

24. Annihilation of Sexuality and Sexual Desire in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*¹

Merve AFACAN²

APA: Afacan, M. (2025). Annihilation of Sexuality and Sexual Desire in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (47), 390-400. **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17036231>

Abstract

Since the publication of Thomas More's prolific work *Utopia* (1516), the desire for the betterment of the society and also the individual as well has become a literary concern that has frequently been employed in literary spheres. The unattainability of the utopian dream has proved itself as the prevailing tendency beginning with the nineteenth century; so, subsequently emerged pessimistic, in other words, anti-utopic/ dystopic prophesies have evolved out of optimistic ones. The awareness of human agency and the troubles that it may initiate require these oppressive political systems to take measures to abolish it beforehand. As is the case with George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), the governmental restrictions inevitably include the repression of sexual practices and the manipulation of gender roles. The aim of the state is to abolish not sexual intercourse but sexual pleasure so as to generate citizens who are isolated from each other through general distrust with the intent of securing the continuity of the state. This article aims to analyse and reveal that the oppressive enforcements channel individuals toward rebellious acts against authority in a restrictive dystopian environment by taking Orwell's cult work into consideration. Throughout the article, the suppressive and regulative effect of the oppressive system on the individuals's personality development is put forward by taking sexual identity into account as a character trait.

Keywords: Dystopia, George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Sexual Manipulation

¹ **Statement (Thesis / Paper):** It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation process of this study and all the studies utilised are indicated in the bibliography. This article is derived from the author's MA thesis titled "Suppression of Sexuality and Gender in Dystopias: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Anthony Burgess's *The Wanting Seed* and Iain Banks's *The Wasp Factory*" submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences at Hacettepe University in 2017.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest is declared.

Funding: No external funding was used to support this research.

Copyright & Licence: The authors own the copyright of their work published in the journal and their work is published under the CC BY-NC 4.0 licence.

Source: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation of this study and all the studies used are stated in the bibliography.

Similarity Report: Received – Turnitin / Rate: %1

Ethics Complaint: editor@rumelide.com

Article Type: Research article, **Article Registration Date:** 04.07.2025-**Acceptance Date:** 30.08.2025-

Publication Date: 31.08.2025; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17036231>

Peer Review: Two External Referees / Double Blind

² Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı / Dr., Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature (Ankara, Türkiye) **eposta:** mrvdkclr@gmail.com **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4960-6746> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/04kwvgz42> **ISNI:** 0000 0001 2342 7339 **Crossref Funder ID** 501100005378

Adres
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com
tel: +90 505 7958124

Address
RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies
e-mail: editor@rumelide.com,
phone: +90 505 7958124

George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* Adlı Eserinde Cinselliğin ve Cinsel Arzunun Yok Edilişi³

Öz

Thomas More'un üretken eseri *Ütopya*'nın (1516) yayımlanmasından bu yana, toplumun ve bireyin iyileştirilmesine yönelik arzu, edebî alanlarda sıklıkla ele alınan bir mesele haline gelmiştir. Ütopik hayalin ulaşılamazlığı, özellikle on dokuzuncu yüzyıldan itibaren baskın bir eğilim olarak kendini göstermiştir; bu nedenle, iyimser hayallerden zamanla kötümser, diğer bir deyişle anti-ütopik/distopik kehanetler türemiştir. İnsan biricikliğinin farkındalığı ve bu farkındalığın doğurabileceği sorunlar, bu baskıcı siyasi sistemlerin önceden önlem almasını gerektirmiştir. George Orwell'in *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört* (1949) adlı eserinde olduğu gibi, devletin koyduğu kısıtlamalar kaçınılmaz bir şekilde cinsel pratiklerin bastırılmasını ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin manipülasyonunu da içerir. Devletin amacı, cinsel ilişkiyi değil, cinsel hazı ortadan kaldırmaktır; böylece, devletin devamlılığını güvence altına alma niyetiyle, genel bir güvensizlik aracılığıyla birbirlerinden izole olmuş vatandaşlar yaratılacaktır. Bu makale, Orwell'in kült eseri dikkate alınarak, baskıcı uygulamaların bireyleri otoriteye karşı isyan etmeye yönlendirdiğini analiz etmeyi ve gözler önüne sermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Makale boyunca, baskıcı sistemin bireylerin kişilik gelişimi üzerindeki baskıcı ve düzenleyici etkisi cinsel kimliğin bir karakter özelliği olarak ele alınmasıyla ortaya koyulmaktadır.

