

---

**THE TANDEM OF SOCIOLOGY AND LITERATURE IN THE ANALYSIS OF  
TOTALITARIANISM (BASED ON THE EXAMPLE OF GEORGE ORWELL'S NOVEL  
"1984")****Kholbekov Abdugani**Professor of the National University of Uzbekistan,  
Doctor of Sociological Sciences,  
e - mail : abdullajon\_23 @ mail . ru**ANNOTATION**

This article explores sociologism as a method of scientifically approaching society, which, when combined with a literary approach to analyzing social phenomena, becomes even more expressive. The literary method itself is characteristic primarily of works of epic literature (novels and stories). However, it has not yet gained widespread recognition and remains understudied.

Using a work of fiction as an example, the author demonstrates the potential of analyzing a specific social phenomenon using the literary method alongside documentary evidence. The author also argues that the method of literary analysis offers sociologists additional opportunities to uncover large-scale social phenomena. World-renowned writers have achieved great success through their profound insight into society. However, they did not set out to scientifically analyze large-scale phenomena occurring in society at various periods in history. This was facilitated by the profound psychologism, realism, and epic nature of these writers' approaches, which, through fractured relationships between individuals and society, revealed the complexity of social life. According to the authors, only the social novel is capable of such analysis, which is equal in its universality to scientific research. Based on this, the article reveals the importance of the literary method in the comprehensive analysis of social life, which serves as an important resource for sociology in the study of society as a whole.

This article presents principles for analyzing totalitarianism using George Orwell's social novel "1984" as a literary method. This is achieved through a comparative analysis of the typical characteristics of various totalitarian regimes and an examination of the key features of the totalitarian society depicted in the novel.

**Key words:** social novel, totalitarianism, alienation, personality, freedom, civil rights, stratification, classes, propaganda, ideology.

**METHODOLOGY.** Sociologism as a method of objective, purely scientific approach to social phenomena, does not contradict the literary approach of analyzing the actions of individuals, characteristic of works of art. When analyzing a particular social phenomenon, a sociologist, along with documentary facts, can also use the literary method, although this method remains little studied in sociology. At the same time, the method of artistic analysis gives the researcher additional opportunities in revealing large-scale social phenomena. Such universal writers of world significance as Charles Dickens, Thackeray, O. Balzac, Stendhal, Flaubert, L. Tolstoy, F. Dostoevsky, M. Bulgakov, Faulkner, Hemingway and others are also "sociologists with a brush in hand" [7; 13].

**INTRODUCTION.** In our view, the time has come to recognize that outstanding works of fiction can be an important resource for studying social life. A similar opinion can be expressed about the famous novel "1984." This work, along with Zamyatin's "We," O. Huxley's "Brave New World," and Robert Bradbury's "Fahrenheit 451," is an example of dystopian fiction.

**MAIN PART.** The novel's plot, the correspondence between the book's main characters and non-characters and historical figures, the terminology, the prototypes, and the novel's political geography—all of this constitutes a kind of generalizing portrait of all totalitarian states past and present.

According to the novel's plot, Winston Smith, a Londoner in his late 40s who dislikes the dominant party ideology and loathes social reality, works for the Ministry of Truth and is a member of the Outer Party. Drawing on his creative nature, he keeps a diary in which he periodically records his critical notes. The reality in which he exists is characterized by universal suspicion. Winston fears even Julia, who, while an employee of the same ministry, was in love with him.

The lower class in the novel is represented by the proletarians, whom the author calls proles. The proles are assigned a separate district, but Party members are forbidden from entering. Despite this, Winston Smith arrives in this district in search of temporary housing. He eventually manages to rent a room from Charrington, an antiques dealer. Smith periodically meets Julia there, falling in love with her, although any free extramarital relationships between men and women were strictly forbidden to Party members.

Smith makes another mistake: he and Julia approach O'Brien, a prominent member of the Inner Party, and ask him to admit them both into the underground Brotherhood. He accepts them into the underground organization and hands them a book by Goldstein (modeled on Leon Trotsky), "The Theory and Practice of Oligarchic Collectivism." Goldstein had previously been one of the leaders of the revolution, but later became its enemy, fleeing abroad and organizing a secret Brotherhood there, for which he was declared public enemy number one.

