

OLYMPIADS SCHOOL/GRADE 10 ENGLISH/HOMEWORK 11

NAME (FIRST AND LAST): _____ GRADE: _____

DAY/TIME/TEACHER: _____

Read these Spark Notes summaries of Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of George Orwell's 1984.

Chapter 5

Winston has lunch with a man named Syme, an intelligent Party member who works on a revised dictionary of Newspeak, the official language of Oceania. Syme tells Winston that Newspeak aims to narrow the range of thought to render thoughtcrime impossible. If there are no words in a language that are capable of expressing independent, rebellious thoughts, no one will ever be able to rebel, or even to conceive of the idea of rebellion. Winston thinks that Syme's intelligence will get him vaporized one day.

Parsons, a pudgy and fervent Party official and the husband of the woman whose plumbing Winston fixed in Chapter II, comes into the canteen and elicits a contribution from Winston for neighborhood Hate Week. He apologizes to Winston for his children's harassment the day before, but is openly proud of their spirit.

Suddenly, an exuberant message from the Ministry of Plenty announces increases in production over the loudspeakers. Winston reflects that the alleged increase in the chocolate ration to twenty grams was actually a reduction from the day before, but those around him seem to accept the announcement joyfully and without suspicion. Winston feels that he is being watched; he looks up and sees the dark-haired girl staring at him. He worries again that she is a Party agent.

Chapter 6

Winston has lunch with a man named Syme, an intelligent Party member who works on a revised dictionary of Newspeak, the official language of Oceania. Syme tells Winston that Newspeak aims to narrow the range of thought to render thoughtcrime impossible. If there are no words in a language that are capable of expressing independent, rebellious thoughts, no one will ever be able to rebel, or even to conceive of the idea of rebellion. Winston thinks that Syme's intelligence will get him vaporized one day.

Parsons, a pudgy and fervent Party official and the husband of the woman whose plumbing Winston fixed in Chapter II, comes into the canteen and elicits a contribution from Winston for neighborhood Hate Week. He apologizes to Winston for his children's harassment the day before, but is openly proud of their spirit.

Suddenly, an exuberant message from the Ministry of Plenty announces increases in production over the loudspeakers. Winston reflects that the alleged increase in the chocolate ration to twenty grams was actually a reduction from the day before, but those around him seem to accept the announcement joyfully and without suspicion. Winston feels that he is being watched; he looks up and sees the dark-haired girl staring at him. He worries again that she is a Party agent.

Chapter 7

Winston writes in his diary that any hope for revolution against the Party must come from the proles. He believes that the Party cannot be destroyed from within, and that even the Brotherhood, a legendary revolutionary group, lacks the wherewithal to defeat the mighty Thought Police. The proles, on the other hand make up eighty-five percent of the population of Oceania, and could easily muster the strength and manpower to overcome the Police. However, the proles lead brutish, ignorant, animalistic lives, and lack both the energy and interest to revolt; most of them do not even understand that the Party is oppressing them.

Winston looks through a children's history book to get a feeling for what has really happened in the world. The Party claims to have built ideal cities, but London, where Winston lives, is a wreck: the electricity seldom works, buildings decay, and people live in poverty and fear. Lacking a reliable official record, Winston does not know what to think about the past. The Party's claims that it has increased the literacy rate, reduced the infant mortality rate, and given everyone better food and shelter could all be fantasy. Winston suspects that these claims are untrue, but he has no way to know for sure, since history has been written entirely by the Party.

Winston remembers an occasion when he caught the Party in a lie. In the mid-1960s, a cultural backlash caused the original leaders of the Revolution to be arrested. One day, Winston saw a few of these deposed leaders sitting at the Chestnut Tree Café, a gathering place for out-of-favor Party members. A song played—"Under the spreading chestnut tree / I sold you and you sold me"—and one of the Party members, Rutherford, began to weep. Winston never forgot the incident, and one day came upon a photograph that proved that the Party members had been in New York at the time that they were allegedly committing treason in Eurasia. Terrified, Winston destroyed the photograph, but it remains embedded in his memory as a concrete example of Party dishonesty.

