

CRITIQUE OF IDEOLOGY BIN GEORGE ORWELL'S NOVEL 1984: A HANS-GEORG GADAMER'S HERMENEUTICS READING

¹Daniel Ahmad Fajri, ²Romel Noverino

^{1,2} English Department, Faculty of Letters and Cultures, Universitas Gunadarma
Jl. Margonda Raya No.100, Depok16424, Jawa Barat

¹danielafajri@student.gunadarma.ac.id, ²romel@staff.gunadarma.ac.id

Abstract

This study is to analyze George Orwell's novel 1984 that published in 1949. This study uses descriptive qualitative method. The analysis of this study focuses on hermeneutical reading of the text. This study aims to find out critique of ideology concept by reading both the text and the researcher (as interpreter) horizons to get a current meaning of the text. This study applies philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Jurgen Habermas's critical theory to analyze the novel. After interprets the horizon of the text with three stages of analysis (understanding, historical consciousness, and history of effect), then the prejudice/presupposition (Habermas' critique of ideology) appear dialectically as interpreter horizon to read the 1984 in its current context. The result proves that, although the work of structure of power in Orwell's life and interpreter are different - Orwell who live in the tension of world ideologies (with fascism, soviet communism, and other totalitarian power) and interpreter in the late-capitalism era (with liberal consensus domination), but analysis of critique of ideology in the 1984 novel in the current context relates to several things. Among other things are, total domination of the system like distorting symbolic interactions and how power works supported - manifested in high-level technology with its propaganda and supervision of civil society. At this point, to resist against totalitarian system, both Orwell and Habermas are similar as well - a process of rationalization with a communication paradigm with emancipatory mission to give a progressive free individual formation in the society.

Keywords: *critical theory, cultural studies, epistemology, hermeneutics, and ideology*

INTRODUCTION

Critique of ideology is a very fresh topic in contemporary discourse of philosophy, politics, also in literature and its relation to society. One of German philosopher who is in the tradition of critical theory named Jürgen Habermas, tries to dismantle ideological motives in modern society and projects a communicative paradigm through a synthesis between social science and philosophy. Regarding the projection of Habermas, Hardiman (2009:34) explains, "Critical theory as critique of ideology carries the task of cracking the 'mask' of positivism". What is

meant by positivism here is not just a positivistic view of science, but is related to the "way of thinking" in advanced industrial societies. It can be said later, Habermas through his critical-communicative theory aims to provide a theoretical basis as well as social praxis to maintain rationality in the form of modern human freedom and autonomy from all ideological threats.

Eric Arthur Blair (1903-1950) or famously known as George Orwell – an English novelist, essayist, journalist and cultural critic, reflects nicely how important a critique of ideology is in one of his most

famous novels entitled *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1984). In this novel, Orwell seems to invite the reader to imagine a future - remembering this novel tells a story about a period of about 40 years after the novel was published in 1949, which is in a state of crisis because a totalitarian system that dominates the whole reality is not only against nature, but towards human autonomy. In fact, Orwell lived between two terrible ideological systems namely fascism and communism, and the novel seemed to be an alert and a kind of warning from Orwell to all kinds of totalitarian systems, because after all human independence is something that must be attached to itself. With what Orwell experience, we can reflect that, in a modern condition like today that seem to be completely practical, easy and sophisticated because of technological advances, put humans' position into a supposition of an ideal condition that they think they "almost" fully real themselves. The high level of consumption, an easy access to information, as far as the "promising" stage of progress in the field of biotechnology totally distinguishes the life of this era with four or three centuries ago both in their way of thinking or daily practicalities. More than just an instrument, let's say, in the social, cultural and political dimensions, we today live in an era of freedom. Nevertheless, in the modern era that shows everything seems to be in the stage of reasonableness and life seems well in itself, paradoxically the life of this modern society

is fundamentally the opposite. For example, a group of intellectuals in the tradition of Western Marxism called the Frankfurt School like the first generation with Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and latest generation represented by Jurgen Habermas, gave a strong critique of the mindset or rationality of modern society. In paradox, the enlightenment or modern age in which is understood as the progress of the human mindset, precisely puts humans in a tremendous catastrophe.

