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ABSTRACT

My thesis examines how rhetoric affects our civil liberties in times of national crisis; more specifically my research focuses on how political rhetoric has affected our civil liberties since 9/11. We often take our rights for granted, but in fact, our civil liberties are constantly reinterpreted and are affected by political rhetoric. The thesis begins with an introduction and literary review of critiques of Orwell's language theories in the first chapter. The second chapter is a Baudrillardian reading of Orwell's Animal Farm and 1984 in which I explore Orwell's language theories to demonstrate how language change affects culture. In the third chapter I offer a rhetorical study of the NSA wiretap controversy that arose since 9/11 and study its effects on the right to privacy and other civil liberties. The conclusion discusses the possible consequences of post-9/11 rhetoric on our future.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Since the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center, journalists such as Keith Olbermann have made reference to George Orwell to describe the rhetoric of fear employed by U.S. government officials in an effort to justify legislation such as the Patriot Act. For example, on the May 11, 2006 broadcast of the MSNBC television show Countdown, Keith Olbermann said in his commentary, "Memo to the Bush Administration, 1984 was not a how-to manual." The political rhetoric of fear employed by the Bush Administration to win support for the Patriot Act is similar to the rhetorical style of the ruling regime in 1984. Such references to Orwell with regard to the Patriot Act can be attributed to the fact that, as Andrei Reznikov notes, Orwell's novels demonstrate the ways "totalitarianism inevitably corrupts language" (117). In Animal Farm, for example we see the manipulation of language. The society of Animal Farm changes as their concept of reality is tampered with by those in power. The new revolutionary government in Animal Farm immediately sets up a list, "The Seven Commandments," which contain the central ideals that the society on the farm
lives by (19). As the new government of Animal Farm becomes corrupt, the commandments are systematically altered to reflect the new reality on the farm. This vision of simulated reality can be explained by Baudrillard’s theory of the hyperreal, which he describes in Simulacra and Simulation. In his theory, Baudrillard claims that the original has been replaced and only a simulation of reality remains (1). This concept can be usefully applied to Constitutional rights that many citizens of the United States take for granted.

In this thesis, I use Baudrillard’s theory of simulacra to explore how the manipulations of language and history affect the perception of reality in both 1984 and Animal Farm. I then use the fruits of this analysis to examine how in recent years the right to privacy in the United States has shifted through similar manipulations of language and history. More specifically, I use my Baudrillardian analysis of Orwell to explore the rhetorical and legislative interpretations of the Fourth Amendment and the right to privacy pre- and post-9/11 in order to illustrate how Orwellian rhetoric has altered our right to privacy and what this means to civil liberties post-9/11. More specifically, the post-9/11 rhetoric of the Bush
Administration is similar to the rhetoric of tyranny in Orwell's novels as both employ an atmosphere of fear as a pretense to restrict civil liberties such as freedom of the press and the right to privacy. The phrase "Orwellian rhetoric" has been adopted by the media and other cultural critics to refer to the manipulation of language by totalitarian regimes. Orwell, of course, exposed and criticized such practices.

Literature Review

While recent references in the media to Orwell are common, much of what is written centers on controversies involving his theories of language. Orwell strongly believed in the importance of thoughtful word choice. His stated reasons for his stance led to some heated debates, particularly his theory stated in his essay "Politics and the English Language." He writes, "One ought to recognize that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language and that one could probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end" (120). Other controversial stances that Orwell took include curtailing the use of empty metaphors and stock clichés because he felt they demonstrate a lack of careful thought.
and word choice which he contended was an indication of laziness and disinterest ("Politics and the English Language" 112).

Although I use Orwell’s language theories in my thesis, my contribution is unique. My Baudrillardian reading of Animal Farm and 1984 illuminates the post-9/11 Bush Administration’s rhetoric. I then examine the implications of this rhetoric on civil liberties in the United States. Such an analysis is of value because the political rhetoric post-9/11 is altering civil liberties in the United States. My thesis argues that political rhetoric post-9/11 has limited Fourth Amendment rights in the United States.

In contrast to my thesis which focuses on the effects of political rhetoric on civil liberties, much scholarly work on Orwell is concerned primarily with linguistics. For example, W.F. Bolton’s book The Language of 1984: Orwell’s English and Ours is a linguistic study of language change from Orwell’s time until Bolton’s book was published in 1984. As Bolton states, “his book limits its field by taking George Orwell as its starting point, concentrating on changes in English and the attitudes towards it as they diverge from his” (11). Bolton’s book is primarily a
linguistic study and is not a study of power shifts resulting from language change. I will argue, as does Orwell, that language manipulation and political rhetoric can change the perception of a concept, and that many concepts we take for granted, such as the right to privacy, are subject to reinterpretation by the rhetoric of the time.

Whereas Bolton examines linguistic changes in the English language since the publication of Orwell’s novels, Andrei Reznikov seeks to prove that Orwell’s writings about language in 1984 constitute a viable language theory. Reznikov analyzes Orwell’s language theories and tests these theories using three different languages: English, German, and Russian. The purpose and scope of Reznikov’s study as he describes it are:

- to describe Orwell’s hypothesis about language (Newspeak being only one piece of the mosaic) and
- to show two things: (1) this theory is proved by facts from different languages no matter what type of society uses this or that language, and (2) Orwell was right not only in his hypothesis about language, but also in his suggestions for reforming the language. My analysis is done
exclusively within linguistic framework, and I cannot — and do not wish to — provide any societal facts or conclusions. (xiii)

I agree with Reznikov’s view that Orwell’s 1984 contains a viable language theory; indeed, my use of the term Orwellian in this thesis is based on the language theory in 1984. However, my thesis differs from Reznikov in both methodology and scope. I explore Orwell’s language theory by the means of a Baudrillardian study of 1984 and Animal Farm, and use the results to analyze post-9/11 rhetoric. My rhetorical analysis differs from Reznikov’s work which is strictly linguistic and objective.

Although I argue that language manipulation does change concepts in society similar to how Reznikov interprets Orwell’s theory, I stress that these changes are not static or predictable as both language and culture are constantly evolving. Thus, a concept like the right to privacy as perceived today is not what it was in the past, nor will it be the same for future generations as it is subject to change by contemporary rhetoric and thus constantly challenged and reinterpreted.

In contrast to Bolton and Reznikov, Stanley Cohen does examine the political implications of language using
Orwell’s theories from 1984. Cohen’s research paper “Government Responses to Human Rights Reports: Claims, Denials, and Counter Claims” analyzes the genre of human rights reports using a modified Swales moves analysis approach\(^1\). In his report, Cohen cites seven moves common to human rights reports: “expressing concern, stating the problem, setting the context, sources of materials, detailed allegations, international and domestic law, and required action” (520). Cohen describes three broad terms of denials used by governments to human rights, and within those terms he discusses strategies. Cohen’s euphemism strategy of denial cites Orwell in the “classic discourse section.” In regards to euphemisms Cohen states:

> Orwell’s original account of the anesthetic function of political language - how words insulate their users and listeners from experiencing fully the meaning of what they are doing - remains the classic source on the subject. (526)

Cohen’s paper concludes that while they have a “rich” source of data “there is no simple technical solution” in making human rights reports more effective (541). The methods of denials used by governments are very effective
ways of avoiding the implementation of the directives in human right reports. Cohen's paper is specific to the genre of human rights reports, while my paper is concerned with post 9/11 rhetoric and its effect on civil liberties in the United States.

While Cohen limits his paper to a specific genre, Oliver Mason and Rhiannon Platt restrict their study, even further, to one specific political speech in "Embracing a New Creed: Lexical Patterning and the Encoding of Ideology." In this paper, Mason and Platt do a corpus based study on George Bush's 2002 State of the Union address. These scholars identify patterns in Bush's speech and analyze their usage by comparing the speech patterns to several corpora. In the results of their study the authors cite Orwell and his theory of language:

Even though Orwell advocates language engineering in order to make language clearer and thus harder to abuse for political purposes he also sets a warning example with his creation of "Newspeak" in 1984. (168)

Their interpretation of Orwell's theories is similar to what I use in this thesis, but their methodology is different as they use a corpus based text analyses of a
relatively recent speech, Bush's 2002 State of the Union address, to analyze patterns in political rhetoric. As the Mason and Platt study notes:

Bush uses the word regime six times to refer to potential enemies, and it is not surprising that the word carries a strongly negative semantic prosody. Its main collates in the Bank of English [a corpus] are communist, Arab, Eastern (Europe), authoritarian, totalitarian, military, and repressive. (162)

Their study shows how Bush chooses words and patterns in a deceptively complicated, sophisticated manner to sway the audience to his political point of view. I apply Orwell's language theories to post-9/11 political rhetoric and the NSA wiretap scandal to show the susceptibility of our civil rights to reinterpretation by political rhetoric.

Political rhetoric and language manipulation is a focus for Orwell in his non-fiction work as well as his novels. In his essay "Politics and the English Language," Orwell argues that the overuse of clichés tends to make writing weak (105-6). In many political speeches, the speaker uses so many stock political party clichés that it is difficult to decipher what, if anything, of value the
speaker is trying to say. This style of writing and speechmaking is the subject of satire, and the basis of many late night comedians' acts. The overuse of political clichés is an Orwellian rhetorical device used post-9/11. For example, the phrase “war on terror,” which was coined post 9/11, is explored in this thesis.

In addition to his concern about clichés, Orwell was uneasy with the Latinization of the English language (“Politics” 108). Jonathan Ree is concerned with Orwell’s comments about the use of Latin “loan words” in the English language (Ree 251). In “The Translation of Philosophy,” Ree discusses the problems associated with translating philosophy. He takes issue with Orwell’s stance that the English language should stop incorporating Latin. According to Ree, Latinized words are easy to translate and are necessary for fields such as philosophy, because Saxon words do not exist for many philosophical concepts (251).

