

**The Meaning of Ideology: A Comparative Analysis of George Orwell's
Animal Farm and Yaşar Kemal's *The Sultan of the Elephants and Red
Bearded Lame Ant***

Author

Ece Özpınar^{1*}

Affiliations

¹Master's Program in English Language and Literature, Graduate School of Social Sciences Yeditepe University, İstanbul, 34755, Turkey.

To whom correspondence should be addressed;

*E-mail: ece.ereren@std.yeditepe.edu.tr.

Preprint

Abstract

In this work, the novels *Animal Farm* by George Orwell and *The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lame Ant* by Yaşar Kemal are analysed comparatively through the Marxist literary theory benefiting from Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton and Lucien Goldmann. This study examines how Orwell and Kemal from different geographies, nationalities and traditions have been influenced by the Marxist literary tradition. The figures in the two novels are compared according to their characteristics/profile, the changes they have gone through, and the protagonists' endings in their own story. The features of the works have been also examined through an analysis of the writers' lives. In the discussion part, the meaning of ideology in novels, and its reflections have been evaluated in terms of the selected writers' biographies, and the ideological elements as well as sociological ones in their works. In addition, the aim of this work displays a comparative thematic and stylistic analysis of the two novels.

Keywords

Animal farm; georg lukács; George orwell; marxist literary criticism; the sultan of the elephants and red bearded lame ant; yaşar kemal

INTRODUCTION

Works become world literature by being taken into the domain of a foreign culture, a space defined in many ways by the national tradition of the host culture and the current needs of their respective authors (Damrosch, 2003, p. 13). If the nature of a work changes, in other words, when it ceases to be national and is included in the field of a foreign culture, it becomes world literature. At this point, a work enters world literature through a dual process: First, by being read as literature; and second, by wandering beyond the linguistic and cultural point of origin to the wider world (Damrosch, 2003, p. 6).

According to Wellek, comparative literature does not include “only sources and influences, causes and effects”, because no work can be reduced completely to “foreign influences or considered as a radiating point of influence only toward foreign countries” (Wellek, 1964, p. 283). Therefore, the scope of comparative literature is related to fields such as sociology and cultural history. Göbenli states “(...) edebiyatveteri harasındada hasıkı birilişkisöz konusudur. Yoksa belli dönemlerde yaşanan olaylar karşıyazarlarca birtavır alma zorunluluğu oluşmazdı (Göbenli, 2004, p. 31). “(...) there is a tighter relationship between literature and history. Otherwise, it would not be necessary for the writers to take a stand against the events that took place in certain periods”. It is obvious that there is a close relationship between literature and history. The literary theory which examines this relationship, including social issues and strata from which the authors come, is Marxist theory. Writers such as George Orwell and Yaşar Kemal, who are the subjects of this thesis, and will be analysed using Marxist literary theory, have given a lot of thought to events that have been influenced by history in their writings, interviews, and even in their novels.

As a product of social interaction, sociology deals with culture that emerges from past interaction, and guides present and future interaction. Hegel stated that because of the division of labour, the individual is no longer dependent on nature, but is dependent on society. Thus, the social environment replaces the natural environment. This point is one of the main themes of Hegelian thought, later developed by Auguste Comte, who gave priority to sociology over psychology (Hyppolite, 2016, p. 118). Accordingly, culture influences the personalities of social beings. Literature, as interpreted by the author, is a

product that reflects the cultural interaction of the past and affects the interaction of the reader. The effect of literature on social interaction through writers and readers is obvious. “Novels are living sourcebooks to which we go for valid insights about such important sociological concerns as the group, the self, social class, and social institutions” (Merrill, 1967, p. 656). In this view, literature is an important source of knowledge about society, culture, and the authors’ interactions with them.

Orwell chose *Animal Farm* (1945) as his title which recalls a fairy tale; Kemal’s *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lame Ant* (1977) was written as a children's novel. However, neither writer wrote specifically for children or adults, but for people of all ages, and both placed emphasis on being understood by all. Both authors are known as writers who did not hesitate to express their opinions on social issues. It is understood from their statements and essays that the political views of both authors were very close to each other. Do these parallels allow us to assume a simple connection between Orwell and Kemal? Although Yaşar Kemal is known to be familiar with Western writers and world literature, and refers to the names of foreign writers from whom he drew immense inspiration, he never mentioned Orwell in any of his interviews or conversations. This makes it interesting to conduct a genetic comparison¹ about the novels of these two different authors. When people read the two novels, they expressed in various ways that they immediately identified an Orwellian flavour in Kemal’s work. My aim is to find out why this similarity was established at first glance, and secondly, more interestingly, to establish the parallels between these two novels in quite different aspects. In other words, what is meant in this thesis is to emphasise that superficial similarities in general are not superior to specific differences.

