



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East Tennessee
State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2020

Govoreeting with Lewdies: A Critical Discourse Analysis of A Clockwork Orange and its Translations Across Media and Language

Willie Wallace
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#), and the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wallace, Willie, "Govoreeting with Lewdies: A Critical Discourse Analysis of A Clockwork Orange and its Translations Across Media and Language" (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3748. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3748>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Govoreeting with Lewdies: A Critical Discourse Analysis of *A Clockwork Orange*
and its Translations Across Media and Language

A thesis
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Literature and Languages
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in English

by
Willie Wallace
May 2020

Dr. Theresa McGarry, Chair
Dr. Yousif Elhindi
Dr. Jan Jost-Fritz

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, *A Clockwork Orange*, Stanley Kubrick, Anthony
Burgess, Translation, German

ABSTRACT

Govoreeting with Lewdies: A Critical Discourse Analysis of *A Clockwork Orange*

and its Translations Across Media and Language

by

Willie Wallace

Much linguistic research has been done on the fictional argot of *A Clockwork Orange*, known as Nadsat, but few efforts have been made to expand beyond the classification and analysis of Nadsat. Using Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper looks at the overarching discourse of *A Clockwork Orange* and aims to answer three questions: What exigencies and discourses inform the creation of these works? What techniques and power structures are employed in the construction of these works? How do these works shape or attempt to shape the discourse? To answer these questions, I look at three instances of the discourse: Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange*, and Krege's translation, *Clockwork Orange*. These instances are varied over time of publication (1962, 1971, 1997), language (English, German), medium (novel, film), and culture (British, American, German), allowing enough variance to examine how the discourse changes to meet the needs of its participants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	2
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
Discourse and CDA.....	5
Dystopia.....	8
Overview.....	11
CHAPTER 2. BURGESS’S 1962 NOVEL, <i>A CLOCKWORK ORANGE</i>	14
Exigencies and Discourse.....	14
Techniques and Power.....	21
Shaping the Discourse.....	29
CHAPTER 3. KUBRICK’S 1971 FILM ADAPTATION.....	32
Exigencies and Discourse.....	32
Techniques and Power.....	38
Shaping the Discourse.....	46
CHAPTER 4. KREGE’S 1997 GERMAN TRANSLATION.....	49
Exigencies and Discourse.....	49
Techniques and Power.....	56
Shaping the Discourse.....	63
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION.....	66
The Discourse Today.....	66
This Research and the Future.....	70
WORKS CITED.....	75
VITA.....	80

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Anthony Burgess's 1962 novel, *A Clockwork Orange*, has been examined through a variety of critical lenses, and this includes various linguistic analyses. Despite the linguistic fascination with his novel, however, little research has been done outside of attempts to define Burgess's constructed argot, a type of highly exclusionary language, Nadsat, often exclusively through its lexical items, or "words." Because of the propensity of researchers to tunnel their vision into the definition of Nadsat, there is a gap in the kinds of linguistic-related research being performed on this novel. This may be, in some part, due to the reality that most linguistic research tends to focus on "real" discourse and does not often use "constructed" discourse as its dataset, with "real" meaning a discourse occurs naturally and "constructed" meaning it is part of some prepared work such as a narrative. This paper will look at how examining a constructed discourse, such as that created when an author responds to exigencies and the larger discourses that surround them, can provide insight into the power and culture that are involved in communication in the same way that looking at real discourse can. The discourse that will serve as the base for this paper is that of *A Clockwork Orange*, which will be analyzed through the lens of critical discourse analysis (CDA), rather than the more typical language analysis or discourse analysis (DA). By using CDA, we can examine the context and power constructs that exist within and without the novel and how these are reinterpreted and adapted along with the novel itself.

It is, of course, not possible to give a fully detailed examination of each iteration of the novel and the socio-cultural contexts in which they exist in such a short paper. I will, however, provide an examination of the original work and two interpretations: Stanley Kubrick's 1971 film adaptation titled *A Clockwork Orange* and the 1997 German translation of the novel by

Wolfgang Krege titled *Clockwork Orange*. By using these three works as the base for the data, we can compare how the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse changes over time (1962, 1971, 1997), across media (novel, film), across cultures (British, American, German), and across languages (English, German). This cross-section, should allow for us to answer the following CDA-relevant questions:

- 1) To which exigencies are the authors responding, and in what discourse(s) are they taking part by creating their works?
- 2) What techniques do the authors use in their works to take part in these discourses, and how do they encode the power constructs present?
- 3) How does their input help to shape or attempt to shape the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse and/or the socio-cultural discourses to which they are responding?

