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NOTAS

1. Zamyatin’s book is on the whole more relevant to our own situation (ORWELL, 1968, p. 75).
2. Orwell’s works are closely connected to the events of his life. (MEYERS, 1975, p. 18).
3. The deceitfulness of authority, the feeling that spies are everywhere, the harsh cross-examinations, the rote learning in an atmosphere of threat – these are all present in both essay and novel (BOWKER, 2003, p. 371).
4. My starting point is always a feeling of partisanship, a sense of injustice. When I sit down to write a book, I do not say to myself, “I am going to produce a work of art.” I write it because there is some lie that I want to expose, some fact to which I want to draw attention, and my initial concern is to get a hearing. But I could not do the work of writing a book, or even a long magazine article, if it were not also an aesthetic experience (ORWELL apud OXLEY, 1967, p. 11).
5. There are no such things as dreams that are “only dreams”; nightmares we know, grow out of the dreamer’s whole life and circumstances, and come in turn to affect that life. The dreams that a writer shares through his work are always of more than personal significance by the very act of telling, and the more they affect us the better we know that they are partly our dreams as well. That in the end is what makes them worth hearing (SMALL, 1975, p. 14).
6. There is no such sort of comfort for the fears the book arouses: it rouses them with such force precisely because we respond to the personal view. The obsessions are ours as well (SMALL, 1975, p. 14).
7. His views on the importance of language, which anticipated much of what we now debate under the rubric of psychobabble, bureaucratic speech, and political correctness; his interest in demotic or popular culture, and in what now passes for ‘cultural studies’; his fascination with the problem of objective or verifiable truth - a central problem in the discourse now offered us by post-modern theorists; his influence on later fiction, including the so-called ‘Angry Young Man’ novel; his concern with the natural environment and what is now considered as ‘green’ or ‘ecological’; his acute awareness of the dangers of ‘nuclearism’ and the nuclear state (HITCHENS, 2002, p. 11).
8. Huxley and Orwell were concerned to demonstrate the dangers of the destruction of individualism, and set out to describe what the absence of individualism could actually mean. But they had to find some way of making their characters interesting, and some way of constructing a plot in which actions would be meaningful. This tends to be a problem of utopian fiction – if life is perfect, or wholly standardized, individual thought and action takes on quite a different relationship to society or the state (CALDER, 1976, p. 17).
9. They use rebellion as a means both of exposing society they describe and of generating characters that have an interest beyond the individualistic and with whom the reader can feel some kinds of identification (CALDER, 1976, p. 17).
10. Para Aristóteles seria insensato e mesmo ridículo (geloion) querer demonstrar a existência do ethos, assim como é ridículo querer demonstrar a existência da physis. Physis e ethos são duas formas primeiras de manifestação do ser, ou de sua presença, não sendo o ethos senão a transcrição da physis na peculiaridade da práxis ou da ação humana e das estruturas histórico-sociais que dela resultam. No ethos está presente a razão profunda da physis que se manifesta no finalismo do bem e, por outro lado, ele rompe a sucessão do mesmo que caracteriza a physis como domínio da necessidade, com o advento do diferente no espaço da liberdade aberto pela práxis (VAZ, 1999, p. 11).
11. The portrayal of an ideal commonwealth has a double function: it establishes a standard, a goal; and by virtue of its existence alone it casts a critical light on society as presently constituted (ELLIOT, 1970, p. 22).
1984 - *A distopia do indivíduo sob controle*

12. O conhecimento, segundo a tradição básica do pensamento ocidental, não significa apenas o conhecimento descritivo do que existe no universo, mas também, como parte essencial e indistinta disso, o conhecimento dos valores, ou de que maneira viver, como agir, que formas de vida são as melhores e as mais dignas, e por quê (BERLIN, 1991, p. 35-36).