This article will include a genetic comparison between a British and a Turkish novelist. Starting from the understanding of social integrity, Lukács emphasised that historical and social changes should be reflected in literary work. Goldmann, on the other hand, brought

¹ Genetic comparison is fundamentally the comparison between two literary works of art written by the authors in different countries under different socioeconomic, cultural conditions, in terms of their similarities and differences.

a different approach to the sociology of literature with the theory of genetic structuralism, and tried to reveal the relationship between literature and society through structure.

In this article, George Orwell's novel *Animal Farm* and Yaşar Kemal's novel *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lame Ant* will be analysed comparatively through Marxist literary theory which benefits from Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton and Lucien Goldmann. The figures in the two novels will be compared according to their characteristics/ profiles, the changes they have gone through, and their endings in their own stories. Features of the works have also been examined through an analysis of the writers' lives. In the theoretical part, the meaning of ideology and its reflections on the novels will be discussed through a critical point of view. The discussion will be concerned with a comparative analysis of the two novels, which also shows the aim of this work.

RESULTS

Both selected novels are allegorical examples, and include fables as genre. In general terms, allegory is a representation of the existence of at least two meanings for the same words, and this double meaning is not related to the reader's interpretation. According to Hunter, genres such as allegory and fable may represent the same written object/art, but different texts may indicate different reader, author, and writing interactions (Hunter, 1989, p. 132). For example, she claims that fable is the genre coming "closest to pure allegory, in which the first meaning of the words tends to be completely effaced" (Hunter, 1989, p. 136).

One can ask if the results of the research into the selected works can be called pessimistic or optimistic. Orwell reveals the truth only at the end of the work, and does not give a moral lesson. He even has full faith in socialism, despite all these experiences, but the realisation of this depends on certain conditions. "The book itself, Orwell makes clear in his letter, was calling not for the end of revolutionary hopes, but for the beginning of a new kind of personal responsibility on the part of revolutionaries" (Letemendia, 2009, pp. 53-54). Kemal, on the other hand, ends his novel in accordance with the Turkmen tale, by which, I think, he is greatly influenced. Because of the characteristics of fables, these allegories do not necessarily teach us a moral lesson. The difference is that while the ants defeat the elephants, as in doomsday myths, in *Animal Farm*, the situation is more complicated: when

everything is managed by the motivation of ballad, and pigs get control of the farm, they forbid the Beasts of England, which is the symbol of rebellion. At this point, it can be thought that there is a sharp contrast between the two novels. However, in my view, this is, in fact, a similar point which seems different. According to Letemendia, Orwell commentators find it easy to conclude from *Animal Farm* that it is despairing and pessimistic on the part of the author or the tale (Letemendia, 2009, p. 46). In this sense, it should be noted that Orwell is playing a two-sided game with his reader through the allegory. In some ways, the author clearly highlights the similarities between the animals in the farm and the humans they are designed to represent; at other times, he shows with both humour and pity, the profound differences that distinguish the animal from the human. In doing so, he compels the reader to distinguish between the personalities and behaviour of monsters, and those of the human world. Despite their great intellectual abilities, pigs are ultimately the most absurd of all farm animals as they seek to assume a human identity that cannot be their own. Therefore, Orwell is not implying by this the despair of a proletarian revolution; rather, he points to the need for education and self-confidence in any working-class movement if it is to remain democratic in character (Letemendia, 2009, p. 47). For this reason, contrary to general belief, although both authors seem to have different views when these novels are compared on democratic socialism, in fact, they believed the same thing, they do not separate at this point. On the contrary, they unite, because it is only their ways of writing which are different, the differences are encrypted. "The text does indeed stand alone to reveal Orwell's consistent belief not only in democratic Socialism, but in the possibility of a democratic Socialist revolution" (Letemendia, 2009, p. 45).

For both writers, their fiction is fictitious because it reveals a certain ideological experience of real history. Orwell works in broader allegorical terms, discussing the interaction between personal and party politics, and the communication upon which this interaction depends (Hunter, 1989, p29). Furthermore, there is a close resemblance between the characters and events in the book and the Soviet Union and its sources: Major speaks for Marx, Napoleon represents Stalin, Snowball typifies Trotsky, and the windmill symbolises the First Five-Year Plan. Finally, the meeting of pigs and humans stands for the Tehran Conference, which was the meeting between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill (Fowler,

1995, pp. 162-163). In this case, because allegory is a rhetorical stance, it is a common assumption that if a meaning can be identified, as in *Animal Farm*'s point-to-point correspondence with events in the early Soviet Union, then it is allegorical (Hunter, 1989, p. 137).

