the most dangerous and deadly because individual freedom has completely disappeared in it. People who appear (and are not born) with predetermined biological and social status naturally become obedient. They no longer fight for a better life. First, because they don't know, and secondly, the governing system has ensured the following:

- Programming of people;
- Disappearance of the desire for individualism;

Thus, one of the main problems of the society in "Brave New World" is the loss of individualism - complete suppression of personal peculiarities and the implantation of collective consciousness, while in Bradbury's novel "Fahrenheit 451," unlike dystopian novels created in the first half of the 20th century, in future America the population voluntarily participates in implementing the state's policy of crushing individual thinking. Bradbury convincingly assures us that hatred and indifferent attitude toward books comes not from a distorted system but from the people themselves, while later the uneducated mass easily fell under the influence of the state. Thus, according to "Fahrenheit 451," the main problem is not the confrontation between the individual and the state, as found in previous and generally dystopian novels, but the conflict here takes a different form - the intellectual opposes the uneducated mass. People here so resemble each other that it is impossible to distinguish them from one another (Bradbury, R, 2013). Undoubtedly, the author borrowed elements of the dictatorial state from Hitler's and Stalin's regimes; it is also noteworthy that the appearance of the work coincides with the era of the beginning of television's dominance, for during this period the television screen seriously threatened the printed word?! Therefore, the novel "Fahrenheit 451" can be considered about the struggle between technology and nature. Thus, in future America, television enjoys great popularity because people are much happier when watching it, unite, and do not think critically. In Huxley's dystopian world, the government also satisfies the needs of the masses

through the use of the drug "soma" and through free sex, while in Orwell's Oceania ("1984"), the subjugation of the population is accomplished through endless wars and fear. In Huxley's novel, people are programmed from infancy, which is why people do not have the desire to fight against the state. Accordingly, the government does not have to use such violent actions as in Orwell's novel. In "Brave New World," the devil is masked because no one is physically harmed; this is a world where everyone gets everything they want. People live in this society not by compulsion but by temptation. There is no disease and social conflict, there is no depression, mental illness, loneliness, or emotional experience, here sex is unlimited. There even exists a ministry to ensure that the time between desire and its fulfillment is minimized. Unlike Atwood's dystopian book "The Handmaid's Tale," which we will discuss below, religion is no longer taken seriously by anyone here, no one is an introvert, the biological family no longer exists, no one reads Shakespeare anymore, and except for the main character of the book, Savage John, no one here remembers the meaning of faith, hope, fear, and struggle. Huxley shows us two sides of the utopian and anti-utopian world, which in the same time segment transformed differently: real and unreal. The writer draws a boundary between the island and the world created by Ford. Their connecting link is the conditional perception of civilization and freedom because in each place different rules operate. A quite interesting psychological portrait of society is created, which embodies different worlds: the main hero of the real world is "Savage John." He is a tragic figure inspired by Shakespeare's tragedies. He believes in love, family, and true emotions. It is precisely through this that he tries to understand the world, but he becomes a victim of civilization. He can adapt neither to the natural nor to the artificial world. John perishes while fleeing from the modern world because his actions, which have become a spectacle, are unacceptable to a society devoid of values. For him, happiness exists in solitude, he tries to find salvation in cleansing himself with cold water and preserving traditions. John was led to the end by his difference and individuality and became a symbol of failure. Savage John was sacrificed to the struggle against personal freedom. Thus, John is a symbol of true, real civilization, while other characters, for example, Lenina – a symbol of stability and obedience, while Bernard, surrounded by internal and external conflicts - creates the image of a weak person. England here is a civilized, sterile state where different customs operate; hypnotized Alphas, Gammas, Betas, and Epsilons mechanically, unconsciously perform their work.