13. Charles Fourier (1772 - 1837): socialista utópico francês, filho de comerciantes, absorveu algumas ideias de Rousseau: o homem nasce puro e bom, a sociedade e as instituições o corrompem. Fourier propôs uma sociedade baseada nas *falanges* e *falanstérios*, fazendas coletivas agroindustriais, onde todos desempenhariam suas tarefas em proveito da comunidade. Nessa sociedade criar-se-ia a falange, com até dois mil homens que trabalhariam para um fundo comum. A divisão das riquezas produzidas seria feita considerando-se a quantidade e qualidade do trabalho de cada indivíduo. Cada falange possuiria seu edifício comum, o *falanstério*, que abrigaria todos os membros e onde seriam instalados os bens coletivos da comunidade (cozinha, biblioteca, etc.). Fourier alegava que os falanstérios superariam a desarmonia capitalista, mas nunca conseguiu empresários interessados em financiar seu projeto.

14. Most utopian fictions are vulnerable to criticism upon two grounds: either they hide the price by not envisioning their world with sufficient thoroughness, or they make the price so obvious that many readers are reluctant to pay it (SCHOLES et RABKIN, 1977, p. 27).

15. The word satire is said to come from *satura*, or hash, and a kind of parody of form seems to run all through its tradition, from the mixture of prose and verse in early satire to the jerky cinematic changes of scene in Rabelais (FRYE, 1970, p. 233-234).


17. Ibid, p. 166.

18. Generally it is used to indicate some optative norm which could be the solution the author believes in, but it may also be uses as an indirect parallel (PASOLD, 1999, p. 50).

19. The Communion Service seems to be parodied when O’ Brien gives Winston and Julia wine to drink and hands them a white tablet to be placed on the tongue (PASOLD, 1999, p. 59).

20. In the struggle to alert his audience to social and political injustice, Orwell’s weapon was language, and he emphasizes the value of the pamphlet as an art form: “the pamphlet ought to be the literary form of an age like our own. We live in a time when political passions run high, channels of free expressions are dwindling, and organised lying exists on a scale never before known. For plugging the holes in history the pamphlet is the ideal form” (MEYERS, 1975, p. 14).

21. *[1984]* is a novel about the future – that is, it is in a sense a fantasy, but in the form of a naturalistic novel... [It is] intended as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable, and which have already been partly realised in Communism and fascism... Totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences (ORWELL apud MEYERS, 1975, p. 145).

22. A work belongs in the genre of science fiction if its narrative world is at least somewhat different from our own, and if that difference is apparent against the background of an organized body of knowledge (RABKIN, 1977, p. 119).

23. In fact, Verne was creating the fictional context, fully against the facts of contemporary science, that would give the submarine the thrill of the fantastic - and then he uses much of the rest of the book to make his fantastic plausible (SCHOLES et RABKIN, 1977, p. 197-198).

24. State control over the lives and even minds of human beings; the debasement of language; the suppression of the individual and individuality in the service of the ‘public good’; all culture turned into political propaganda; inefficiency and corruption in ordinary services; shortage; want; mindless or alienating work; unnecessary war; puritanism; a cynical disregard of the poor; torture; the falsification of the past, etc (PASOLD, 1999, p. 58).

26. No one would, I suppose, be tempted to claim that the telescreens had produced Big Brother or his kind of rule: without them Oceania would be a less efficient totalitarian state but no less a totalitarian state. In other words, ideology controls technology in Nineteen Eighty-Four, rather from issuing from it as in, say, Zamyatin’s We or Huxley’s Brave New World or Kurt Vonnegut’s Player Piano (BEAUCHAMP, 1986, p. 55).

27. One which considers more fully what Wells called “human ecology” and is central to science fiction; and another, more purely political, which is less concerned with scientific development and the impact of technology on man and more interested in making concrete certain tendencies in political thought (SCHOLES et RABKIN, 1977, p. 34-35).

28. When Orwell tries to be more sophisticated and imaginative about such things, he is rather unconvincing, as when Police Patrols snoop into windows with helicopters, and concealed microphones in the vast countryside not only pick up but also recognize voices (MEYERS, 1975, p. 146).