In the selected novels, the worlds of the exploiters and the exploited are handled allegorically. In Kemal's novel, industrious ants have been chosen as the symbol of working and labouring people. Elephants, who can be thought of as having power with their big trunks, are chosen as the exploiters with strong backs who oppress them. Kemal's elephants, like Orwell's pigs, represent people who do not respect the worker's labour and rights, and who can operate all kinds of injustice for their own interests. This reminds us of the Aghas and men who oppress the people in many of Yaşar Kemal's novels. All the elephants lie on their sides just like the Aghas, rubbing their butts against the trees, enjoying themselves. Relying on their physical powers, they make the ants do whatever they want. However, like Orwell, Kemal is playing a two-sided game with his reader through this allegory. The mind of the Sultan, who is very confident in his physical strength, does not work very well. Rather, Ulukepez, the head of the *hudhud*, directs him. With physical superiority and propaganda, while thousands of ants are working, the minority with big bodies take everything, and the helpless majority starve. In the end, elephants, who are not as smart as Orwell's pigs, cannot escape from the tiny ants taking them down, because the ants are united. On the other hand, there is no common assumption in research of Kemal's novel that it is allegorical in terms of its rhetorical stance, as in *Animal Farm*'s point-to-point correspondence with events in the early Soviet Union.

Both Orwell and Kemal explain the importance of using language in almost every regime to 'have a say' against those who deceive the people. It can be seen that each of them tries to emphasise the importance of language for free thought and action in the novels discussed in this thesis. Kemal said that he saw himself as a writer because he consciously introduced myth and dream to human reality (Naci, 1993). He had a strong belief that the structure of the language formed the form and content of the novel. Therefore, while writing his novels, he emphasised the importance of language; the forms and contents created by the language will be found when you go deeper. From this point of view, he supported the idea that the

language of every novel written by an author should not be the same. In a way, what we tell determines our way of expression. As such, he stated that if an author writes every novel in the same way, nothing rich will come out (Naci, 1993). According to Eagleton, although both ideology and aesthetic mode of production are typically complex formations, Kemal drew attention to the special homogeneity relationship between these elements. On the other hand, Crick underlined Orwell's "passionate concern with preserving the clarity of the English language" (Crick, 1980, p. 303). In addition, it is a known fact that Orwell disliked unclear and poetic language, because he clarified that language can lead to corrupt thought, so he planned to be plain-spoken, and in *Animal Farm*, he proceeded in the same way. In my opinion, Orwell's idea here may mean ideology. Language should be as ordinary as possible so that what we call ideology, or thought, should not lack any element. It is the most important tool of ideology or thought. According to Meyers, the fairy-tale form not only allows Orwell to convey a complex message in simple terms, but also matches his preference for grammatically simple sentences and unpretentious vocabulary (Meyers, 2009, p. 31). The main theme of the book is the perversion of the language, which Kemal also focused on, by an oppressive dictatorship. The corruption of language by elephants and pigs is revealed. Orwell analysed the ills of political speech, suggesting that writing those ills results in self-deception and lying, the intellectual prerequisites of totalitarianism. Orwell "had developed a demotic idiolect which, while vernacular in vocabulary, is hardly cool or neutral, rising often to heights of rhetoric and stridence" (Fowler, 1995, p. 164). Like Orwell on this point, Kemal planned to give his message simply, by adapting a folk tale, and unlike Orwell, he prefers to use an epic language. According to Parla:

(...) he compensated for the impoverishment of that language ingeniously by enriching his style with folk vocabulary and idiom from his native district in southern Turkey. His linguistic innovations, therefore, were not perceived as a statement against the language reform; rather, they were welcomed as a skillful employment of local colour... (...) I believe that Kemal was the only novelist who managed to forge a powerful aesthetic idiom out of the standardised language of modern Turkey. (Parla, 2008, p. 32).

Yaşar Kemal enriches his style with Çukurova's folk dictionary and idioms. For this reason, linguistic innovations are welcomed as a masterful use of local colour. Moreover, Parlaemphasises that Kemal is the only novelist who manages to create a strong aesthetic style from the automatic language of modern Turkey. His legendary plea for the fate of the people previously indifferent, offers a refreshing alternative to the standard republican narratives filled with national, ideological clichés of engagement (Parla, 2008, p. 32). The - seemingly different - similarity between Orwell and Kemal is that they both tend to write in the public language. When Orwell begins writing *Animal Farm*, his new focus on the morality of colloquial language is established (Fowler, 1996, p. 164). The simplification, even refinement, of his language in *Animal Farm* undoubtedly reflects his desire for linguistic honesty in political writing.

There are plenty of colloquial idiomatic phrases, such as 'safely out of the way', 'got her figure back'. Understandably, there are many ordinary words relating to farm equipment and procedures, and to animals: 'hen-houses', 'pop-holes', 'tushes', 'perched', 'fluttered', 'chew the cud', 'harness-room', 'stables', 'bits', 'nose-rings', 'dog-chains', 'knives', 'castrate', 'reins', 'halters', 'blinkers', etc. (Fowler, 1996, p. 20).