In this study, the researcher conducts a Hans-Georg Gadamer hermeneutic study with elements of literary and society relations from the 1984 novel. Here, the researcher wants to find an understanding of critique of ideology that assumed occur in the text of that novel and see the contextual relationship with the conditions of modern society today. The researcher chose the 1984 novel because after reading Orwell's work – taking Gadamer's term, there is a potentiality of *Horizontverschmelzung* or fusion of horizons between the author's and researchers' in *Wirkungsgeschichte* or reception history about the critique of ideology. For Gadamer, understanding the past does not mean presenting the past but transforming it as a new form of meeting current conditions. This problem is nothing but different historical dimension between author of the novel and the researcher as interpreter to capture a phenomenon, it can be said that the understanding of authors and researchers within a horizon or space in a particular understanding. In other words, the author and

researcher move in different areas of mutual understanding that have been assumed to be just like that dialectically. Because of the historical situation in which the author and researcher are take a part in it, then the continuity or process in the hermeneutical situation to result new meaning is possible.

By conducting this research based on Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics theory as a scalpel, this research aim is to analyze Frankfurt School specifically Jürgen Habermas's critique of ideology on the conditions of modern society and interrelate it in Orwell's novel text which is assumed to contain an understanding of critique of ideology. In other words, the researcher interpreting the text to see how contextual situation relates in literary work. With clarity about this study, it is to shows how the relation of an extrinsic elements in relation between reflection in the works of literature and society is become more important.

METHODS

In this study, the researcher uses descriptive qualitative method with Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermerneutics model as technique of analysis to interpret the data of the research. Qualitative method, Bungin (2001:67-68) argues "... Analysis of qualitative data explains more facts in and more explains things that are not exhibited by objects of research to outsiders". The researcher chose one technique and approach

in the qualitative method, namely the hermeneutical analysis model. In general, hermeneutics, can be derived from the ancient Greek word *hermeneuein* which means "to translate" or "act as interpreter". In its most recent sense, hermeneutics is not only limited to a method for interpreting sacred texts only, but texts in general such as cultural phenomena, legal issues, discourse on other humanities, including the study of literature in them.

Gadamer himself in his book entitled *truth and method* in overall argues that hermeneutics is not only about the methodology of interpretation but rather on the dimensions of ontology or *the way of being* in human life. He began his discussion by questioning the notion of hermeneutics in general, Gadamer (1975:268) explains "Hermeneutics has traditionally understood itself as an art or technique. This is the true event of the Dilemma's expansion of hermeneutics into an organon of the human sciences. One might wonder whether there is an art or technique of understanding.". Gadamer's suspicions that contained in his writing was addressed to his predecessors who intended to find objective meaning in interpreting a text. In other words, a practical hermeneutics in Gadamer's view must find the meaning of the text contextually. For Gadamer, each interpreter and author has always moved in the area of understanding or in terms of gadamer, a different horizon that they have just assumed. According to

Gadamer, citing Hardiman (2015:163) "understanding is not a representation of the meaning of the past, but a fusion between the author's horizon and the current horizon of the reader."

Therefore, the researcher concludes, qualitative research is a research that concerns on human problems and it is manner based on dynamic and never-ending nature of life. And then, Gadmer's hermeneutics model provides a different color in a textual interpretation because it involves a contemporary dimension that is based on the experience of the subjective pre-understanding of the researcher. According to that point, this research is very suitable to use qualitative descriptive method with Gadamer's hermeneutics model as a technique because it does not require statistics or other quantification way. Further, this research emphasizes more to the process of analysis.