29. According to those inexorable laws, human existence consists of the life or death struggle between collectivities – races or classes – whose motion is the real meaning of history […] Neither stable institutions nor individual initiative can be allowed to get in the way of this frantic dynamism (CANOVAN, 2000, p. 28).

30. Total power can be achieved and safeguarded only in a world of conditioned reflexes, of marionettes without the slightest trace of spontaneity (ARENDT, 1967, p. 457).

31. Brave New World and Nineteen Eighty-Four are usually placed in the category of anti-utopian fiction, nightmares not dreams, warnings not portraits of an ideal. Yet both were aware that there existed as they were writing processes of thought and action that could lead to what they described, and people who were more than ready to make human sacrifices in order to achieve progress or power. Progress and idealism have always attracted the human race. To be unable to believe that things can and will get better is at best negative, at worst destructive. But to believe that the realization of an ideal is worth any sacrifice, or that progress by its very nature must be good for humanity, is extremely dangerous (CALDER, 1976, p. 7).

32. If Huxley was sceptical in 1930 when he wrote Brave New World, Orwell had almost given up hope in 1948 when he wrote Nineteen Eighty-Four. Orwell saw power politics, not science, as the major threat to mankind, and he had had over the previous twelve years or so plenty of opportunity to savour the possibilities of power. In Nineteen Eighty-Four he was coping with both a personal and a public depression. His hopes of social revolution now seemed to him illusory. There was a brief period during the war when he had thought there was a genuine movement towards equality, and this had sustained him, but what he saw in the post-war period was defeat in the ashes of victory (CALDER, 1976, p. 8).

33. The secret freedom which you can supposedly enjoy under a despotic government is nonsense, because your thoughts are never entirely your own (ORWELL, 1945. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 03, 1968, p. 133).

34. Winston Smith, the final embodiment of defeated man, has predecessors in all of Orwell’s books: in his impoverished and exploited personae in Paris, London, Wigan and Spain; in Flory, Dorothy Hare, Gordon Comstock, George Bowling and Boxer […] And each character struggles against the bondage of his threatening world toward individual freedom and responsibility (MEYERS, 1975, p. 153-154).

35. Na obra Vigiar e Punir, Foucault propõe um exemplo da aplicação dos princípios do Panóptico a partir do espaço de uma oficina: “Percorrendo-se o corredor central da oficina, é possível realizar uma vigilância ao mesmo tempo geral e individual; constatar a presença, a aplicação do operário, a qualidade de seu trabalho; comparar os operários entre si, classificá-los segundo a sua habilidade e rapidez; acompanhar os sucessivos estágios de fabricação. Todas essas serições formam um quadrículado permanente: as confusões se desfazem” (FOUCAULT, 1984, p. 133).

36. When Huxley wrote to Orwell after reading Nineteen Eighty-Four he suggested […] that a more authentic picture of the future would not contain the violence of Orwell’s book. It would not be
necessary, for men had the means to control the mass of humanity through influencing their minds. That kind of power made the punishment of their bodies unnecessary (CALDER, 1976, p. 9).

37. It is not only under the influence of the Two Minutes Hate that images of violence dominate his mind. He has been thoroughly infected by the Party ethic, primed to accept O’Brien ultimate justification of power, in spite of the fact that he is trying so hard to rediscover his humanity (CALDER, 1976, p. 21).

38. By the end of Book One, Orwell has reduced much – though not all – of the tension and simultaneously complicated our understanding of the major instability (PHELAN, 1989, p. 30).

39. Though Winston is distinguished from his associates by his intelligence and his resistance to the Party, he is not given any great powers of action – he is a man more ordinary than extraordinary (PHELAN, 1989, p. 32).

40. My claim about 1984 is that the initial defamiliarizations emphasize the tension (the difference between it and other narratives that carry the illusion of occurring in our world is a matter of degree) and that this tension is not – indeed cannot be – quickly resolved (PHELAN, 1989, p. 29).


42. James Burnham’s theory has been much discussed, but few people have yet considered its ideological implications – that is, the kind of world-view, the kind of beliefs, and the social structure that would probably prevail in a state which was at once unconquerable and in a permanent state of “cold war” with its neighbours (ORWELL, 1945. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 9).