While, unlike them, the Indian reservation, which represents the so-called savage society, has preserved naturalness, freedom, family, they are not programmed and obedient. Therefore, harmony in the first world is an illusory sensation, which "soma" establishes to avoid emotional conflicts, and as a result, the characters of the work are always happy. Lenina is an incomparable example of this. But the fact is that this is only the result of mind manipulation and not a feeling of internal stability. The psychological image of the characters revealed that they represented different worlds. It is noteworthy that in this world, art is neglected, which in itself implies the means of freedom and emotional expression. For understandable reasons, we will not follow the plot line to the end, but we must certainly discuss how realistic Huxley's prophecy about the world's future is. We think that comparison with Orwell's "1984" will help us properly understand this issue: in general, the nightmare of Orwell's "1984" ultimately resembles the nightmare of the world presented in "Brave New World." This novel, one of the greatest of the 20th century, and warning-book, is desperate about humanity's future. The novel reveals the author's hatred and critical attitude toward totalitarianism and communism. The reader experiences a terrible feeling of powerlessness toward violence, torture, and inhumanity. Let us return to the issue of prophecy in dystopian novels; the philosophy of the ruling minority described in "1984" is sadism, which reaches its logical result with the complete prohibition and rejection of physical relationships (as we know, in the novel, the issue of couples' marriage is also decided by a special commission; they do not give the right to marry to people who have physical attraction toward each other, because the main purpose of marriage is only reproduction and the birth of a child). In reality, the indefinite continuation of such savage politics is doubtful. The ruling power will find lighter and more effective means to satisfy its irresistible striving for power, approximately like what is described in "Brave New World": training-formation of newborns and narco-hypnosis; we must also not forget the possibility of biological and atomic war, to which Huxley used to allude; therefore, one can think that the theme of his novel is not scientific progress but its influence on the individual; according to American writer and culturologist Neil Postman, the reality of 1984 corresponds less to Orwell's prophecy. Even without "Big Brother" (Orwell, 2014), freedom, thought, and history can be taken from people (Postman, 1985); according to Huxley, this can be achieved through people's love of their own "controllers" and technologies. With Orwell, the fear of banning books is traced,

while with Huxley, that there would be no reason to ban books because there would be no one who would want to read books; Orwell feared the prohibition of information, while Huxley – such an abundance of information that humans could not cope with; Orwell reveals the fear of hiding truth, while Huxley - the uselessness of this truth; Orwell condemns slavish culture, while Huxley flees trivial culture, which implies recreational sexual relationships and meaningless entertainment. As we know, in "1984," people are governed by inflicting pain, while in "Brave New World" – by granting pleasure. Thus, Orwell thought that people would be destroyed by their own fears; Huxley thought by their own desires. Therefore, Huxley's prophecy about the world's future is more realistic than Orwell's. According to Japanese-origin American philosopher and writer Fukuyama, Orwell's prognosis about politics was not fulfilled. In just a few years from 1984, the fall of the Berlin Wall became the symbol of the collapse of the world's greatest totalitarian state. Thus, George Orwell's information-technological prognosis was fulfilled in reverse: in the 1980s, the personal computer that went on sale gave humans themselves the means to observe "Big Brother," democratized information and deprived the idea of totalitarianism based on information monopoly of its foundation, unlike the "telescreen," which was an instrument of tyranny and centralization (Fukuyama, 2002); as for Huxley's prophecy, his biotechnological prognoses – in-vitro fertilization, surrogacy, psychotropic medications, and genetic engineering for "producing" children already represent reality; Huxley declares: "A truly revolutionary revolution can be accomplished not in the external world but only in the human soul and body" (Shanidze, 2017), in "Brave New World" precisely such "revolutionarily" transformed people live.

Thus, against the background of totalitarian regimes depicted in the novels, writers described two different future technologies that radically changed the world in just two generations. Orwell described what we today call information technologies; "Orwell's 'telescreen' was actually a modern personal computer connected to the internet, and this technology determined the success of the greatest totalitarian empire" (Fukuyama, 2002). Huxley prophesied another kind of great technological revolution. This was "the biotechnological revolution – the development of genetic engineering, in-vitro 'production' of humans, neuropharmacology" (Shanidze, 2017), which conditioned the existence and stability of a totalitarian state diametrically different from that described in "1984." Thus, seeing the danger of the biotechnological revolution,

we fear those consequences that dehumanization will bring to people. On the one hand, humans can exercise caution and moderation in using technologies – for example, nuclear weapons, nanotechnologies, and even biotechnologies – and subject to their control the obvious dangers caused by these technologies; on the other hand, biotechnologies are characterized by such typical dangers that Huxley well described in his novel. As Fukuyama notes, the practical application of biotechnologies, that is, pharmacology, genetic engineering, stem cells, and reproductive technologies, which is expressed in granting happiness to humans, prolonging their life, and improving genetics, is always accompanied by side effects, and it is precisely because of these side effects that it demands a very great sacrifice from humans – all this sacrifices the human soul (Fukuyama, 2002).