Documentation technique is used for the steps of collecting data. About this, Khatib (2018:99) explained that documentation technique is collection data based on documents, which can be in form of notes of events, writing, picture, and so forth. This technique uses identification, classification, and categorization as a mean to get the research data. Therefore, referring to the description above, there are few steps of collecting data as expounds: (1) Reading George Orwell's novel 1984, (2) Identifying and underlying each quotations and sentences that are related to the topic, (3) Taking notes

all related quotations and sentences after underlining, (4) Finding the theories from some books that related to the topic, (5) Identifying the quotations and sentences that are compatible with the theories to the research. In this research, the researcher uses Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutics as technique of analyzing data. Operationally, in his hermeneutics, Gadamer divides the two processes of understanding in which each of them is formed historically and has it is own horizon - the text and interpreter. After that there is a fusion of the horizon or the current meaning of the interpreted text. However, the process of analyzing the data is as follow: (1) The identified text - quotations and sentences that assumed occur critique of ideology, are classified into two different horizon – the text itself and the researcher, (2) Outlining the horizon of the text through the stages of understanding, historical consciousness, and history of effect, (3) Elaborating the researcher's horizon with the presupposition or prejudice of Habermas's critique of Ideology, (4) Communicating the two horizons that based on the steps above, both on the text horizon itself and the researchers' horizon to get the contextual meaning of critique of ideology topic in the novel.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As explained above, in Gadamer hermeneutics, it also does not focus solely on the text. Another important aspect is that the interpreter makes a direct interpretation of the

text. In the Gadamer hermeneutic, with a "prejudice" or presupposition of interpreter, the interpreter here is then assumed to have a dialectical element to find new meaning for the interpretation of the text.

Horizon of the Text

The horizon of a text contains three elements in Gadamer's hermeneutic dimension. First, the stages of understanding (to look for facts of the meaning of the text). Second, historical consciousness of the text (to find out how the text is present). And third, history of effect (to find the suitability of the text and its context).

Understanding the Text (Ideological Expression)

At this stage of 'understanding,' the researcher made a critical reading from the point of view formed in the text to understand how what the author intended was true. This is done by means of first looking at the background of the text and then describing the facts related to the intended text

In the novel, the researchers found at least four ideological expressions used by the party led by Big Brother to seize individual freedom in Oceania. (1) *Newspeak* as power's control through language. Here, the researcher found, as the most important ideological prerequisite, English Socialism or *Ingsoc* led by Big Brother in Oceania first touched the dimension of human language by creating a new language called Newspeak. By creating

Newspeak as the official language and the only means of communication, the Ingsoc and Big Brother parties can then control their citizens easily. In this discussion, the researcher will not discuss it thoroughly, but about the usefulness of Newspeak, Orwell himself in the novel explains: **"The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought – that is, a thought diverging from the principle of Ingsoc – should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words".** (1984, 1950: 299-300). At some point, to control in this form of language does not only limit freedom of thought in principle, but gradually and systematically, the party with Newspeak wants to replace a climate of thinking that according to the method specified by the party. (2) *Doublethink* as power's direct control. Political indoctrination through language which was fundamentally carried out by the Ingsoc party through Newspeak then produced conditions on the way people think in the country of Oceania. The effect that occurs is the acceptance of Doublethink which can be interpreted as, Orwell himself in his 1984 novel writes: **"Doublethink means the power to of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's**

mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. The party intellectual knows in which direction his memories must be altered; he therefore knows that he is playing tricks with reality; but by the exercise of doublethink he also satisfies himself that reality is not violated. The process have to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it also has to be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity and hence of guilt” (1984, 1950: 214). By flipping through the reality that produces the paradoxical mindset of Doublethink as part of Newspeak, this illustrates that, the planting of ideologies from a running system does not merely use brutal and repressive apparatus. In other words, through language, a totalitarian system effectively operates in order to perpetuate its ideological intentions. Not surprisingly, in this story, the citizens of Oceania are very loyal to Big Brother. (3) *Thought-Police* as power’s surveillance of unapproved thought. The next ideological expression in the 1984 novel by Orwell was a kind of secret police from the Oceania country called the Thought Police or in the Newspeak language called *Thinkpol*. In this 1984 novel about Thought Police, Orwell reveals: **“There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. How often, or on that system, the Thought Police plugged in on my individual wire was guesswork. It was even conceivable that they watched**

