

George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* as Timeless Scenarios: A Political Perspective

Dr. AMIR MOHAMMED ALBLOLY

Najran University

Dr. MOHAMMED ABDULLAH A. HIZABR ALHUSAMI

Najran University

Abstract

This paper was basically set to uncover the veil of George Orwell's creativity in placing unexpired and timeless image adhered to the novels of "Animal Farm" and "Nineteen Ninety Four" that coincided with political scenarios whose occurrence dated back to approximately not more than fifty or sixty decades ago. But in such a way these images repapered, reproduced, and interconnected with similar situations, political incidents and scenarios in both 20th and 21st centuries. The researchers critically analyzed the characters' acts in both novels underlining the political images and its insinuations that the writer displayed not only for criticizing the political systems and regimes at that time but also for foreseeing his readers' future which will witness the repetition of the same scenarios. The article proved how the images appeared in Orwell's novels will remain as a mirror of renewable incidents as long as the dirty games in politics will never be over or removed. Finally, the article concluded with that the political ideology and scenarios in Orwell's "Animal Farm" and "Nineteen Ninety Four" akin to such scenarios and incidents in truth in addition to the timeless qualities of his works which still appeal for readers of different generations and different cultures.

Key words: timeless, political image, dictatorial control, capitalism, socialism, totalitarianism

INTRODUCTION

In recent times, the relevance of Orwell's political writing has been felt across a spectrum of social disciplines. Savage and *et al.* (1989) affirmed that as social scientists we believe that the symbolic figure of George Orwell deserves political scrutiny and may be used to explore some of the major political issues of our present and future. According to them, Orwell's work survives due to political conditions and trends he foresaw as threatening the world now more than ever before 1989.

Among the most pertinent issues of concern for these scholars is the exercise of power by the state through the control of the mind. Savage and *et al.* (1989), like Orwell himself, believe that this control and coercion are achieved through the use, or rather the abuse, of language. As an example, they refer to former US Secretary of State, Alexander Haig, whose use of language was "designed to control his environment, particularly in his interactions with media representatives". The main objectives of this essay is to show the political and scenarios in Orwell's *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Ninety Four* are akin to such scenarios and incidents in and neat demonstrate why Orwell's novels possess timeless qualities which appeal to different generations of readers and different cultures.

George Orwell: From the Formative Years to the Works of Maturity

As remarked by Rodden (2007) that Eric Blair born in India in 1903, George Orwell was educated as a scholarship student at prestigious boarding schools in England. Due to his background – his family as "lower-upper-middle class"– he never quite fit in, and felt somehow oppressed and outraged by the dictatorial control that the schools he attended exercised over their students' lives. After graduating at the famous Public school Eton, Orwell decided to leave college in order to work as a British Imperial Policeman in Burma. He hated his duties in Burma, where he was required to enforce the strict laws of a political regime he hated, to say the least. His failing health, which will trouble him throughout his whole life, caused him to return to England on convalescent leave. Once back in England, he quit the Imperial Police and dedicated himself to becoming a writer. Inspired by Jack London's 1903 book *The People of the Abyss* (1903), which in

the wake of Charles Dickens detailed London's experience in the slums of London, Orwell bought ragged clothes from a second-hand store and went to live among the very poor Londoners. He published a book about this experience, entitled *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). Later he lived among destitute coal miners in northern England, an experience which caused him to give up capitalism for democratic socialism. In 1936, he traveled to Spain to report on the Spanish Civil War, where he experienced directly the nightmarish atrocities committed by Fascist political regimes. The rise to power of dictators such as Adolf Hitler in Germany and Joseph Stalin in the Soviet Union inspired Orwell's mounting hatred of totalitarianism and political authority. He, as a result, devoted his energy to writing politically laden novels, first with *Animal Farm* in 1945, then *1984* in 1949.