Ree makes some excellent points, particularly that Latin words have traditionally been borrowed and incorporated into English to explain concepts that are not translatable in native English, and also that words from Latin have the advantage of being easy to translate into many languages, including English, that are dependent on
Latin. It makes perfect sense that if, for example, a new scientific word needed to be coined that it would have a Latin base that would make it easily translatable to the international scientific community (251).

While it is necessary in many instances to use Latinized words, and Latin is deeply entrenched in the English language, there is the issue Orwell brings up of intentional confusion produced by politicians and others by incorporating foreign expressions into English to create a pretentious language that is at times unintelligible to many average citizens. Orwell was afraid of spin, the concept of manipulating language in an attempt to deceive. I analyze spin as an Orwellian rhetorical device in my thesis.

In the following chapters, I examine Orwell’s theories to explore how language manipulation and rhetoric shapes our civil liberties, specifically focusing on the right to privacy. In chapter two, I focus on his theories of language manipulation as shown in his texts Animal Farm and 1984 and take into consideration his collection of essays in his book Why I Write. In chapter three, I use examples of his mock language from 1984, ‘Newspeak,’ and compare these to current political rhetoric as a means to
illustrate his theories in a contemporary framework. My intent is to show, through Orwell’s theory of language manipulation, that our civil rights implied in the United States Constitution have changed post 9/11. Specifically, I argue that the political rhetoric post-9/11 limits Fourth Amendment rights in the United States in cases such as the NSA controversy, when the Bush Administration uses national security as a reason for warrantless wiretaps. Furthermore, I argue that the Bush Administration’s post 9/11 rhetoric suppresses freedom of the press by using national security as their reason to threaten prosecution of reporters for releasing information on possible government misconduct (“Attorney General: Reporters” 1). The silencing of the opposition and the use of manipulation by a political rhetoric of fear that is evident in the Bush Administration’s post-9/11 rhetoric is also a major theme of Orwell’s novels.
Indeed, as Orwell’s novels *1984* and *Animal Farm* illustrate how totalitarianism is a product of political rhetoric, language manipulation, and the silencing of the opposition, the parallel to the post-9/11 rhetoric is alarming. Orwell’s fear of tyranny is evident in his novels and his essays. His mistrust of political rhetoric is evident in a comment taken from his essay “Politics and the English Language.” Orwell states, “Political language ... is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable and to give an appearance of solidarity to pure wind” (120).

While it is true that Orwell made no secret of his fear and distrust of tyranny, he was also a man who was passionate about the English language. These seemingly diverse interests converge in his literature, and are manifest in his commentary on how changes in language can transform a culture. According to W.F. Bolton, Orwell was familiar with the effects of intentional language manipulation during his time as a correspondent for the BBC as the altered language Basic English was implemented in
the United Kingdom. Orwell had once supported Basic English and had used it on air for a time (Bolton 116-18).

Two of Orwell's novels, *1984* and *Animal Farm*, describe in great detail how language change and rhetoric can be used to manipulate culture. Orwell demonstrates in these novels how modifications in the language can change the behavior of people and transform societies. According to Andrei Reznikov, the mock language used in *1984*, Newspeak, "is in many respects modeled on Basic [English]" (12). Reznikov reports that the problem with Basic arose according to language translators as a result of the "limited vocabulary" of Basic:

Thus, the person who did the translation (or who was responsible for the translation) would have the power to decide what was being said. This is exactly what Winston Smith does in *1984* when 'rectifying' what was said. (Reznikov 13)

Reznikov illustrates with this excerpt how Orwell's experience with language manipulation in Basic English becomes an integral part of his language theory in *1984*. In fact, when Winston Smith 'rectifies' the language, a simulacra of reality occurs as the hyperreal replaces reality. Thus elements of Baudrillard's theories are
evident in 1984 as manipulation through language change and political rhetoric transform the present concept of reality and history into simulacra.

In this chapter, I offer a Baudrillardian reading of 1984 and Animal Farm. In addition to Baudrillard’s theory of simulacra, I rely on Keith Jenkins’ perspectives on George Orwell and Jean Baudrillard’s theories on history. For the sake of clarity, I will discuss each of Orwell’s books separately; I will begin these sections with a brief synopsis of the books discussed.

I explore Orwell’s theories of language more in-depth in the 1984 section as there is a lack of scholarly work available on Animal Farm and language use. There also is a surprising scarcity of in depth literary criticism on Animal Farm. George Woodcock, a friend and colleague of Orwell, claims in his memoir of Orwell, The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell, that the reason for the lack of criticism is that the allegory of the Russian Revolution is so concisely written, that there is not much left for critics to comment on except to place the novel in its historical context:

“Animal Farm,” said Orwell in 1947, “was the first book in which I tried, with full
consciousness of what I was doing to fuse political purpose with artistic purpose in one whole." He succeeded admirably, and produced a book so clear in intent and writing that the critic is usually nonplussed as to what he should say about it; all is so magnificently there, and the only thing that really needs to be done is to place this crystalline little book into its proper setting. (132)

Woodcock claims that Orwell was normally quite modest and self-deprecating when he spoke of his work, but was quite proud of Animal Farm (xv). No one disputes what Orwell's intent was, because it is so obvious. Those who are familiar with the Cold War era can easily spot the characters in this satire. I suspect some of the reluctance to critique Animal Farm has to do with the genre of the piece as well as the political climate. Animal Farm is a fable that is sometimes quite humorous on the surface, but the subject matter and moral of the story are serious. Moreover, Orwell had angered several critics and staunch party line Communists with his reports from the Spanish Civil war front and his book Homage to Catalonia which was released prior to Animal Farm. According to
Christopher Hitchens' BBC program *Why Orwell Still Matters*, Orwell, who once fought for the Marxist cause in Spain, angered many leftists in Britain, who felt betrayed when he wrote about the tyranny of Stalin:

It is almost impossible to overstate the influence that Josef Stalin's horrific regime then had over the minds of intellectuals. By refusing to agree that Russia was on course for Utopia, Orwell took a position that put him in a very small minority. As a result, he was often defamed and slandered, and very often denied the chance to publish his work either in magazine, or book form. He never experienced a day of freedom from poverty, and was only recognized and rewarded for his *Animal Farm* or *1984* as he lay dying. (1)

Orwell had been fighting with the Trotskyite forces and wrote about betrayal by the Stalinists in Spain in reports from the battlefield and *Homage to Catalonia*, which describes his first-person account of the Spanish Civil War. In fact, Hitchens notes in his book *Why Orwell Matters* that although Orwell put his life at risk to defeat the fascists in Spain, his accounts from the battlefield were
censored by those who favored the communist party-line accounts of the Spanish Civil War (68-69). In that same source Hitchens further notes that while Orwell was fighting in Spain, he felt betrayed by Stalin and also appalled by the propaganda and misinformation that was reported by the British press:

Orwell had barely even a voice when he left Catalonia; a fascist bullet had torn through his throat and damaged his vocal cords. But for the next ten years of his life, which were also the last, he wrote to try and vindicate his Spanish friends and their cause. It suited Authority in the West, and some of the men-in-the-street too, to maintain that the war was what it seemed — Catholic nationalist Spain on one side and 'Red' anti-clerical Spain on the other. (It also suited Stalin's supporters to be taken at their own valuation). Orwell was thus in a unique and challenging position for a writer; he knew that the whole picture was false and the whole story was a lie, and he had only his own integrity as a soldier and a writer to back him up. His dispatches from Spain were almost unpublishable —
the New Statesman famously refused to print them because they might let down the republican side - and Homage to Catalonia was an obscure collector's item of a book throughout Orwell's lifetime (68-69).

It is ironic that Orwell, who spent years trying to get his message out about the atrocities of the Stalinists through non-fiction, finally succeeded with the novels Animal Farm and 1984. Although he had written novels before, he did not consider himself a novelist and was frustrated, and apologetic, about his fiction writing before Animal Farm (Woodcock xv). Orwell was at various times a reporter, essayist, critic, and BBC radio correspondent whose work was primarily non-fiction, so it adds to the irony that his only financially successful novels in his lifetime, Animal Farm and 1984, were published shortly before his death. In fact, as Christopher Hitchens noted in the BBC program, Why Orwell Still Matters, the years of censorship in Britain had left him quite impoverished and unable to get proper medical care (1).
A Baudrillardian Reading of Animal Farm

Animal Farm is Orwell’s famous satire of the Russian Revolution. It is cleverly written as an allegory in which the characters are thinly veiled caricatures of the participants of the Russian Revolution portrayed as farm animals. Although the novel is thought provoking, it is very humorous. The leaders are represented as pigs and their henchmen, KGB counterparts, are dogs. Stalin’s character is a tyrant named Napoleon, and Trotsky’s character is named Snowball, an intellectual writer for the revolution that disappears under mysterious circumstances. Snowball is blamed for all the ills of the new nation after he is gone. Before the revolution, the animals live on Manor Farm and are treated cruelly by Farmer Jones, the czar character. Old Major, the Marx character, is portrayed as a wise horse and great orator who inspires the animals. His legacy of great teachings are co-opted and revised by Snowball and Napoleon. Most notably missing from the fable is the character of Lenin. Christopher Hitchens claims this damages the allegory: “As an allegory the story has one enormous failure: the persons of Lenin and Trotsky are combined into one, or it might be truer to say that there is no Lenin pig at all” (186).
Snowball and Napoleon lead a revolution on the farm. Snowball, along with Squealer a party-line propagandist, condense Old Major’s words into a set of commandments. The animals have a coup and take over the farm; in the process they change the name from Manor Farm to Animal Farm. Napoleon and Snowball become engaged in a power struggle. Napoleon becomes more powerful and uses his army of dogs to do his dirty work. Snowball, who was their great general, disappears, and almost immediately Napoleon slanders him. The animals are deceived by Napoleon, who systematically takes away their rights. Great purges take place where animals are deemed traitors and exterminated. By the end of the book, the animals are worse off than they were with Jones, but since they have no referent of the truth left, they are left in a state of confusion.