These questions will serve as the backbone of this analysis.

Discourse and CDA

Before we move further into this paper we must look at what “discourse” and CDA are. Discourse, as used in this paper, will follow Wodak’s interpretation of the scholarly use of “discourse” in the context of CDA. Wodak explains that, in this context, discourses are “linguistic social practices” that establish and create both “non-discursive and discursive social practices” which, in turn, constitute said discourse (Wodak and Meyer 66). This means that discourse is a form of enacted social practice, such as speaking or writing, which then creates other discourses or impacts those taking part in the discourse (known as interlocutors), and that these creations/impacts on the interlocutors have a cyclical relationship with the discourse that spawned them, helping to shape it. This particular definition may be a little confusing when we begin to talk about the discourses inside discourses, such as the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse

which exists within larger socio-cultural discourses while also folding them into itself, but it is because of this seemingly circular logic that this definition is important when performing a CDA. By looking at how discourses shape and become shaped by other discourses, we can analyze how ideas, beliefs, and rhetoric become accepted and propagated or rejected and removed from the discourse, something which is at the core of CDA.

According to Wodak and Meyer, CDA looks at “institutional, political, gender and media discourses (in the broadest sense) which testify to more or less overt relations of struggle and conflict” (2). This means that CDA can be applied to any kind of discourse: real, fictional, spoken, written, performed, etc. It is not the type of discourse that matters; it is the way that we approach the analysis of said discourse. “Struggle and conflict,” however, does not mean that we should be looking at only argumentative discourse, but rather we must look at the three concepts of “power,” “history,” and “ideology” and how “struggle and conflict” apply to them (Wodak and Meyer 3). Power, meaning any kind of social power (e.g. political rank, class, non-minority status, etc.), historical information, and ideology are examined in CDA with the idea that discourses shape our world and other discourses in mind. We use this information to see how these concepts are encoded into a discourse or work and track how a newly constructed discourse interacts with others in a broader context. In this way, we can look at how these concepts promote “the interests of certain groups with social power, ensuring that events, practices and behaviors come to be regarded as legitimate and common-sense” (Mayr qtd. in Aidinlou et. al. 263).

Fairclough and Kress, in the words of Wodak, explain that a fully complete CDA must include “a theorization and description of both the social processes and structures which give rise to the production of a text, and of the social structures and processes within which individuals or

groups as social historical subjects, create meanings in their interaction with texts” (Wodak and Meyer 3). An appropriate analysis must therefore look at the discourse which prompts a text, how the texts attempt to add to said discourse, and the discourse(s) that the text itself creates. To satisfy these requirements, I look at the socio-cultural contexts that surround each of the three chosen works and how these are encoded into each work. Because a novel is a cultural artifact with some meaningful permanence, it is not possible to explore every effect it has on the rhetoric or discourse of any given society, in much the same way I cannot look at all possible discourses. I can, however, examine the exigencies and contexts that prompted the original work and the change of the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse or the rhetoric that constructs it based on the needs or cultural understanding of those who are interpreting the message. What makes a novel such a good candidate to explore these discourses is that those adapting the novel must maintain and translate some parts of them, although film allows for more freedom in interpretation.

Just like its less rhetorical cousin, DA, CDA is typically performed on non-fiction works or “real” discourses, such as prepared speeches and natural conversation. This does not mean that it cannot be applied to narrative works and seems to be more flexible in this regard than DA—a major reason I chose to perform a CDA rather than a DA. Aidinlou et. al. provide an example of how CDA can be used to look at narratives in their article “Ideology, Change & Power in Literature and Society: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Literary Translations.” In the article, they look at two Persian translations of the same novel, George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, specifically the translations of “The Seven Commandments” (260). They explain that CDA is actually very well-suited to narratives and the exploration of their adaptation and translation, defining translation as “the recontextualization of an original culture, ideology, language, and text in a new social, cultural, and linguistic context” (260). Considering this definition, it is

especially fitting that they chose to look at *Animal Farm*, a novel filled with allegories representing social fears and ideologies of the time, bordering on the edge of what we understand dystopian to be. They based their research around the idea that “ideology, change and power in literature and society, particular sociocultural, sociopolitical and ideological constraints” play an important role in literary narratives and their translations (270). This framework is the core of what CDA is today. To explore any work using CDA then, we must do more than simply read it; we have to look at the context, or discourse, in which the work is constructed—in short, interpretation.