everybody all the time. But at any rate that they could plug in your wire whenever they wanted to. You had to live – did live, from that habit that became instinct – in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and, except in darkness, every movement scrutinized” (1984, 1950: 3). In the novel it is told, when Winston wrote a daily cookie, at first there was some kind of doubt because the police thought. The existence of this Thought Police simply has the task of watching over, finding out, and then arresting any of the citizens of Oceania who challenge the authority of the Ingsoc Party. All the time there is always supervision of citizens, there is no personal dimension that is typical of Oceania's human mind because the Big Brother regime's power ambitions are total. (4) *Telescreen* as power’s control device and propaganda. Telescreen is an extension of Thought Police in the form of a surveillance tool that aims to perpetuate party power. The way the telescreen works is almost like a television, but no one can turn it off and the most unique thing about this is, because it is a monitoring tool, then not only can people watch the telescreen, but the whole movement of the community is watched by the authorities for the sake of some kind of "discipline". **“Behind Winston’s back the voice from the telescreen was still babbling away about pig iron and the overfulfillment of the Ninth Three-Year Plan. The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston**

made, above the level of a very lower whisper, would be picked up by it; moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision heard.” (1984, 1950: 2-3).

In addition to watching and preventing things that are not desired by the party, the telescreen also has a function as a propaganda tool. **“The sound from the telescreen paused. A trumpet call, clear and beautiful, floated into stagnant air. The voice continued raspingly: 'Attention! Your attention, please! A newsflash has this moment arrived from the Malabar front. Our forces in South India have won glorious victory. I am authorized to say that the action we are now reporting may well bring the war within measurable distance of its end. Here is the newsflash –”** (1984, 1950: 25-6). In this case, telescreen is the most effective tool for the party, not only spreading doctrine, but controlling one's behavior with news that glorifies the Big Brother regime. With the telescreen as well, the Oceania government can immediately prevent any indication of fraud or any form of rebellion from its citizens.

Historical Consciousness Stage (Historical Aspect of the Text)

The historical background of the text in the stage of understanding that refers primarily to the 1984 text, the researcher reads it is nothing but a reflection of Orwell's life which is among the regime of large destructive ideologies, namely nazism and

communism. Orwell, in making the work, has gone through several important moments and experiences in relentless brutality and terror, therefore the insufficient internal contemplation of the emerging complex phenomenon produced a very influential work in this modern English literature. Rodden (2007: 146) asserts, “Nineteen Eighty-Four is misread if not read in the context of its time - around 1948: a postwar world brutally and arbitrarily divided into spheres of influence by the great powers; the atom bomb exploded; and the fictive London of Winston Smith a recognizable caricature of the actual postwar London that Orwell had walked, and that this author can vividly remember”.

The main objective of Orwell's criticism, as a socialist, was the communist regime of the Soviet Union at that time. Bounds (2009: 137) writes, “Orwell agreed with the anti-Stalinists from the beginning and wrote bitter attacks on the USSR from 1936 onwards. At the same time (and unlike some of his more propaganda-minded contemporaries) he was interested not simply in denouncing Stalinism but in understanding it”. At the stage of understanding above, it is clearly stated that Orwell in his novel seeks to express ideology in forms such as, controlling fundamentally through language which then influences the way of thinking and Thought Police assisted by a telescreen to destroy all forms of thinking that are different from lines party. In 1984, Bounds (2009: 137)) adds, “Orwell chose to skewer the authoritarian

strain in modern socialism not by writing directly about the USSR (something he had already done at length) but by conjuring a dystopian fantasy in which Britain is governed by a socialist dictatorship that takes Stalin's methods to new extremes". Under Stalin's regime, many critics says communism did not show the slightest human face. Supervision of society, the prohibition of freedom of thought and opinion, terror and punishment of anyone outside the party line, discrimination against religions, the "Gulag" labour camp which has a very high mortality rate are some pictures of a horrible horror of his cruel regime. And all these terrible things do not apply only to opponents, but friends and party members can be suspected and then evaporated.

This shows that the historical context has continued since Orwell wrote his latest work with commentators. Phillips Bound, in his book on Orwell thinking and Marxism, comments on Orwell's diligence in attacking the Stalinist regime and culminating in a "prophecy" or dystopian fantasy in his last work, *1984*. A criticism of Orwell became a kind of "resistance" to the political conditions at that time. In other words, in this work there is an element of an emancipatory message which emphasizes a self-reflection of the experience in which Orwell lived in a post-war destructive society situation involving two powerful ideological forces, fascism and communism.