Keywords: Distopya, George Orwell, *Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört*, Cinsel Manipülasyon

³ **Beyan (Tez/ Bildiri):** Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur. Bu makale, yazarın 2017 yılında Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'ne sunduğu "Distopyalarda Cinsellik ve Cinsiyetin Bastırılması: George Orwell'in Bin Dokuz Yüz Seksen Dört, Anthony Burgess'in *The Wanting Seed* ve Iain Banks'ın *The Wasp Factory*" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezinden alınmıştır.

Finansman: Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.

Telif Hakkı & Lisans: Yazarlar dergide yayımlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

Kaynak: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.

Benzerlik Raporu: Alındı – Turnitin / Oran: %1

Etik Şikayeti: editor@rumelide.com

Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi, **Makale Kayıt Tarihi:** 04.07.2025-**Kabul Tarihi:** 30.08.2025-**Yayın Tarihi:** 31.08.2025; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17036231>

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme

<p>Adres RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi e-posta: editor@rumelide.com tel: +90 505 7958124</p>	<p>Address RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies e-mail: editor@rumelide.com, phone: +90 505 7958124</p>
---	--

It has been acknowledged that literary discourse serves as “one of the most important means by which any culture can investigate new ways of defining itself and of exploring alternatives to the social and political status quo” (Booker, 1994, p. 3). This distinct focus has also served a satirical purpose and created a convenient platform to offer solutions for the political and social problems that displeased individuals. The vision of a seemingly perfect society where political and social systems meet members's needs, underpins the genre named for Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516). The name “utopia” stands for the no place where no one can live. The topic and goal of these optimistic studies define a society where the main principle provides a harmonious environment for every citizen. Though earlier examples existed in the classical period, More initiated a community-focused philosophy that literary circles would widely reference and debate. Following the publication of Thomas More's “humanist satire on the corrupt European social practices,” utopian fiction emerged as a popular literary genre in the sixteenth century, and many examples followed (Simon, 1981, p. 21).

When read from the opposite perspective, Utopian texts do not offer purely ideal societies. They proposed “that the understanding of human reality could be reduced to a set of universal categories arrived at by abstract reasoning” (Yoran, 2010, p. 4). In this way, More's *Utopia* stands as a satire; it offers nostalgia and criticism about the social and political environment of its time. Thus, a utopian society arises from a long political process that relies on impersonal, institutional apparatuses. In this light, the societies depicted in utopian fiction serve as commentaries on dominant ideologies and expose their dysfunctional practices. More did not assert “a quest for what would be ideally right in the world but a good working idea of what was actually wrong with it” (Hexter, 1952, p. 65). Thomas More “recogni[s]e[d] human sinfulness as the basis of all social evils, [and] believed that existing social institutions presented continuing worldly temptations which most men were incapable of resisting” (Kenyon, 1983, p. 355). This sinful human nature is continued to be presented in anti-utopian/dystopian fiction which has turned out to be a genre itself that flourished in the latter half of the twentieth century. In other words, the emergence of this dystopian tendency resulted from the utopian ideal's unattainability. Utopian ideal is realised to be an abstract concept, the one that is not achievable through the suggestions of More and other leading utopian scholars and authors. Belief that human agency drives social improvement or decline compels the state to regulate every aspect of life. This study examines George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) in respect to dystopian literature and the destructive effects of the manipulation of sexuality and sexual desire through the protagonist Winston and his “girlfriend” Julia in the fiction's restrictive atmosphere. Within the scope of this study, it is stated that under the rule of repressive totalitarian regimes, sexual relations are the primary motives that the protagonists realise their nature and individuality. This study highlights the repression of sexuality and the annihilation of sexual desire as the regime's pre-eminent controls. These measures block the protagonists' personality formation and trigger resistance to the order. The article also sets out the broader restrictive policies that shape private life in this dystopia. It demonstrates and illustrate how these measures create a catastrophic environment for both individuals and society.