As can be seen from the quote above, there are many everyday idiomatic expressions that Orwell prefers to use in this book, as well as many common words related to farm equipment, procedures, and animals. Fowler writes that, "the prevalence of this type of vocabulary gives the text an old-fashioned pastoral air" that fits so well with Orwell's atmosphere of an earlier rural England (Fowler, 1995, p. 169). In addition, according to Eagleton, as was discussed before, pre-textual ideology can be found in the work in various forms: in everyday language, in the approved symbol and tradition, in the codes of perceptual habit. It can also find itself in aesthetic, political, ethical, and other formulas that can instantly permeate ordinary language but emerge as different meanings from it. It is out of the question to reduce the textual discourse of both authors to ideological discourses, but it was not just ideology that provided the author with the necessary materials for the formal aesthetic operations of the text.

In the end, both authors reflect the literary tradition they come from: Kemal uses Çukurova's territorial epic language, and Orwell focuses on honest and direct public language that he observes, because the novel "is associated with the eternally living element of unofficial language and unofficial thought (holiday forms, familiar speech, profanation)" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 20). Therefore, "territorial dialects, social and professional dialects and jargons, literary language, generic languages" cannot exist peacefully together (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 12). The language used in different ways in the two works ultimately seems to confirm Bakhtin's view.

Gerard Genette, the French literary theorist, reveals that, "the novelist's choice, unlike the narrator's, is not between two grammatical forms, but between two narrative postures" emerging as grammatical forms that are simply an outcome, "to have the story told by one of its characters, or to have it told by a narrator outside of the story" (Genette, 1980, p. 244). He discusses how the novelist and the narrator exist separately from each other. Thus, the novelist exhibits two narrative stances that emerge as grammatical forms, which are a natural consequence of the story being told by one of its characters or by a third person. That is, the novelist does not stand between two grammatical forms, but between two narrative postures. According to Saunders, it must be noted that much of *Animal Farm* "is narrated by a limited intermediary, by a voice suggestive of someone acting as a spokesperson for the animals, and someone who wishes to believe in the promises of socialist progress being made to the animals" (Saunders, 2008, p. 51). Saunders states that much of the book is run by a limited narrator, in other words, it should be noted that it is told in a voice that evokes someone who acts as the spokesperson for those who make promises of socialist progress to animals and is hopeful about it. This idea is exemplified by an excerpt as follows:

Somehow it seemed as though the farm had grown richer without making the animals themselves any richer – except, of course, for the pigs and the dogs. Perhaps this was partly because there were so many pigs and so many dogs (Orwell, 1976, p. 61).

The adverbs such as 'somehow' and 'perhaps' point to a narrator who does not have privileged knowledge, is not omniscient, and at the same time tries to justify suspicious

behaviour. However, the style used leaves the reader in no doubt about the injustice done to other animals. In Kemal's novel, a similar idea is shown as follows:

Ama neredebulacaklardıtopalkarıncaı? Koca filler sultanı filler sultanykenbunca zaman aramış da kırmızısakallardanenküçükbiripucu bile eldeedememişti (Kemal, 2016, p. 120).

But where would they find the lame ant? The great sultan of the elephants as the sultan of the elephants had searched all this time and could not get even the slightest clue from the red beards.

The quote above points to a narrator who asks a question through the mouth of ants, indicating that the narrator in the novel is not omniscient. "The epic poet tells a story as a professional storyteller, including his own comments within the poem, and giving the narration proper (as distinct from dialogue) in his own style" (Wellek & Austen, 1956, p. 22). In this novel, Kemal conveys the story to the readers as an epic poet. As a professional storyteller, he explores in his own style, as opposed to dialogue, by including his own interpretations or questions in the poem. Even the presence of a narrator, who hopes and expects that the exploitation of elephants will one-day end, draws attention similarly to Orwell's style, as mentioned above.

Besides, in both Kemal and Orwell, the narrator knows as much as the animals do, and they do not have a privileged, God-like knowledge through which to distinguish the narrator from the animals or show them as superior to animals. However, he presents an example of poetic language from the novel.