History of Effect (Critique of Ideology)

This stage is a continuation of the stage of historical consciousness which is integrally part of the understanding itself. Reviewing this history of effect is done in two ways, namely in terms of its origin and in terms of its contents. In the first way, it has been found that in terms of its origin, as has been explained in historical consciousness, the text is a manifestation of Orwell's effort in two tensions between two destructive, powerful ideologies. This is reinforced by Orwell commentators about this subject which shows the continuity of tradition. The second way, in terms of textual content, which has also been described in the stage of historical consciousness, this text focuses on Orwell's reflection on power structure or ideological criticism.

Continuous propaganda carried out by the party made everything become a fog. The craziest thing is that, one day the party announced that two plus two equals five, and everyone had to obey them. Common sense becomes a heretic from all heretics. Party philosophy and logic reject all forms of factual external reality to the validity of human experience. But Winston still believed in human ratios by rejecting the party's paradoxical dogmatic rationality. He wrote in his note important arguments: **"Freedom is the freedom to state that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows."** (*1984, 1950: 81*).

Winston's courage was not only floating in his mind. In a sense, in his practical dimension, he personally met Julia who was not only his lover, but also his friend to exchange ideas and lines of unnatural policies from the party. Then he met the figure of O'Brien, a member of the core party whom he believed was in his favour and had access to a brotherhood that allowed freedom of thought. He met O'Brien several times, talking about his brotherhood and agenda to make an active rebellion against the party even though it was difficult. **“There is no possibility that any perceptible change will happen within our lifetime. We are dead. Our only true life is in the future. We shall take part in it as handfuls of dust and splinters of bone. But how far away that future may be, there is no knowing. It might be a thousand years. At present nothing is possible except to extend the area of sanity little by little. We cannot act collectively. We can only spread or knowledge outwards from individual to individual, generation after generation. In the face of Thought Police, there is no other way.”** (1984, 1950: 176). Little by little, with the aim of which he wants to find a feeling as a human being who is truly valuable, even though his efforts do not produce anything, with a process, at least in his mind he has defeated the party. Orwell very clearly conveyed the ratio as a distinctive feature of human subjectivity that has equality goals. Because in his narrative, in

the end, O'Brien, the person Winston truly believed had access to brotherhood, turned out to be just another mask of power. Winston was taken away while spending time with Julia, and it was O'Brien who directly interrogated him in times of exile and torture. About the core of this message, Orwell wrote: **“Where there is equality there can be sanity. Sooner or later it would happen: Strength would change into consciousness.”** (1984, 1950: 220). These different historical dimensions can be connected because of a common understanding between the text and interpreters of critique of ideology which later in Gadamer Hermeneutics aims to gain new understanding. But before getting a new understanding of Orwell's text, or Orwell's current text meaning, researchers in this case must first explain the Horizon of the interpreter.

Interpreter's Horizon (Habermas' Critique of Ideology)

In the study of Gadamer's hermeneutics, the prejudice or pre-supposition of the researcher is the main point for understanding the text. Here, the researcher brings an understanding of what is in the researcher to be validated later. The researcher horizon as this interpreter, the researcher will describe how the criticism of Habermas's ideology in the *Late-Capitalism* period becomes a pre-presumption to read the text in its present dimension. Compared to his predecessor, Habermas still survives but established a new

epistemology that is still in connection between the theory and practical human social, namely the communication paradigm. In its praxis, Habermas pays attention to the dimension that is different from Marx, namely communication. In his book entitled *Toward a Rational Society*, Habermas (1987) claims "In order to reformulate what Weber called 'rationalization', I should like to go beyond the subjective approach that Parsons shares with Weber and propose another categorical framework. I shall take as my starting point the fundamental distinction between work and interaction" (Hal.91). For Marx as well as Habermas, the starting point of human praxis is matter, concrete conditions, and humans who live as knowing subjects. However, Habermas thinks that, Marx is a way too excessive by focusing human praxis on just one dimension (work) and forgetting the other (interaction).