As already stated, both utopian and dystopian fictions are political satires in terms of their subject matters owing to the fact that they criticise the existent social and political structures. As the governmental systems in these political satires cannot be evaluated independently of the dominant ideology of the time, these works put forward alternative ideological structures in order to raise awareness among the readers. The most prominent cause of pessimism in the Western world is the political changes of the twentieth century. Since World War II, widespread pessimism and its reflection in literature have raised doubts about whether the utopian ideal is truly applicable. The belief in the betterment of the society through political means is interpreted as “[t]he possibility exposed by World War II that the state might eventually master the tools of domination” (Rosenfeld, 2000, p. 174). The prevailing modernism in the twentieth century has proved itself not the path that would lead the society

to a utopian dream but instead to a dystopian nightmare, “in which [the members] awaken to fulfilment and find that fulfilment is the greatest disappointment” (Roth, 2012, p. 87). In response to modernisation, the turn to industrialisation and nationalism produced several catastrophic outcomes. Chief among them are

massive urban growth without vital urban services, the importation of advanced labor-saving technology leading to staggering problems of unemployment, massive rural to urban migration – all on background of advanced pollution and undeveloped services in urban areas and primitive subsistence agriculture in the rural areas. (Knowles, 1973, p. 203).

Furthermore, these foresights offer themes that reflect a response to the era's modernisation and industrialisation that springs from “various forms of social and political oppression; from humanity's domination by machines... or from environmental catastrophe” (Claeys, 2013, p. 169). In other words, the second half of the twentieth century saw a shift from socialism to oppressive regimes. This shift reshaped interpretations of the utopian ideal and defined the dystopian turn as “social planning that backfires and slides into nightmare, whatever its original intent may have been” (Walsh, 1962, p. 137).

These interpretations function as prophetic visions. They expose inverted social, political and economic conditions. They arise from critical analysis of utopias. Heightened pessimism about human nature yields “a tradition of cultural and social criticism that [has undertaken] a wide-ranging critique of the chief assumptions and postulates of modernity: science, reason, democracy, the idea of progress” (Kumar, 1987, p. 111). This tradition has come to be known as the dystopian literary genre. Dystopia, in brief terms, is the representation of the “objections to utopia not in generalized reflections about human nature but by taking us on a journey through hell, in all its vivid particulars” to bear on the central aim (Kumar, 1987, p. 102). This specific genre is predominantly concerned with “fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices that might otherwise be taken for granted or considered natural and inevitable” (Booker, 1994, pp. 3-4). This pessimistic and realist tradition stands as an emblem of resistance that renders utopia unattainable. In contrast to utopian texts, dystopian narratives examine oppressive societies and “warn the human race about the menacing effects of scientific inventions and discoveries” (Purkar, 2013, p. 4).

Dystopias examine human potential and set out the dangers that a postmodern reassessment of traditional values may produce. For this reason, dystopias serve as cautions against ideological excess and social control and

help us to imagine and envisage how the present can change into something very nasty. They tell us what's wrong with the now, and they imagine how things could (easily) become much worse. . . Dystopias thus interrogate the now and offer warnings and sometimes prophecies about the future; they are often the jeremiads of utopianism. But sometimes they offer glimmers of hope. (Sargisson, 2013, p. 40)

These twentieth century utopias have abandoned utopian hope, “and most of them have focused on excessive centrali[s]ation of power as the primary cause of the troubles of society” (Sargent, 1982, p. 565). So, the main object of dystopia is the fictional representation of how far the unpleasing present situation can get worse especially within the context of “the age-old issue of despotism, sometimes portrayed as the power of the community over the individual, sometimes as that of oligarchy over the whole” (Claeys, 2013, p. 172). Administration plays a crucial role in dystopian societies. The repressive policy of governments or power-holders, that policy's restrictive effects on individual lives and the immediate threat of punishment that dominates even thoughts create tension in dystopian stories. Along with the fear of punishment, the

