

“1984”: THE FICTIONAL REPRESENTATION OF A TOTALITARIAN STATE

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n1-074>

Submission date: 12/07/2024

Publication date: 01/07/2025

Saulo Barreto Lima Fernandes¹ and Douglas Rodrigues de Sousa²

ABSTRACT

This article aims to demonstrate how British writer George Orwell, through his main work “1984”, conceived and positioned himself against any types of political and social anomalies that could put human freedom at risk in the 20th century. Orwellian literature encompasses the most diverse genres in the field of prose: essays, reviews, chronicles, letters, diaries, and fiction. In practically all of them, a strong social critique of his time is evident. As in “1894”, in most of these works the author ends up addressing the subject that seems to be the core of the entire problem presented, the fight against totalitarianism and how governments like these subject their people to serious violations of fundamental human rights.

Keywords: George Orwell. “1984”. Totalitarianism. Literature.

¹ Graduated in Social Sciences (UEMA), Master in Literature (Scholarship/UEMA).

Master in Literature from the State University of Maranhão (UEMA)

E-mail: sauloblif@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3747-1138>

² Doctor in Literature and Social Practices from the University of Brasília (UnB)

Graduated in Portuguese Literature from the Federal University of Piauí (UFPI) and Specialist in Teaching Portuguese Language and Brazilian and African Literature in Portuguese from the Regional University of Cariri (URCA). Master in Literature – Literary Studies from the Federal University of Piauí and PhD in Literature and Social Practices from the University of Brasília (UnB). In 2017-2019 he completed a postdoctoral internship at the State University of Piauí (UESPI). He is a professor in the Department of Letters at CESP/UEMA and in the Master's in Letters at UEMA. He has organized books, as well as chapters in national books and articles in electronic journals. He coordinates research, extension, and guidance projects at the scientific initiation and stricto sensu levels. He was a scholarship holder for Regional Scientific Development C, CNPq.

E-mail: doug.rsousa@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3109-8074>

INTRODUCTION

In G. Orwell's scattered writings, even though they deal with other topics such as literature (his field of intellectual activity), the term "totalitarianism" has often been present throughout many of his intellectual productions. In the following essay entitled "Why I Write", the British writer, as a man of his time, reveals his greatest purpose for literature: "[...] Every line of the serious work I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for socialist democracy, as I understand it [...]" (Orwell, 2021b, p. 22). Thus, Orwell does not shy away from ratifying his greatest fear. In his article "The Prevention of Literature", he reaffirms:

[...] The history of totalitarian societies, or of groups that have adopted the totalitarian perspective, suggests that the loss of freedom is, nevertheless, the enemy of all forms of literature. German literature almost disappeared during Hitler's regime, and the situation in Italy was not much better. Russian literature, as far as can be judged from the translations, has deteriorated markedly since the early days of the Revolution, and verse seems better than prose [...] (Orwell, 2021b, p. 41-42).

Thus Orwell realized that this nefarious form of government is not restricted to a certain location, much less correlated only to a historical time. Orwell's concern is that this manifestation will go from being "local" to becoming "global", in a world where we no longer speak exclusively of "globalization", but now also of "globalism". More and more nations are seeking to group themselves into blocs, and the tendency for the population to be governed under the guidelines imposed by a single command becomes more concrete. Also in the article "Literature and Totalitarianism", his fear that this form of government will take over the entire world is clear. Throughout his writing, he makes a point of correlating the literature through which many express themselves and find truth in the face of the pressing threat that looms. According to him, if totalitarianism reaches the "global scale" mark, it would certainly strike books, human thought, and, consequently, individuals in their acquired fundamental rights, with death, making a point of leaving his warning:

As I say, we take this notion for granted, and, however, as soon as we put it into words, we realize how literature is threatened. This is the era of the totalitarian State, which does not and probably cannot allow the individual any freedom, whatever it may be. When totalitarianism is mentioned, one immediately thinks of Germany, Russia, and Italy, but I believe that we must face the risk that this phenomenon will become global. [...] If totalitarianism becomes global and permanent, what we have known as literature must come to an end. And it will not do – as it may seem plausible at first – to say that what will come to an end is only the literature of post-Renaissance Europe. I believe that literature of all kinds, from

epic poems to critical essays, is threatened by the modern state's attempt to control the emotional life of the individual (Orwell, 2021d, p. 24-25).