Another important point about the use of language can be given as an example: in Kemal's novel, ants stop working and live like elephants; this does not suit the Sultan, so he says living like elephants is only for those who were elephants at the start, not something for others to aspire to later. In this sense, a very similar approach comes to mind in *Animal Farm*: "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" (Orwell, 1976, p. 63). Doublethink, voiced in the language, has a stylistic shock effect. In this sentence, there is an obvious distortion of the meaning of the key logical and ethical term 'equal', because equality is not a comparative term. As with other orders given by pigs to rule animals, there is a semantic contradiction (Fowler, 1995, p. 179). In this sense, it is necessary to remember Orwell's thoughts on the perversion of language by politicians and

its relationship with this fable. “Language is also part of the action of the book, and the way the relationship of language and power is symbolised by linguistic actions is a theme examined by this fable. The theme becomes more specifically focused as the pigs’ regime gets indefensibly brutal and selfish: language is used in a perverted way to support a distorted, untruthful, version of reality” (Fowler, 1995, p. 177). In both Kemal and Orwell’s work, there is a relationship between language and power, which is symbolised by linguistic actions. Language can be used perversely to support a distorted, unrealistic version of reality. Authorities impose restrictions by making these kinds of speeches, as if equality is something comparable. In Kemal’s novel, there is an example of similar linguistic action: “Olsebepten, kıçlarınığağaçlarasürerekuyumakyalınızasilfilleremahsustur, sonra fil olmuşkarınca filler içindeğildir” (Kemal, 2016, p. 97). “For that reason, sleeping with their butts on trees is only for the actual elephants, not for the Eleph-Ants”. Through this sentence, we are forced to make a clear distinction between the ‘born’ elephants and the ‘made’ Eleph-Ants. Just like Orwell, Kemal uses stylistic shock almost to say that all Eleph-ants are equal, but some elephants are more equal than others.

Compared thematically, there are similarities and differences between the two novels. For instance, the motif of the ballad appears as “Beast of England” which is taught by Old Major in *Animal Farm*: “Many years ago, when I was a little pig, my mother and the other sows used to sing an old song of which they knew only the tune and the first three words (...) but when I have taught you the tune, you can sing it better for yourselves. It is called Beasts of England” (Orwell, 1976, p. 27). Orwell is aware of the importance of revolutionary ballads, and uses them as a political instrument of pathway to victory, because they are accepted as one of the biggest sources of motivation for mobilisation. Although the novel as a literary form has this problem, it must be reinvented among different authors in various countries. Moreover, on the literary level, the content of an entire period must be rediscovered by the authors, without any significant relation between the form and the most important aspects of social life (Goldmann, 1996, p. 209). Like Orwell, Kemal is aware of ballads’ effects, and in *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red-Bearded Lame Ant*, he demonstrates it by making the ants forget their ant-ship, with the help of the mass media, in order to prevent a possible rebellion and pacify them for easy control, but the ballad of the ants reminds them their real identity, so it becomes more

powerful than the law of the elephants. Another mutual point of ballads in these two novels is that they are archaic and forgotten, but later remembered for rebellion or as a way of salvation.

There is an intriguing resemblance between the power-hungry Sultan and Orwell's pigs, who are increasingly oppressing. Yaşar Kemal clearly summarised that bureaucracy in Turkey did not have a solid foundation like the bourgeoisie or the working-class people, in order to provide freedom, so they had to set up a terrible order of repression in order to stay in power (İpekçi, 1971). Just as Kemal criticises bureaucracy here, Orwell criticises intellectuals in *Animal Farm*. An overt critique of intellectuals is evident in the novel's self-proclaimed portrayal of ruthless and power-obsessed pigs (Marks, 2011, p. 140). Pigs, who define themselves as 'brainworkers' in a way, take on the task of thinking, and leave all the work that requires physical strength to other animals; The Sultan of the elephants does the same.

The Sultan of the elephants removes some words from the dictionary, especially the word 'exploitation', forbids them to be said, and constantly invents things to prevent the ants from thinking, to implement his ideology without resorting to physical violence. Moreover, the reason why the Sultan is so obsessed with the word 'exploitation' and even declares that anyone who utters the word will be killed immediately, contrary to his domination through ideological devices without using violence, is important. Thus, it is necessary to remember Althusser's views on the word 'exploitation'. According to him,

The base or infrastructure of the class state is thus well and truly, as Lenin said, exploitation. The effect produced by the superstructure is simultaneously to ensure the conditions under which this exploitation is carried out (Repressive State Apparatus) and the reproduction of the relations of production, that is, of exploitation (Ideological State Apparatuses) (Althusser, 2014, p93).

At the root of the class state is 'exploitation'. The Sultan of the elephants declares war because ants are constantly producing. It is the effect of providing the conditions under which exploitation is carried out (State Apparatus of Repression) and the reproduction of relations of production, that is, exploitation (Ideological Devices of the State). In addition,

the Sultan constantly invents things to prevent the ants from thinking, to implement his ideology without resorting to physical violence.

In addition, the red bearded lame ant symbolises the whole community of socialist people, by himself, as the epic hero. “The epic hero is, strictly speaking, never an individual. It is traditionally thought that one of the essential characteristics of the epic is the fact that its theme is not a personal destiny, but the destiny of a community” (Lukács, 1971, p. 66). Kemal’s hero has a heroic destiny that determines the destiny of the community. Getting rid of the oppression of the elephants is not the destiny of a single hero, but the destiny of the entire ant nation. Freedom has been gained by this community, and working-class people have achieved this by uniting and organising together, which Kemal constantly emphasises as his socialist ideal.