[c]ontrol over common resources is often key to maintaining this power; in the degree to which this is the case, we again see the maintenance of communal resources for the common good rather than

that of the ruler in utopianism as symmetrically mirroring its opposite in dystopia. To some degree all despotic regimes erode or suppress individualism, but fear often functions chiefly as a means of controlling individuals rather than eliminating their personal identity. (Claeys, 2013, p. 162)

Elimination of personal identity forms a key aspect of dystopian control. Mass regulation in a dystopian regime rests on strict control of human agency. The state shapes reality even before birth. The leader claims all decisions about identity formation. The government keeps subjects “focused on their tasks, allowing no time or space to think, consider, reflect or ponder” (Ferris, n.d., p. 13). In such regimes one is accepted as long as s/he is acquiescent; on the grounds that “[t]otalitarian movements are possible wherever there are masses who for one reason or another have acquired the appetite for political organi[s]ation” (Arendt, 1973, p. 311). An individual feels obliged to integrate into communal life to survive regardless of their pleasure with the social norms they inherit. Authorities exploit the compulsory bond between citizens and the state. Dystopian discourse effaces individuality to secure the state's continuity. “A dystopia becomes successful when it finally removes the individuality from the individual; the humanity from the human” indicates Ferris (n.d., p. 25). Individuals appear to have no choice but to obey the state's repressive regulations. However, dystopian stories, through their protagonists, reveal the dissatisfaction of individuals who cannot adapt to repressive societal norms. These norms develop “either because of the tyranny of the ‘perfect’ system over the will of the individual, or because of the difficulty of stopping individuals or elites from imposing authority over the majority, or, indeed, over minorities” (James, 2003, p. 220). With the aim of establishing the political order and maintaining the persistence of the system, “secular and spiritual power [are] combined and used to stabilize and to extend the totalitarian rule and to enforce the supreme values contained in the ideology” (Bernholz, 2007, p. 266).

George Orwell (1903-1950) was a socially concerned and active writer whose political view developed in the nineteen thirties and forties. Orwell was and always remained to be a patriotic Englishman. For him, patriotism was the core of England's social and political life. “Orwell wanted patriotism to be a force for political and social change and he believed the present crisis afforded such an opportunity” (Rodden, 2007, p. 93) and expected that the deprivations and shortages that the war had caused would hopefully pave the way for a new beginning for his country. In other words, Orwell regarded this new, in other words, compulsory beginning as “a potential revolutionary phase, one when for the first time it was realistic to believe that the English people were ready to embrace socialism” (Rodden, 2007, p. 94). He has come to be recognised “as a kind of legendary symbol of resistance to political dishonesty, hypocrisy, and totalitarianism” (Beadle, 1975, p. 287). In terms of his political view which is democratic socialism, he “has become an icon, someone who could reconcile a concern for social justice with a concern for civil rights, and indeed who saw that there was no possibility of one without the other” (Williams, 2007, p. 110). As a socialist, he prophesies a dark future for humanity and warns the society through fiction in terms that “aligning oneself with ostensibly progressive policies like a centrali[s]ed economy and state-based liberal initiatives can be as potentially harmful as goose-stepping in line behind reactionary measures, if you do not think (and act) critically and dispassionately” (Horan, 2006, p. 106).