In fact, “censorship” and “ideological policing” have given rise to a certain amount of space for the adoption of a kind of successive “historical revisionism”. With the advancement of social networks, books and authors are being summarily “canceled” not only by people but also by algorithms driven by the development of current Artificial Intelligence (AI). In this way, we can understand how Orwell understood that literature is one of the best ways to fight against ideas like these, which is why all of his work converges in this sense, whether in the field of fiction, diary, journalism, or essays. Thus, literature in the Orwellian sense is and should be used as an “antidote” to combat the destructive “virus” of totalitarianism. “Whoever feels the value of literature, whoever sees the central role it plays in the development of human history, must also see the life-and-death necessity of resisting totalitarianism, whether it is imposed on us from without or from within,” he concluded (Orwell, 2021d, p. 27). One of the best-known ways of combating this threat by Orwell, which elevated him to the status of a classic, is the dystopian novel “1984,” which was first published in 1949. It is certainly his best-known work, which reveals, in a far from promising future, the evils that a totalitarian government can impose on its citizens.

“1984”: LITERATURE AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

Without a doubt, his most impactful and best-known work, which has sparked the greatest amount of debate, whether in political or academic circles, is “1984.” This was the narrative chosen by Orwell to denounce the evils resulting from a totalitarian system. As expected, it was not very well received by some countries and suffered from censorship. Its “omnipresence” reaches the point that, many times, certain political commentators quote excerpts or elements of this novel without necessarily knowing its author or in which work the reference is inserted. The repercussion of the book has already yielded various editions, especially in this decade, since the work entered the public domain in 2021. This is because there was no mention of the translations into various languages and the adaptations for other types of arts such as comics, animation, cinema, theater, and music. All this success, certainly, is largely due to the central theme addressed, not to mention the stylistic talent peculiar to the writing style of the author in question. The American literary critic Irving Howe (2019, p. 400) said about it: “No other book has managed to expose so

completely the essential characteristic of totalitarianism. The scope of 1984 [...] simply evokes the ‘tone’ of life in a totalitarian society [...]”. The book itself is divided into three parts and subdivided into chapters with numerical variations between 6, 8, and 10. In general terms, the story suggests a not-too-distant future, in which the basis of the society portrayed is completely relegated to total domination. In other words, a dystopian scenario, where several social mechanisms of domination are present to maintain a totalitarian state. The scenario is one of inconsolable hopelessness. Its characters resemble “zombies”, “the living dead”, and “slaves” with a minimum of individual freedom and thought rights. In a broader view, the world is divided and polarized into three large political blocs which he calls “superstates”. They are: Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia. This cluster of countries is in constant geopolitical tension due to their ongoing conflicts, very similar to what was experienced in the recent Cold War, where the post-WWII world was left in fear due to the imminent nuclear war between the USA and the USSR. The atmosphere strategically implanted by the Socing Party, especially through the “telescreens” in the characters, is that they can enter into a “hot war” at any moment, after all, as the Party’s motto states – “war is peace”: “[...] when Oceania was at war with one of these powers [Eurasia or Eastasia], she was generally at peace with the other” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 157). The highest state entity that dealt with this issue was the body with the curious name of the Ministry “of Peace”. Here it is worth mentioning the Orwellian irony in suggesting fictitious ministries when, in reality, their implicit intention is precisely to promote the opposite of what that entity supposedly “defends”. In addition to this, there were three other similar ministries – the Ministry “of Love”, the Ministry “of Truth” and also the Ministry “of Plenty” – each one committed to covering up the reality they supposedly defend.

The division of the world into three great superstates was an event that could have been foreseen, and indeed was, before the middle of the 20th century. With the absorption of Europe by Russia and of the British Empire by the United States, two of the three existing powers, Eurasia and Oceania, came into existence. The third, Eastasia, did not emerge as a distinct unit until another decade of confused fighting. In some places the boundaries between the three superstates are arbitrary, and in others, they fluctuate with the winds of war, but in general, they follow geographical demarcations. Eurasia comprises the whole of the northern European and Asian landmasses, from Portugal to the Bering Strait. Oceania comprises the Americas, and the Atlantic islands, including the British Isles, Australasia, and the southern portion of Africa. Eastasia, smaller than the others and with a less defined western border, comprises China and the countries to the south, the islands of Japan, and a large and variable part of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet (Orwell, 2021a, p. 333).

