

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Research

70 years ago, precisely on June 1949, the world was shocked by a dystopian novel written by George Orwell entitled *1984*. The novel talks about an appalling future-life in 1984 under the reign of totalitarian government where everything is controlled by The Big Brother. It has eyes everywhere, history is rewritten and always reproduced to distract the people from the true history, and any effort of rebellion is suddenly eradicated.

Orwell is considered a revolutionary writer that has contributed to fighting totalitarian regimes in so many countries such as Burma, Italy, Paris, and Spain which sees the future in Orwell's perspective. Moreover, at that time the Soviet Union was the biggest and the strongest country which tremendously promoted communism—which is misunderstood as totalitarianism—to other countries, especially Asian countries which were suffering from the Western colonialism.

Orwell's *1984* depicts the madness of such totalitarianism to build awareness and warn people of the hidden agenda behind the practiced communism. Another reason, Orwell's radical outlook of communism was derived from his disappointment against the way Stalins' regime misused the power on behalf of socialism. The root of his disappointment can be seen from his memoir entitled *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). He explained about the poverty in two cities which he visited: Paris and London. That experiences brought him to believe that socialism as the only way to fix out this problem (Orwell 1933: 56). But, what Stalin did during his regime in the Soviet Union inspired

Orwell's criticism against the malpractice of socialism through *Animal Farm* (1945) and *1984* (1949).

His nightmarish vision of totalitarianism is conveyed in those works in which he depicted totalitarian government that tends to abuse the power, anti-criticism, and eradicate the freedom of speech. Orwell opted to convince people that there is no better future as yearned and expected by the communism through its "classless" utopia.

Considered as one of the biggest canonical works that had been written in 20 century, George Orwell's *1984* seems to be agreed by many, even though the year 1984 has passed, Orwell's prophecy seems meet its fact. A renowned philosopher, linguist and social activist, Noam Chomsky mentioned on his book *How the World Works* (2009) that the mechanism of international politics played by the U.S., Soviet Union (Russia) and China matches George Orwell's depiction of future in his *1984*. Furthermore, Chomsky created a terminology so-called *Orwellian Politics*¹....

In 2009, precisely 60 years after the publishing of *1984*, there is a writer who responded Orwell's *1984* with uniquely different approach. He is a Japanese author named Haruki Murakami who wrote the *1Q84*.

Discussing about Murakami, it is important to discuss and highlight about modern literary periodization which was occupied by the first world countries literatures, began to gradually intertwined with a new trend in which Third World Country Literatures and its issues are more appreciated.

Borrowing the postcolonial perspective, the alienation of Third World Country Literature is seen as the injection of *colonialist ideological manifestation* which created major discourse in which only Anglo-European culture is considered civilized,

¹. Orwellian Politics was first mentioned by Noam Chomsky in his book *How the World Works* (2010). The terminology used to represent the mechanism of international politics played by superpower country such U.S. and England against third world countries.

sophisticated, and superior societies. Therefore, the indigenous were defined as savage, primitive, undeveloped, and backward (Tyson 2006: 419)

Murakami's work is formulated by the element of postmodernism, such as: metafiction, intertextuality, parody, pastiche, and magical realism. Thus, he is considered as one of the postmodern authors. The term postmodern used to describe characteristics of some contemporary literature distinguished from modernism literature. Modernism literature was categorized through its commitment to the unified value, coherent work employing symbols and myth. Otherwise, postmodernism work deals with incoherence, discontinuity, pastiche, irrationality, magical realism, and the principle of metafiction. ⁱ

Haruki Murakami's works are categorized as surrealism works which focuses more on surrealistic things and magical realism things. Almost all of his works are containing surrealistic things and the only realism novel he ever wrote is *Norwegian Wood* which sold more than 1 million copy in US (Fuminobu 2005: 36). There are many reviewers and critics responded to *1Q84* since it was published in 2009. The responses are not only published in newspapers, blog or journals, but also in YouTube videos. Some of them argue that the discourse in *1Q84* is the antithesis of Orwell's discourse in *1984*. Eka Kurniawan, an Indonesian author, once wrote an article in his blog about *1Q84* in which he argues that *1Q84* is a real satirical work presented by Murakami for Orwell's *1984* (Eka Kurniawan, 2012). *1Q84* is a complex work which is focused not only at criticizing the *1984*, but also showing an effort of reconciliation with the eastern memories in the past regarding to the ideological issues such the Cultural Revolution in China and the 2th World War.