Winston thinks of his writing in his diary as a kind of letter to O'Brien. Though Winston knows almost nothing about O'Brien beyond his name, he is sure that he detects a strain of independence and rebellion in him, a consciousness of oppression similar to Winston's own. Thinking about the Party's control of every record of the truth, Winston realizes that the Party requires its members to deny the evidence of their eyes and ears. He believes that true freedom lies in the ability to interpret reality as one perceives it, to be able to say " $2 + 2 = 4$."

Chapter 8

Winston goes for a walk through the prole district, and envies the simple lives of the common people. He enters a pub where he sees an old man—a possible link to the past. He talks to the old man and tries to ascertain whether, in the days before the Party, people were really exploited by bloated capitalists, as the Party records claim. The old man's memory is too vague to provide an answer. Winston laments that the past has been left to the proles, who will inevitably forget it.

Winston walks to the secondhand store in which he bought the diary and buys a clear glass paperweight with a pink coral center from Mr. Charrington, the proprietor. Mr. Charrington takes him upstairs to a private room with no telescreen, where a print of St. Clement's Church looks down from the wall, evoking the old rhyme: "Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St. Clement's / You owe me three farthings, say the bells of St. Martin's."

Winston goes for a walk through the prole district, and envies the simple lives of the common people. He enters a pub where he sees an old man—a possible link to the past. He talks to the old man and tries to ascertain whether, in the days before the Party, people were really exploited by bloated capitalists, as the Party records claim. The old man's memory is too vague to provide an answer. Winston laments that the past has been left to the proles, who will inevitably forget it.

Winston walks to the secondhand store in which he bought the diary and buys a clear glass paperweight with a pink coral center from Mr. Charrington, the proprietor. Mr. Charrington takes him upstairs to a private room with no telescreen, where a print of St. Clement's Church looks down from the wall, evoking the old rhyme: "Oranges and lemons, say the bells of St. Clement's / You owe me three farthings, say the bells of St. Martin's."

Familiarity with the Text (Please respond in complete sentences.)

About Chapter 5

1. Which department does Winston's friend, Syme, work in?

2. Which character is a philologist? _____

3. What is a philologist? _____

4. Which character is a specialist in Newspeak?

5. Which part of speech is Syme currently working on?

6. What does “part of speech” mean?

7. Who says, “It’s a beautiful thing, the destruction of words”? _____

8. Why does Winston believe that Syme will be vaporized?

9. “Was it possible that they could swallow that, after only twenty-four hours?”
What’s that?

10. What is *facecrime*?

About Chapter 6

1. What does Winston write about in his diary?

2. “Your worst enemy, he reflected, was your own _____.”

3. Who is Katherine?

4. What is the Party tacitly inclined to encourage?

5. What does the word “tacit” mean?

6. What does the Party aim to remove from sex?

7. What advocates complete celibacy for both sexes?

8. What is *artsem*? _____

About Chapter 7

1. "*If there is hope, wrote Winston, it lies in the _____.*"

2. What percentage of the population of Oceania do the proles make up?

3. What example of doublethink is mentioned in the chapter.

4. After the Revolution, what does the Party teach about the proles?

5. "As the Party slogan put it, 'Proles and _____ are free.'"

6. Winston copies a passage into his diary. Where is the passage from?

7. Who are Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford?

8. What prompts Winston to write in his diary, "I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY"?

9. For whom does Winston feel compelled to write his diary?

About Chapter 8

1. What has Winston missed for the second time in three weeks?

2. What is *ownlife*?

3. Which words keep coming back to Winston?

4. What is a steamer?

5. To what public event do the proles pay serious attention?

6. Which ministry is the Lottery managed by?

7. What does Winston spend four dollars on?

8. Who is Charrington?

9. What causes Winston to be too paralyzed to move?

Selection 1, from Chapter 5 of Orwell's 1984

'How is the Dictionary getting on?' said Winston, raising his voice to overcome the noise.

'Slowly,' said Syme. 'I'm on the adjectives. It's fascinating.'

He had brightened up immediately at the mention of Newspeak. He pushed his pannikin aside, took up his hunk of bread in one delicate hand and his cheese in the other, and leaned across the table so as to be able to speak without shouting.

'The Eleventh Edition is the definitive edition,' he said. 'We're getting the language into its final shape—the shape it's going to have when nobody speaks anything else. When we've finished with it, people like you will have to learn it all over again. You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words—scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone. The Eleventh Edition won't contain a single word that will become obsolete before the year 2050.'