By displaying the opposite approach to violence, Kemal’s Sultan behaves like a god who makes sinners’ experience hell, but also forgives his repentant servants with his endless mercy. Orwell uses religious implications, such as the Seven Commandments of *Animal Farm* and Sugarcandy Mountain. Similarly, in Kemal’s novel, the promises made by the god Sultan to the ants, his acceptance as immortal, his saying ‘ants are my servants’, the country of tile match, the living water in heaven, the existence of a fairy-tale mountain such as the holy Mount Qaf make us think of this. While Yaşar Kemal often refers to the prophet Suleiman or Solomon the King, Orwell makes references to Moses.

In *Animal Farm*, the social structures are determined by the pigs, who claim that they should be at the head of the farm because of their intelligence and abilities, so they should take place hierarchically at the top, and the others’ responsibility is determined as work. In Kemal’s novel, the elephants lounge about all day because of their superiority in the social structure, and the ants work, but later the situation becomes more complicated, compared to the relationship in *Animal Farm* between the pigs and the others, because the pigs only give importance to their own congeneric. While the Sultan is transforming the ants into elephants, he also labels different types of ants as enemy units, to establish ‘we-feeling’ with the help of his head propagandist. Umberto Eco clarifies this situation in *Inventing the Enemy*, as follows: “Having an enemy is important not only to define your identity but also to provide us with an obstacle against which to measure our system of values, and in

seeking to overcome it, to demonstrate your own worth. So, when there is no enemy, we must invent one” (Eco, 2012, p. 2).

To conclude, there are both apparent and subtle literary, stylistic, and thematic similarities and differences in both works. The reason for sensing Orwellian resemblances in Kemal’s work may be the clear thematic similarities and motifs. However, more complex aspects of both novels can be revealed.

DISCUSSION

The main similarity between the two authors is that they both had similar life experiences in their pasts. Orwell came from a middle-class family with a poor living. Kemal, being a working-class child and not being indifferent to social issues come together as a common ground between these two writers. Sociological, ideological, economic, and cultural influences direct their writing styles. According to Goldmann, since important work cannot emerge as the result of purely individual experience, the genre of the novel is likely to emerge and develop only as long as a non-conceptualized, emotional longing for qualitative values is developed within society, or perhaps, only among the middle strata from which most novelists come.

For Lukács, humans are always at the focal point of literature since humans cannot be separated from their social and historical environment. Yaşar Kemal supported the idea that his working style was in favour of the people. He defined himself as a working artist, a writer working with the public. He believed that his politics could not be separated from his art, and clearly stated that he was against whoever oppressed the people and exploited them, whether through feudalism or the bourgeoisie. He clearly stated that what he wanted to do in literature was to raise awareness of the workers through his art (İpekçi, 1971). Like Kemal, Orwell was affected by events and reflected this in his work. As he stated in “Why I Write”: “I do not think one can assess a writer’s motives without knowing something of his early development” (“Why I Write”, Orwell, 1946). When he was in Spain as a civil war reporter, he joined the republican militia, which established the grounds for his hatred of fascist figures, which can be firstly seen in *Homage to Catalonia* and later in *Animal*

Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four. Thus, literature is a human product and human orientated. The writer and his product cannot be considered separately from the content they create. Since Lukács discusses that a person's environment plays a huge role in determining his personality, Orwell and Kemal combine the subjectivity of the individual and objective reality.

Yaşar Kemal claimed what he did in literature was to create a story parallel to his own culture as a writer. Therefore, as an artist, he tries, as far as possible, not to become alienated from his own values. He consciously tried to stay loyal to the realities of the country, to human values. He frequently underlined that he did not separate his art from the conditions, personality, and colour of his hometown. He clearly stated that he was in the business of creating a world of literature in which part is based on society, part is based on nature and the rest is based on human values (İpekçi, 1971). The relationship between the novel itself as a form, and the structure of the social environment in which it emerged, is important. Lucien Goldmann denotes that the sociology of literature basically has a relationship between the most important literary works and the collective consciousness of a particular social group from which they emerge. The literary work is the reflection of a real collective consciousness. The obsession with psychopathology in modernist literature, which Lukács strictly criticises, manifests itself as a desire to escape the reality of capitalism. Yaşar Kemal stated that his art was at the disposal of the interests and profits of the working-class people, which he defined as the class to which he belonged. He did not believe in an art that was separated from the people in this age (İpekçi, 1971). Therefore, he himself was never concerned with the pathological; when he chose between the important and the superficial, he chose the most important. Kemal, while describing himself as a socialist man of literature, mentioned that a man of letters had a struggle. This war was the war to save the world. He saw himself as a person who tried to save the sweat of the human being, the humanity of the human being and the human value of the human being, while trying to save the nature on which the human being lives. For him, the capitalist class, which exploits the creativity of humanity and destroys everything, also exploits, and destroys nature along with it. Kemal wished to oppose this terrible destruction and exploitation in his novels. He also believed the capitalist order, which must leave the worker with something to live on, exploits nature without giving anything away. He clearly