In his fable Animal Farm, Orwell demonstrates how a society changes as its perception of reality is tampered with by those in power. As the story progresses, the perception of reality turns full circle. Origins are lost as they are systematically altered by the rhetoric of the political hierarchy. This phenomenon is similar to Baudrillard’s theory of how simulacra transform into a
culture's perceived reality. According to Baudrillard in *Simulacra and Simulation*:

Simulation... stems from the utopia of the principle of equivalence, from the radical negation of the sign as value, from the sign as the reversion and death of every reference. Whereas representation attempts to absorb simulation by interpreting it as a false representation, simulation envelopes the whole edifice of representation itself as a simulacrum. Such would be the successive phases of the image: it is the reflection of a profound reality; it masks and denatures a profound reality; it masks the absence of a profound reality; it has no relation to any reality whatsoever: it is its own pure simulacrum. (6)

An example of how Baudrillard’s theory of simulacra unfolds in *Animal Farm* through the animals’ belief system, which evolves and transforms through several steps to become a simulacrum. The concept of Animalism is a set of ideals taken from the teachings of the recently deceased old sage Major. Animalism is converted into an oral code of ethics by leaders of the revolution. As the revolution
progresses, the oral tradition of Animalism transforms into a written list, "The Seven Commandments," which represents the central truths that the society on the farm are to live by:

1. Whatever goes on two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes on four legs or has wings, is a friend.
3. No animal should wear clothes.
4. No animal should sleep in a bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. All animals are equal. (18)

As the revolutionary government in Animal Farm becomes increasingly corrupt, these commandments are modified to reflect the new reality on the farm. For example, the Fourth Commandment prohibits animals from sleeping on beds, so when two of the farm animals recall the original rule, "No animal should sleep in a bed," they are told they were mistaken and shown the altered rule "No animal must sleep in beds without sheets," which they accept as the original (48).

In another instance, the revolutionary government justifies its mass murder of dissenters by claiming that
the Sixth Commandment which was "No animal shall kill any other animal" has always been "No animal shall kill any other animal without cause" (63). Since many of the animals are barely literate, and the rhetoric of the politicians is compelling, the animals become convinced that their leaders are correct and that their own memories must be faulty even though there is clearly evidence that the commandments are being tampered with. For example, a drunken pig is found passed out next to a spilt pail of paint next to the commandments. It is obvious in the scene that before passing out the pig was in the process of changing the Fifth Commandment from the original form of "No animal shall drink alcohol" to the revised principle "No animal shall drink alcohol to excess," but the other animals are duped and do not comprehend that the revised commandment is not the original (75).

The world becomes complete simulacra by the end of the novel when the Seven Commandments are replaced with a maxim that is diametrically different in meaning and form:

    Benjamin felt a nose nuzzling at his shoulder. He looked around. It was Clover. Her old eyes looked dimmer than ever. Without saying anything she tugged gently at his mane and led him round to
the end of the big barn, where the Seven Commandments were written. For a minute or two they sat gazing at the tatt[er]ed wall with its white lettering.

"My sight is failing," she said finally. "Even when I was young I could not have read what was written there. But it appears to me that that wall looks different. Are the Seven Commandments the same as they used to be?" For once Benjamin consented to break his rule, and he read out to her what was written on the wall. There was nothing there now except a single Commandment. It ran: "All Animals are Equal, but Some Animals are More Equal than Others." (92)

This passage illustrates the unfolding of events that occurs simultaneously as the animals lose their notion of reality. This realization signals that the simulacra are complete as the events that follow confirm.

Indeed, shortly after this maxim is discovered, the effacement of the original social structure is apparent. The ruling pigs begin a grotesque transformation, and reality is completely lost. Napoleon, the leader of the pigs, changes the name of the farm from Animal Farm, to the
original name of Manor Farm, but it is not the same Manor Farm as that entity no longer exists. They are left with an eerie simulacrum of the original Manor Farm. While the name of the farm has gone full circle, the farm has not returned to its original state. The animals are at a loss to find reality, because it no longer exists as is shown in the novel’s last paragraph:

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which. (97)

In this scene, the pigs and farmers become indistinguishable from each other as the pigs transform and take on the physical and behavioral characteristics of the farmers. Tyranny is tyranny: the pigs (communist leaders) and the farmers (former regime leaders) are both evil. This deterioration of reality into simulacra is a predictable result according to Baudrillard who contends that those in power must manufacture crises in order to retain their control (22). Baudrillard states:
As long as the historical threat came at it [power] from the real, power played at deterrence and simulation, disintegrating all the contradictions by dint of producing equivalent signs. Today when the danger comes at it from simulation (that of being dissolved in the play of signs), power plays at the real, plays at crisis, plays at remanufacturing artificial, social, economic, and political stakes. For power, it is a question of life and death. But it is too late. (22)

The revolutionary government of Animal Farm throughout the novel employs the same tactics that Baudrillard speaks of in the preceding passage. That is, the revolutionary government in Animal Farm creates crises in order to stay in power similar to what Baudrillard speaks of. These strategies contribute to the actual crisis and the referents of reality will eventually no longer exist. This results in the scenario at the end of the novel where the Animal Farm revolutionary government, with its idealistic seven commandments, is been slowly transformed into the tyrannical regime of the new Manor Farm. Each deception that takes place, and each commandment that is secretly
modified, is a step away from the existing power structure. Thus, the steps taken by those in power to strengthen the regime result in a coup that creates a totalitarian regime in place of the utopian socialist state that the founders of the revolution promised to the animals.

This scenario that Baudrillard speaks of, when the real no longer exists as an inevitable result of power intentionally creating crises, is apparent in Animal Farm. As the mock crises increase, the deterioration of history accelerates and reality becomes lost. In the beginning of the novel, Snowball is portrayed as a leader of the revolution, and a war hero. As power shifts to his rival Napoleon, Snowball becomes a scapegoat for many of the problems evident in the farm community. By the middle of the book, Napoleon openly defames Snowball: "Snowball, who, as we all know, was no better than a criminal" (40). When a number of animals protested that they remembered differently, they were corrected by Napoleon who said that the masses were mistaken and that "the time will come when Snowball’s part in it [the battle of Cowshed] was much exaggerated" (40). The animals are deceived by this political rhetoric which contradicts the original account of the Cowshed battle in which Snowball was considered a
hero and received a medal. At a later date when the animals recall the resolutions against commerce with humans, they are again deceived by rhetoric blaming Snowball:

Afterwards Squealer made a round of the farm and set the animals' minds at rest. He assured them that the resolution against engaging in trade and using money had never been passed, or even suggested. It was pure imagination, probably traceable in the beginning to lies circulated by Snowball. A few animals felt faintly doubtful, but Squealer asked them shrewdly, "Are you certain that this is not something that you have dreamed? Have you any record of such a resolution? Is it written down anywhere?" And since it was certainly true that nothing of the kind existed in writing, the animals were satisfied that they had been mistaken. (46-47)

Thus, both the current crises, and the historical accounts, were manufactured to maintain those in power. As the animals relied mainly on an oral tradition which those in authority cast doubts upon, they had been particularly vulnerable to political rhetoric and history was easily manipulated. Jenkins, in his book Why History?: Ethics and
Modernity, examines Jean Baudrillard's views on history in Baudrillard's volume The Illusion of the End. In Jenkins' interpretation, he believes that when Baudrillard says it is the end of history, what he means is that it is the end of written linear history, the concept Jenkins calls "linear endism" (66). This leaves us with an opportunity for different ways and means to "discover" history ("Why History" 69). Jenkins incorporates several quotes from Baudrillard's The Illusion of the End in his interpretation of the text, Jenkins states:

Against the simulation of a linear (modernist) history as "progress," we can thus privilege "those backfires, those malign deviations"; those ruptures, breaks, reversals that are covered over by our language of continuity, we can now see as just other types of tropes, none crazier or more sensible than linearity but just "different."

All of which suggests, that not only has "history" never been actually unfolded in a linear fashion, but that "perhaps language has never unfolded in a linear fashion" either:

"Everything moves in loops, tropes, inversions of meaning, except in numerical and artificial
languages which, for that very reason, no longer are languages.” We live in a world which just is parasitic, which is to say asyntactic, which is to say meaning-less. We live today recognizing that the grammar of our language created a “grammatical history,” it did not allow us to “discover one.” (69)

In other words, history does not develop like a timeline from marker to marker; rather, multiple events simultaneously occur. Conventional history is linear and progresses from event to event, but that is not how events develop; yet, that is how historians write historical accounts. Our language influences how we write history which is what Baudrillard and Jenkins call grammatical history.

The manipulated history first perpetuated by the party-leaders of Animal Farm has created an alternate persona of Snowball. This alternate reality of Snowball is carried forward, and the once honored war hero is soon envisioned by the masses as an evil trickster who is bent on wreaking havoc on the farm. Thus, the manipulation of history creates an atmosphere of mass hysteria in the present. As the scenario unfolds, the myths the Animal Farm
government created about Snowball self-perpetuate and increase exponentially:

Every night, it was said, that he [Snowball] came creeping in under cover of darkness and performed all kinds of mischief. He stole the corn, he upset the milk-pails, he broke the eggs, he trampled the seedbeds, and he gnawed the bark off the fruit trees. Whenever anything went wrong it became usual to attribute it to Snowball. If a window was broken or a drain was blocked up, someone was certain to say that Snowball had come in the night and done it, and when the key to the store-shed was lost, the whole farm was convinced that Snowball had thrown it down the well.

Curiously enough, they went on believing this even after the mislaid key was found under a sack of meal. (55)

Occasionally, animals would recall incidents that conflicted with the official accounts regarding Snowball, but were fed more lies which furthered the simulacra of Snowball.