He bit hungrily into his bread and swallowed a couple of mouthfuls, then continued speaking, with a sort of pedant's passion. His thin dark face had become animated, his eyes had lost their mocking expression and grown almost dreamy.

'It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives, but there are hundreds of nouns that can be got rid of as well. It isn't only the synonyms; there are also the antonyms. After all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other word? A word contains its opposite in itself. Take "good", for instance. If you have a word like "good", what need is there for a word like "bad"? "Ungood" will do just as well—better, because it's an exact opposite, which the other is not. Or again, if you want a stronger version of "good", what sense is there in having a whole string of vague useless words like "excellent" and "splendid" and all the rest of them? "Plusgood" covers the meaning, or "doubleplusgood" if you want something stronger still. Of course we use those forms already, but in the final version of Newspeak there'll be nothing else. In the end the whole notion of goodness and badness will be covered by only six words—in reality, only one word. Don't you see the beauty of that, Winston? It was B.B.'s idea originally, of course,' he added as an afterthought.

A sort of vapid eagerness flitted across Winston's face at the mention of Big Brother. Nevertheless Syme immediately detected a certain lack of enthusiasm.

'You haven't a real appreciation of Newspeak, Winston,' he said almost sadly. 'Even when you write it you're still thinking in Oldspeak. I've read some of those pieces that you write in the *Times* occasionally. They're good enough, but they're translations. In your heart you'd prefer to stick to Oldspeak, with all its vagueness and its useless shades of meaning. You don't grasp the beauty of the destruction of words. Do you know that Newspeak is the only language in the world whose vocabulary gets smaller every year?'

Winston did know that, of course. He smiled, sympathetically he hoped, not trusting himself to speak. Syme bit off another fragment of the dark-coloured bread, chewed it briefly, and went on:

'Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly *one* word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten. Already, in the Eleventh Edition, we're not far from that point. But the process will still be continuing long after you and I are dead. Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller. Even now, of course, there's no reason or excuse for committing thoughtcrime. It's merely a question of self-discipline, reality-control. But in the end there won't be any need even for that. The Revolution will be complete when the language is perfect. Newspeak is Ingsoc and Ingsoc is Newspeak,' he added with a sort of mystical satisfaction. 'Has it ever occurred to you, Winston, that by the year 2050, at the very latest, not a single human being will be alive who could understand such a conversation as we are having now?'

'Except—' began Winston doubtfully, and he stopped.

It had been on the tip of his tongue to say 'Except the proles,' but he checked himself, not feeling fully certain that this remark was not in some way unorthodox. Syme, however, had divined what he was about to say.

'The proles are not human beings,' he said carelessly. 'By 2050—earlier, probably—all real knowledge of Oldspeak will have disappeared. 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 could 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.'

Selection 2, an article about bilingualism and consciousness from theguardian.com

(<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/27/world-view-learn-another-language>)

Think your world view is fixed? Learn another language and you'll think differently

New research says that a German speaker and an English speaker perceive the world in different ways – thanks to the grammatical toolkit they're using

[Panos Athanasopoulos](#) for the Conversation

Monday 27 April 2015 17.30 BST

Bilinguals get all the perks. Better job prospects, a cognitive boost, and even protection against dementia. Now new research shows that they can also view the world in different ways depending on the language they are operating in.

In the past 15 years there has been an overwhelming amount of research on the bilingual mind, with the majority of the evidence pointing to the tangible advantages of using more than one language. Going back and forth between languages appears to be a kind of brain training, pushing your brain to be flexible.

Just as regular exercise gives your body some biological benefits, mentally controlling two or more languages gives your brain cognitive benefits. This mental flexibility pays big dividends especially later in life: the typical signs of cognitive ageing occur later in bilinguals – and the onset of age-related degenerative disorders such as dementia or Alzheimer's are delayed in bilinguals by up to five years.

In the research we recently published in *Psychological Science*, we studied German-English bilinguals and monolinguals to find out how different language patterns affected how they reacted in experiments.

We showed German-English bilinguals video clips of events with a motion in them, such as a woman walking towards a car or a man cycling towards the supermarket and then asked them to describe the scenes.