Many people believe that Orwell's discourses are always relevant to the current political situation, meanwhile, the base of economic industry has changed, and it is no longer similar to Orwell's proposition in *1984*.

Baudrillard, in *For the Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, argue that Marx's concept about fetishism and ideology is not relevant anymore in today's base economic industryⁱⁱ. Today's problems are no longer about the alienation or dehumanization of the Proletariat as the worker that separated from the mystification of commodities like what happened in the industrial revolution because it has been changed and simplified into the development of mode production such as simulation, computerization, and automatization. The new bourgeoisie create myth for its commodities which drive people consume it, massively, without even really need it which lead to the emerging of consumerist society.ⁱⁱⁱ

1.2. The Identification of Problem

Since firstly published in 2009 and became a worldwide issue as a response to Orwell's *1984*, Murakami's *1Q84* is now considered as an antithesis or a criticism against it. Based on that fact, this research is going to analyze how Murakami's *1Q84* criticizes Orwell's *1984* major ideological discourses by using postmodern literary criticism theories.

1.3. The Scope of the Research

The research focuses on analyzing the *1984*'s major and famous political-ideological discourses through *1Q84*.

1.4. The Research Questions

This research will focus on three questions:

1. What are modern political-ideological discourses offered by George Orwell in 1984?
2. How does *1Q84* respond and criticize ideological-political discourses in *1984*?
3. What is the implication of the *1Q84* criticism at the *1984*?

1.5. The objective of the Research

This research intends to show the irrelevance of *1984*'s major political-ideological discourses that is still faithfully quoted by using *IQ84* as a response to show the irrelevance of Orwell's political-ideological discourses in the current of the political situation. *IQ84* is also used to criticize Orwell's modern perspective in *1984*.

1.6. The Review of Previous Studies

The idea of this research appeared from exploring related previous studies such as novels, dissertations, articles, and books. Haruki Murakami is now considered as an important author thus it is not hard to find research that discussed his works. Even though there are plenty of articles talking about Haruki Murakami's works, no articles discuss the relation between *IQ84* and *1984* specifically. However, there are several articles found that can support this research. Jiwoon Baik wrote an article entitled *Murakami Haruki and the Historical Memory of East Asia (2010)*. This article focuses on how Murakami's major works such as *Norwegian Wood*, *Kafka on the Shore* and *IQ84* help Asian people to do reconciliation with the historical memory in the past. Baik states that Murakami healed the dark historical memory in the past by creating the past as a romantic memory that can be revisited and remembered again.

The reason I choose this article is because this article has proven that in China Murakami's works are succeed making people reconcile with their historical memory. That invention is totally important for my research which focus on criticizing the ideological manifestation in Orwell's *1984*.

An article by Tomoki Wakatsuki, *Haruki Murakami as a Cosmopolitan Phenomenon: from 'Ordinary' to 'Celebrity' (2017)*, in which he discussed the 'Haruki Phenomenon' which happens worldwide. His works are not only appreciated in Japan, but also in other countries such as US, UK, North America, South America, and Asia. Tomo concluded the

reason why Murakami's works are accepted worldwide is because his works can express the kind of feeling that people around the world experience every day. Murakami's works contain the universality and the respect of diversity which seldom appear in other Japanese literary works.

I chose this article because this article focuses on the universality appear in Murakami's works. This article obviously proves that Murakami's works are not only depicting personal problems. But also focused on the daily life that is faced by people in different country and place. It provides the answer why Haruki Murakami's works are being read worldwide, because his works show universality.