Orwell rejected two postwar outcomes: Marxism and totalitarianism. His “explicitly and militantly anti-capitalist” (Resch, 1997, p. 138) democratic socialism shaped the main theme in his works after 1936, the date called as “the betrayal of the Russian Revolution” (Gottlieb, 2001, p. 247). He revealed his concern that the same political disaster would happen in England through his outstanding political satires, *Animal Farm* (1946) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In these works,

dealing with the vision of the worst of all possible worlds, a world readers should recogni[s]e as a serious parody of the totalitarian dictatorship in Stalin's Russia – the kind of society, Orwell warns, that could come about in the west, in Britain in particular, should the satirist's Adversary fail to see the truth behind the ‘Soviet myth’. (Gottlieb, 2001, p. 243)

His first postwar literary work is *Animal Farm*. The novella critiques the Soviet Union under Stalin. "Orwell's customary tendency to see the skull beneath the skin, his experience of wartime Britain, the shortages, the rationing, the bureaucratic regulation" (Rodden, 2007, p. 107) resonated with the reader and motivated him to write another satirical novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in which he would make use of "contemporary references which time can erode or misconceive, and warnings depend on plausibility in the circumstances of the day" so as to make his story more effective (Crick, 2007, p. 148). Like *Animal Farm*, this dystopian satire presents a catastrophic future as avoidable. In Phillips's (2008) words, the novel in question "is the manipulation of a nostalgia in relation to wartime London" (p. 70).

Nineteen Eighty-Four traces the turmoil of Winston Smith under an authoritarian state in Oceania. He endures constant surveillance. He resides in the "chief city of Airstrip One, itself the third most populous of the provinces of Oceania" (Orwell, 2008, p. 5). He works in the Ministry of Truth as a records clerk. His duty erases facts and replaces them with party doctrine. His nature remains rebellious. His desire for a life without limits persists. Memory draws him toward the past as a source of meaning. Overwhelming repression forces concealment. He hides his "true self" from the Thought Police. His core offense is thoughtcrime. The offense arises from the purchase of a diary and the decision to write in Oldspeak rather than the state's official Newspeak. He foresees arrest and punishment for this offense. He seeks a bond with his personal history. He therefore dares to "open a diary . . . [that] was not illegal (nothing was illegal, since there were no longer any laws), but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forcedlabour camp" (Orwell, 2008, p. 8). Rumours circulate about a covert resistance known as the Brotherhood. The Party's leader, Big Brother, dominates every image of public life. Winston meets Julia, a coworker in the Ministry of Truth. She shows a defiant temperament. She also seeks private sexual relations as a form of revolt. Their relationship fuses erotic desire with a quest for freedom. O'Brien, a figure within the Inner Party, appears as a mentor. He invites Winston to join the Brotherhood and provides *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* by Emmanuel Goldstein. Winston reads the book to Julia. The Thought Police interrupt and arrest them. The Ministry of Love then subjects Winston to torture. The process severs his attachment to Julia. It also compels full acceptance of Party authority.

The Party's power not only regulates social order but also restricts and manipulates the private lives of its members. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Big Brother and the Party operate as totalitarian authorities. They interfere in personal life chiefly through sexual control. Resistance to authority reduces to "a look in the eyes, an infection of the voice; at the most, an occasional whispered word" (Orwell, 2008, p. 72). The regime abolishes all forms of pleasure, with sexual pleasure foremost. It constructs sexual intercourse, under prescribed conditions, as a duty to the state. The government removes pleasure from sex with the intent to create a selfless community. This discussion will highlight the repression and manipulation of sexuality among the enforcements. These acts stand as the main predominant restrictive aspects that greatly affect the protagonist and drive him to act against the order. The Party's repressive ideology, above all, seeks to suppress human nature and individuality. This represents a common totalitarian trait: dehumanisation acts as its foundation and additional regulations derive from selfless citizens that the political system's restrictive and repressive rules create. Rosenfeld interprets Orwell's (2008) work as

the outcome of a particular model of paranoid subjectivity as much as the outcome of a set of totalitarian possibilities. 1984 is both reduction of politics and its culmination: one man, one state, finally merging. In fact, the novel's horror resides in its naturalization of man's inhuman relation to himself. Then neither a mystification of the psychological into political terms, nor the mystification of the political into psychological terms, the novel is a rejection of any such dialectical opposition. (p. 178-179; emphasis in original)

Oceania's oppressive regime directly lays bare the prophesying dangers that the totalitarian systems

bring along. This is the case in Orwell's novel which "demonstrate[s] how the authorities exert their force through a series of political and psychological methods" (Baykal, 2013, p. 19).