George Orwell was a prominent English writer of the first half of the 20th century. He was recognized as one of the most influential satiric writers whose works deserve detailed scholarly scrutiny. More than half a century after they were written, Orwell's books are still much in demand. John Rodden, the critic, wrote in 1989 that Orwell was still 'alive today' because the topics of his works are alive today, and this is equally true in the twenty-first century. He is regarded as one of the greatest political writers in English of the twentieth century.

Rodden, (2007) claimed that George Orwell's world fame is first and foremost due to a combination of high esteem from intellectuals and immense popularity with the general reading public. Although he died at the early age of forty-six, his last two works – *Animal Farm* and *1984* – have sold more than forty million copies and stand as some of the most influential books of political fiction of the twentieth century. He stressed that Orwell was read more like a fabulist than a novelist, and in fact, he has always been a pamphleteer, who sought to join English tradition that includes Defoe, Swift, Edmund Burke, Carlyle and Ruskin, among many others. The satirical nature of his books and ridiculing the defects of the society was derived by him from Jonathan Swift. There is no doubt that Orwell held Swift in high esteem. On one occasion he even said that 'Gulliver's Travels has meant more to me than any other book ever written.

Rodden, (2007) remarked that Orwell's creative work is multi-faceted and he is often cited by other researchers. Orwell's influence, however, is not limited to literary studies: historians, anthropologists, sociologists, philosophers, psychologists, and political scientists resort to Orwell's books in their research. In his works, they find answers to such questions as the psychology of management, leadership theory, sociology of revolution, political organization, the symbolism of power, social stratification, social inequality, ideology and propaganda, conformity, and the sects of social revolution. George Orwell is recognized today as one of the most original political writers of the twentieth century, particularly in his understanding of the negative side of communism, most famously expressed in *Animal Farm* and *1984*. While Orwell's anti-communism dates back to the mid-1930s, especially his experience during the Spanish Civil War, he was at first less insightful about the other great totalitarian movement of that "low, dishonest decade", fascism. His critique of communism is both incisive and original. He was among the first writers to recognize that communism was not a revolutionary force but instead was a new, dangerous form of totalitarianism, a powerful tool for controlling the masses. Conversely, his initial comments on fascism were curiously flat and imitative of the standard left-wing interpretation—that is, fascism was nothing more than the capitalist system stretched to its extreme limits.

Rodden, (2007) stressed that Orwell's political education followed a gradual process. Five years as a member of the Imperial Police in Burma (1921–27) left him with views that can best be characterized as vaguely radical. In fact, he was described in the early 1930s as a Tory radical, someone in the mold of William Cobbett or Orwell's personal hero, Charles Dickens.

Rodden, (2007) added that Orwell's political education began when he ventured among the poor, the downtrodden, the underdogs and the tramps after his return from Burma. His book *Down and Out in Paris and London* was an attempt to show the impact of his time among the lowest rungs of society. He wrote that he wanted to purge himself from all the evils of imperialism and thought that by immersing himself among the poor he would do so. His first serious publications appeared in the unconventional English left-wing journal *Adelphi*, which provided an outlet for him to develop his ideas and

where the evidence of his unique direct prose style first appeared. He also wrote occasional pieces for the *New English Weekly*, which, like *Adelphi*, was idiosyncratically socialist. These contacts put him in touch with individuals drawn from all parts of the leftist spectrum: anarchists, pacifists, socialists, Trotskyists, and communists. His political ideas were no doubt unformed but definitely radical and anti-capitalist in their global orientation.

Rodden, (2007) highlighted that by the time Orwell left England to take part in the Spanish Civil War, in December 1936, his emerging left-wing views had already been sharpened by his time among the unemployed in the north of England. In *Wigan Pier*, which appeared while he was in Spain, he elaborated on some of his unique opinions about Socialism. For Socialism to prevail, he wrote, it must lose its image as appealing to “unsatisfactory or even inhuman types”. In an oft-quoted passage, he wrote that most people regarded socialists as a juxtaposition of the strange and the odd. “One sometimes gets the impression that the mere words ‘Socialism’ and ‘Communism’ draw towards them with magnetic force every fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearer, sex-maniac, Quaker, ‘Nature Cure’ quack, pacifist and feminist in England.