This phenomenon – especially for scholars – is not far from reality, reaching more advanced stages in the coming decades. Heads of nations are in constant contact, forging international agreements and seeking allies to form blocs. This global composition is increasingly moving away from fiction with chances of becoming real. The UN – United Nations institution created after World War II seems to be the greatest exponent of this phenomenon. For sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1999, p. 7): “[...] For everyone, however, ‘globalization’ is the irremediable destiny of the world, an irreversible process; it is also a process that affects us all to the same extent and in the same way. We are all being ‘globalized’ – and this means the same thing for everyone”. Organized with armies under a single government, super-relativizing a possible world war in unimaginable proportions given the accumulation of nuclear warheads by many of these gatherings. And nations, so to speak.

The superstate chosen to serve as the setting for the story is Oceania, where political power is concentrated in the hands of a single party, the Socialist Party (English Socialism), which in turn has its highest representative concentrated in the hands of “Big Brother”. Throughout the story, we see how the party’s propaganda is used to incite personalism through an exacerbated cult of its image associated with a kind of constant surveillance to the point that there are posters spread throughout the city with sayings such as: “Big Brother is watching you” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 145). Due to the similarity in temperament and even physical appearance, many even associate his figure with that of Hitler or Stalin. One similarity that unites the trio is that they all concentrated control over the parties. The first was with the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, and the second was with the Communist Party of the recently established Soviet Union. Single parties or parties tending toward hegemony are not anomalies exclusive to the last century. Currently, the most emblematic examples are the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the Workers’ Party of Korea (WPK) in North Korea. This single-party format in a democratic society with a plurality of ideas is reckless. Brazil, at least in this aspect, is far from this risk, since according to international data it is considered one of the countries with the largest number of party groups. However, this phenomenon does not always indicate something positive; quite the opposite, there are currently political movements to discourage the creation of more parties. The United States, on the other hand, has reduced its number of parties to two: Democrats (progressive) and Republicans (conservative). With two, few, or more parties, the greatest danger lies in the figure of single parties. Regarding this specific

issue, Jorge Miranda (2019, p. 165) in his article “Political parties in a democratic regime” must highlight: “[...] anti-liberal regimes push away political pluralism and totalitarian parties, when they reach government, destroy all others. The idea of a single party appears with the Soviet Communist Party, a work of Lenin since 1917, and is transplanted, with other inspirations, to fascist Italy in the 1920s and National Socialist Germany in the 1930s”.

One of the evils resulting from a phenomenon like this is intrinsically linked to totalitarianism. This becomes quite evident when O’Brien, a high-ranking member of the Party, is chosen to infiltrate the party as a friend of the protagonist to investigate his supposed “subversive activities”. In the story under analysis, it is up to O’Brien to reveal, without mincing words, the real objectives of the Party he serves, and to which all others are subject.

[...] the Party wants power exclusively for its good. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested only in power. Not in wealth, in luxury, in a long life, or happiness: only in power, in pure power. Now you will understand what pure power means. We are different from all the oligarchies of the past because we know what we are doing. All the others, even those who resembled us, were cowards and hypocrites. The German Nazis and the Russian Communists came very close to us in their methods, but they never dared to recognize their motives. They pretended, perhaps even believed, that they had assumed power unwillingly and for a limited time and that all they had to do was turn the corner to reach a paradise where human beings could be free and equal. We are not like that. We know that no one ever takes power intending to relinquish it. Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship to safeguard a revolution; one makes a revolution to establish a dictatorship. The aim of persecution is persecution. The purpose of torture is torture. The purpose of power is power. Now do you begin to understand me? (Orwell, 2021a, p. 415-416, our emphasis).

O’Brien’s use of the expression “pure power” is excruciating. The essence of the Party is consistent with the main dictates of a totalitarian state. The explicit intention of the party in its words reveals the sole objectives of the political elite – the enrichment of the state and the maintenance of this status quo at any cost. The figure of the single party is just one of the strategies for consolidating this power. To gain support and keep its subjects entertained, there is a need to create an environment of fear, which in turn is personified in an enemy figure that can put the sovereignty of its country at risk.