One of the rhetorical strategies used by the hierarchy in Animal Farm was to elicit fear in the general population
by implying there were outside threats. The government manipulates the population by portraying outside entities as enemies, as that served the government's interest. For example, the government of Animal Farm was negotiating possible trade pacts with two rival farmers, Mr. Frederic of Foxwood Farm and Mr. Pilkington of Pinchfield Farm. As the negotiations leaned towards a certain farm, the rival farm would be demonized as an enemy of the state:

It was noticed that whenever he [Napoleon] seemed on the point of coming to an agreement with Frederick, Snowball was declared to be hiding at Foxwood, while, when he inclined toward Pilkington, Snowball was said to be at Pinchfield.(55)

The threat that the former owner of the farm, Jones, would come back and enslave the animals is continually brought up by the hierarchy to instill fear in the animals so as to insure they will obey the authorities. What the animals cannot grasp is that their situation is much worse now than it ever was with Jones. As the memories of the older animals began to fade, the younger animals are left without a referent for history, thus society is left to the mercy
of the simulacra of truth depicted in official government accounts:

They could not remember. There was nothing with which they could compare their present lives: they had nothing to go upon except Squealer's lists of figures which invariably demonstrated that everything was getting better and better.

(89)

Woodcock uses this passage to back-up his claim that "Orwell never falls into error of suggesting that the farmers are any better," and that there is no difference between the governments (135). This is contradicted by the text, which insinuates the new tyrants are more oppressive; for example, a neighboring farmer Pilkington states, "He believed that he was right in saying that the lower animals on the farm did more work and received less food than any animals in the county" (94). This theme of government manipulation of history and of the simulacra taken as reality is a common thread of both Animal Farm and 1984.
A Baudrillardian Reading of 1984:

The novel 1984 is sometimes misunderstood, as Bernard Crick explains in his essay for the BBC production, “George Orwell: Voice of a Long Generation.” According to Crick, Nineteen Eighty-Four was not a morbid prophecy of what was sure to happen in society, but a savage, Swiftian satiric warning of what could happen if power was pursued for its own sake. Many right-wing American critics, however, read him in a contrary sense, some mistakenly, others deliberately. (3)

Crick is referring to the fact that many right-wing politicians cite 1984 out of context to validate their own political agenda. This is contrary to Orwell who was a socialist that once advocated “a democratic socialist United States of Europe” (Crick 4).

1984 is set in a surreal police state, Oceania, as the protagonist Winston Smith quietly rebels against Big Brother, a falsified icon whose picture and slogans are everywhere, and the Thought Police, the secret police. Away from the constant surveillance of “telescreens” and listening devices, Winston rents a small flat among the “Proles,” the lowest social class in Oceania, to journalize
his thoughts in a diary. He tries to unravel his thoughts from the propaganda of the state, and tries to recall forbidden memories. This is exceedingly difficult for Winston as he is employed by the state to rewrite history to fit the ever-changing political needs of Oceania’s leadership and in doing so his sense of reality is constantly challenged. Winston slowly realizes that the Government’s intent in rewriting history and altering the language of Oceania is to destroy critical thought. Eventually he has an epiphany and writes in his diary the phrase “freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two equals four” (81).

Winston finds a lover, Julia, an act which is also forbidden by the state. The lovers rendezvous clandestinely at the flat. The couple meets several times, but they are eventually discovered. Winston has been betrayed by O’Brien, a person whom Winston believed was a fellow rebel. O’Brien re-educates Julia and Winston by means of torture in the infamous room 101. In the end, the re-programming works, and ultimately the state wins out over love and freedom of thought as Julia and Winston both betray each other. Winston is now convinced by the programming and torture that “two plus two equals five” (290). When Julia
and Winston next meet, they are emotion-less, re-programmed beings. Winston now accepts the altered reality. In a dreamlike sequence, Winston is happy to finally be shot in the head, and he finds peace in his love for Big Brother as blood trickles down his face.

The totalitarian government convinces the population that they are in a constant state of war as a tactic to manipulate the population. For example, to motivate patriotic feelings for the regime, the government mandates a daily ritual called the "Two Minutes of Hate" against whomever the regime decrees is the enemy, an entity which changes frequently at the directive of the regime ("1984" 11). Part of Winston’s job is to re-write history to accommodate whomever the government decides Oceania is at war against. The chief tool of the government of Oceania is the manipulation of language and history which destabilizes people’s ability to think critically, and distorts one’s perception of self. Winston has flashbacks of memories which deviate from the party-line simulated reality. The loss of personal memories causes an identity crisis. This phenomenon is explained by Keith Jenkins in Re-thinking History. When Jenkins explains his own theory of personal history and identification he refers to Orwell’s 1984.
According to Jenkins, narrative history gives people and communities a tool to establish and retain their self-image, and when the ruling authorities usurp history to enhance the power structure they destroy the history of the cultures it overtakes (23). When historians ignore groups of people, historians erase other people’s culture and de-legitimize their existence. Jenkins explains this phenomenon in relation to 1984:

In his novel 1984, Orwell wrote that those who control the past control the future. This seems likely outside fiction too. Thus people(s) in the present need antecedents to locate themselves now and legitimate their ongoing and future ways of living... History is the way people(s) create, in part, their identities. It is far more than a slot in the school/academic curriculum, though we can see how what goes into such spaces is crucially important for all those variously interested parties.

Do we not know this all the time? Is it not obvious that such an important ‘legitimating’ phenomenon as history is rooted in real needs and power? I think it is, except that when the
dominant discourse refers to the constant re-writing of histories it does so in ways that displace the needs: it muses blandly that each generation re-writes its own history. But the question is how and why? And the arguable answer, alluded to by Orwell is because power relations produce ideological discourses such as 'history and knowledge' which are necessary for all involved in terms of conflicting legitimating exercises. ("Rethinking" 22-23)

There is a correlation between historical narratives and the balance of power. If groups of peoples are excluded from historical narratives, their voices are silenced. Thus, what is included or excluded from historical narratives affects the perception of power, consequently affecting the balance of power.

In 1984, the government of Oceania, the sovereignty in Orwell's novel, is constantly in the process of revising history and changing the language which makes it impossible for the public to comprehend or document the truth. This results in a simulacrum of reality. As reality is affected by those in power, the citizenry of Oceania is left with a simulated reality. Winston, the protagonist of the story,
is employed in a department of the government that changes history to suit the government. As the official policy changes or people are eliminated, the original source documents are changed to the point that, in effect, there is no origin left. This vision of simulated reality is best explained by Baudrillard in *Simulacra and Simulation*:

> Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being, or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or a reality: a hyperreal. The territory no longer precedes the map, nor does it survive it. It is nevertheless the map that precedes the territory — precession of simulacra — that engenders the territory, and if one must return to the fable today it is the territory whose shreds slowly rot across the extent of the map. (1)

The theory presented by Baudrillard in *Simulacra and Simulation* is precisely what Orwell envisioned in his novel *1984*, although the deception of the citizens of Oceania is intentional and malevolent.

In Oceania, the government has totalitarian motives for its deception as it seeks to remove from the collective consciousness any memory that living conditions were
previously more bearable. Through language manipulation and change as directed by the government, such as removing adjectives with Newspeak, there were no words left to describe conditions. Since there were no referents left, the meanings were lost because people could not formulate the concepts anymore. Winston has a vague memory of better living conditions that pops into his head occasionally, but he cannot reconcile his memories without a referent. The government did this intentionally in order to deceive the population into thinking life was improving. Winston would send out press releases, as ordered by the government, reporting that life was better and no one could dispute it because, like him, they had no referent:

It was true that he had no memories of anything greatly different. In any time that he could accurately remember, there had never been quite enough to eat, one had never had socks or underclothes that were not full of holes, furniture had always been battered and rickety, rooms underheated, Tube trains crowded, houses falling to pieces, bread dark-colored, tea a rarity, coffee filthy-tasting, cigarettes insufficient—nothing cheap and plentiful except
synthetic gin. And though, of course, it grew worse as one’s body aged, was it not a sign that this was ‘not’ the natural order of things, if one’s heart sickened at the discomfort and dirt and scarcity, the interminable winters, the stickiness of one’s socks, the lifts, that never worked, the cold water, the gritty soap, the cigarettes that came to pieces, the food with its strange evil tastes? Why would one feel it intolerable unless one had some kind of ancestral memory that things had once been different? (59-60)

This passage shows how language manipulation creates the hyperreal. As Winston has no referent, he cannot articulate the past which causes his confusion. This confusion muddles reality and creates an atmosphere which is conducive to the belief in the simulacrum of the past that the government of Oceania feeds the public.

Thus, the simulated language and history of Oceania survives on fear and ignorance. The underclass in Oceania, the Proles, are kept illiterate and ignorant; they are preoccupied with what they are convinced is a lottery, but which in fact is a simulation with phantom winners (87).
As long as the masses are kept ignorant, the empire can manipulate them. The middle class is "terrified into complete intellectual surrender" (87). The rewriting of history is used to destroy all reference to prior civilization, for as Winston states,

Every record has been destroyed and falsified, every book has been rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and every street has been renamed. History has stopped. Nothing exists except the endless present in which the party is always right. (155)

In this scenario, the simulacrum is complete.