There is also an article discussed about his famous novel *1Q84*. The article was written by Gaston Franssen entitled *The Literary Auto-representation of Haruki Murakami: Rewriting Celebrity Authorship in 1Q84 (2018)* which discuss the *1Q84* as an auto-representation of Murakami's biographical career as a writer. Franssen argued that in *1Q84*, Murakami tries to answer the question about how he never won the Akutagawa Prize which is considered for the highly aesthetic literary works of serious writer. In this article, through his fictional characters, Franssen convinces that *1Q84* is an auto-representation of Murakami as a celebrity author that outcased from Japanese literature.

This article explains that *1Q84* was deliberately used to criticize Japanese literary critics who tend to categorize literary works. It can be seen from Murakami's writing career in Japanese. Even though his works are rapidly sold out, that fact does not change the literary critics' perspective in Japan that his works are worthy to be awarded the most precious award: Akutagawa Prize. So that is why I use this article to support my research, because his work—especially *1Q84*—is discussing the literary politics in Japan.

This article proves us that as a writer, Murakami tries to break the wall between high and low literature which has been a tradition since years ago. This dichotomization

becomes Murakami's main critic in his novel, and the ideological background that is used in Japan is modernism, and it makes works that do not follow the modern standard are not going to be perceived as good work. This is why I chose this article, because this article has a significant contribution against my research.

There were plenty of articles discussed *1984* through various of perspectives. But, there is no discussion that particularly discussing the relation between *1984* with *1Q84* as discussed in this research. However, there are some articles that can support this research.

An article by Douglas Kerr entitled: *Law and Race in George Orwell (2016)* discusses Orwell's insight on law and race in his novel *1984*, which was influenced from his experiences as a policeman in Burma during the British colonialization. Staying eight years in Burma, Orwell saw so many injustice enforcements conducted against the native which affected his views on race and law as he depicted in the *1984*.

This article is chosen as a supporting data to strengthen my statement that Orwell is a kind of person who refuses oppression of any kind. It is proven with this article that even though he has an authorization as a policeman, he did not abuse it because he sees that in Burma, policeman tends to abuse the power against lower class people.

There is also a book review by Stephen Ingle published in *Science journal* concerning the ideological-political discourses that appear in Orwell's works, He wrote a review about Orwell's views on Marxism, entitled: *The Political and Cultural Thinking of George Orwell: Orwell and Marxism (2010)*. Ingle argues that Orwell totally hated the pseudo-Marxists who tend to manifest or impose socialism as a dogmatic tenet such that represented by the Russian communist. Orwell believed that ideological confrontation is just a game among the middle-class intellectuals. From this research Ingle believed that Orwell was actually an ethical socialist which denied all of Stalin's ideological implementation in against Russian society.

This article is really connected with my assumption that the motive lies behind the writing of *1984* was affected by his disappointment against pseudo-socialist who politically took opportunities from that ideological label and caused the demise as happened in Uni Soviet and Mao Tse-sung under his communist regime.

In 2017, there was also an interesting article discussing the *1984* through the perspective of education. The article entitled *For the Future and for the Unborn: Considerations of History and Historian for Art Educators: Generated from George Orwell's 1984* (2017) written by Dolin. He asserted five important ideas emerged from his reading on the *1984*. They are the uncertainty of historian, the impulse of historian, the responsibility of historian, the power of historian, and the connectivity of historian. Dolin argues that the development of art education can only be developed if the historian understands how to deal with these five ideas. He sees the demise of totalitarianism in Orwell's *1984* as the agenda of rewriting the history conducted by the historian.

This article is very useful to support my assumption that *1984* is more than just a canonical work, it is rather a book that contains perfect depiction of political agendas implemented by totalitarian government, and it makes the book directly provides ideological perspective that government tends to abuse the power by implementing political agendas.

In the use of politics and postmodern aesthetics, there was a thesis entitled *Politics of Postmodern Aesthetics on Salman Rushdie's Haroun and the Sea of Stories: Marxist Reading* (2015) written by Heru Joni Putra. This research talks about the way Salman Rushdie used postmodern aesthetics to criticize Ayatollah Khomeini who put fatwa on Rushdie because of his controversial novel *The Satanic Verses*. In this research, Heru argues that the point of using postmodern aesthetics in his allegorical novel is to convey the freedom of expression.