The dimension of human praxis based on work is aimed at nothing but to deceive nature. Therefore, for Habermas, rationality in this sense is still instrumental. The thesis proposed by Habermas is nothing else because the development of the system of capitalism itself is very different from the Marx. The mass production or work area has mastered the dimensions of culture (life-world). In this era of capitalism. technology and science advances support the production process which has an automatic mechanism that guarantees sustainable productivity. Commenting on Habermas, Hardiman (2009)

about this new-style capitalism argues "With the emergence of capitalist production, according to Habermas, the legitimacy of the institutional framework is directly related to the social work system. At the same time, the property rights order changes from a political relations to a production relations governed by a market mechanism." (p. 104-5). With the production of advertising, TV, internet, etc., it automatically expands the rationality-purpose subsystem in society. The process of domination of this market mechanism results in the fading of the 'metaphysical' dimension in the dimensions of human interaction.

The other presumption of the author is that, Orwell, even though he is an intellectual left, but he is not an orthodox one. Like Orwell, Habermas also wants to get out of orthodox Marxist traditions. By removing the proletariat as a savior to mankind in revolution, Habermas then proposes something more general, namely the ratio of man himself. With the communication paradigm, here, Habermas was trying to comb back to understand the very core idea and reconstruct the enlightenment process with it is rationalization, undoubtedly it is because for him enlightenment with the rationalization is an unfinished project. The researcher concludes then, that Orwell's reflection on the power structure is not related to work, but with symbolic interactions that have been chaotic. In other words, in Habermas's thought, ideology works as frozen knowledge of human communication in *Life-World* that

has been systematically distorted. Here Orwell did not pay attention to revolutionary resistance and overall change to create socialist society as had been done by the communist party and other movements. However, little by little, as Habermas expressed, the process of sanity or rationalization in this dimension of interaction provides a basis for the equality of people who have a progressive individual formation.

Fusion of Horizons (Present Context of 1984)

This stage is the final stage in Gadamer's hermeneutics. As written in the text horizon, commentators Orwell said that, 1984 was a kind of Orwell self-reflection that lived between world ideologies such as fascism and especially communism. The use of languages such as "power" expressed by Orwell's commentators transmits a tradition, so that the past can be understood in the context of its present. The researcher understands that - supported by the commentators' writings, "Power" in the Orwell tradition, is aimed at a totalitarian regime especially communism under the Stalinist regime. Whereas to understand "power" today in the era of openness and freedom - where the ideologies of the world are dead (including communism itself), is more complex. In the contemporary tradition, as understood also in the thoughts of the Frankfurt School and Habermas, power relations are everywhere. So, with this, the

intersection between text and interpreters is a matter of reflection on power or critique of ideology.

However, analysis of ideological criticism in the 1984 novel on the current context relates to several things. Among them is how power operates by distorting symbolic interactions or making communication systems chaotic. What is meant by the researcher here is, for example, we can read Newspeak today in a political phenomenon called Post-Truth which is continuously reproduced in the mass media and gets a place with their 'propagandistic language' marked by euphemism, circumlocution, and the inversion of customary meanings. As with Newspeak, the phenomenon of post-truth with false news that occurs today in a democratic political culture also deliberately raises things that are very ambiguous and sometimes contradictory with the aim of manipulating the public. Trump's victory, the issue of Brexit, the blasphemy case in Jakarta, and various kinds of politics that emphasize emotions, constructed certain values, and ambiguous political promises are concrete examples today.

In our mediated culture and electronic consciousness or whatever, with its political dynamics, people who get oversight seem to need doublethink to justify the regime in power. The most concrete example of doublethink here was during the inauguration of the president of the United States, Donald Trump two years ago. In this case, one of

Donald Trump's stuff uses the term "alternative facts" to justify narcissism and his obsession with power by manipulating the number of crowds he claims are very large. The reliance on "alternative facts" to deflect criticism requires an entire system and method of thought, a system which knows no cognitive limits and almost all politicians in the world using the populist way to share their doublethink in which compounded by the strongest opinions on social media that defeating the real evidence. Those of us who currently live in the era of the internet and other Hi-Tech devices, are in a very dark domain - a kind of very excessive oversight.