43. If it is a rare and costly object […], it is likelier to put an end to large-scale wars at the cost of prolonging indefinitely “a peace that is no peace” (ORWELL, 1945. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 9-10).

44. In Oceania there is a state of perpetual crisis which is used as a weapon to get people to do what is wanted, to submit to power. They are persuaded that their own individual interests are identical with the national interest. Exactly the same thing was happening in wartime Britain. Individuals were encouraged to believe that their particular effort, their particular sacrifice, would help to win the war (CALDER, 1976, p. 9).

45. The atomic bomb may complete the process by robbing the exploited classes and peoples of all power to revolt, and at the same time putting the possessors of the bomb on a basis of military equality. Unable to conquer one another, they are likely to continue ruling the world between them… (ORWELL, 1945. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 9).

46. He comes to represent the individual citizen, and what he does and what happens to him matters to us because of what these things imply about the possibility of individual freedom in totalitarian society (PHELAN, 1989, p. 32).

47. The unceasing campaign against the probably nonexistent Emmanuel Goldstein, held to be the evil genius behind all that goes amiss under the rule of Big Brother, is modeled after the elaborate Stalinist vilification of Trotsky. Even the facial features of Big Brother and Goldstein suggest those of Stalin and Trotsky, respectively, and “Goldstein” is surely a verbal echo of “Bronstein”, Trotsky original surname (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 609).

48. Such structural reverse is at the heart of science fiction as a genre and at the heart of utopian literature as a genre. It is a small wonder that these three genres overlap (RABKIN, 1977, p. 146).


50. If large numbers of people are interested in freedom of speech, there will be freedom of speech, even if the law forbids it; if public opinion is sluggish, inconvenient minorities will be persecuted, even if laws exist to protect them (ORWELL, 1945. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 40).

51. When the general atmosphere is bad, language must suffer. I should expect to find – this is a guess I have not sufficient knowledge to verify – that the German, Russian and Italian languages have all deteriorated in the last ten or fifteen years, as a result of dictatorship. But if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought. A bad usage can spread by tradition and imitation, even
among people who should and do know better. The debased language that I have been discussing is in some ways very convenient (ORWELL, 1946, In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v.04, 1968, p. 137).

52. The appropriate sounds are coming out of his larynx but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself. (ORWELL, 1946, In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 136).

53. The satirist, the third-person narrator, is clearly horrified at what he sees and surely intent on changing the reader’s view; thus, he has a moral intention (PASOLD, 1999, p. 58).

54. That doublethink, like most of the satiric ideas in the book, could be given real social and psychological grounding, is suggested by the Sartrean concept of mauvaise foi. This refers basically to the same process but he has been given a real explanation: Sartre, in his later period, maintained that the mind of the bourgeois is driven to self-contradiction through a need to avoid the intolerable remorse, that would result from recognizing that the ultimate source of his standard of living is the exploitation of workers (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 608).


56. Os expurgos, mencionados no período revolucionário do Ingoc e transformados em uma prática constante na sociedade da Oceania, remontam diretamente às práticas utilizadas na Rússia após os grandes julgamentos de supostos traidores ocorridos em 1936 e 1937. Como afirma Aldous Huxley, “[..] onde a oposição é declarada ilegal, de imediato passa a ser movimento subterrâneo e se transforma em conspiração” (HUXLEY, 1979, p. 40).

57. Reflecting on the dream, in which almost dried up sources of feeling have been touched, he sees how his mother’s gesture of love and forgiveness, like the Jewish mother’s in the horrible scrap of film, entirely transcends material circumstances […]. Could indeed, though he does not take his thought so far, be stronger than death (SMALL, 1975, p. 159).

58. Subjectivity thus returns with a vengeance, both in the sense that the centre of consciousness in the story, the mind of Winston Smith, is wholly inside the situation, is indeed trapped in it, and in the implication that private motives are not different from and cannot in the end be kept apart from those that rule public life (SMALL, 1975, p. 141).