One of the sharpest insights from his experiences in *Wigan Pier* was to advocate the triumph of socialism to the middle classes must show empathy for, and merge their interests with, those of the proletariat. A running thread through the second part of *Wigan Pier* consists of Orwell’s plea that the gulf between the middle and lower classes can and should be bridged. In Spain Orwell’s commitment to socialism reached its peak, therefore he sharpened his hatred against communism. There, he joined the anarchist-Trotskyist party, POUM (Partido Obrero de Unification Marxista), spending six months with them, including time at the front lines. He was shot at the throat and nearly died before returning to England, in June 1937.

Rodden, (2007) stressed that in England, Orwell saw his anarchist Trotskyist friends in Spain denounced by Leftists of all stripes as enemies of the Revolution and, what is worse, crypto-fascists. One of the popular communist posters during the war showed the Trotskyite POUM with a mask beneath, which was the face of fascism. He never forgave those in England who took part in this political assassination of his Spanish comrades. He returned from

Spain as a dedicated anti-communist and, as he told his old friend, Cyril Connolly, for the first time he was a true believer in socialism.

Rodden, (2007) pointed out that Orwell's understanding of the other great "ism" of the twentieth century, Fascism, took a long time to mature than did his unique insights into communism. Orwell never found anything appealing in fascism, which was an example of an evil political concept that threatened the very nature of democratic society. Unlike communism, which Orwell detested while recognizing its appeal to certain idealistic types, fascism had no redeeming value. As he was groping toward an understanding of the intricacies of Socialism, he continued to accept the standard left-wing view that fascism was a logical extension of capitalism.

After his return from Spain, Orwell joined the Independent Labor Party, the most radical and pacifist of the left-wing movements in England. He agreed with their rejection of the idea of war against fascism as he believed that, in toppling down the fascist system, you would only be stabilizing capitalism and imperialism, something that is far bigger and in a different way just as bad.

Rodden, (2007) concluded that as the war progressed, Orwell's references to Fascism bore no comparison to his growing concerns about the rising threat of communism to the Western ideals of freedom. His focus shifted to concerns about the appeal of Communism, especially to the intelligentsia, a natural enough reaction, given Russia's major role in the defeat of the Nazis. Orwell soon began developing his ideas about what the future would hold for the West, especially his growing fear that the idea of objective truth was disappearing and the dehumanization of the individual was taking over, the very themes he would develop in his last two famous works, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By the end of the war, Orwell noted that fascism had lost all concrete meaning and become a verbal means of vilifying your enemies, a point he made most explicit in his great essay *Politics and the English Language*.

The Correspondence between *Animal Farm* and Real Political Scenarios

Asserting the relevance of *Animal Farm* to modern society Hammond, (1982) observed that one of the reasons why the book has such a wide appeal today is that it possesses those timeless qualities which enable

readers of different generations and different cultures to apply its lessons to their own predicament.

Animal Farm envisions a somewhat different scenario for political promises. Writing about the Russian Revolution's failures, Orwell portrays a farm that overthrew its human master and replaced him with a collective leadership of pigs. These clever pigs promised to reorganize society along egalitarian (populist) lines with the animal workers being rewarded for their labor on a just and fair farm. Mirroring Russia, where Stalin replaced Trotsky and Lenin's vision with the Gulag camps and a system of brutal repression and corruption, the ruling pigs of *Animal Farm* gradually became human-like and their promises of change forgotten.

1. *Animal Farm* Perfectly Describes Life in the Era of Donald Trump

Russo, (2017) claimed that following President Donald Trump's inauguration, the Left's must-read book was George Orwell's 1984. Published in 1949, the dystopian novel predicts a world of authoritarian thought control, no wonder that it shoots to the top of Amazon's best-seller list.

There is no sign that there is or will ever be any effective thought control or political repression as described in 1984. Democracy seems as powerful as ever: The courts "on an island in the Pacific" effortlessly tie up Trump's immigration orders and the ratings on late-night television's anti-Trump rants are through the roof. The bogeyman in the night, Trump, seems to fade with each morning's sunrise of policy reversals and statements like, "I don't stand by anything." The White House and the Republican-dominated Congress barely agree on a few basics, such as a budget.