When judging risk, bilinguals also tend to make more rational, economic decisions in a second language

When you give a scene like that to a monolingual German speaker they will tend to describe the action but also the goal of the action. So they would tend to say, “A woman walks towards her car,” or “A man cycles towards the supermarket.” English monolingual speakers would simply describe those scenes as “A woman is walking,” or “a man is cycling,” without mentioning the goal of the action.

The worldview assumed by German speakers is a holistic one – they tend to look at the event as a whole – whereas English speakers tend to zoom in on the event and focus only on the action.

The linguistic basis of this tendency appears to be rooted in the way different grammatical toolkits situate actions in time. English requires its speakers to grammatically mark events that are ongoing, by obligatorily applying the –ing morpheme: “I am playing the piano and I cannot come to the phone,” or “I was playing the piano when the phone rang.” German doesn’t have this feature.

Research with second language users shows a relationship between linguistic proficiency in such grammatical constructions and the frequency with which speakers mention the goals of events.

In our study we also found that these cross-linguistic differences extend beyond language usage itself, to nonverbal categorisation of events. We asked English and German monolinguals to watch a series of video clips that showed people walking, cycling, running or driving. In each set of three videos, we asked subjects to decide whether a scene with an ambiguous goal (a woman walks down a road toward a parked car) was more similar to a clearly goal-oriented scene (a woman walks into a building) or a scene with no goal (a woman walks down a country lane).

German monolinguals matched ambiguous scenes with goal-oriented scenes more frequently than English monolinguals did. This difference mirrors the one found for language usage: German speakers are more likely to focus on possible outcomes of people’s actions, but English speakers pay more attention to the action itself.

When it came to bilingual speakers, they seemed to switch between these perspectives based on the language context they were given the task in. We found that Germans fluent in English were just as goal-focused as any other native speaker when tested in German in their home country. But a similar group of German-English bilinguals tested in English in the United Kingdom were just as action-focused as native English speakers.

In another group of German-English bilinguals, we kept one language in the forefront of their minds during the video-matching task by making participants repeat strings of

numbers out loud in either English or German. Distracting one language seemed to automatically bring the influence of the other language to the fore.

When we “blocked” English, the bilinguals acted like typical Germans and saw ambiguous videos as more goal-oriented. With German blocked, bilingual subjects acted like English speakers and matched ambiguous and open-ended scenes. When we surprised subjects by switching the language of the distracting numbers halfway through the experiment, the subjects’ focus on goals versus process switched right along with it.

These findings are in line with other research showing distinct behaviour in bilinguals depending on the language of operation. Israeli Arabs are more likely to associate Arab names such as Ahmed and Samir with positive words in an Arabic language context than in a Hebrew one, for example.

People self-report that they feel like a different person when using their different languages and that expressing certain emotions carries different emotional resonance depending on the language they are using.

When judging risk, bilinguals also tend to make more rational, economic decisions in a second language. In contrast to one’s first language, it tends to lack the deep-seated, misleading affective biases that unduly influence how risks and benefits are perceived. So the language you speak in reality can affect the way you think.

Selection 3, a summary of “Docile Bodies” from Michel Foucault’s work

Discipline and Punish. (Adapted from faculty.washington.edu/.../SampleHandoutFoucault_DocileBodies.doc)

Context:

A French philosopher, Foucault is known for his critical studies of various social institutions, most notably psychiatry, medicine, parameters of educational timeframes, and the prison system, and also for his work on the history of sexuality. His work concerning power and the relation between power and knowledge, as well as his ideas concerning "discourse" in relation to the history of Western thought, have been widely discussed and applied. His work is often described as postmodernist or post-structuralist by commentators and critics; during the 1960s, however, he was more often associated with the structuralist movement.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault)

“Docile Bodies,” comes from the larger work *Discipline and Punish*, in which Foucault argues that individuals are under constant surveillance and regulation in ways that are often subtle and thereby seemingly invisible, leading to normalization and acceptance of such systems.

Foucault’s claim in “Docile Bodies”:

In this essay Foucault focuses on the body specifically as the sight of regulation, or more specifically “as object and target of power” (136) historically. The notion of ‘docility’—the point at which “the analyzable body and the manipulable body” are joined—is employed to illustrate how individuals within their bodies are subjected to institutional regulation (136). He continues by stating that “A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved” (136). Bodies are spatially enclosed, partitioned, and ranked so as to maintain “order and discipline.” Foucault illustrates how this subjugation of the body is ordered, asserting that out of discipline bodies are endowed with four characteristics which utilize four techniques of disciplinary practice as charted below.