59. Winston’s “private” acts are directly related to the State which forbids them; they are secretly engaged in not for their own sake but because they are a means of rebellion. The book is “about politics” in that all its significant action is brought into the area of public concern, and that it was written with what at least seemed clear political purpose. It is also intensely personal, and the personal combines with the political, not only in showing how the political demands of absolute tyranny invade every corner of life, but as politics seen in the most literal sense “from inside”, as the reflection of a state of mind (SMALL, 1975, p. 142).

60. 1984 is the story of Winston’s homecoming; but in fact we can see that his destination was decided long before (SMALL, 1975, p. 138).

61. So long as you are not actually ill, hungry, frightened or immured in a prison or a holiday camp, spring is still spring. The atom bombs are piling up in the factories, the police are prowling through the cities, the lies are streaming from the loudspeakers, but the earth is still going round the sun, and neither the dictators nor the bureaucrats, deeply as they disapprove of the process, are able to prevent it (ORWELL, 1946. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 144-145).

62. By the time we come to 1984 and its arresting first sentence, it is clear that April is the cruelest month (SMALL, 1975, p. 145).

63. In Imperial India and at school, those lesser imitations of a divine power, Orwell had known long ago that you are not judged for what you do but for what you are (SMALL, 1975, p. 165).

64. The tragic hero is one of us. He is not necessarily virtuous, not necessarily free from profound guilt. What he is a man who reminds us strongly of our humanity, who can be accepted as standing for us (CONRAD apud LEECH, 1970, p. 42).

65. Winston Smith is dominated by fear from the first, and the hatred which is his only recourse against it proves quite inadequate; though fear and hatred beget each other, it appears that fear is the stronger and the older of the two (SMALL, 1975, p. 147).
66. His history is concerned with Truth and Love, the two great commanding abstractions whose outward forms, in the enormous Ministerial headquarters towering over the city of men, are before his eyes but from both of which he is deeply estranged (SMALL, 1975, p. 149).

67. This is the most significant event within these societies: the emergence, in the very course of their mobilization and revolutionary process (they are all revolutionary by the standards of past centuries), of an equivalent force of inertia, of an immense indifference and the silent potency of that indifference (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 3).

68. Political events already lack sufficient energy of their own to move us: so they run on like a silent film for which we bear collective irresponsibility (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 4).

69. Crossing the threshold of the critical mass where populations, events and information are concerned triggers the opposite process of historical and political inertia (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 4).

70. It is because we are moving further and further away from our history that we are avid for signs of the past, not, by any means, in order to resuscitate them, but to fill up the empty space of our memories. Or perhaps man, in the process of losing track of his history, is seized by a nostalgia for societies without history, perhaps obscurely sensing that he is returning to the same point. All these relics which we call upon to bear witness to our origin would then become the involuntary sign of its loss (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 74).

71. What we seek now is not glory but identity, not an illusion but, on the contrary, an accumulation of proofs – anything that can serve as evidence of a historical existence (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 21).

72. Ideology complements terror by eliminating the capacity for individual thought and experience among the executioners themselves, binding them into the unified movement of destruction. Ideologies – pseudo-scientific theories purporting to give insight into history – give their believers the total explanation of the past, the total knowledge of the present, and the reliable prediction of the future (CANOVAN In: ARENDT, 2000, p. 27-28).

73. If there is something distinctive about an event – about what constitutes an event and thus has historical value – it is the fact that it is irreversible, that there is always something in it which exceeds meaning and interpretation. But it is precisely the opposite we are seeing today: all that has happened in this century in terms of progress, liberation, revolution and violence is about to be revised for the better (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 13).

74. Planners of Utopia have often tried to approximate that condition, aiming at a static perfection which would rule out the vicissitudes of history and to some degree those of time (ELLIOT, 1970, p. 9).

75. The attempt of utopian writers to freeze history – the fight of utopia against history – has prompted severe criticism of the whole utopian enterprise; but the attempt has been merely one way in which man has tried to arrive imaginatively at the condition of paradise on earth (ELLIOT, 1970, p. 10).