The reason I chose this article was because Heru was successfully depicting Salman Rushdie's intention of making *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*, which was to criticize Ayatollah Khomeini who put fatwa on him, by using the element of postmodernism. What Heru did in his research was actually what inspired me to analyze *IQ84* by using the element of postmodernism.

For the idea to criticize Orwell's *1984* and the theory that was chosen to support this research was coming from an unexpected moment. It was because of a controversial dissertation by Abdul Aziz entitled *The Concept of Milk Al-Yamin by Muhammad Syahrur as the Legality of Non-marital Sexual Intercourse (2019)*. In his dissertation, Abdul Aziz uses hermeneutic by Hans Gadamer as a methodology to criticize the previous traditional concept of *Milk Al-Yamin* which is frequently being abused by men to legalize the non-marital sexual intercourse.

This dissertation was chosen because Abdul Aziz used Gadamer's hermeneutic theory to criticize the discourse about non-marital sexual intercourse. The name of the theory is Historical Effectiveness Theory and The Fusion of Horizons which can find the contextual truth. That is why I used this theory to see ideological discourse in *1984* and *IQ84*, and assimilating those two discourses I order to find which discourse is more relevant with today's society.

In order to strengthen my comparative analysis, I used a dissertation by Sandra Vlasta entitled *Contemporary Migration Literature. In German and English: A comparative Study (2015)*. In this research Vlasta explained that the understanding of migration literature has been criticized by authors and critics, because most of the reader does not think that migration literature shows topic related to the experiences as migrant, but rather as a diasporic author who see the country with hybrid perspectives. And in this research, Vlasta used renowned contemporary works written by diaspora contemporary authors.

The reason why I used this research is because Haruki Murakami also offers the same issue, which fuses two different cultural perspectives in his texts. He shows how is modernism glorified by Japanese society but at the same time also embraces its cultural primordially unconsciously. It makes his works are interesting to be compared in cultural aspects.

1.7. Theoretical Framework

In the early 20th century, the Nazi Germany vehemently and massively promoted fascism, and at the same time communism ideology was trusted as a way out of capitalism. At that time, literary work was mostly written structurally in the linear-form which are categorized as modern literary work. The root of postmodern was actually started there and initiated by Friedrich Nietzsche who argued that modernism glorified ratiom without considering the “emotional aspect” in every aspect of analysis.^{iv}

Since that time, postmodernism, as a criticism against modernism, evolves and made some significant inventions in academics field. One of the famous postmodernist theories is a called Deconstruction by Jacques Derrida which focuses on re-examining the truth through language and text.

In criticizing the political and ideological discourse in *1984*, this research borrows Fredric Jameson’s political unconscious to see the ideological and political discourses in the depiction of historical situation of the *1984*. Jameson stated that cultural text is tied to an ideological-political unconscious which underlies it. To uncover the political unconscious in the text, Jameson uses the ‘mediation’ as the dialectical term to represent the establishment of relationships between the formal analysis of a work of art and its social ground, or between the internal dynamics of the political state and its economic base (Jameson 1981: 5-39).

Jameson said that narrative requires interpretation in which essentially allegorical. He argues that narrative text is not only a form of writing but it also has symbolic meaning that lies within the text. The text is implicitly containing unconscious politics perspective which has a strong connection with the reality of social life. It means from the narrative text we can trace its political unconscious that actually represents the author's ideological-political discourses by critically reading and observing the text (Jameson 1981: 3). And to support this, we need some evidences regarding to the author's political background and the time of the author's work publication in order to synchronize it.