The protagonists in *Animal Farm* maintain thought control by obscuring the facts with smokescreens. In this way, the allegory of the Trump administration is dead on. Executives from Wall Street, once lambasted by Trump as "getting away with murder," are now in charge. The "currency manipulator" to be punished on Trump's first day in office, China, is now a strategically helping to fend off North Korea.

That the populist Trump has offered unprecedented access to some of the largest corporations in America in exchange for their

millions of dollars of donations is another page straight out of "*Animal Farm*". The entire façade of governance in "*Animal Farm*" was meant to placate the horses, sheep, and chickens with feel-good slogans and false agendas. Trump's "drain the swamp" mantra would have been an appropriate "*Animal Farm*" infrastructure slogan. The pigs, who were afraid they would lose control of the farm, created imaginary threats as a tactic to bind their subjects. How is this different from Trump's alerting us to the threat of Mexican rapists?

Orwell, who counts among the most brilliant political mind of the twentieth century, even anticipated the phenomenon of fake news. The historic Battle of the Cowshed, in which the animals liberated the farm from the humans, was told and retold with fake news added as the pigs began to squabble. New spins on the facts were constantly required. Thus, a true hero of the Battle of the Cowshed, Snowball, was later reported to have sided with the humans. Even Trump's deleted tweet about how it was an "honor to host [Palestinian] President Mahmoud Abbas" at the White House was foreseen in *Animal Farm*, as writing on the barn wall was changed and erased as politically necessary. The animals could not recall the original writings or how they were altered.

Orwell even anticipated Sean Spicer. The pigs have a spokes pig named Squealer who is in charge of reconciling the irreconcilable and parsing the absurdities of *nonsequitur* pronouncements from the pigs' administration. To read Squealer's spin on the changes in farm policy is a literary treat no reader will no doubt ever forget.

2. 1984 Modern Accents of Political Scenarios

Bossche, (2018) remarked that art imitates life and vice versa. Some of the greatest works in literature turned out to predict major events throughout history. It is important not to forget that well-known authors decide to write their novels after being inspired by the society of some specific age. When discussing the relationship between society and art, it is impossible to neglect the connection between George Orwell's most famous work in 1984 and society today. In fact, the book and our environment nowadays can be compared in more ways than one, which is the primary purpose of this essay. George Orwell successfully played the role of Nostradamus and wrote a book that perfectly depicts the world we live in today.

In 1984, almost all private and public places feature large TV screens that only broadcast government propaganda, news, and of course, the approved entertainment. At the same time, these large screens are two-way monitors which spy on people's private lives. Nowadays, we have easy access to media which, also, aims to display government propaganda, news, and entertainment. Although we try to convince ourselves thinking entertainment today is largely "free", that is not the case. Social media websites such as Facebook track our likes, dislikes, even messages and the surveillance spreads to other websites we use on a daily basis at the same time. We may not have a two-way screen that tracks our every move, but there are multiple ways to get spied on and it is impossible to escape.

The similarities between George Orwell's book and modern society also stretch to the endless, global war. The novel describes a global war that has been going on since forever and shows no signs of slowing down. Furthermore, the main hero, Winston Smith, realizes that the enemy keeps changing. In reality, things are not much different war-wise. The United States is in a war for decades just with different nations and we can also add to that a long list of names such as Russia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, France, and many others. The so-called war on terror has no end in sight and its only "accomplishment" is spreading fear among the general public.

Moreover, Big Brother gained tremendous power was through mind manipulation of the people. Big Brother erased history, changed facts, and rewrote past in a bid to favor a communist agenda. Winston Churchill said: "*History is written by the victors.*" The quote perfectly describes the past, present, and future. Those in power, i.e. victors, have the ability to not only rule in present but to "rewrite" what happened before. If we were to ask any historian or even students whose major is history, they would instantly name all those times certain historical facts were rewritten just to conform to someone's political agenda.