That in dystopian society humans are powerless and violence is everyday life is well visible from the discussed examples, but it is interesting what the feminist vision of totalitarian regime is and how a female hero fights it, what result this struggle ultimately brings both for her and for society? We examine this issue according to contemporary Canadian writer Margaret Atwood's "The Handmaid's Tale," which gives quite interesting development to the dystopian genre. Published in 1985, this novel quickly attracted the attention of readers and critics due to its content, characteristic manner of narration, and relevance of social and political issues to modernity. In the book, the author raises contemporary society's problems – religious fundamentalism, feminism, consumerism, and abuse of power, which are actively discussed from the mid-1980s, which made the novel almost prophetic. "The Handmaid's Tale" is about what can happen if we constantly turn a blind eye to violence, fear to see problems, close ourselves off and do not notice how religious extremists gather strength and expand their influence. By relying on others' hope, people contribute to the formation of a totalitarian regime, while later the individual living in this system has difficulty liberating themselves from the dictatorial regime and must make great effort to gain freedom. Through the description and characterization of Offred, Moira, and Offred's mother, Atwood indicates to us that passivity is dangerous because inertia facilitates the establishment of dictatorship. In the work, the action takes place in the near future, in New England, in a patriarchal, totalitarian state, the Republic of Gilead. The book's main character - Offred, belongs to the caste of handmaids, who are obliged to bear children for men – for the ruling class of Gilead. Her real name is June. She was named Offred in Gilead;

the name Offred signifies belonging to that man (Fred) for whom she must bear a child. Her narration is characterized by fragmentality, and the reader themselves must arrange and then comprehend Offred's story. Atwood's book once again reminds us of the horrors of Orwell's novel and makes us feel that we should expect nothing good from the future. For the protagonists of both artistic creations, for Offred and Winston Smith, memory is the only means of resisting the government because knowledge of the past gives them the opportunity to compare the old and new systems and, accordingly, to see the flaws of the new system. The ending of both novels shows us that the totalitarian regime came to an end. The novel "1984" ends with an appendix about "Newspeak," which is written in past tense in ordinary language, which indicates to us that the government of Oceania no longer exists and in the future a researcher conducted scientific analysis of the characteristics of this regime. Atwood's book also ends with detailed discussion of one of the reports at a conference studying Gilead, from which it is clear that Gilead's totalitarian government also collapsed, though the ultimate fate of the main character Offred remains unknown to the reader. Moreover, these two works have in common: unbearable torture of people with different opinions, spreading false information through media, turning people into a crowd and crushing individualism; however, compared to Atwood, Orwell's and Huxley's political satire is sharper; moreover, it is more difficult to imagine the connection of events depicted in "The Handmaid's Tale" with the present than "Brave New World" or "1984." We must also note that like other writers, Atwood also employs the technique of extrapolation and based on what has already happened presents to us how events will develop in future America. This is natural; in this case, it once again raises the issue of complete equality between women and men. However surprising it may not be, for a country like America, according to the constitution, the issue of women's rights remains a relevant issue even today. This is why Atwood creates the American theocratic regime – Gilead, whose establishment was conditioned by the world's unsolvable problems, environmental pollution, and universal infertility. She depicts for us the picture according to which we imagine how the American government and generally the American people undergo transformation if an organization similar to the "Moral Majority" or authorities with Puritan ideology come to power. In order to govern the individual, Gilead's government corrects history and controls media. Through state television, they broadcast only victory stories. To make people lose the desire to fight

against the regime, Gilead's system also resorts to the method of threat and intimidation. Torture of opponents of the system is frequent. They also hang human corpses at the main gateway, presumably of those people who did not obey the system's rules and fought tirelessly to overthrow it. Thus, Gilead's regime attempts to turn people into a crowd and eliminate their individualism. The authorities do not ease women's lives but psychologically influence them and convince them that they are incapable of doing anything other than the function granted by the government. Like robots, women have only one activity assigned; they perform the action with which they were programmed. Such division of women's functions reminds us of the divided classes (castes) in Huxley's novel "Brave New World" – Alphas, Betas, and Gammas. The difference lies in the fact that in Huxley's novel, people are programmed from infancy, so they are satisfied with their life from birth, while in Atwood's novel, women are not resigned to their fate and for many of them performing the role that the state demands from them is insufficient for self-realization. The most thought-provoking and outrageous fact of violating women's rights in future society is the prohibition of literacy for them. In case of being caught in the process of reading, the punishment is amputation of limbs because cutting off hands and feet does not represent a hindering factor in reproduction. What is the author's main appeal and what does she indicate to us? Probably that Gilead's dictatorial system would not have formed if people had fought against it, and with their passivity they, on the contrary, contributed to Gilead's strengthening. From this, is Offred a strong character? Is she a rebel or a powerless victim of the system? Despite all prohibitions, Offred tries to preserve memories, makes notes about Gilead's system, and keeps information, which already indicates Offred's unyielding character. Then she starts a romance with Nick, which seemingly should signify rebellion because in Gilead, a love relationship implies going against the system. However, isn't this for Offred an attempt to escape from reality? The author indicates to us with this that people will endure everything if they receive compensation, even in small form. At the same time, she introduces a new stroke in dystopian novels politically and exposes the government disguised as religion, which oppresses women; male authority that narrows women and uses them to implement its own goals. Thus, what is Offred's psychological image here? We think that her own life is important to her because she does not intend to get involved in the machinations of the organization "Mayday" fighting against Gilead's regime and does not want to share the fate of