Winston's rebellious nature comes to light when he decides to buy an old diary and shows courage by "mark[ing] the paper [which] was the decisive act" (Orwell, 2008, p. 9). His relationship with Julia develops upon this act and Tirohl suggests that Julia's seduction of Winston works as the main driving force behind his rebellion in three certain ways: First of all, it "provides an outlet for his sexual needs" which makes him realise his natural instincts as a human being, secondly, it "demonstrates a failure in the Party to control her sexuality" which makes him consider the possibility that he can also hide himself from the panoptic gaze of the Party, and thirdly, it "offers Winston loyalty and the message that he is not alone in his thoughts" which encourages him to unite with the others for the purpose of putting an end to the Party's rule (2000, p. 58). Initially a diary, and later an emotional commitment to Julia, Winston's personal escapism transforms into an active rebellious attempt against the state's order. His rebellion shifts from a personal focus to a communal one. It stages the conflict between the system's demands and human instinct. Sexual instinct stands as a primitive element of the human condition and "may be used both as a means for keeping the society in order and as a means of rebellion against this order" (Minarik, 2009, p. 39). The state therefore treats it as the primary site of control to mechanise subjects. Mechanisation and isolation of citizens appear vital to the state's future. Through his sexual relation with Julia, he moves from passive awareness of social wrongs to active commitment. He accepts sacrifice for the improvement of society. Gheran (2012) interprets Winston's revolt as the natural consequence "of repressed human nature and individuality challenging the dominating discourse articulated with the help of a topos that is put into contrast with monstrous [sic] geography" (p. 8). He aligns himself with truth. O'Brien and the Inner Party live a lie. He trusts in social memory and hopes to be remembered as a hero whose name will retain significance after death (Horan, 2006, p. 122). He treats his revolt as self-sacrifice and judges it a heroic deed. Yet, in the Party's view—and as O'Brien states—he is only "a flaw in the pattern, . . . a stain that must be wiped out" (Orwell, 2008, p. 267).

The reason why the Party intentionally employs the manipulation of sexuality as the major repressive regulative method is "that the libido is the part of us that can't be fully coloni[s]ed, and therefore always retains its revolutionary potential" (Horan, 2006, pp. 10-11). Because sexuality creates emotional bonds among those with shared interests, intercourse conflicts with the Party's aim to dehumanise and isolate individuals. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the regime does not abolish sexuality but regulates it. The purpose of sex is altered by the power holders. The strive for pleasure is removed from intercourse and the act is institutionalised as a duty to be fulfilled by the loyal members of the state. As it cannot be completely annihilated in Oceania as it is still the only way of procreation. The intention of the Party is revealed in the work as "not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose [is] to remove all pleasure from the sexual act" (Orwell, 2008, p. 68). After the divorce, Winston confesses that his sexual urge urged him to commit an illegal sexual act despite the orders. He consorted with a prostitute at the risk of "five years in a forced labour camp; no more, if [he] had committed no other offence" (Orwell, 2008, p. 68). This is his first rebellious attempt that is presented as the crime "[t]acitly the Party was even inclined to encourage . . . as long as it was furtive and joyless, and only involved the women of a submerged and despised class" (Orwell, 2008, p. 68). In accordance with the hierarchy, while it is an acceptable mistake for a higher class man to abuse a lower class woman, promiscuity between the Party members is unforgiveable.