1984 is more than a brilliant work of art and one of the most important works in contemporary fiction. One can easily compare the book with reality, today's modern society in numerous ways and this essay just outlined some of them. This just goes to show that art and life do go together hand in hand and there is plenty to learn from Mr. Orwell. Bossche remarked that in a free society," wrote the French

philosopher Montesquieu, "it is not always important that individuals reason well, it is sufficient that they reason; from their individual thought, freedom is born". Exactly two centuries later, in his futuristic novel "1984," the English political novelist George Orwell gave a tragic illustration of what the world would be without the freedom to think. Orwell intended to call his book "The Last Man in Europe," as a tribute to the essential quality that distinguishes man from the world around him, namely his ability to think for himself.

Winston, the main character of the novel, lives in a country where individual thought is banned, where only the leader, Big Brother, is allowed to reason and to decide. Prodded by his natural need for reflection and critical analysis, Winston finds it hard not to make use of his inborn talents. He starts questioning the wisdom of Big Brother and moves hopefully toward his own liberation. But in his struggle for emancipation, he stands alone. The large mass of common people did not find themselves the need to think independently, to question or to investigate what they have been taught. His fellow intellectuals have sold their inalienable right to think freely for security and a semblance of physical well-being. Winston is the last man in Europe, the only human being who wants to use his independent mind. He cannot believe that he is alone, that he is the last man in London to resist Big Brother's conquest of the minds. He trusts the wrong men and is doomed to fail. When he finally is "converted" to believe in and to love Big Brother, another slave is born, another cog is placed in the machinery of the State, the last man in Europe is dead. *1984* is a political statement. It contains no prophetic declaration, only a simple warning to mankind. Orwell did not believe that 35 years after the publication of his book, the world would be ruled by Big Brother, but he often proclaimed that 1984 could happen if man did not become aware of the assaults on his personal freedom and did not defend his most precious right, the right to have his own thoughts.

The personal tragedy of Winston is only a small incident in the worldwide agony of human freedom. "1984" portrays a world subdivided between three States, each of them sovereign and under totalitarian rule. Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia are not countries in the traditional sense of the world, they are conglomerates of power in which infallible and all-powerful Big Brothers rule. Oceania looks

very much like an extended version of NATO, at least in its geography. Eurasia is obviously the Russian zone of influence, and Eastasia the Far East. At the time of the publication of the novel, the North Atlantic alliance was being formed, Russia had entered the arms race and China was still in the grip of civil war, but it was already clear that Mao Tse-Tung would defeat the demoralized armies of the Nationalists.

The survival of each of the three Orwellian States was based on the following interior and exterior strategies: the State had to subdue its citizens into a mindless mass which executed the will of Big Brother; the State had to fuel the hatred of the population against its enemy through a constant state of limited war; at all times the State should have the capacity to destroy the other States so that each one's military strength would be a deterrent to all-out war; and, finally, the States should periodically change their alliances to prevent the union of two States against the third.

Today, about forty years after 1984, we ask ourselves how much of Orwell's fictional world has become reality and what the prospects are for a more sensible world; how much its diegesis has absorbed the mimesis.

In 1984, Big Brother will not conquer the world. However, the warnings of George Orwell are more than ever relevant. Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia do not exist and Big Brother did not succeed in destroying individual thought. However, in a large part of our world, he did succeed, through the management of the news and the censorship of the written and spoken word, in severely impairing man's ability to think freely. Even in the free world, many maintain, inroads have been made: commercial interests try to doctor the news and sometimes succeed, elected officials are tempted to misrepresent the truth, Government agencies attempt to and sometimes do invade the privacy of the individuals, and military leaders feel compelled to hide some of their activities. It is the vigilance of the citizens that has prevented Big Brother from starting his reign in the free world. This vigilance, Orwell would say today, may not relent if freedom is to be saved.

Orwell's imaginary States do not exist, but the world order of 1984 resembles in some ways the world of "1984." Indeed, there are

two major world powers with a third one on the rise. They seem to divide the world into three zones of influence.