those who were punished, tortured, and destroyed: "Dear God, – I say in my mind, – I will act as you wish. Because this time you saved me, I will wash everything out of my heart, I will be as they command me. I will completely empty myself, I will really become a vessel. I will leave Nick alone, I will forget the rest too, I will no longer complain. I will submit to my lot. I will sacrifice myself, I will repent of sins, I will refuse to think, I will refuse principles" (Atwood, 2015, 383). Thus, Offred is more a powerless victim than a rebel, and unlike characters in dystopian novels, she is more passive. Here we must add that it is easy to judge Offred; it is possible that many of us in her situation would have acted like her or worse. Ultimately, like Offred, many live constantly bowed down in silence and obedience to save themselves. Although Offred imagines such ways of escaping from Gilead's power as burning the house or suicide, ultimately she does not do this, but if we recall Moira from the "Red Center," her rebellion against the existing system, who dares to escape from this closed system, we will see wonderful courage for freedom, since her capture means inevitable death?! We cannot bypass Offred's mother either, whose fighting and unyielding character Gilead's government could do nothing about, though they still "silenced" her by sending her to a colony polluted with toxic chemicals. Here let us recall Montag from "Fahrenheit 451," who so feels living in falsehood, is so alienated from the external world, that he dares unimaginable rebellion, kills his fire chief and flees, escapes from the mechanical hound, from which escape is actually impossible. A fighting hero is also Winston in Orwell's "1984," who seeks like-minded people, despite the fear of torture cannot stop and begins secret struggle against the authorities. Here we must underline that Winston is the deepest character among other protagonists. Therefore, these characters believe that it is possible to overthrow the dictatorial regime or escape from this society; although they are lonely, in rare cases they also have like-minded people, for example, Montag has Faber and other professors, Offred has several handmaids and the entire secret organization "Mayday," Winston has Julia and the secret brotherhood, and they continue the struggle to the end. However, the culmination, that is, the concluding part, which is the most interesting element of the dystopian genre, looks like this: the problem remains unsolved, the hero flees, is caught, tortured, or killed. Dystopian society continues to exist. Winston is terribly tortured in prison, Montag flees (it is noteworthy that he does not refuse his goal), Offred also flees and leaves her story

recorded on tape, though the recording breaks off and we ultimately do not know how her life developed.

The role of language in establishing totalitarian regime must also be highlighted. If we rely on David Sisk, it is precisely language that plays a great role in turning people into a zombified mass (Siski, 1997). Thus, authors of dystopian novels, when imagining the future world, create a language that will be in correspondence with the social relationships of future society. The best example of this is Oceania's "Newspeak," which was created in accordance with the ideological needs of English Socialism. Orwell creates a forcibly impoverished language; grammar and lexicon are very simplified, reduced, and adapted to totalitarian regime. Its goal is the gradual elimination of different opinion, and this happens by removing from the lexicon such words that express rebellion, freedom, and similar content. Reinterpretation and word creation represent instruments of violence. Day by day their imprinting in consciousness occurs. The authorities manipulate public consciousness. By inversion of signs included in the concept of a word. For example, it says "well-being," they read "deficit," it says "temporary difficulties," they read "permanent crisis." Thus, Newspeak is an artificial product created for correction of human memory and their representations about the world. Therefore, the creation of new speech language was intended to forget Oldspeak: "Newspeak was not created to expand the range of thought; on the contrary, it was created to reduce the stock of words to a minimum" (Orwell, 2017, 343); this was precisely what "A vocabulary," "B vocabulary," and "C vocabulary" served (Orwell, 2017, 344), for the needs of everyday life, political, and scientific-technical terms. The Party's main goal is to eliminate from language such words as "equality," "independence," because if these words do not exist, accordingly, people will not know their meaning and will never desire to fight for independence and equality. Thus, "Newspeak" fights against the formation of thought and words. In another dystopian novel, say, in "The Handmaid's Tale," the speech of future people does not differ from the speech of Americans of the 1980s. It is possible that author Atwood deliberately does not create a unique language so that by using identical language she helps society recognize themselves in the inhabitants of Gilead. Instead, the state of Gilead, which uses the Bible as a guarantor of state stability, resorts to biblical language in everyday phrases. For example: standard greetings among neighbors are as follows: "Blessed be the fruit," "May the Lord open," police in Gilead are called "Guardians of the faith," and all stores in Gilead have Bible-inspired names:

"Lilies of the field," "Milk and honey," "all flesh." In war, military units have the following names: "The angels of the apocalypse, Fourth division," "The twenty-first battalion of the angels of light" (Atwood, 2015). Similar biblical nomenclature is less commonly found in dystopian works. Thus, language and the face of dystopian society are determined by government engaged in personal interests, disguised with lies, corrupt authorities who resort to every trick, do not avoid even violating law in order to preserve power: for example, Mustapha Mond in Huxley's book "Brave New World," O'Brien in Orwell's "1984," and Colonel Beatty in Bradbury's novel "Fahrenheit 451." Mustapha Mond violates the supreme law established by himself and reads books forbidden for ordinary citizens, as he himself says: "...because here I establish laws, I can also violate them" (Huxley, 2021, 225). According to O'Brien's explanation, when coming to power, the Party's only goal is to seize power and not to bring well-being to the people.

Thus, the novels under discussion are unified by the depiction of totalitarian regimes and authoritarian rule: the absence of free speech, constant surveillance, meticulously calculated daily schedules, pervasive monotony, food shortages, the presence of underground organizations, and attempts to escape or break free from the regime. From an ideological and thematic perspective, they are connected by the portrayal of restrictions on individual freedom, wherein the sacrifice of the individual for the so-called welfare of society becomes particularly striking. They reveal the destructive dominance of surveillance and propaganda, a moral and ethical crisis, the cultivation of fear, the disintegration of the family institution, the neglect of art and creativity, and the denial of the past.

Each character serves as a symbolic figure and represents:

- Humanity
- Freedom
- Power
- Obedience
- Otherness

All the authors – George Orwell in particular – investigate the underlying causes of totalitarian governments and conclude that the roots of tyranny lie in the human desire for and attachment to power.

Ultimately, dystopian novels help us to critically assess our own capabilities and to recognize that freedom is the greatest achievement of humankind. They also serve as warnings: technology exposes the darkest aspects of human nature, strengthens hierarchies, increases

mechanisms of control, and harms nature, human nature, and the environment. The unintended consequences of technology are predominantly negative; new technologies do not solve the problems of old ones – on the contrary, they generate new issues. In conclusion, it must be emphasized that literature – in this case, dystopian literature – is essential for politics, as it awakens politicians, exposes their actions, and holds them more accountable for what they attempt to conceal.

Bibliography:

Adams, J. J. (2011). *Dystopian fiction: An introduction*, www.tor.com, accessed on 25 March 2025.

Amiranashvili, T. (2022). *Dystopian novel as a literary phenomenon in XX century*, Language and Culture, Scientific Peer Reviewed Journal, VII, 2022-03-09, pp. 208–224.

Atwood, M. (2015). *The handmaid's tale*, Batumi: Books in Batumi.

Booker, M. K. (1994). *The dystopian impulse in modern literature: Fiction as social criticism*, Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press;

Bradbury, R. (2013). *Fahrenheit 451*, Tbilisi: Palitra L.

Freud, Z. (2022). *Discontent in civilization*, trans. Gorgishvili, V., Tbilisi: Ak'ti Publishing.

Fukuyama, Y. F. (2002). *Our posthuman future: Consequences of the biotechnology revolution*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Huxley, A. (2021). *Brave new world*, Tbilisi: Siesta.

Kunkel, B. (2008). *Dystopia and the end of politics*, Dissent Magazine.

Orwell, G. (2017). *1984*, Tbilisi: Palitra L.

Oxford University Press. (2012) *Oxford dictionaries*.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*, New York: Viking Penguin.

Ratiani, I. (2005). *Chronotope in the anti-utopian novel: For the interpretation of scatological anti-utopia*, Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press.

Shanidze, T. (2017). *Huxley, Orwell, dystopias and modernity*, Arili Literary Journal, <http://arilimag.ge/Tamar-Shanidze-Huxley-Oru/>, accessed on 25 March 2025.

Siski, D. (1997). *The transformation of language in modern dystopia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.