76. A tradução literal para esse termo pode prejudicar ou alterar sensivelmente o significado atribuído por Baudrillard de forma que preferimos mantê-lo na língua original e explicitar logo em seguida o conceito definido pelo autor.

77. It [deterrence] can remove all certainty about facts and evidence. It can destabilize memory just as it destabilizes prediction [...] For the past can only be represented and reflected if it pushes us in the other direction, towards a future of some kind. Retrospection is dependent on a prospection which enables us to refer to something as past and gone, and thus as having really taken place (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 17, 20).

78. Dentro de um amplio espectro de posiciones críticas habría un cierto sentir común en cuanto a la necesidad de buscar formas de reflexión sobre la moralidad sensibles a los contextos reales de la acción (LIMA, 1994, p. 44).

79. Segundo o próprio Winston, ele teria encontrado pessoalmente os três indivíduos em uma tarde modorrenta no Café Castanheira. Essa cena, incluindo a música transmitida pela teletela antecipa a cena final da narrativa quando o protagonista assume o lugar de Jones, Aaronson e Rutherford e remonta suas atitudes.
80. It is a bit like *in vitro* procreation: the embryo of the real event is transferred into the artificial womb of the news media, there to give birth to many orphaned fetuses which have neither fathers nor mothers. The event is entitled to the same procreative practices as birth and the same euthanasian practices as death (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 19-20).

81. Even they admit as much when it appears that they make love not so much from mutual desire as in an act of rebellion against the rule they both hate (SMALL, 1975, p. 150).

82. Hatred appears to be their primary motive. Their mutual declaration is that they “hate purity, hate goodness”, are both “corrupt to the bones”; of course we know, or are supposed to know, that in their world where everything has been reversed this doesn’t mean what it sounds like (SMALL, 1975, p. 150).

83. His [Winston’s] conversations with Julia indicate that the next generation simply cannot envision life without the Party. Having grown up with the Party as a fact of life, Julia takes it so much for granted that it constrains her ideas of rebellion; until she meets Winston, her goal in life is to manipulate the Party’s system rather than overthrow it […] This disparity between Winston and Julia clearly marks him off as member of the last group of citizens to remember life without the Party, the last group that could use that connection to the past as a motive for rebellion […] As the narrative progresses, Winston’s name and age combine to make him a figure of the “last man in Europe”, a phrase that Orwell considered using as the book’s title (PHELAN, 1989, p. 33).

84. She is in fact a kind of intersex, her “swift athletic movements” and “boyishness” especially in the act of throwing, being particularly noted […] the “atmosphere of hockey-fields and cold baths and community hikes” that Winston first perceives about her, the badge of the Junior Anti-Sex League that she wears, are more appropriate than they are meant to be […] In Julia they are intended, of course, to be no more than a disguise, beneath which her passions are hidden; but these passions are much harder to believe in than the cover they assume. In Winston they rouse resentment and hatred. He indulges in fantasies of violence upon her; even later, when he and she become lovers amid the “faint, sickly smell of bluebells” he feels an “incredulity” which we may well share (SMALL, 1975, p. 151).

85. The most intense and satisfying reading experiences may depend upon what we call involvement with characters, but successful critical investigation of the structure and effects of a novel, as a literary construct, may require thinking of characters as sets of predicates grouped under proper names (CULLER apud PHELAN, 1989, p. 3).

86. She is, perhaps, no more than a part of the process which (as Winston reflects) starts with the keeping of his illicit diary and leads inevitably to the cellars of the Ministry of Love; but she is the instrument by which he is brought out of his total isolation and comparative safety into the danger of feeling (SMALL, 1975, p. 151).

87. There are, for instance, numerous hints in the text that Winston’s lover Julia has all along been an agent of the Thought Police; but there is also evidence to the contrary, and, as often in totalitarian life itself, it is not possible to be sure (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 603).

88. The intimate glance that O’ Brien one day gives Winston in the Ministry of Truth ultimately means something very different from what Winston initially hopes and believes. Winston is an intelligent interpreter, but not an infallible one (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 603).