Who has his opponent, the antithesis of his concentrated hatred, the figure of Emmanuel Goldstein, to whom the so-called “Two Minutes of Hate” was dedicated, a kind of obligatory exercise of intolerance towards the posed by the population in the face of the greatest enemy of the sovereign leader, and consequently enemies of his subjects. Giving

their own lives to go to war to defend the nation and the great leader. “[...] Goldstein was the renegade and apostate who long ago (no one remembered exactly when) had been one of the leading figures in the Party, almost on the same level as Big Brother himself, but who later became involved in counter-revolutionary activities, was sentenced to death, managed to escape mysteriously and disappeared [...]” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 155). All the hatred was concentrated on him, as a way of diverting attention from what was happening, in addition to justifying the constant warlike character through the danger of the constant external threat.

The Hatred reached its climax. Goldstein's voice had become a true sheep's bleat and suddenly his face transformed into that of a sheep. Soon after, the sheep's snout took on the figure of a Eurasian soldier who seemed to be advancing, huge and terrible, the submachine gun roaring and seeming to come out of the screen, making some of the people in the front row shrink in their chairs. But at the same instant, provoking a deep sigh of relief from everyone, the hostile figure merged with the face of Big Brother, black-haired, black-mustachioed, full of power and mysterious calm, so vast that it almost filled the screen. No one heard what Big Brother was saying. They were just a few words of encouragement, like words spoken in the clamor of battle, individually indistinct but restoring confidence by the fact that they were said. Then Big Brother's face faded away again, giving way to the three slogans of the Party, highlighted in capital letters: WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH (Orwell, 2021a, p. 159).

The idea of an external enemy has always been and still is an efficient way of drawing the attention of the unwary to something that is not convenient. As an example, it is not uncommon to see Middle Eastern tyrants shouting and inciting hatred towards the United States, blaming it for all the evils they have suffered. This direction is not restricted to nations. They can be loaded with an ethnic, racial, religious, ideological character, etc. Researcher Pedro Estevam A. P. Serrano (2020, p. 208-209) in his article “Liquid authoritarianism and new forms of exceptional practice in the 21st Century” highlights: “In the Nazi dictatorship, the suspension of rights based on the declaration of a state of exception was used to combat the Jewish and communist enemies; in the fascist dictatorship, to combat the ‘bourgeois’ and socialist and communist enemies; in the Franco dictatorship, to combat the communist and atheist enemies; in the military dictatorships of Latin America, including the Brazilian case, amid the Cold War, to persecute the communist enemy”.

The idea of the gradual and “internal” mental “annihilation” of man, making him easily manipulated and submissive, permeates the atmosphere of the entire narrative. This state of torpor and prostration is not only perceived in the protagonist Winston Smith but also all those around him. Everyone lives under constant, day-to-day surveillance not only

by telescreens but also by agents of repression such as the Thought Police, including infiltrators. It used all its mechanisms of domination efficiently. Although some elements of maintenance of totalitarianism were already present. These three elements, namely: the adoption of the so-called “Newspeak”, induction of “doublethink” and the “rewriting” of history summarized how this totalitarian state in question operated. Orwell, in turn, tries to classify them as “sacred principles” of the Party to make it a perpetual institution, like the megalomaniac Hitler who once dreamed of a government lasting a millennium for his Reich.

On the street, the wind swayed the torn poster from side to side, making the word socing appear and disappear intermittently. Socing. The sacred principles of Socing. Newspeak, doublethink, the mutability of the past. Winston felt as if he were wandering through the forests of the deep sea, lost in a monstrous world in which he was the monster. Alone. The past was dead, the future was unimaginable. How could he be sure that a single living human being would now be on his side? And how could he know that the Party's rule would not last forever? In response, the three slogans on the white facade of the Ministry of Truth came back to him: WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH (Orwell, 2021a, p. 170, emphasis added).

The first issue, “Newspeak” demonstrates how important it is to create a “world image” through the new words created by the Party itself, advocated by the party's ideology, and which should be followed without distinction by its fellow citizens. There was even a specific dictionary with several updates. izations and reissues for this purpose. “Worldviews are not dissociated from language, because ideology seen as something immanent to reality is inseparable from language. Ideas and, consequently, discourses are an expression of real life. Reality expresses itself through discourses” (Fiorin, 1998, p. 33). An important element for the construction of narratives and discourses shaped by the maintenance of power. This issue of language, whether or not associated with the issue of totalitarianism, was a recurring personal concern of Orwell. In his essay “Politics and the English Language” he highlights his concern for language and language: “[...] Our civilization is in decline, and our language – so the argument goes – must inevitably share in the general collapse. [...] Now, it is clear that the decline of language must ultimately have political and economic causes: it is not due simply to the bad influence of this or that individual writer” (Orwell, 2021c, p. 146). It is worth noting that the deterioration of language, contrary to what it may seem, is mainly caused by politics and not by the “misuse” of one or another person who misuses it, whether in spoken or written form.