Characteristics of Individuality	Techniques Employed	Examples
Cellular— Spatial manipulation of the body	Draw up tables	<i>Cells, places, and ranks</i>
Organic—Coded activities that are temporally established for the body to follow	Prescribe movements and schedules	<i>Time-tables, monastic rituals, and following recipes</i>
Genetic—Accumulation of time constituting ‘progress.’	Impose exercises	<i>Dictation, Homework, and Drills</i>
Combinatory— Composition of forces to attain efficiency.	Arranges ‘tactics’	<i>“Knowledge of men, weapons, tensions, circumstances...”</i>

Selection 4, from Chapter 6 of Orwell's 1984

When he had gone with that woman it had been his first lapse in two years or thereabouts. Consorting with prostitutes was forbidden, of course, but it was one of those rules that you could occasionally nerve yourself to break. It was dangerous, but it was not a life-and-death matter. To be caught with a prostitute might mean five years in a forced-labour camp: not more, if you had committed no other offence. And it was easy enough, provided that you could avoid being caught in the act. The poorer quarters swarmed with women who were ready to sell themselves. Some could even be purchased for a bottle of gin, which the proles were not supposed to drink. Tacitly the Party was even inclined to encourage prostitution, as an outlet for instincts which could not be altogether suppressed. Mere debauchery did not matter very much, so long as it was furtive and joyless and only involved the women of a submerged and despised class. The unforgivable crime was promiscuity between Party members. But—though this was one of the crimes that the accused in the great purges invariably confessed to—it was difficult to imagine any such thing actually happening.

The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and—though the principle was never clearly stated—permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. This again was never put into plain words, but in an indirect way it was rubbed into every Party member from childhood onwards. There were even organizations such as the Junior Anti-Sex League, which advocated complete celibacy for both sexes. All children were to be begotten by artificial insemination (*artsem*, it was called in Newspeak) and brought up in public institutions. This, Winston was aware, was not meant altogether seriously, but somehow it fitted in with the general ideology of the Party. The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it. He did not know why this was so, but it seemed natural that it should be so. And as far as the women were concerned, the Party's efforts were largely successful.

Refer back to the selections in the previous pages to help you answer the questions below. Feel free to use evidence/examples from other parts of the novel. Try to fill up all the lines provided. Try to sound as coherent and analytical as you can. Structure your responses whenever possible, beginning with a point (topic sentence), followed by a discussion of evidence/examples/details that support your point, and then ending with a clincher sentence.

Selection 1

Summarize Syme's explanation of Newspeak. The summary should show an understanding of a relationship between language and consciousness.

Selection 2

- i. What does the research show about the worldviews of German monolinguals and English monolinguals?

- ii. What "linguistic basis" does the writer draw attention to, to explain the variation in worldviews?

Selection 1 and 2

Imagine that you meet someone by the name of Bob. Even though Bob has not read *1984*, he has heard about a concept called Newspeak and is curious about how it works. You then explain Syme's perspective to Bob. Nevertheless, at the end of your explanation, Bob is still confused. Refer to the material in Selection 2 to offer another way of explaining Newspeak to Bob. Begin with the sentences below.

"Oh, you still don't understand how Newspeak could regulate consciousness? No worries, I'm going to explain the relationship between language and consciousness in another way. There was this research study about bilingualism..."

Selection 3

- i. What argument about society does Michel Foucault convey through his nonfiction book, *Discipline and Punish*? How does Foucault's worldview remind us of the world represented in George Orwell's *1984*?

- ii. Pay attention to the four techniques of disciplinary practice summarized in the selection. Discuss an example of such a technique being implemented in your own life, or in any institutional environment that you have experienced before (e.g., a school).

Selection 3 and 4

According to Foucault, the ways in which individuals “are under constant surveillance and regulation in ways that are often subtle and thereby seemingly invisible, leading to normalization and acceptance of such systems.” Using at least three of Foucault’s words and ideas (reproduced in the box below), discuss a way in which the Party in Orwell’s *1984* controls its citizens’ bodies. Feel free to change the parts of speech.

the body	regulation	object/target	power	normalization
institutional regulation	docile	order and discipline	subjugation	

THE END