Eastern totalitarian states govern their people and their satellites with iron hands; governments and individuals must please their masters in all they do, write and "think aloud." The survival of these regimes, they believe, rests on the blind obedience of the citizens. The Western zone, called the free world, lives in the shadow of the military and economic might of the United States. It does not resemble Oceania in which Winston lived. Governments and people of the Western world are free to disagree, to criticize and to act independently. But the free countries know very well that, in the end, limits are placed on their freedom. Their freedom and prosperity depend in a large measure on their allegiance to the world power of the West. Why, indeed, would European countries agree to have nuclear missiles placed on their soil, knowing very well that the Soviet Union would retaliate; why did Japan agree to "voluntary" reductions in exports and liberalization of its import regulations, knowing that these measures would hurt their own economy?

The geopolitical relationship between the major powers also has its Orwellian side. The balance of power between the world leaders is still considered the best prevention against the war. Did we not hear recently that more and better weapons mean a more secure world peace? China tries desperately to catch up with the other powers by acquiring nuclear capability. The United States places missiles in Europe to respond to the nuclear arsenal in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union counters with an increase in nuclear warheads all over the world. (Did the world of today replace Big Brother's slogan "War is Peace" with "Nuclear Arms is Peace"?) Changing alliances have always been the diplomatic game that nations play around the world, often to facilitate conquest, sometimes to strengthen their defenses. Today, the nations of the world continue that game: friendship with China serves to counter the egomaniac dreams of a former ally.

In the real 1984, world powers do not rule the world, their carefully designed world order is marred by the erratic behavior of a number of young nations that pride themselves on being called "non-aligned." Some of them have been able to interfere in the global plans of the world powers or to endanger the economic health of the

industrialized nations. Some of these countries are so unstable that they threaten not only the peace in their region but also the tenuous harmony between the great powers. Their instability could be a greater threat to world peace than the cold war that pitches the great powers against each other.

When the United Nations convened for the first time in 1945, it was the hope of its founders that the organization would build a new order of peace and end all warfare in the world. The signers of the Charter stated that they were "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." After 40 years, the record of the U.N. can be called outstanding in many areas but dismal in the prevention of war. The great world powers, it is true, have not made use of their nuclear arms against each other, but their nuclear arsenals have grown immensely and other countries have joined the "elite" group of nuclear powers.

Furthermore, in these four decades, conventional wars have brought death to millions of people, destruction, and misery to large areas of the world. Two years after the signing of the Charter, China was engulfed in a civil war, Hindus and Moslems fought each other in India and Pakistan, and Arabs and Jews began their chronic battles in Israel. Since then, a few years have passed without armed confrontations. The United Nations has not been able to free humanity from the horrors of war.

The United Nations is not a world government, it is a forum in which nations can air their grievances, seek redress of the wrongs they have suffered, and hope that the major powers will not veto the organization's decision to separate fighting factions. The effective power of our local and national governments lies in the fact that they have the means to enforce the laws through their police. The United Nations does not have such means.

To become a worldwide government, the Security Council of the United Nations must be transformed in an executive body that can call on the armed forces of its member states to impose its will, deter the nations from violence, and return the national borders as they were before the conflict. It must also have the means to regulate economic relations between nations so that poverty does disappear and a more equitable partition of the world's wealth can be achieved. Unfortunately, this is not a realistic expectation for the foreseeable

future. Few countries, if any, are willing to abdicate part of their sovereignty to a world government that has the means to impose its decisions on them. Few, if any, of the rich nations, are willing to share their wealth or their technology with underdeveloped countries.

World order and peace cannot be established if the nations of the world are not willing to solve their conflicts without the use of violence; if the world powers are not willing to abandon their expansionist aims to reduce simultaneously their nuclear arsenal, and reverse the buildup of conventional weapons; if the industrial nations are not willing to transfer some of their technological know-how to underdeveloped countries, if the people and their leaders are not willing to moderate their religious, ethnic, cultural and national fervor for the well-being of the others and the peaceful coexistence of all the peoples of the world.