mentioned that this pain was the main subject of his novels, and that he did not think that he would touch on the subject further. Moreover, he gave examples from history while explaining this. He described how the bourgeoisie, overwhelmed by the working-class people in Germany, had resorted to Nazism. According to him, a democracy takes place when the working-class people seize power one hundred percent. He discussed that when economic equality is achieved, political equality will surely follow. He suggested that all the oppression in the world will perpetuate economic inequality because inequalities lie at the root of oppression. Like Kemal, Orwell agreed insincere literature is the worst thing, and that modern literature is essentially an individual thing. However, the individuality of literature is something that did not fit Orwell. A work of art should be the truthful expression of what man thinks and feels. Whoever feels the value of literature and sees the central part it plays in the development of human history must also see the life and death necessity of resisting totalitarianism.

CONCLUSION

With the development of technology, the face of war, and the struggles that took place on the world stage at the beginning of the 20th century also changed radically. In particular, 1917 was the year that started a century-long storm of war and revolution around the world. The famine, hunger and deaths brought on by the First World War were on the public agenda. Long working hours, low wages, and the abuse of power caused by the war, heralded a major crisis in Russia. Solving the crisis by creating another crisis would bring irreversible destruction to the Tsar. The victory of the revolution in the Tsarist capital was completed towards the evening of February 27.

The February Revolution brought two leading parties to the stage of history: the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. However, this merger only lasted a few months. The Bolsheviks came to power in the October Revolution. With the death of Lenin, and the rise of Stalin, time passed, and the Second World War was at the door. America and the Soviet Union had developed a forced alliance against their common enemy, Hitler. When this war also ended, the Cold War began, which caused great cultural change. The atmosphere of peace between America and the Soviet Union, whose mandatory alliance

ended, did not last long. The culture war between the two countries, involving the manipulation of intelligence and the media, had begun.

As in America and the Soviet Union, the Cold War between modernism and realism had begun. Modern art had been used as a cultural weapon of war, a propaganda tool with its abstract aesthetic understanding. Films adapted from the books of some authors, including Orwell, were distributed around the world as among the greatest cultural operations of the Cold War. The non-communist left, including Orwell, did not hesitate to support the ideas of intellectuals who were heartbroken about communism but remained committed to the ideals of socialism. Orwell's roots were in lower-middle class culture, and he was known to like to think and write about them. For this reason, he did not write in accordance with the dominant narrative aesthetics of the West or modernism, especially in his early writings in the 1930s. Similarly, Yaşar Kemal's writings and works were predominantly on social issues. The social topics that made up the content of his works were social justice, education, health, and social security. Yaşar Kemal, who can be regarded as the author of a novel of the Second Period in Turkish Literature, touched upon the unjust order problems arising from the social structure. It also explains the social and economic change in Turkey and the changing subjects in his novels after 1950. The policy followed in the Republican period brought with it classification and class conflict over time. Kemal wrote novels questioning the dominant ideology, not novels that look at the dominant ideology from the outside and reproduce the order.

The comparison of these two novels was primarily based on the production relations of the writers' class and the society they lived in. Although the reality of what is described in the selected works can be referred to historical facts, the fictitious features of both literary examples were finally revealed. Literary techniques were researched and the basic similarities and differences in the two works were discussed. The works subject to comparison were examined in terms of theme and style, so their literary values were revealed.

Authors such as George Orwell and Yaşar Kemal made it interesting to do a genetic comparison of novels. When people read these two novels, they expressed, in various ways, that they immediately noticed an Orwellian atmosphere in Kemal's works. To find out why

this similarity was established at first glance, the two works were examined allegorically, stylistically, and thematically.

In this thesis, a genetic comparison between an English and a Turkish novelist was made. George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Yaşar Kemal's novel *The Sultan of the Elephants and the Red Bearded Lame Ant* were analysed comparatively through Marxist literary theory, mainly benefiting from the ideas of Georg Lukács, Terry Eagleton, and Lucien Goldmann. Starting from the understanding of social integrity, Lukács emphasised that historical and social changes should be reflected in literary work. Goldmann, on the other hand, brought a different approach to the sociology of literature with the theory of genetic structuralism, and tried to reveal the relationship between literature and society through structure. Eagleton discussed that a text may deal with real history, but it must be remembered that in the end, it would always remain a work of literature, that is, a fiction.