Language and education are both weapons of the Oceania Empire against their citizenry. The language is being rewritten intentionally with the purpose of erasing concepts that the empire feels threatened by. Orwell goes to great length to describe how language change is used to destroy the civilization in the mock language he created for 1984, "Newspeak." Newspeak is the primary weapon used to destroy any remnants of the old civilization that existed prior to Oceania. As the old language is abolished, the terminology for old concepts is not replaced thus leaving the citizenry without a way to conceptualize
anything from the past. It is most fascinating to follow
Orwell’s different hypothetical scenarios as the language
is modified in 1984. Newspeak is devised so that the
language is pared down and the individuality of the speaker
is erased; for example, grammar as we know it is
dismantled. Orwell writes in 1984:

Any word in the language (in principle this
applied to even abstract words such as if or
when) could be used either as a verb, noun,
adjective, or adverb. Between the verb and the
noun form when they were of the same root, there
was never any variation, this rule of itself
involving the destruction of many archaic forms.
The word “thought” for example did not exist in
Newspeak. (300)

Those who devise Newspeak experiment with the
language to see how many words can be eliminated. The
official dictionary of Oceania is in a constant state of
revision as explained by the character Syme: “It’s a
beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course the
great wastage is the verbs and the adjectives, but there
are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. It
isn’t only the synonyms; there are also antonyms” (51).
Reznikov notes how the paring down of language in Newspeak parallels that of Basic English (45). George Woodcock also believes that Basic English is parodied in the novel (150). Although W.F. Bolton acknowledges some similarities to Basic, he comes to a quite different conclusion as he claims, "Orwell's Newspeak is neither a reductionist caricature of artificial Basic English and its congener nor the evolutionary outcome of present-day natural English" (154). Nevertheless, it is apparent that Newspeak was influenced by Basic, regardless of whether it fits strictly into the definition of 'parody' that Bolton employs.

According to Orwell's appendix to 1984, Newspeak is divided into three categories. In a study of this length, only the basics of each category can be addressed as Orwell was quite detailed in his description of the language. The "A Vocabulary" is the common language used for everyday functions. It is based on English, but the vocabulary is pared down. Multiple interpretations are eliminated as are most adverbs and many adjectives. Parts of speech are "interchangeable" (300). A noun is the root of adjectives and adverbs alike. The suffix for adjectives is "ful" and for adverbs is "wise." As stated in the appendix, "[The A
vocabulary] was intended only to express simple, purposive thoughts, usually involving concrete objects or physical action" (300). Since there are no words that express emotions or concepts, such as philosophy, emotions and the concept of philosophy are lost. Thus, the culture is reshaped by the language change. The transformation to the hyperreal Oceania is dependent upon the replacement of the language. In fact, it could be argued that Newspeak is not a language, but rather a simulacrum of what was once English. Newspeak is used to create simulacra of the English literary canon as Syme proudly asserts:

The whole literature of the past will have been destroyed. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron - they'll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be. Even the literature of the Party will change. Even the slogans will change. How can you have a slogan like 'freedom is slavery' when the concept of freedom has been abolished? The whole climate of thought will be different. In fact, there will be no thought as we understand it now. Orthodoxy means not
thinking - not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness. (53)

Thus, Newspeak, the simulacra of language, by virtue of its very nature, creates a simulacrum of reality. The “B Vocabulary” of Newspeak is used by bureaucrats and politicians. One technique that the B category uses creates binaries which in turn destabilize the existing system.

There are three key words in Newspeak that Orwell spends a great deal of time explaining: “crimestop,” “blackwhite,” and “doublespeak.” Some of these combined words do not correlate which gives them an even more twisted distortion of reality. Reznikov contends that distortion and lack of meaning is a result of the pairing of opposites and the fact that there are no antonyms in Newspeak:

Again, the most striking feature about these words in Newspeak is not just the fact that they combine within themselves two opposite meanings. It is that the speaker chooses which meaning attaches to the word, and that he or she does it unconsciously, by virtue of his or her training. As a result, words cease to have any meanings whatsoever and become, as Hayek wrote,
just "empty shells" ready to accommodate whatever
meaning they're told to accommodate. (48)

The problem of losing antonyms is precisely the same
problem that arose with Basic English. The problem is that
when a large vocabulary is translated into a limited
vocabulary it forces words and meanings to be lost. Whoever
is translating has power over the translated meaning as he
or she can chose the words they feel fit closest to the
lost words.

Using the 1984 appendix as a guide, the definition of
Blackwhite is the ability to accept whatever the government
tells you without question. In other words, if the party
tells you black is white; then, as Orwell states in 1984,
"black is white and has never been black" (212). Crimestop
is what Orwell calls "protective stupidity," or keeping out
of danger by blocking logical thinking. Logic is twisted in
crimestop; because in actuality there is no crime to be
stopped. What crimestop does curtail are the thoughts of
the masses that lead to the revelation of the criminal
behavior of the rulers of the empire ("1984" 212).

Doublespeak is the ability to believe in contradictory
thoughts simultaneously ("1984" 215).
There are also the three party slogans that flash on telescreens that share the same type of convoluted attributes: "war is peace," "freedom is slavery," and "ignorance is strength." According to Reznikov, in George Orwell's *Theory of Language*, "By claiming that they are the same, Newspeak eliminates their opposition, and war becomes peace, freedom really becomes slavery, and ignorance really becomes strength" (48). The conflation of these binaries keeps the citizenry from rational thought or as Orwell states: "In general, the greater the understanding, the greater the delusion: the more intelligent, the less sane" ("1984" 215). Words systematically become more condensed as phrases such as the Ministry of Truth are transformed to 'minitrue' for example. These combination words, like the slogans, are actually opposite of what they mean; for example, the Ministry of Truth is a large bureaucracy that disseminates propaganda, but the word minitrue implies something hardly true. The B vocabulary condenses even further with the use of anagrams such as 'INSOC' which upon hearing bear no reflection of their meaning. The political reality is deconstructed by the use of these combined words, anagrams, and nonsensical political slogans. The "C Vocabulary" was not spoken in the main section of the novel
because it is used mainly by scientists. It is a technical
language that uses similar techniques to dismantle science.

Newspeak is a form of language meant to disable the
citizens of Oceania. The language of the people is being
systematically replaced in a way that insures their
enslavement to the empire. As a result of the changes made
to the language, civilization has become a fraudulent
misrepresentation of itself. Music is no longer created by
people but by machinery (138). The government even
recreates its citizens through duress as it remanufactures
those that do not fit well into the new simulated reality.
When the government deems it necessary, individuals will
have altered identities and synthetic faces. Thus the
government is creating simulacra of what it deems ideal
citizens. This process is described to Julia who is
imprisoned, as is Winston, for the crime of falling in
love:

Do you understand that even if he survives, he
may be a different person? We may be obliged to
give him a new identity. His face, his movements,
the shape of his hands, the color of his hair—
even his voice would be different. And you
yourself might have become a different person.
Our surgeons can alter people beyond recognition. Sometimes we even amputate a limb. (173-74)

An entire culture has been lost and in its place is an ever changing simulated reality. Central to the transformation is the manipulation of language and history which evolves into the simulacra as described in Baudrillard’s theory. In both of Orwell’s novels, language and history are manipulated to empower political regimes; freedom vanishes as a consequence.
Many of the problems Orwell warned about in 1984 are of concern to modern day citizens of the United States. In particular, policies restricting privacy rights and freedom of the press since 9/11 are sources of considerable controversy. Orwell demonstrates how political rhetoric and language change affects the perception of human rights and history in his novels 1984 and Animal Farm. My Baudrillardian reading of Orwell’s novels in chapter two demonstrates the destabilizing affect on the perception of reality that occurs from rhetoric and language change. In order to study the affects of language change and political rhetoric on civil liberties during a time of national crisis, this chapter studies post 9/11 challenges to civil liberties in the United States. More specifically, it looks at the role language manipulation has played in challenges to, and ultimately in the revising of, what we perceive to be U.S. civil liberties.

To understand the NSA scandal, a brief history and explanation of the original FISA, Federal Intelligence
Security Act, law and court are necessary. Congress recently has passed laws that affect privacy rights as they did in 1978 with the first FISA Act which was meant to oversee the wiretapping by the executive branch. According to Brenton Hund, of Yeshiva University, although the citizens of the United States have privacy rights interpreted through the Fourth Amendment, the President is "enabled and required to gather intelligence information for the preservation of the nation" (Hund 1). Hund claims that:

The history and law related to conducting electronic surveillance and protecting national security have evolved from a tension between the competing demands of the President and the public....Also created was an appellate court, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (FISCR), which has jurisdiction to review denials of FISA Applications by the FISC....The primary purpose test ultimately served as a safeguard to protect against possible wiretapping abuses by the Executive....Additionally, the nonresident alien loophole enables the government to conduct "fishing expeditions" on less than
probable cause, without a nexus with a foreign power, and without an emergency. (Hund 169)

In other words, the conflict between the original FISA legislation of 1978 was written to ensure safeguards against further intrusions on privacy by the executive branch while protecting national security, but it also created a nonresident alien loophole which the executive branch exploited. This conflict between the executive branch’s need for information and the people’s rights of privacy became more of an issue post-9/11 as the country grappled with a new threat. The people’s rights are balanced against security concerns, conflicting Constitutional issues, and power struggles between all three branches of the United States government. During a time of national crisis, Executive powers traditionally increase and can override Constitutional rights. There is increased pressure on all three branches of the government during a crisis, as there are real threats to security, but too much power by any branch of the government leaves open the opportunity for abuse. There is also the danger, as Baudrillard has mentioned, of creating or feeding a crisis in order to perpetuate and increase power which he claims is ultimately self-defeating and self-destructive. This
In fact, the Bush Administration’s use of the term Patriot Act for this legislation is a clever rhetorical ploy. As any Senator who votes against the Patriot Act, by implication, is put into a position of defending his or her patriotism, or accusing the president of not being a patriot. For a senator to get out of this quagmire, he or she must explain in detail why this legislation is an affront to civil liberties in the United States. This is not an easy task as many citizens of the United States are used to short sound bites from radio or television for the bulk of their information. The senators have an additional burden as the President has the trappings of the office and stature of his position to his advantage.

Since average citizens of the United States are not privy to top secret government information on pending threats, they are at the mercy of political rhetoric to decide if the government’s measures are justified. Further complicating the situation are power struggles between competing political parties as well as the branches of government. For example, at this time there has not been an attack on the United States by terrorists since 9/11. The Bush Administration can claim this as a success and say their strategies were necessary. In contrast, Congress may
claim it is because of a united effort and take some of the credit, or suggest that perhaps there are other reasons why we have not been attacked again that have nothing to do with these challenges to civil liberties.