89. Although the vision of O’ Brien comes hard upon the heels of his renewed courage, the narrator’s comment about the absence of any obvious association directs the audience to supply that association: Winston subconsciously links O’ Brien and Big Brother (PHELAN, 1989, p. 37).

90. Again, though, the general point is that Orwell is using the attributes to increase the psychological realism of his treatment of Winston and thereby to increase the extent of our emotional involvement in his unfolding story (PHELAN, 1989, p. 37).
92. In Orwell’s novel, the régime is so repressive that it is able to disintegrate totally the personality of those who resist and to make the Winston Smiths believe what they know to be false (MEYERS, 1975, p. 151).

93. In the concentration camps, even more than life, it was death that was exterminated. The prisoners were dispossessed of their deaths – deader than dead, disappeared (BAUDRILLARD, 1994, p. 98).

94. It [totalitarian government] does not simply kill people but first eradicates their individuality and capacity for action. Any remnant of spontaneity would stand in the way of complete domination (CANOVAN In: ARENDT, 2000, p. 26).

95. Nothing in the book is more vivid and naturalistic than the physical and mental agonies Winston suffers in the Ministry of Love. Nothing is more satiric than the ultimate explanation given for those agonies (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 613).

96. The preliminary torture cells are already below ground level, but Room 101, the final destination, is many meters underground, as deep down as it was possible to go. He [Winston] goes down to the bottom; or at least far enough to see that the pit of himself he is forced to enter is indeed bottomless (SMALL, 1975, p. 153).

97. One man’s utopia is another man’s – particularly a disillusioned man’s – nightmare (ELLIOT, 1970, p. 87).

98. Solipsism, is obviously and irremovably dependent on the autonomous individual, a solitary consciousness separate from all others and knowing, as certainty, only itself: as such it is logically unassailable. But what O’ Brien is really saying is not a philosophical proposition at all, merely a social observation, that “truth” is the equivalent of received opinion, the opinion of majority or of those able to enforce it; and that, socially speaking, there are collective delusions (SMALL, 1975, p. 155).

99. For the moment let us consider the concept of doublethink. It is yet another of the key satiric theses of the text. It completes the Party’s collective solipsism, which is primarily enabled by the complete forgery and fabrication of documents (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 608).

100. Winston, as the guardian of the truth, can now fall back only on a tautology, that 2+2= 4. Orwell himself, in returning many times to this formula and his fear that tyranny might be able to make 2+2= 5 at command, seems to have used it both as a symbol of common sense, what everybody knows, and as irreducible example of scientific knowledge (SMALL, 1975, p. 154).

101. O’ Brien’s assault on Winston’s mind is aimed at destroying both his trust in “the laws of science” (of which he knows nothing himself but which, like Orwell, he accepts as being “true”) and his internal powers of judgment, his ability to put two and two together (SMALL, 1975, p. 154).

102. The second beating had not hurt very much either. Fright and shame seemed to have anesthetized me. I was crying partly because I felt that this was expected of me, partly from genuine repentance, but partly also because of a deeper grief which is peculiar to childhood and not easy to convey […] I sat snivelling on the edge of a chair in Sambo’s study, with not even the self-possession to stand up while he stormed at me, I had a conviction of sin and folly and weakness, such as I do not remember to have felt before (ORWELL, 1947. In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 334).

103. But there is one more thing to be remarked. This is that I did not wet my bed again – at least, I did wet it once again, and received another beating, after which the trouble stopped. So perhaps this barbarous remedy does work, though at a heavy price, I have no doubt (ORWELL, 1947, In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 335).

104. A state built in the image of an ideology, presided over by a single party legitimized by the ideology, employing unlimited powers of coercion and indoctrination to prevent any deviation from orthodoxy. The construction of such a polity is associated by some theorists with the attempt to build Utopia; others interpret its perpetuation in a state of frozen immobility as a quasi-religious retreat from the anxieties of modernity (CANOVAN In: ARENDT, 2000, p. 25-26).