Idealist philosophers have always stated that language creates an image of the world. What do these philosophers mean by this statement? Language contains a vision of the world, which determines our way of perceiving and conceiving reality, and imposes this vision on us. Language is like a mold that orders the chaos, which is reality itself. As language shapes this chaos, determining what a thing, an event, etc. is, it creates an ordered image of the world. Each language orders the world in its way. Thus, for example, the Portuguese categorize green and blue as two distinct colors, while the Japanese consider them to be shades of a single color, designating them as Aoi. This does not mean that the Japanese do not perceive the real difference between green and blue, but that such differences are placed in the category of hues of the same color. The examples could be multiplied (Fiorin, 1998, p. 52, emphasis added).

Other very important additions to this issue specifically are the considerations of the contemporary intellectual Umberto Eco (2019). Next, the Italian thinker – whom we will make better use of later – referring specifically to the work analyzed, lists other harmful intentions that a practice like this can entail, namely: impoverishing the language as this would result in the “atrophy” of human cognitive capacity, in addition to warning about the subtle way in which such modifications are inserted.

Ur-Fascism speaks “newspeak”. “Newspeak” was invented by Orwell in 1984 as the official language of Ingsoc, English Socialism, but certain elements of Ur-Fascism are common to various forms of dictatorship. All Nazi or fascist school texts were based on a poor lexicon and elementary syntax, to limit the tools for complex and critical reasoning. We must, however, be ready to identify other forms of Newspeak, even when they take the innocent form of a popular talk show (Eco, 2019, p. 58-59).

Thus, it is clear how the above analysis is consistent with the proposal of the work analyzed here because, according to Orwell in “Principles of Newspeak”, it: “was designed not to enlarge but to restrict the range of thought, and this purpose was indirectly helped by reducing the choice of words to a minimum” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 453, original emphasis). These principles are set out at the end of the work as an appendix. A little earlier he had already added: “The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a means of expressing the world view and mental habits appropriate to the adherents of Socing, but to make all other modes of thought impossible” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 452).

This brings us to the second aspect, which is closely linked to the first, which concerns the so-called “doublethink”. This stratagem is based on provoking, through the corruption of language, a kind of mental incoherence in taking conflicting ideas that clash with each other as coherent, which today is referred to in academic circles as Cognitive Dissonance. This, in turn, has its concept developed by the psychologist Leon Festinger

(1975, p. 21, original emphasis), who in his book “Theory of Cognitive Dissonance” (1957) highlighted:

The definition of dissonance will ignore the existence of all other cognitive elements that are relevant to one or the other or to both of those considered and will deal simply with these two. These two elements are in a dissonant relationship if, considered in isolation, the inverse of one element follows from the other. Said a little more formally, if x and y are dissonant if non-x follows from y. Thus, for example, if a person knew that there were only friends in his neighborhood and also felt fear, there would be a dissonant relationship between these two cognitive elements. Or, to give another example, if a person was already in debt and also bought a new car, the corresponding cognitive elements would be dissonant with each other. The dissonance would exist because of what the person had learned or the expectations he or she now has, because of what is considered usual or appropriate, or for many other reasons.

This is evident in the party's motto when it proposes to transform “antonymous” words into “synonyms”. “His [Winston's] mind wandered into the labyrinthine world of doublethink. To know and not to know, to be conscious of total truthfulness while telling carefully crafted lies, to have two opinions that cancel each other out at the same time, knowing them to be contradictory and believing them both, to use logic against logic, to repudiate and preach morality simultaneously [...]” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 179). “Doublethink” has its foundations written in a pamphlet-like book called “Theory and Practice of Oligarchic Collectivism,” supposedly attributed to Emmanuel Goldstein. Much of this document is transcribed in “1984.” A work that, despite being strictly prohibited, somehow Smith kept in touch with, not only by reading it but also by taking notes and reflecting on it. It was just another piece of propaganda created by the Ministry of Truth, like a kind of “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” (1903), to criminalize in the eyes of the public an ideology that was incompatible with the current power. Obedience to the prohibition of reading such a book, like a kind of mental control, also appeared as a test of passivity and alienation capable of measuring the degree of domination that is found in the population’s domestication, in this case, at a very high level.