Furthermore, the opposition to these changes in the FISA act has affected the rhetoric used by the Bush Administration in its defense of the changes. The changes that were made to FISA by the Bush Administration were temporary and had to be renegotiated with the Congress. This new legislation, enacted in August 2007, is called “The Protect America Act” which avoids the taint of the NSA controversy by leaving out FISA, a term associated with the controversy, and replacing it with a phrase no Senator would seemingly dare vote against. Clearly this creates many of the same issues for opponents to the legislation as those opposed to The Patriot Act faced. A senator has quite a hurdle explaining to the public why he or she is voting against something called The Protect America Act. A vote against this bill implies the senator does not care about protecting citizens of the United States. The term “Protect America Act” is doublespeak to those who find the Protect America Act is a threat to civil liberties. The tactic of the Bush Administration of repeatedly invoking the horrors
of 9/11, and invoking the vision of the recurrence of terrorism as a means to legitimate government policies is frequent. Similarly, Baudrillard uses several examples such as terrorist bombings and Watergate to illustrate his theory that power invokes simulations of scandal and death for the purpose of legitimacy in *Simulacra and Simulation*:

> Everything is metamorphosed into its opposite to perpetuate itself in its expurgated form. All the powers, all the institutions speak of themselves through denial, in order to attempt, by simulating death to escape their real death throes. Power can stage its own murder to rediscover a glimmer of existence and legitimacy.

(19)

The Bush Administration's rhetoric was notched up as the review date of the temporary extension known as the Protect America Act came closer as evident in this excerpt from Bush's September 19, 2007 press conference:

> In August, a bipartisan majority in Congress passed the Protect America Act. This law has helped close a critical intelligence gap, allowing us to collect important foreign intelligence and information about terrorist
plots. The problem is the law expires on February First - that's 135 days from today. The threat from al Qaeda is not going to expire in 135 days ("President Bush Discusses the Protect").

This statement implies that a vote against making this law permanent is an invitation to terrorists to attack the United States. The statement also implies that a majority of Congress was in full support of the bill. In fact, the bill was passed as only a temporary measure with the expressed intent of being revisited when more information was available. When the House of Representatives later proposed a revised bill that addressed some of their concerns about civil liberties, President Bush responded in his October 10, 2007 press conference with a statement that makes Congress appear spineless and inept:

Today, the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees are considering a proposed bill that instead of making the Protect America Act permanent would take us backward. While the House bill is not final, my administration has serious concerns about some of the provisions, and I am hopeful that the deficiencies in the bill can be fixed. Congress and the President have no higher
responsibility than protecting the American people from enemies who attacked our country and who want to do so again. Terrorists in far away places are plotting to kill Americans ("President Bush Discusses Foreign").

With this statement, President Bush is suggesting that the Senators do not care about their responsibilities or the safety of citizens of the United States and would leave the United States open for an attack because of their revisions to the bill. He is discounting their concern about civil liberties when he states that their first concern should be national security.

National Security Versus the First Amendment

The passage of the Protect America Act of August 2007 does not end the controversy over the conflict of loss of privacy versus security concerns. In fact, there is an escalation of heated debate over the federal government’s use of wire taps and surveillance of U.S. citizens which many contend is an illegal abuse of power. We may never know the truth about these allegations because of three current government actions, all of which cite national
security interests: one directed against federal employees who are whistleblowers, one against the press reporting sensitive material, and one against National Security Administration (NSA) lawsuits. Since all three of these actions seek to block the opposition from stating their case, if these actions are successful, there is no opposition to contend with as the opposition is effectively silenced. With the opposition silenced, those in power can control and manipulate the information given to the public. This is precisely the ploy the Government of Oceania used when it had Winston Smith rewrite history in 1984. MSNBC news reports in their online article, “Court Curbs Government Whistleblowers,” that the government has recently won a case against “whistleblower’s” rights of free speech in the Supreme Court case of Garcetti versus Ceballo (1). According to this MSNBC online article, this case limits the government employees’ right to sue the government in cases where the employees feel they were fired for retaliation (3). According to the MSNBC report, The Bush Administration had urged the high court to place limits on when government whistleblowers can sue, arguing that those workers have other
options, including the filing of civil service complaints. ("Court Curbs" 3)

While this argument sounds plausible, if the option of filing a complaint after a civil servant is fired is such an easy resolution, one could argue that workers would not have to file suit. The use of the word "options" by the Bush Administration makes it appear as though workers who sue are greedy and litigious as they have other choices available, but this argument is deceiving. By incorporating large sections of the government under the umbrella of national security interests, and keeping the only resolution process for whistleblowers within the government, which has already fired them, the government insures misdeeds will not be made public. The options that the Bush Administration argues for are not viable options for honest employees who uncover unethical or criminal acts by the government. Rather, these options are self-serving for those in power as they keep government wrong doing hidden at the expense of honest workers, and limit the workers' avenues for justice.

In fact, in a legal research report, "Comment: The Silent Citizens: The Post-Garcetti Landscape for the Public Sector," Jaime Sasser, writing for the University of
Richmond Law Review, claims that those workers who fall under the broad category of employees whose jobs can be tied to national security are particularly vulnerable to retaliation by the government:

This ruling creates a predicament for government employees who in the future witness corruption, fraud waste, or mismanagement in the workplace: either disclose their observations internally by following proper procedure and run the risk that their reports will be met by hostile and unsympathetic supervisors in which case they will not be protected by the First Amendment, or alternatively, hold a press conference on the front steps of the government building and publicly embarrass government officials to assure themselves First Amendment protection. Being placed in this predicament is as illogical as it is bizarre. (Sasser 792)

The second government action that affects free press is reported in the MSNBC news online article "Attorney General: Reporters Can Be Prosecuted for Publishing Classified Leaks," which reports former Attorney General Alberto Gonzales' threat to prosecute the members of the
press who leaked classified information and uncovered the
NSA controversy. With this strategy, even if evidence is
uncovered it cannot be freely reported without consequence.
The information the public is given is controlled by fear.
Gonzales was vague about the statutes he would use, and
said “There are some statutes on the book which, if you
read the language carefully would seem to indicate that
that [prosecution of journalists] is a possibility”
(“Attorney General: Reporters” 1). According to the MSNBC
article, Gonzales argues:

The First Amendment right of a free press should
not be absolute when it comes to national
security. If the government’s probe into the NSA
leak turns up criminal activity, prosecutors have
an obligation to enforce the law. ("Attorney
General: Reporters" 1)

As is evident in this passage, Gonzales’ argument stresses
national security issues over other constitutional rights,
specifically, freedom of the press and the right to free
speech. The “criminal activity” that Gonzales seems to
allude to is the whistleblower who gave information to the
press. This statement implicates the press as participants
in criminal activity for revealing information that, in the
case of the NSA controversy, is possibly illegal conduct by the executive branch of the United States government. This argument is taken further in a quote by Gonzales in the MSNBC article which was taken from an ABC television interview on “This Week”:

It can’t be the case that right [The First Amendment] trumps over the right that Americans would like to see, the ability of the federal government to go after criminal activity. (qtd. in “Attorney General: Reporters 1)

In this quote, Gonzales insinuates that an elitist press is obstructing justice and trampling over the wishes of the majority of the citizens of the United States. Gonzales’ argument makes it appear that the press feels that they are above the law. Of course, Gonzales does not speak for all citizens of the United States, nor does he acknowledge that the press has a legitimate reason to report unethical and illegal activity by the government as a check against tyranny. Indeed, the MSNBC news report quotes Lucy Dalglish of The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press as stating: “I can’t imagine a bigger chill on free speech and the public’s right to know what its government is up to” (“Attorney General: Reporters” 1-2).
Finally, the United States Government has filed a suit to block the lawsuits against the NSA wiretaps claiming that going to court would reveal national security secrets as reported in the MSNBC online article “White House Seeks to Block NSA Lawsuits.” The ACLU and The Center for Constitutional Rights have both filed lawsuits to stop the NSA wiretaps as unconstitutional, but the White House is claiming they cannot defend the lawsuit without giving out national secrets and have filed motions in New York and New Jersey to quash these lawsuits (“White House Seeks” 1-2). According to the same MSNBC article:

Justice Department attorneys said in their legal brief that the legality of the President’s actions could only be properly judged by understanding “the specific threat facing the nation and the particular actions taken by the president to meet that threat...That understanding is not possible without revealing to the very adversaries we are trying to defeat what we know about them and how we are preceding to stop them.” (“White House Seeks” 1-2)

In essence, the Bush Administration’s argument is that the suit against them for abuse of power in the NSA controversy
should be dropped for national security reasons because the case cannot be pursued without documents that are top secret. The Administration contends that releasing the information needed for the case would jeopardize the security of the nation and that doing so is irresponsible. This action by the White House, if successful, has chilling implications according to Shayana Kadidal, from the Center for Constitutional Rights:

The Bush Administration is trying to crush a very strong case against domestic spying without any evidence or argument [...] Can the president tell the courts which cases they can rule on? If so, the courts will never be able to hold the president accountable for breaking the law. (qtd. in "White House Seeks" 1)

The legal ploy by the government of claiming national security as a reason not to divulge information to plaintiffs worked, for as CNN reported, in the story "Court Dismisses Suit Challenging Domestic Spying," the case was dismissed because the plaintiffs in a class action lawsuit represented by the ACLU "had no legal standing to pursue their claims because they could not show they were targeted by the National Security Agency’s wireless spying program"
(Mears 1). The legal maneuvers in the domestic spying case may not be over as the ACLU can appeal the ruling to the Supreme Court. These three government actions limit the ability of U.S. citizens to know the truth about how much wiretapping and surveillance is occurring.