To conclude, there are both obvious and subtle thematic similarities and differences in both works. Clear thematic similarities and motifs might be the reason for the Orwellian flavour in Kemal's works. However, more complex aspects of both novels are revealed. Since it was looked at from a comparative perspective, a brief history of comparative literature was brought to the forefront in the Introduction. In the second part, information about Soviet history and Marxism was given. Then, the relationship between modern art and the cultural Cold War was touched on. In addition, the meaning of ideology, and its reflections in the novels, were discussed from a critical point of view. In the third and fourth chapters, the characteristics of the works were examined through the lives of the authors. In the fifth chapter, both authors' works were analysed through Marxist literary theory from thematic and stylistic perspectives.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Althusser, L. (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. (Trans. G. M. Goshgarian). Verso London.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). Epic and Novel. In Michael Holquist (eds.), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. BAKHTIN*. (Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist). University of Texas Press: Austin.

Bluemel, K. (2004). *George Orwell and the Radical Eccentrics: Intermodernism in Literary London*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Crick, B. (1980). *Orwell - A Life*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Damrosch, D. (2003). Introduction: Goethe Coins a Phrase From the book What Is World Literature? *World Literature Today*, Vol. 77, No. 1. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma (pp. 9-14): <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691188645-003>

Eagleton, T. (1996). Towards a Science of the Text. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 296-327).

Eco, U. (2012). *Inventing the Enemy: And Other Occasional Writings*. (Trans. R. Dixon), London: Vintage Books.

Fowler, R. (1995). *The Language of George Orwell*. UK: Macmillan Education.

Göbenli, M. (2006). *Direnmenin Estetiği'ne Güven: Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Bağlamında Peter Weiss ve Vedat Türkali* [Trust in the Aesthetics of Resistance: Peter Weiss and Vedat Türkali in the Context of Comparative Literature]. Donkişot Yayınları.

Goldmann, L. (1996). Introduction to the Problems of a Sociology of the Novel. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 204-220).

Hunter, L. (1989). *Modern Allegory and Fantasy: Rhetorical Stances of Contemporary Writing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hunter, L. (2004). Prescience and Resilience in George Orwell's Political Aesthetics. In T. Cushman and J. Rodden (eds.), *George Orwell into The Twenty-First Century* (pp. 229-243).

Hyppolite, J. (2016). *Marx ve Hegel Üzerine Çalışmalar* [Studies on Marx and Hegel]. (Trans. D. Barış Kılınc). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Ingle, S. (2006). *The Social and Political Thought of George Orwell: A Reassessment*. Routledge, London.

İpekçi, A. (1971). *EdebiyatvePolitika* [Literature and Politics]:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20150306062344/http://www.yasarkemal.net/soylesi/docs/abdiipekci.html>

Jakobson, R. (1987). *Language in Literature*. In K. Pomorska and S. Rudy (eds.), Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kemal, Y. (2016). *Filler SultanileKırmızıSakallıTopalKarınca* [The Sultan of the Elephants and Red Bearded Lame Ant]. İstanbul, YapıKrediYayınları.

Letemendia, V. C. (2009). Revolution on Animal Farm: Orwell's Neglected Commentary. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 45-58).

Lukács, G. (1971). *The Theory of the Novel. A Historico-Philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature*. (Trans. Anna Bostock). MIT Press.

Lukács, G. (1996). The Ideology of Modernism. In T. Eagleton and D. Milne (eds.), *Marxist Literary Theory* (pp. 141-162).

Meyers, V. (2009). Animal Farm: An Allegory of Revolution. In Harold Bloom (eds.), *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's Animal Farm* (pp. 23-34).

Naci, F. (2004). *YaşarKemal'inRomancılığı*[The Novelism of Yaşar Kemal]. İstanbul: YKY.

Orwell, G. (1946). *Why I Write*:
<https://srjcstaff.santarosa.edu/~mheydon/whywriteD.pdf>

Orwell, G. (1976). *George Orwell: Animal Farm, Burmese Days, A Clergyman's Daughter, Coming Up for Air, Keep the Aspidistra Flying, Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker & Warburg/Octopus.

Orwell, G. (2016). *Katalonya 'yaSelam*[Homage to Catalonia]. (Trans. J. Ergüder) İstanbul: BGS.

Parla, J. (2008). The Wounded Tongue: Turkey's Language Reform and the Canonicity of the Novel. PMLA, Jan., Vol. 123, No. 1, pp. 27-40 Published by: Modern Language Association.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used as established information without consulting multiple experts in the field.

Wellek, R. & Warren, A. (1956). *The Theory of Literature*. New York: A Harvest Book Harcourt, Brace & World, INC.

Wellek, R. (1964). *Concepts of Criticism*. In S., G. Nichols, Jr. (eds), New Haven, Yale University Press.

*All translations from Turkish are mine unless otherwise indicated.

Preprint