Doublethink means the power to maintain two contradictory truths at the same time and to accept both of them. The Party intellectual knows in which direction his memories must be altered, and therefore knows that he is playing tricks with reality, but by exercising doublethink he also convinces himself that reality has not been violated. The process must be conscious, or it would not be carried out with the necessary precision, but it must also be unconscious, so as not to arouse a feeling of falseness and therefore of doubt. Doublethink lies at the very heart of Socing, for the essential action of the Party is to use conscious illusion and at the same time maintain the firmness of purpose implied in complete honesty. To lie intentionally and to believe firmly in these lies, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient and then, when it becomes necessary once more, to extract it from oblivion for the

necessary time, to deny the existence of objective reality and at the same time to take into account the reality being denied – all this is indispensably necessary. Even to use the word doublethink one must exercise doublethink, for to use the word one must admit that one is adulterating reality; but a new act of doublethink erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the lie always one step ahead of the truth. Ultimately, it is through doublethink that the Party has been able – and, as far as we know, can continue to do so for thousands of years – to stop the course of history (Orwell, 2021a, p. 363-364).

Failing to heed the objections that the Party advocated was typified as a “thoughtcrime”, punishable by arrest and in some extreme cases by “vaporization”, which in a direct sense, would result in not only the physical elimination of the person but also of all their records as if they had never even existed. To avoid committing this serious crime and to have their life preserved, Winston Smith:

He began to practice stopping crime. He presented himself with some propositions. “The Party says the Earth is flat,” “The Party says ice is heavier than water,” and he trained himself not to see or understand the arguments that contradicted them. It was not easy. It required great reasoning and improvisational skills. The arithmetic problems raised, for example, by a statement like ‘two plus two equals five’ were beyond his intellectual comprehension. It also required a kind of mental gymnastics, the ability to make the most delicate use of logic one moment and, the next, be unaware of the grossest logical errors. Stupidity was as necessary as intelligence, and equally difficult to achieve (Orwell, 2021a, p. 431).

Finally, we come to the third and final issue, no less serious, which is the adulteration of history and control of the past as a form of alienation and elimination of any memories that might shed light on or confront what is happening in the present. “[...] All history was a palimpsest, wiped clean and rewritten exactly as often as necessary. Once rewritten, it was impossible to prevent the occurrence of any falsification [...]” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 185). All history and the past were systematically adulterated to support the “new order” that was installed. Anything and everything that threatened the current status quo was summarily “denied”. It affected not only one aspect or another but also the entire urban organization and architecture itself in this case: “History could no more be learned from architecture than from books. Statues, inscriptions, memorial stones, street names – anything that might shed some light on the past had been systematically altered” (Orwell, 2021a, p. 242). Everything went through the censorship sector, with the so-called Ministry of Truth being responsible for deciding what was or was not thrown into the “memory hole”. Nothing more than an officialized system that would be capable of perpetrating what is the same as the synonym for denialism, in other words, historical revisionism:

The alteration of the past is necessary for two reasons, one of which is subsidiary and, so to speak, preventive. The subsidiary reason is that the Party member, like the proletarian, tolerates the conditions of the present day partly because he has no standards of comparison. He needs to be isolated from the past, just as he needs to be isolated from foreign countries because he needs to believe that he is better off than his ancestors and that the average level of material comfort is always increasing. But by far the most important reason for the readjustment of the past is the need to safeguard the infallibility of the Party. It is not enough that speeches, statistics, and documents of all kinds be constantly updated to show that the Party's predictions were correct in all cases. It is also necessary never to admit any change in its doctrine or its political alignment. To change one's mind, or even one's policy is an admission of weakness. If, for example, Eurasia or Eastasia (whichever one) is today's enemy, then the country must have always been at war with the enemy. And if the facts say otherwise, the facts need to be changed. In this way, history is continually being rewritten. This daily falsification of the past, carried out by the Ministry of Truth, is as necessary for the stability of the regime as the work of repression and espionage carried out by the Ministry of Love (Orwell, 2021a, p. 362).