Moreover, there have been reports in the press that are rather unsettling; for example, in the MSNBC news online article “FBI Secretly Sought Data on 3501 People in 2005,” it is reported that the government sought an alarming amount of information on U.S. citizens without “court approval” ("FBI" 1). This information collected on U.S. citizens by using a “national security letter” to bypass warrants included sources such as “banks and credit card, telephone and internet companies” ("FBI" 1). This is yet another example of how the government has used the rhetoric of national security issues and 9/11 as reasons to override the right to privacy.

The National Security Administration Wiretap Controversy in Newspeak Terminology

To illustrate just how Orwellian the rhetoric surrounding the NSA controversy is, one can easily translate it into Newspeak jargon: Big Brother (George
Bush) has empowered the Thought Police (FBI) to wiretap average citizens (Proles). By wire tapping the press, the Thought Police (FBI) will stop them from reporting leaks by intimidation. If the Thought Police (FBI) can instill enough fear, the press will be afraid to even think about reporting leaks (crimestop). Although there is a law on the books that was written in 1978 prohibiting the action of wiretapping without court approval, President Bush (Big Brother) says it is legal (doublespeak). President Bush (Big Brother) and the Thought Police (FBI) state that the Bush Administration's interpretation must be accepted unquestionably (blackwhite). If government workers or members of the press expose wrongdoing, they can face consequences by President Bush (Big Brother) through the Thought Police (FBI). Without having access to the truth, reality can be rewritten in the United States much like Winston Smith does in Oceania in 1984.

The NSA scandal is not the only government action taking place in the name of national security. Recently, it has been increasingly difficult to keep up with the controversy regarding the White House’s abuse of power because of the increasing numbers of news stories related to these issues. Yet, the ever increasing flurry of
activity reported indicates how serious a situation the NSA controversy is. For example, Kevin Bohn in his report for CNN, "Feds Put Squeeze on Internet Firms," states that the government is forcing internet firms to keep their records for up to two years so that the NSA can access them (Bohn 1). These records include various customer information and use patterns (Bohn 1). Major phone companies recently complied with a demand to provide similar information to the NSA (Bohn 1-2). Are we headed in the direction of a society where the phone and internet companies will be agents for the state? Perhaps they will, but not without strong opposition. As it stands, there are lawsuits against the phone companies for their complicity with the government alleging Fourth Amendment violations, and the government is trying to negotiate with reluctant executives at the internet companies. According to MSNBC’s report titled, "Classified Surveillance Intel Revealed," National Intelligence Director Mike McConnell acknowledges that these companies aided the government in wireless wiretaps and should be given "immunity" from ongoing lawsuits against them because of their cooperation with the government’s requests (1).
In a report by Roland Jones, "Homeland Security Seen Spurring Biometrics," the government appears even more Orwellian. Biometrics, as Jones explains, "Typically use details of an individual's unique physical features - facial, eye, or fingerprint patterns to substantiate their identity" (1). According to the report,

A handful of consortiums, which include firms like IBM, Raytheon and Unisys are competing for a chance to build the technology for U.S. VISIT. The winners' directive: Expand the current border control system and install biometrics measuring systems at U.S. embassies and consulates abroad so travelers can be screened overseas" (Jones 1).

Although the government claims to have implemented rules in the Patriot Act for national security purposes, what the average citizen sees as a result of these rules is often chaos. All the new technology that can be developed is useless when applied by an overworked, under trained, and/or complacent security force. As new rules are implemented, revoked, and/or changed, the rules add to the confusion at already chaotic airports. This chaos adds to the aggravation of travelers, airline employees, as well as airport staff. Unfortunately, these new security measures
have increased the frustration level and confusion to the point where at times the security measures appear to be counterproductive. Since this is what the average citizen sees as a result of the Patriot Act, it is understandable that U.S. citizens are skeptical about what the government does in the name of national security. So far, the majority of citizens in the United States have been compliant with the rules. For example, in January the government required that everyone traveling to Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean carry a passport. According to the MSNBC report "U.S. Halts New Passport Rules," the passport offices were "flooded" and travelers were faced with extraordinary delays in getting their passports, and the excuse for the delays given in a press conference by a government spokesperson, Maura Hearty, was: "What we did not anticipate adequately enough was the United States citizen’s willingness and desire to comply with the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative in the timeframe that they did" (1). Essentially, the government is admitting failure of the program and gave an extension to travelers because they failed to believe that citizens of the United States would comply and did not hire and train enough workers to process the passports ("U.S. Halts" 1).
Are we any safer now than we were before the attacks? Clearly, most citizens of the United States want to be protected from terrorism, and no reasonable person would advocate giving up measures that save lives because they were slightly inconvenienced. Most citizens are willing to remove shoes or be randomly searched, but are these intrusions by the government justified in presumably thwarting terrorism, or are we giving away our Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable search and seizure to make it seem as if we are safer? Is this security, or simulacra?

Indeed the phrase "war on terror" that Bush coined fits the mold of an Orwellian phrase. Wars are traditionally fought against nations. A war on a concept like terrorism does not correlate. The success of such a war is somewhat subjective. In a war between nations, the war is typically won when a sovereign nation surrenders and signs a peace treaty. No one really knows how victory in the war on terror is defined. Would the fact that the U.S. has not been attacked constitute victory, or does every terrorist need to surrender? If one terror group disbands, another can crop up. Since there are no soldiers aligned with enemy forces in the traditional sense, how enemy
forces are defined is new territory. For example, is an enemy soldier someone who trains to fight against the U.S., or is it a matter of alliance to a philosophy? If it is an alliance to a philosophy, what constitutes criminal alliance? Who can legally be considered a prisoner of war? Is guilt by association enough, or is there a test of intent? The ramifications of having a war against a concept becomes progressively more confusing. This reaction is precisely the reaction to Newspeak that the character Winston Smith describes in 1984 when he endures the effects of "doublespeak" (215). Eventually, the concept of the "War on Terror" deconstructs as a war against a concept is illogical. Other related problems develop as new terminology is invented to fit the new concept of the "War-on-Terror." For example, as the terms "enemy combatant" and "detainee" replaced the term prisoner-of-war in the "war on terror" a grey area in the law was created and questions arose whether the detainees were covered under the Geneva Conference guidelines for prisoners-of-war since they are now called "detainees."
The News Media and the National Security Administration
Wiretap Controversy

On August 6, 2007, it was reported by the major news agencies including MSNBC and FOX news that the FISA act was renewed for six months, and changes were made to enhance the executive branch’s powers. To illustrate the political rhetoric employed by both sides of the NSA controversy, the following section compares the rhetoric used in the reporting of this story using news transcripts of CNBC’s Countdown show with liberal commentator Keith Olbermann and the August 6, 2007 Fox News’ report “Democrats’ 180 On Bush’s Secret Wiretapping Program” by longtime conservative Fox News commentator and radio talk show host John Gibson. Olbermann is a consistent critic of the Bush Administration on his show and in his blogs, while Gibson is a strong, consistent supporter of the Republicans on his shows and in his commentaries.

Both commentators have harsh words for Congress, but give different reasons. Gibson infers that the Democrats in the legislative branch are hypocritical in his commentary of August 6, 2007: “The Democrats in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives voted to make legal everything Bush’s secret NSA program was up to and more”
(Gibson 1). Gibson fails to mention that Congress was briefed before the vote about impending threats, or that the statute would be reviewed in six months. Gibson is not giving members of Congress the benefit of the doubt that there may be a good reason for their change of heart. Gibson is also not acknowledging that Congress, by granting only a six month extension subject to review, cannot be construed as giving unconditional support to the executive branch. Gibson insinuates that this vote validates Bush’s position that wiretapping is a good thing. He is also implying that wireless wiretapping is a valuable tool to fight terror rather than an infringement on the right to privacy that must be balanced carefully against national security interests. Gibson states:

Boom! What was illegal is now legal. And the very people who condemned Bush for doing it now, with their vote, admitted wiretapping keeps Americans safe, just as Bush said.

Did I mention that sometimes politicians are truly despicable? (1)

The transcript of Olbermann’s show, Countdown, On August 6, 2007, covers his interview with Jonathan Atler, a senior editor for Newsweek and frequent guest on Countdown.
In referring to the vote, Olbermann introduces the segment of the *Countdown* show in a style which gives the impression that the Congress has the best intentions, but is misguided:

Most Democrats opposed it, but fifty-seven agreed with Republicans that fears of terrorism justify rewriting the Fourth and Fifth Amendments, which brings us to Justice Brandeis's famous dissent in the Olmstead writing, quote, "experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding."

When Olbermann quotes from Judge Brandeis, he is giving his argument legitimacy as if the honored judge is in agreement with Olbermann's point of view. Judge Brandeis' words are carefully chosen and diplomatic in their tone and add to the urgency of Olbermann's argument.

Later in the interview, from the *Countdown* show of August 6, 2007, Olbermann insinuates that the Bush
Administration misleads gullible Congress members by using what he terms “alleged” national security threats as a cover for wiretapping:

There is a pattern here; whether it applies to this case I am not sure. But you reveal alleged security needs only at the last minute and then insist on rushing the job. Why is it that Democrats still act as if he has any credibility fighting terror and being proactive about it? (7)

Olbermann is in essence calling those Democrats who voted with the President on this issue naïve fools. Whenever Olbermann refers to the President he calls him Mr. Bush, which is an indication of disrespect for the man in the office. In his introduction, Olbermann was careful to note that a minority of Democrats voted for the NSA act. While the FISA act was temporarily extended by Congress, court challenges against the act continue. Consequences of the NSA scandal continue to reverberate throughout the government.