Perhaps, one day, in the 21st century, the people of the world will agree that the time has come to establish a new world order. In the meantime, nations and people can only continue the dialogue that is going on in different parts of the world and in the United Nations and that keeps the hope for peace and justice alive. And citizens can continue to heed the warnings of "1984."

Conclusion

The present article has mainly focused on revealing the relevance of the incidents and events narrated by Orwell in *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* to real political situations and scenarios took place and still happening throughout the lifetime of people from different walks of life. *Animal Farm* foresaw somewhat different scenarios for political promises. Writing about the failures of the Russian Revolution Orwell imaged a farm that overthrew its human master and replaced him with a collective leadership of pigs. These clever pigs promised to reorganize society along egalitarian (populist) lines with the animal workers being rewarded for their labor on a just and fair farm. Mirroring Russia, where Stalin replaced Trotsky and Lenin's vision with the Gulag camps and a system of brutal repression and corruption, the ruling pigs of *Animal Farm* gradually became human-like and their promises of change forgotten.

The leaders of *Animal Farm* maintained thought control by obscuring the facts with smokescreens. In this way, the allegory of the Trump administration is dead on. Executives from Wall Street, once attacked and criticized by Trump as “getting away with murder,” are now in charge. The “currency manipulator” to be punished on Trump’s first day in office, China, is now a strategically helping to fend off North Korea. In Orwell’s 1984 Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia do not really exist and Big Brother did not succeed in damaging individual thought. However, in a large part of our world, the Big Brother did succeed, by running the news and monitoring the written and spoken words, in severely worsening man's ability to think freely. Even in the free world, many maintain, inroads have been made: commercial interests try to doctor the news and sometimes succeed, elected officials are tempted to misrepresent the truth, Government agencies attempt to and sometimes do invade the privacy of the individuals, and military leaders feel compelled to hide some of their activities. Orwell’s “Animal Farm” and “Nineteen Ninety Four” have relevance to real scenarios and events repeated in the real life of different people in the world besides the timeless validity and the universal appeal for readers of different generations and different cultures.

REFERENCES

1. CRICK, Bernard. (1980). *George Orwell: A Life*. Boston: Little, Brown.
2. CUSHMAN, Thomas, and Rodden, John. (2004). *George Orwell: Into the Twenty-First Century*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
3. DAVIDSON, Peter Hobley. (1996). *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
4. HAMMOND, J.R. (1982). *A George Orwell Companion*. London: Macmillan.
5. HITCHENS, Christopher. (2003). *Why Orwell Matters*. New York: Basic Books.
6. HOWE, Irving. (1983). *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century*. New York: Harper Row.

7. O'Neill, Terry, ed. (1998). *Readings on Animal Farm*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.
8. ORWELL, George. (1949). *1984*. New York: Signet Classic.
9. _____. (1996). *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*. Orlando: Signet Classics, [First pub. 1945].
10. RODDEN, J. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
11. SAVAGE, R.L., Combs, J. & Nimmo, D. (eds.) (1989). *The Orwellian Moment: Hindsight and Foresight in the Post-1984 World*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.
12. STEINHOFF, William R. (1975). *George Orwell and the Origins of 1984*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Webliography

1. BOSSCHE, E. V. D. (2018) *The Message For Today in Orwell's '1984'*. www.nytimes.com. Accessed: [02/03/18 08:15pm].
2. RUSSO, J. (2017). *Animal Farm' Perfectly Describes Life in the Era of Donald Trump*. [www.http://observer.com](http://www.observer.com). Accessed: [10/06/18 9:30am].
3. www.sparknotes.com. (2007). *George Orwell 1984*. USA: New York, NY 10011.
4. www.sparknotes.com. (2019). *1984 Future Study By George Orwell*. USA: New York, NY 10011.
5. www.au.edusson.com/bundles/asterfreelance.pdf.(2018). Compare George Orwell's 1984 to Society Today. Accessed: [09/05/18 10:40pm].