Ultimately, Smith and Julia are arrested in a secret room belonging to Charrington, who turns out to be a member of the Thought Police. They are brought to the Ministry of Love and subjected to a lengthy indoctrination, where the protagonist is revealed to be O'Brien. Smith thus becomes the victim of a double betrayal. He is subjected to physical and mental torture, i.e., brainwashing, aimed at his "pulverization." Despite his resistance, Smith succumbs to the ordeal, particularly tormented by fear, that eternal and total companion of life in society. He ultimately renounces his views. Ultimately, he also betrays his love for Julia. Upon his release, he realizes he has been completely cured. However, he feels he has lost his humanity, having lost the love for the woman he loved. Instead, he has been consumed by love for the Party and Big Brother (the prototype being Stalin). Such is Smith's complete defeat in a totalitarian society: he is completely enslaved. Thus, through the example of one man's tragedy, Orwell was able to reveal the essence of totalitarianism as a political regime. This regime gravitates toward complete state control over all aspects of private and public life, in the spirit of love for the state. Thus, the novel reveals the mechanism by which love is replaced: a universal, impersonal love for the state, represented by Big Brother, replaces individual and purely human love. This demonstrates the author's mastery as a social artist.

Orwell, as a "sociologist with a brush in hand," generally succeeded in depicting the post-capitalist totalitarian system in artistic form. The complete absence of individual freedom, the total mobilization of all social forces in the service of the "one true" idea, universal control, the repression of dissent, a centrally planned economy despite widespread poverty, misery, and fear—all of this anticipated the realities of 20th-century totalitarian regimes. The author himself, a proponent of "democratic socialism," did not believe that the society depicted in his work would ever exist. Overall, the author conceived of the novel as a sharply satirical pamphlet on the totalitarian system. The writer primarily wanted to demonstrate that the totalitarian idea lives in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, even in free societies. As a realist, he attempts to follow

this idea to its logical conclusion, and as a social writer, he describes its basic concepts through artistic imagination. He himself witnessed how totalitarian regimes, such as fascism, can arise even in democratic countries like Germany (Weimar Germany was a democratic country before Hitler came to power). He deliberately sets the novel in England to prove that totalitarianism can prevail anywhere if left unchecked.

Without going into detail about all the elements of the novel's plot, it's enough to note the book's social panorama. It suggests that society is divided into three strata. The author himself offers an original interpretation of the stratification of society : the upper class, the middle class, and the lower class.

Many sociologists note the difference between the concepts of "communism" and "socialism," giving preference to the latter. For example, the modern sociologist E. Giddens asks: "Will socialist ideas be able to inspire social movements in the future?" In his opinion, "socialism" in the current understanding is a broader concept than "communism," which denotes the ideas and movements associated with the names of Marx and Lenin and embodied in the social structure of the USSR [1; 605].

Apparently, the author of 1984, like many proponents of socialism, considered it a stage emerging after Western-style capitalist economies. Orwell was convinced that Western societies, due to irreconcilable contradictions, could not achieve their proclaimed goals of equality and democracy. The limitations of capitalism prevented this, although there was room for freedom. But what is freedom without social justice, which, in turn, is the core value of socialism? In any case, by fundamentally rejecting totalitarianism, the author of the novel disagreed with the order that existed in his native country, as the main events of the novel take place in a classic capitalist country – England.

However, the situation with socialism is not so simple. Thus, after a thorough analysis of the experience of building socialism in the former USSR, Cuba, and the countries of Eastern Europe, many sociologists come to the conclusion that although many of the aforementioned countries had "higher rates of literacy, health care, and social security," socialism as represented by them cannot serve as an acceptable model for industrially developed countries [1; 606]. The most radical plans of the social democratic parties of Western countries also failed to materialize. They were not approved by the electorate on one hand, and big business on the other, although they still enjoy significant influence. It must be acknowledged that, thanks to the fact that socialist parties and closely related labor parties (Orwell himself was a supporter of this party) were in power in some Western capitalist countries, programs for organizing a social security system and mitigating the inequalities generated by uncontrolled market mechanisms were implemented. Sweden is given as an example here. Sweden has a higher per capita income than the United States, and poverty has been completely eradicated. However, at its economic core, Sweden remains a capitalist society, and many economists believe that further development of socialism in the country would result in authoritarianism and hypercentralism, as happened in Eastern European countries [5].