And then, thought-Police without a doubt is for the 21st century. At the moment, every word is monitored, words that are not in accordance with the rules are deleted, history is rewritten and deleted (picking facts according to interests), and anyone who is not in line with those in power will be eliminated, alienated from society and so on. Absolute power today not only manifested in the totalitarian repressive state, but in private companies working in Silicon Valley that totally controls the online world where humans today spend more time in that virtual dimension. Smartphones take on the role of *telescreen*, in addition to acting on one side as a window that allows us to see the world, on the other hand private companies whose requirements have a lot of data and can access their personal data at any time. In social media also propaganda such as gender

sensitivity, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, radicalism in the name of religion are produced endlessly and celebrated as a party that is open to anyone. Instead of being filled with debates full of common sense, public space on social media is filled with hypocritical and consumptive ignorant people.

The position of the researcher as an interpreter feels that Orwell's reflection on the power structure is very close to what is meant by critique of ideology in the thinking of Jurgen Habermas. The tendency of advanced modern society with the technocrat mindset - everything must be viewed with a scientific perspective, seeing everything as far as it can be operated. Humans who used knowledge and technology as facilities, today are dominated by them. Humans at this instrumental stage will not achieve a true freedom. All reality has been grasped, the system validates itself in cultural hegemony so that its power in economics and politics gets stronger. Mass production covers the area of culture where symbolic interaction is possible in it. In general, for Habermas, in fact, today instrumental rationality still dominates. Therefore, with distorted communication and the dominance of technical rationality, Habermas formulates the act of communicative rationality with communicative action. Although it cannot provide changes in its entirety, but little by little, as Habermas reveals, the process of sanity or rationalization in this dimension of

interaction provides a basis for equality of people who have a progressive individual formation. Orwell's understanding and interpreters are basically different one of them about the power structure itself. However, after being reviewed, both in terms of the history of the text, as well as the current context brought by the author, what was produced by reading ideological critics in Orwell's novel met a meeting point such as the problem of a distorted communication system and communicative rationality with acts of communicative action that had an *emancipatory* mission as the solution.

CONCLUSION

Although the structure of power and understanding of power in Orwell's life and interpreters are different - Orwell who live in the tension of world ideologies (with fascism, soviet communism, and other totalitarian power) and interpreters in the late-capitalism era (with domination of liberal consensus) whose power structure is more complex, but analysis of critique of ideology in the *1984* novel in the current context relates to several things. Among other things, first how power works are supported - even manifesting in high-level technology, distorting symbolic interactions or making communication systems chaotic. Distortion in this dimension of language causes instrumental rationality in the modern world to dominate. Second, in addition to total domination in the system, propaganda and supervision in today's era is

very Orwellian! What is called the era of freedom at this time is very paradoxical, the restraints and rules of civilians and others as well - whether realized or not it has been structured in such a way. What we eat, do, aspire and all activities to personal matters such as 'love' have been determined by a system that is supported or tangible in technology. Our lives are gloomy, humans have "died" because they have been tightly regulated and monitored by power. Therefore, to fight against an absolute totalitarian system - although it cannot be done as a whole, to revive people who are active in Life-World, there needs to be a process of rationalization with a communication paradigm with emancipatory mission that has progressive free individual formation in the society.

REFERENCES

- Bounds, P. (2009). *Orwell and marxism*. London:L.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
- Bungin, B. (2001). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Gadamer, H-G., (1975). *Truth and method*. London: Sheed & Ward Ltd and The Continuum
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Toward a rational society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hardiman, F. B. (2009). *Kritik ideologi*. Yogyakarta: PT Kanisius.
- Hardiman, F. B. (2015). *Seni memahami: hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher*

*sampai Derrida. Yogyakarta: PT
Kanisius*

Khatib, A. J. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian
sastra*. Jakarta: Gunadarma.

Orwell, G. (1950). *1984*. London. Signet
Classics

Rodden, J. (2007). *The Cambridge
companion to George Orwell*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.