Jameson's *Political Unconscious* is categorized as a theory equipped with postmodernistic views. But it does not mean that the mechanism of his theory works as the other postmodern theories like postmodern theory initiated by Jean Baudrillard, Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault that focus more on the object. For example, Roland Barthes theory called "The Author is Dead". Barthes argued that the text is not a single writing, because the text is tied with another text taken from various sources which makes the text has multiple interpretations. That is why, what is written in the text must not be linked to the author, because what is written in the text is no longer can represent the author's perspectives. Linking the text with the author means the reader limits the interpretation. That is why he said the author is dead. But in Jameson's theory, he opposed what Barthes said. For him, the text cannot be separated from the author, because what is written in the text has a significant thing of what he called "Ideologemes" which means a sort of the smallest unit of ideological atom where the ideological discourse can be elaborated through the analysis (Jameson 1981: 89)

So, in Jameson's theory, the most important thing to trace the political unconscious of the author are political, social and historical. These three horizons are the theoretical element to reveal the modes of production used by the bourgeoisie. Based on these

explanations, it shows us that Jameson's Marxism is much more complex and totally unconventional. Because he uses cultural text to reveal its political unconscious that represents the situation of the socioeconomic base which has a strong connection to cultural aspects that contain gender, class, sexuality, myth, symbol, and allegory which can be critically explored and analyzed.

Other than Jameson's *Political Unconscious*, this research also uses Hermeneutic Theory by Hans-Georg Gadamer called *Historical Effectiveness Theory* is also used to interpret the context of political and ideological discourses in 1984 that are continuously cited by people to address similar political issues in different context of situation (Gadamer 1981: 295)

Gadamer said that in terms of interpreting text, someone has to rehab his or her comprehension. Someone must be aware that in the process of interpreting the text, two horizons must be dialectically assimilated. These two horizons namely books (categorized as historical horizon) and reader (categorized as present horizon) which have to be communicated and assimilated to each other to dissolve the tension between the objectivity of text as the historical horizon and the subjectivity of the reader as the present horizon. This dialectical assimilation works based what is seen by the reader in the text as source of objective knowledge. It means the reader has to divide every information the reader obtains from the text, like primary information and secondary information. The function of primary information is to support knowledge of the reader as present horizon, meanwhile the function of secondary information is merely to enrich knowledge of the reader because the secondary information is categorized as irrelevant information with what is happening around the reader which constructs the reader's paradigm. That is why the process of assimilation horizons help the reader to obtain objective truths because the reader has

filtered the information from the book that the reader thinks is important and relevant with what happened in the present situation (Gadamer 1981: 305-361).

The *grand narratives* Orwell developed in the novel *1984* that, there is no such egalitarian society as expected by the communist, is the main focus of this analysis. Orwell's radical perspective to overgeneralize the demise of socialism utopia that he depicted in *1984* is a result of his modern way of thinking which only relied on rationalism and empiricism—Karen Armstrong explained in his book *History of God* that's something that can only physically be seen (Armstrong 1993: 343). And as a modernist, he denied emotion as a significant. It makes his perspective against corrupted socialism ideology implied by Stalin and Mao Tse-sung made he put a negative connotation against Marxism ideology itself. That is why those political and ideological discourses will be critically discussed and assimilated with the political-ideological discourses offered in *IQ84* by using one of several theoretical methods formulated by Gadamer namely *The Assimilation of Horizons*.

1.8. The Method of Collecting Data

This is a library research which explores two kinds of data: primary and secondary data. The Primary data are extracted from the novel *1984* and *IQ84*. The secondary data are obtained from the texts related to the main data, such as academic articles in international journals, book and web that can support the research.

1.9. The Method of Analyzing Data

This research will use a qualitative method to analyze the novel. Started by a close reading on the two novels, finding the issues related to the topic of discussions and theory, then examining quotations related to the issues found in the locus of data by using the theoretical perspectives.

1.10. The Method of Presenting Data

The research is presented in descriptive method. The argumentation is supported by the data from the novel and relevant secondary sources in order to build a comprehensive qualitative research analysis. The analysis is started by presenting preliminary analysis of two novels separately, and then in the next chapter the result of preliminary analysis is discussed intensively in order to reveal the ideological discourse between two novels. At the end, a conclusion is withdrawn by answering the research question.

1. Edward Quiin, *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*, Facts on File, New York: 2006, p. 330
2. Jean Baudrillard, *For the Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, Telos Press, USA, 1981
3. Jean Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. Teror Press, USA, 1981p. 91
4. Kevin O'Donnell, *Postmodrnism*, fourth editon, Lion Publishing, Oxford, 2003, p. 12.