The truth, as always, lies somewhere in the middle. And as many experts rightly believe, Sweden's characteristic "combination of economic prosperity, liberalism, and social justice is likely the result of an effective compromise between socialist ideals and capitalist mechanisms" [1; 606].

Critics of the novel "1984" consider it an illustration of the evolution of a private property society. They argue that the novel , at its core, expresses the nature of alienation as the eternal companion of capitalist society. Leaving aside the scholars and specialists, it should be noted that the problem of inequality has been a central theme in nearly all social novels and other epic

works by famous writers. Perhaps for this reason, social fiction provides more information about society for a general readership than the scholarly works of social scientists. This is natural, as the accessibility and popularity of fiction enables millions of people to use these books to seek answers to questions such as: "Does someone in my social class have the potential to reach the top rungs of the economic ladder?" and "Why are some groups or strata wealthier than others?"

Based on the above, a comparative analysis of the problems of social stratification in the novel "1984" and the main postulates of sociological concepts on this issue is of particular interest.

Let's begin with the classic of modern sociology, Anthony Giddens. In his renowned work on sociology, Giddens outlines the most important sociological theories of stratification. Among these, he considers the theories of Karl Marx and Max Weber to be the most influential, their scientific approaches forming the basis of almost all subsequent stratification theories. However, as is well known, Marx absolutized the role of classes in social processes, exaggerating the idea of humanity's liberation from classes. Even before his death, he was working on the manuscript of *Capital*, which ends with the question: "What constitutes a class?" [1; 200]. Marx defines a class as a group of people who stand in an equal relationship to the means of production and particularly emphasizes the class of capitalists and workers. It should be noted that Marx's ideas are controversial, but their significance is recognized throughout the world.

Max Weber developed the concept of a status group, which, alongside economic differences, also includes differences of a different nature, not directly related to property—status, prestige, and so on. In other words, according to Weber, other types of stratification, in addition to class, significantly influence people's lives. Thus, Weber offers a more flexible and broader framework for analyzing stratification than Marx's [1; 202, 203].

Social stratification theories within sociology, in various modifications, continued to develop in the 20th century, particularly within the framework of modern class theories (E.O. Wright, F. Parkin, M. Rutkevich, T. Zaslavskaya, O. Radaev, O. Shkaratan, V. Yadov, and others). However, the basic characteristics remained the same as those of the aforementioned theories. Today, this area has become an important fundamental problem in sociology. In this regard, it requires a comprehensive study not only of the complex processes of social stratification but also of the dynamics of the social structure of the population, based on specific sociological data.

The ideas raised in the novel "1984" are indeed connected to important sociological concepts. However, sociology as a science, relying primarily on social facts, overlooks the problems of addressing this issue in fiction in general and in the social novel in particular. Social fiction is socially significant epic works of fiction (novels and stories) that reflect social problems with specific insights into family, society, and the state. It embodies a deep analysis of the inner world of the individual and social life, i.e., the study of the individual within a specific social context. This is the development of the sociological movement of realism, with its emphasis on the study of society as a specific entity, i.e., *socium*. True, the lyricism, aesthetics, and poetics of social fiction are clearly evident here, which cannot be said of sociological scientific works, which are often characterized by a dryness, empiricism, and a penchant for specifics.

Despite the fact that the novel "1984" was banned in the former USSR until 1988, it was subsequently included in all lists of best books and occupied high positions. For example, in 2013, the newspaper "The Guardian" conducted a poll on the novel. To the question "Was Orwell right about the direction of society's development?", 89% of respondents answered "yes." [8]

The author of the novel, through the protagonist, expounds on his concept of the social stratification of society. He believes that throughout history, the world has seen three classes of people: upper, middle, and lower. These groups have changed structurally, but "the fundamental structure of society has remained unchanged" [3; 203]. This interpretation of the problem is consistent with the opinion of T. Parsons, who argued that social strata are divided into upper, lower, and middle groups, respectively [4; 288].