In fact, on August 27, 2007, Alberto Gonzales resigned his post as attorney general amid controversy. Several senators had recently called for his resignation because of numerous controversial actions he took which include his
stance on the NSA controversy. Naturally, the rhetoric associated with this resignation is affected by the political leanings of the person speaking; in fact, Massimo Calabresi reported in a Time Magazine story "Why Gonzales Finally Caved," published the very morning of the resignation:

Both camps on Capitol Hill saw Gonzales’s departure as an opportunity to dial up the spin for their respective bases. Texas Senator John Cornyn lamented that the departure would “lead to more posturing and more controversy” in Congress as the Senate debates whomever Bush nominates as a successor. And hints that Gonzales’s tenure at Justice may be at the center of a confirmation battle have already emerged in statements from key Democrats. (2)

President Bush was extremely brief with his comments on the morning of the resignation. In a national news conference, on that date, ABC News’ report “Attorney General Gonzales Resigns” states that Bush claimed Gonzales was “dragged through the mud for political reasons” (1). Democratic Senator Charles Schumer, who has been an ongoing critic of Gonzales, is quoted by Fox News in the article “Attorney
General Alberto Gonzales’ Resignation Prompts Strong Reaction” as saying:

It has been a long and difficult struggle, but at least the attorney general has done the right thing and stepped down. For the previous six months, the Justice Department has been virtually nonfunctional and desperately needs new leadership. (1)

These are only samples of the many immediate responses to Gonzales’ resignation. While Gonzales is currently being investigated for another matter concerning the firing of justice department attorneys, the focus of my research is on the NSA controversy which also aroused concern. In a set of events that can best be described as bizarre, testimony given at the House Judiciary Committee in the summer of 2007 demonstrate questionable judgment in 2004 regarding the NSA wiretaps on the part of Gonzales.

Dan Eggen from the Washington Post in “FBI Director’s Notes Contradict Gonzales Version of Ashcroft Visit,” cites notes from FBI director Robert S. Muellers’ log that confirm the former Deputy Attorney General James B. Comey’s disturbing account of then White House Council Alberto Gonzales and White House Council Andrew Card’s
behavior on March 10, 2004. In the scenario of events reported by Comey and confirmed by Mueller, Gonzales and Card had been informed that the NSA wiretaps were illegal by the Justice Department. The attorney general at the time, John Ashcroft, was incapacitated in the hospital, but Gonzales wanted Ashcroft “to sign off on the warrantless wiretapping program over Justice Department objections” even though Ashcroft was in no condition to do so; they tried to force him to sign papers even though he was clearly incapacitated (Eggen 1). In response, Comey asked Mueller “to bar anyone other than relatives from later entering Ashcroft’s hospital room” (Eggen 1). Eggen’s article cites notes from Mueller’s log:

Saw AG...only minutes after Gonzales and White house chief of staff Andrew H. Card Jr. had visited Ashcroft. Janet Ashcroft in the room. AG in chair; is feeble, barely articulate, clearly stressed. (“FBI Director’s Notes” 1)

According to Eggen’s article, Gonzales’ contradictory statement to the House Judiciary Committee prompted Senator Patrick Leahy to “investigate whether Gonzales has misled lawmakers in those and other statements, including some related to last year’s controversial firings of nine U.S.
attorneys (Eggen 2). Eggen added that Leahy was not the
alone in his concern over Gonzales’ behavior and that
“Other Democrats asked for a full perjury investigation”
(Eggen 2).

It is apparent from this incident that Gonzales was
well aware that there were Constitutional issues with the
NSA wiretap program. When the New York Times broke the
story about the existence of the wireless wiretap program,
Gonzales brought up the possibility of prosecuting
reporters for revealing state secrets as reported by MSNBC
in the article “Attorney General: Reporters Can Be
Prosecuted for Publishing ClassifiedLeaks.” According to
Gonzales:

The First Amendment’s right of a free press
should not be absolute when it comes to
national security. If the government’s probe
into the NSA leak turns up criminal activity,
prosecutors have an “obligation to enforce the
law.” (1)

As stated earlier, threats against the press are seen as
challenges to our civil liberties by many.

The NSA wiretap controversy illustrates how civil
liberties compete with national security issues, and also
illustrates the affect of rhetoric on our rights. The political rhetoric post 9/11 translates easily into Orwellian rhetoric. We know from historiography that there are always multiple and alternative viewpoints that are often not heard.
CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Many of the problems Orwell warned about in 1984 and Animal Farm are of concern to modern day citizens of the United States; for example, the way that the United States is coping with privacy and freedom of the press are issues that are a source of considerable controversy. Our Constitutional rights are fragile and subject to political rhetoric. When conflicts arise, it may seem safer to err on the side of national security, until you, or someone you know, has their rights violated. Attorneys Ellen Alderman and Caroline Kennedy examine challenges to civil liberties in their book The Right to Privacy with a discussion of several legal cases that affect civil liberties. Alderman and Kennedy report that the Supreme Court "now speaks of a warrant as a constitutional preference" (29). Technology has advanced rapidly since the inception of the Bill of Rights, and there are now things brought into evidence, such as phone conversations and DNA evidence, that can be destroyed or lost if official investigators wait to get a warrant (Alderman and Kennedy 29). As Alderman and Kennedy state, the right to privacy is inherently vital to our wellbeing as a society:
Why we as Americans so cherish our privacy is not easy to explain. Privacy covers many things. It allows us the independence that is part of raising a family. It protects our right to be secure in our own homes and possessions, assured that the government cannot come barging in. Privacy also encompasses our right to self-determination and to define who we are. Although we live in a world of noisy self-confession, privacy allows us to keep certain facts to ourselves if we so choose. The right to privacy, it seems, is what makes us civilized. (xiii)

Threats to national security have often been occasions when our civil liberties have been challenged. The government must balance our safety against individual civil liberties. Many great men, including Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, have succumbed to the rhetoric of tyranny that is rampant in times of national crisis. Franklin D. Roosevelt imprisoned Japanese citizens of the United States during World War Two. Jonathon Atler stated, on the Countdown show of August 6, 2007, that during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln suspended habeas corpus. These war measures, as heinous as they were, were temporary and
ended as the perceived threats ended and the heated political rhetoric toned down. What is different about 9/11 is that there is no end to the conflict in sight as the government is fighting a concept, the War on Terror. There is also no end to the heated political rhetoric. Conceivably, if we lose rights under these conditions, we may never get them back. Is it conceivable given our history and the heated political rhetoric today that we would mistreat Arab citizens of the United States as we did Japanese citizens of the United States in World War Two? Have we suspended habeas corpus and detained suspects for extended periods without trials as we did in the United States’ Civil War? It could be argued that we already have crossed this line with the situation of detainees in Guantanamo Bay.

The political rhetoric surrounding the NSA wiretap controversy illustrates how our right to privacy is pitted against national security interests during crises. Our fears about our security could cost us our right to privacy, which Alderman and Kennedy contend is “what makes us civilized” (xiii). Our rights can slip away. If we are not vigilant, we may end up like Benjamin and Clover in Animal Farm who were stunned by the sight of the ruins of
their once sacred Seven Commandments, which had so gradually been taken away from them that they did not realize it until it was too late: all hope was lost and they were at the mercy of tyrants (92).

The tyrants in Orwell's novels use rhetoric of fear to create totalitarian regimes. As the rhetoric of fear escalates and feeds the regime in power, civil liberties systematically disappear. Thus, a totalitarian state is created and sustained through means of rhetoric of fear as described in Orwell’s novels. The most chilling consequences of the loss of civil liberties in 1984 concern the intrusion of the state on personal relationships. Family members disappear without explanation. Winston Smith’s father and, later, his mother vanish from his home with no explanation, but this is not an unusual occurrence in Oceania. Smith’s only sister dies of starvation, which is also common in Oceania, but since the language no longer contains referents to explain these occurrences and history has been rewritten it is difficult for Smith to retain more than faint memories.

Furthermore, as intimate relations are only sanctioned in marriages, which are arranged by the state for the sole purpose of procreation, the state is intentionally trying
to destroy love, as the state contends love distracts from party loyalty. When Winston finds a lover, Julia, their love is considered a crime against the state, for which they are arrested and tortured. Winston is eventually executed for his crime. The couple’s love is doomed from the beginning as the society is constantly under surveillance. As there is no privacy, the state intrudes in every aspect of people’s lives, and controls their every move. The justification for the constant surveillance is the rhetoric of fear used by the totalitarian regime which convinces the populous that they are in a constant state of war. According to the state, surveillance is deemed necessary for the national security of Oceania. Accordingly, the citizens give up their right to privacy. Constant surveillance in conjunction with heated political rhetoric feed the insatiable need for power of the totalitarian state in 1984.

While Orwell’s novels are fictional, they illustrate the danger of unchecked power and its tendency to spiral out of control. The rhetorical tactics used by the totalitarian regime in 1984 offer a powerful analogue for the rhetoric of fear used by the Busch Administration to implement the Patriot Act. We should feel amply warned.
1 A modified Swales move analysis is a linguistic term for a system of analysis that identifies genres and common moves within those genres. The system is named after John M. Swales of the University of Michigan who first implemented the approach with research genres.

2 Basic English was an attempt to simplify the English Language so that it would be a more universal form of the language. In the early Twentieth-Century there were several competing universal languages of which Orwell was familiar. Basic was supported by Ezra Pound, H.G. Wells, Winston Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt (Bolton 116-18).

3 Reznikov refers to BBC reporter W. Emerson’s letter to Charles Ogden in which Emerson complains that the limited vocabulary of Basic gives the translator too much influence on the meaning of the text. Thus, the translated text reflects the viewpoint of the translator in Basic English (Reznikov 13). In Orwell’s 1984, Winston Smith is employed as a translator of English into Newspeak and encounters the same issues. This is discussed further at the end of this chapter.
Homage to Catalonia is Orwell’s book that documents the betrayal of the Trotskyite P.O.U.M forces (of which Orwell was a member) by the Stalinist’s during the Spanish Civil War.

Written linear history can be defined as a narrowly focused set of events that goes forth in a linear fashion, like a timeline, and does not take multiple interpretations into consideration.

U. S. VISIT is a “biometrics identification system” which is already in limited use, but is going to be greatly expanded and enhanced (Jones 1).
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