105. The central concept in the ideology of the Party, that freedom and happiness cannot coexist, evolves from Dostoyevsky’s The Brothers Karamazov by way of Zamyatin’s We (MEYERS, 1975, p. 152).
106. The horrible irony, of course, is that the people of 1984 have neither freedom nor happiness. The omnipotence of the Church and State is defended by the Grand Inquisitor (and by O’ Brien) who maintains that men are terribly weak and unable to choose between good and evil (MEYERS, 1975, p. 152).

107. Unlike the violence and coercion used by ordinary tyrants it [totalitarian domination] does not have a utilitarian purpose such as repressing opposition, and it reaches its climax only after genuine opposition has already been repressed; its only function is to further the Project of total domination by crushing out all human individuality (CANOVAN In: ARENDT, 2000, p. 27).

108. A contradição ao qual o autor se refere é a coexistência do gênero satírico e do gênero realista na obra de Orwell.

109. I do not mean that Orwell should necessarily put forward any particular explanation of Oceanian totalitarianism [...] Orwell, no doubt, would claim that he, like Zamyatin, has grasped the irrational side of totalitarianism [...] The claim may be granted. Indeed the mad but horribly lucid speeches of O’ Brien do satirize the basis of this irrational side of totalitarianism with the same skill that marks the satiric program of the book in general. But, by failing to account for a rational side as well, Orwell has, in the final and culminating part of Nineteen Eighty-Four – in the part that is meant to explain all the rest – made glaringly obvious the generic contradiction that characterizes the book as a whole (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 612, 613).

110. The dangerous thing about the Church is that it is not reactionary in the ordinary sense [...] It is perfectly capable of coming to terms with Socialism, or appearing to do so, provided that its own position is safeguarded. But if it is allowed to survive as a powerful organisation, it will make the establishment of true Socialism impossible, because its influence is and always must be against freedom of thought and speech, against human equality, and against any form of society tending to promote earthly happiness (ORWELL, 1947, In: ORWELL; ANGUS, v. 04, 1968, p. 374).

111. By this stage, if not before, it is impossible not to see 1984 as religious parable, or rather as a monstrous parody of one. The Party is God, Big Brother the divine “embodiment” or incarnation. His tabernacle and dwelling-place is the Ministry of Love; his priests and messengers, the legions of his angels, are the agents of the Party and the Thought Police, ubiquitous and all-powerful; in himself, as his servant O’ Brien teaches, he is immortal, all-seeing, all-knowing, and omnipotent. Through the device of “collective solipsism” he is literally able to do anything, with absolute power over the “laws of Nature” (SMALL, 1975, p. 160).

112. A imagem vislumbrada por Winston diante de espelho remete claramente para o débil estado físico no qual os prisioneiros dos campos de concentração foram resgatados no final da Segunda Guerra Mundial.

113. Smith makes progress in his lessons. He can almost understand that two and two make five; that, as the immortal collective brain of mankind, the Party must always be right; that sanity is statistical. He exercises himself in ‘crimestop’. But once he reverts to his dream of the Golden Country, and wakes crying out for Julia. He has surrendered only in his mind; his heart is still treacherously given to private things [...] He contemplates the final rebellious gesture of hatred for Big Brother that his integrity can make (OXLEY, 1967, p. 124).

114. It is the place where he [Winston] is brought ineluctably up against his own nothingness: the truly bottomless abyss into which will fall all personal property, including the hatred which he hoped to cling to at the last. He calls for the torment to be transferred to “Julia”; but by now Julia is transparently a figment, that part of his mind with which he has made a pact to die in “freedom”, hating. Threatened with the most hateful torture he hates the hatred for which he is to be tortured; it is his last possession and he gives up. He has nothing: he is nothing (SMALL, 1975, p. 164).

115. What is most deeply ironic about the name of the Ministry of Love is that it is finally not ironic at all (FREEDMAN, 1984, p. 611).

116. None of the classical utopias have made room for freedom [...] Similarly, Thomas More, Campanella, Cabet, and others all fail to provide for individual freedom (ELLIOT, 1970, p. 90).