According to the author of the novel, each of these groups pursues its own goals, which are completely incompatible. The goal of the higher is to remain where they are. The goal of the middle class is to exchange places with the higher, and the goal of the lower—when they have a goal—for the lower are characterized by being crushed by hard work and only occasionally looking beyond the boundaries of everyday life—is to abolish all differences and create a society in which all people are equal" [3; 203].

Orwell interprets the cyclical nature of society, noting that "throughout history the struggle flares up again and again, in general terms always the same" [3; 203].

Orwell interprets revolutions as the result of class struggle (influenced by Marxism). As already noted, Orwell was an adherent of "democratic socialism." In his view, for a long time "the upper classes appear to hold power firmly, but sooner or later a moment comes when they lose either faith in themselves or the ability to govern effectively, or both " [3; 203]. Then the middle classes overthrow the upper classes, attracting the lower classes to their side by playing the role of fighters for freedom and justice. Having achieved their goal, they push the lower classes back into their former position of servitude and themselves become upper classes. Meanwhile, the new middle classes split off from one of the other two groups, or from both, and the struggle begins anew. Of the three groups, only the lower classes never succeed in achieving their goals, even temporarily [3; 203-204].

**CONCLUSION.** Thus, Orwell, whose name has become a symbol of the dystopian genre, is a social writer and creates a thoroughly realistic social picture of the "society of ideas," where total unfreedom reigns. In essence, Orwell was able to demonstrate the full depth of the abyss of the social structure of a totalitarian state better than even some social scientists. The ruling group's primary goal is to preserve the social order by destroying the fruits of human labor through periodic wars without victory or defeat. They feared the general rise in prosperity, for it threatened the destruction of a hierarchical and pyramidal society with a demigod-like leader, ultimately depriving the ruling group of power. Indeed, if the vast majority of people become literate and learn to think for themselves, they can cast the minority overboard. Therefore, in the social structure of society, according to Orwell, the lower class always remains under the yoke of poverty and obedience in conditions of war and famine.

Given the contemporary reality of developed democratic countries, it's difficult to agree with Orwell's thesis that "it's usually the middle class, not the lower class, that starts a revolution." Naturally, in the novel, the regime demands strict control over the middle class. However, the modern middle class has long ceased to care about revolutions. It values the gains it has made since those historical times when social revolutions swept across many European countries. This becomes even more obvious when one considers that the novel "1984" is essentially a communist dystopia. In this sense, the work vividly demonstrated the tendencies of capitalist society, particularly such a global flaw as social alienation. In any case, the events that accompanied the book from its publication in 1949 until the collapse of the former USSR in the late 1980s only added to its popularity. Incidentally, it was precisely during the "beginning of the end" of communist ideology that sociology as a science intensively developed throughout the

post-Soviet space. This once again confirms our thesis that all topical social epic works are an important resource for the sociological analysis of any significant social processes.

#### LITERATURE

1. Giddens E. Sociology. - M.: Editorial URSS, 1999. – 704 p.
2. 2 . Ivanov V.N. Sociological lyrics. Anniversary of ISPI RAS. 3rd edition, add. and Spanish -M.: RIC ISPI RAS, 2006. – 320 p.
3. Orwell, George. 1984: [novel] / George Orwell; translated from English by V. Golysheva. – Moscow: AST Publishing House, 2015. – 318 p.
4. Sorokin P.A. Man. Civilization. Society . – M. , 1994.
5. Himmelstrand Ulf et al. Beyond Welfare Capitalism . London , 1981.
6. Kholbekov A. In search of social harmony: the tandem of a sociologist and a writer (based on the sociological study of F.M. Dostoevsky’s novel “The Idiot”) // Journal of the National University of Uzbekistan. 2021, No. 1/6/3/. – P. 237-239.
7. Sztompka P. Sociology. Analysis of modern society / trans. from Polish WITH . M. Chervonnaya . - M. : Logos , - 2005. - 664 p .
8. Totalitarianism . – Wikipedia .
9. <https://ru.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A2%D0%BE%D1%82%D0%BO%D0%BB%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%BO%D1%80%D0%D8%D0%B7%D0%DC>