Enzo Traverso (2021, p. 178) understands that this is an issue that goes far beyond being characterized as a merely historiographical problem. Above all, for the Italian researcher, "[...] 'revisionism' is also a political phenomenon deeply related to attitudes and statements that transcend academic boundaries and call into question the relationship of our societies with their past." Its origins in political practices lead to the deduction that those in power would be the most interested in rewriting history according to their ideological inclinations, creating a kind of elimination of any thoughts that diverge from their own. Under this argument, according to researchers Marcos Napolitano and Mary Anne Junqueira (2019, p. 2), recognizing the complexity that the term carries, they propose to subdivide them into two for a better understanding of the subject:

Revisionism is, on the other hand, a more complex concept. Two types of revisionism are identifiable: historiographical and ideological. The first of these recognizes the legitimate and necessary work of historiography. Ideological revisionism, on the other hand, brings together authors who are politically interested in manipulating data and distorting facts in the name of specific interests given a priori. As Deborah Lipstadt stated in the book *Denial*, historians have the right to interpret the facts, but they cannot consciously distort facts. The Jewish Holocaust is a fact, as are other facts related to Brazilian history: the Portuguese were in Africa to practice slave trafficking, indigenous populations were massacred throughout Brazilian history, and torture was used during the military dictatorship. Denying such facts is denying evidence, it is the same as saying that the Earth is not round.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In conclusion, having analyzed the three elements of "Newspeak", "doublethink" and the "mutability of the past" chosen to join forces so that the Soving Party can maintain its power, it summarizes well the purpose of the work "1984". These warnings, according to

those who set themselves up as “owners of the past” taking control of what should or should not happen and/or remain in the collective memory, have unfortunately found a scattered echo in some parts of the world. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to what historian Jacques Le Goff (1990, p. 427, emphasis added) rightly pointed out in his book “History and Memory”: “[...] In the same way, collective memory is at stake importantly in the struggle of social forces for power. Becoming masters of memory and forgetfulness is one of the great concerns of the classes, groups, and individuals who have dominated and dominated historical societies. The forgetfulness and silences of history reveal these mechanisms of manipulation of collective memory. [...]”.

REFERENCES

1. Bauman, Z. (1999). *Globalização: As consequências humanas* (M. Penchel, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editora.
2. Eco, U. (2019). *O fascismo eterno* (E. Aguiar, Trad., 3ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Record.
3. Festinger, L. (1975). *Teoria da dissonância cognitiva* (E. Almeida, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
4. Fiorin, J. L. (1998). *Linguagem e ideologia* (6ª ed.). São Paulo: Ática.
5. How, I. (2019). 1984: A história como pesadelo. In G. Orwell, 1984 (A. Hubner & H. Jahn, Trans.). São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
6. Le Goff, J. (1990). *História e memória* (B. Leitão, Trad.). Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.
7. Miranda, J. (2019). Os partidos políticos no regime democrático. *Revista Populus*, (7), 2019.2. Salvador: Tribunal Regional Eleitoral da Bahia.
8. Napolitano, M., & Junqueira, M. A. (2019). Como historiadores e professores devem lidar com negacionismos e revisionismos. In *Negacionismos e revisionismos: O conhecimento histórico sob ameaça*. Evento científico do Departamento de História da FFLCH/USP, 7 a 9 maio, 2019.
9. Orwell, G. (2021a). *A revolução dos bichos: 1984* (W. Glauber, C. Carina & S. Carvalho, Trans.). Porto Alegre: CDG.
10. Orwell, G. (2021b). *A literatura, os escritores e o Leviatã* (J. B. Cruz, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira. (Coleção Biblioteca Diamante).
11. Orwell, G. (2021c). *Dentro da baleia e outros ensaios* (K. Lima, Trad.). Jandira, SP: Principis.
12. Orwell, G. (2021d). *Fascismo e democracia* (A. P. Vieira, Trad.). São Paulo: Montecristo Editora.
13. Serrano, P. E. A. P. (2020). Autoritarismo líquido e as novas modalidades de prática de exceção no século XXI. *Themis: Revista da ESMEC / Escola Superior da Magistratura do Estado do Ceará*, 18(1).
14. Traverso, E. (2021). *As novas faces do fascismo: Populismo e a extrema direita* (M. Fernandes, R. Mello, & R. L. Seabra, Trans.). Belo Horizonte: Editora Âyiné.