Even though sexual intimacy and family bonds face destruction, people must officially marry for procreation. Citizens are led to believe that they owe the state a duty to have children with the intent to meet governmentally predetermined requirements that as Kasap states, "[i]n some historical periods and cultural contexts, the age of consent, societal norms, and practices regarding marriage and sexuality

may have been different" (2023, p. 107). In addition to the surveillance and the political regulation of the intimate self by the power dynamics that Kasap indicates in his article through a victimised female figure in a traditional folk song, the similar oppressive requirements include the arranged marriages in the novel that are

approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and — though the principle was never clearly stated — permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. This again was never put into plain words, but in an indirect way it was rubbed into every Party member from childhood onwards. . . The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it. (Orwell, 2008, pp. 68-69)

So, sexual intercourse in Orwell's work appears to be not a personal but a political act; "[i]n the fight against love and family the dystopian state uses not only vilifying, but a wide range of methods, brainwashing, spies, taboos or even extermination of the enemy" (Leth, 2013, p. 21). Sexuality now functions as a political instrument that controls private life and in broad sense the individual identity. Alongside the Party's policies on language and history, sexual regulation seeks the institutionalisation of sex as a device that blocks opposition to the regime. The system defines sexuality not as a unifying force but as a divisive one. The Party redirects sexual drive for its own means. "Misdirected sex is the energy on which propaganda and production depend" (Horan, 2006, p. 115); so, the Party organises "Two Minutes Hate" rituals to unite people against Goldstein and channels their frustration into hatred for Goldstein and other traitors. These rituals exemplify the Party's control over people's instincts in the way that "while traditional sexuality separates people in Oceania, the sexual orientation in accordance with the Party's regulations unites them as citizens of Oceania" (Dikiciler, 2017, p. 35).

Apparently, although "she uses simpler intellectual routes than Winston" in consequence of the Party's regulations, Julia is depicted as more intelligent than Winston (Tirohl, 2000, p. 57). Julia is aware of the dehumanisation process carried out by the Party and realises the intended purpose of "Two Minutes Hate". As put forward by Julia:

When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time. All this marching up and down and cheering and waving flags is simply sex gone sour. If you're happy inside yourself, why should you get excited about Big Brother and the Three-Year Plans and the Two Minutes Hate and all the rest of their bloody rot? (Orwell, 2008, p. 139)

She also knows how to hide from the Thought Police and conveys the impression that she would not risk herself for mere sexual pleasure. To avoid raising doubts about herself, she serves the state voluntarily; she states she spends "an astonishing amount of time in attending lectures and demonstrations, distributing literature for the Junior Anti-Sex League whose emblem is the narrow scarlet sash that Julia wears, preparing banners for Hate Week, making collections for the savings campaign, and such-like activities" (Orwell, 2008, p. 135). In the eyes of Winston, Julia is "only a rebel from the waist downwards" (163). While Julia seeks solely sexual pleasure, Winston takes the dominance of the totalitarian oppression much more seriously and aims to undermine the Party. Crick (n. d.) defines their relation as "not a love affair in a genuine sense, it is, however, exemplary of 'mutual trust' right up to the end when they are tortured" (p. 151). She passively objects to the Party politics and does not show any interest in an underground, anti-government organisation.

To conclude, Orwell depicts a regime that aims to abolish human agency and arrest personality formation. The state asserts control over sexuality, language, memory, and affect. Newspeak narrows thought and seals off dissent. The Ministry of Truth revises records and voids the past. Party doctrine and the Anti-Sex League sever desire from pleasure and from love. Constant surveillance, ritual hatred,

and public denunciation isolate citizens and deform trust. These pressures breed dissatisfaction, anxiety, and a will to revolt. Illicit bonds then arise as acts of choice and care. Winston and Julia give that impulse an example. Their union affirms pleasure, memory, and judgment as sources of self. O'Brien personifies the logic of domination: power seeks power for its own sake. Ultimately, it is tried to be proved within the specified work that the repressed human nature and the conflict between the individuals and the demands of the oppressive systems result in the individuals's rebellious acts in attempt to gain their individual freedom. Among these, the most prominent factor is stressed to be the sexual manipulation. Sexuality is proved to be the most influential element that motivates the protagonist to become concerned with the social and political issues. Winston's sexual awareness discloses his individuality. Within the novel, sexual repression emerges as the decisive force that impels him to attempt to end the Party's rule.

Works Cited

- Arendt, H. (1973). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Baykal, N. E. (2013). *Political and Psychological Aspects of Submission in George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey.
- Beadle, G. B. (1975). George Orwell and the Victorian Radical Tradition. *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 7(4), 287.
- Bernholz, P., & Schafer, M. (2007). Ideology, sects, state and totalitarianism. In H. Maier (Ed.), *Totalitarianism and Political Religions* (Vol. 1, pp. 246-271). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Booker, M. K. (1994). *Dystopian literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.
- Claeys, G. (2013). News from Somewhere: Enhanced Sociability and the Composite Definition of Utopia and Dystopia. *History*, 98(330), 145-173.
- Crick, B. (2007). *Nineteen Eighty-Four: Context and Controversy*. In J. Rodden (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell* (pp. 146-159). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dikiciler, M. (2017). *Suppression of Sexuality and Gender in Dystopias: George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four, Anthony Burgess's The Wanting Seed and Iain Banks's The Wasp Factory*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Ferris, H. (n.d.). *A Study in Dystopian Fiction*. Jacksonville University. Retrieved from [https://www.ju.edu/jrad/docs/ferris-dystopian_fiction_final.pdf]
- Gheran, N. (2012). Fracturing the Monstrous Geography of George Orwell's 1984, and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* - Eroticism, Dissidence and Individualism. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai*, 57(4).
- Gottlieb, E. (2007). George Orwell's Dystopias: *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In B. W. Shaffer (Ed.), *A Companion to the British and Irish novel: 1945-2000* (pp. 241-253). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hexter, J. H. (1952). *More's Utopia: The Biography of an Idea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Horan, T. (2006). *Sexual Revolutions: Desire as Redemption in the Twentieth-Century Dystopian Novel*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- James, E. (2003). Utopias and Anti-Utopias. In E. James & F. Mendlesohn (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction* (pp. 219-229). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasap, S. (2024). A Discourse Analysis of Women Sexuality in the Lyrics of an Anonymous Turkish Folk Song. *Kadın/Woman 2000*, 24(2), 101-118.
- Kenyon, T. (1983). The Problem of Freedom and Moral Behavior in Thomas More's *Utopia*. *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 21(3), 349-373.
- Knowles, J. H. (1973). Utopia or Dystopia in an Age of Confusion. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 16(2), 199-214.
- Kumar, K. (1987). *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leth, C. (2013). *What is the Meaning of Meaningless Sex in Dystopia?* [Unpublished master thesis]. University of Gävle, Gävle, Sweden.
- Minárik, M. (2009). *Development of British Dystopian Literature*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic.
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin.
- Phillips, L. (2008). Sex, Violence and Concrete: The Post-War Dystopian Vision of London in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *Critical Survey*, 20(1), 69-79.
- Purkar, N. (2013). Dystopian Writing as a Part of Science Fiction. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 4(5), 1-4.
- Resch, R. P. (1997). Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *Boundary 2*, 24(1), 137-176.

- Rodden, J. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenfeld, A. S. (2000). *Paranoia and the Dystopian Literary Imagination*. [Unpublished master thesis]. New York University, New York.
- Roth, M. S. (2012). *Memory, Trauma and History: Essays on Living with the Past*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sargent, L. T. (1982). Authority & Utopia: Utopianism in Political Thought. *Polity*, 14(4), 565-584.
- Sargisson, L. (2013). Dystopias Do Matter. In F. Vieira (Ed.), *Dystopia[n] Matters: On the Page, On Screen, On Stage* (pp. 10-14). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Simon, E. P. (1981). Thomas More's Utopia: Creating an Image of the Soul. *Moreana*, 18(69), 21-40.
- Tirohl, B. (2000). "We are the dead ... You are the dead": An Examination of Sexuality as a Weapon of Revolt in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(1), 55-61.
- Walsh, C. (1962). *From Utopia to Nightmare*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Williams, I. (2007). Orwell and the British Left. In J. Rodden (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell* (pp. 100-111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yoran, H. (2010). *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More and the Humanist Republic of Letters*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.