Dystopia

To fully understand how *A Clockwork Orange* and its translations fit into their relevant socio-cultural discourse, we must first understand the limitations and expectations of the genre into which they fall—dystopia. Although dystopian works are not and have not ever been exclusively British, some of the most well-known dystopian works do come from British authors: Orwell’s *1984*, Huxley’s *Brave New World*, and Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale* to name a few. Knowing that these works exist helps us to understand that *A Clockwork Orange* is just one part of a greater tradition, meaning that Burgess’s choice to write using the dystopian genre is not something that can be viewed in isolation, and while I will not be examining the socio-cultural pressures that may have helped shape Burgess’s fictional world at this time (see chapter two), it is important to understand the general form of a dystopian novel and why dystopian works are typically produced.

The genre of “dystopia” can be, and often is, further divided into subgenres, such as feminist-dystopian or eco-dystopian, and shares some overlap with other fiction or speculative genres, including sci-fi and magical realism. Regardless of the subgenre or whether or not the

setting is more contemporary or speculative, however, each dystopian work has a similar exigency—fear or socio-cultural discomfort. Dystopian works often try to explore these fears by constructing worlds where socio-cultural context in which the fear is rooted has been taken to the extreme. One great example of this exploration of fear is in the aforementioned *Brave New World*, and Huxley’s own response to the novel in “Brave New World Revisited.” In “Revisited,” Huxley brings to light the contexts and fears behind the imagery he includes in *Brave New World*, with chapter titles including “Over-Population” (237), “Propaganda in a Democratic Society” (262), and “Brainwashing” (285). Each chapter gives insight into the fears and exigencies that prompted *Brave New World*.

For an example of these explanations, we can look to “Quantity, Quality, Morality.” In this chapter, Huxley lays out his reasoning for including government-controlled eugenics in the novel, saying:

... [W]e do nothing systematic about our breeding; but in our random and unregulated way we are not only over-populating our planet, we are also, it would seem, making sure that these greater numbers shall be of biologically poorer quality. ... Today, thanks to sanitation, modern pharmacology and the social conscience, most of the children born with hereditary defects reach maturity and multiply their kind. (248-9)

What Huxley intends to be “dystopian” here is not that eugenics is being used; rather he wants to highlight the “horror” of the continued existence of people with disabilities. The exigencies here are the fears of overpopulation and a “biologically poorer” population and the rhetoric he chooses to use to add to these discourses is one of eugenics and government programs (the novel was published in 1932). The understanding of what *Brave New World* says is very different today, however. Unlike Huxley, we live in a post-Holocaust world and have seen the horrors of

pogroms intended to erase a people deemed “inferior.” Today, the message readers see is not against allowing the population to become “biologically poorer”; rather they see a message against designer babies and cultural genocide. Despite this shift in its interpretation, the novel remains dystopian because it still speaks to new social fears which are both reminders of the past and concerns for our own future, something at the core of dystopian works.

The second major limitation of dystopian works is that of their setting. Dystopian works do not ever divorce themselves from our reality fully, meaning that you are not likely to find a dystopian set in a completely fictionalized world. Dystopias are always a reflection of the world we inhabit, even if taken to seemingly incomprehensible extremes, such as Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*. This novel is set in the United Kingdom of a world where diseases such as cancer have been “cured,” by cloning humans and raising them until their organs are ready to be harvested for transplant (263). It may seem absurd to us that cloning humans would ever be allowed, much less for the purpose of harvesting their organs, but it still takes place in a world that we recognize, and the people in this world seem to hold the same customs and ideals that we do. This world is just one where our fears and ugly truths are taken to the extreme, with the central point being that we choose to ignore that which makes us uncomfortable if confronting it would require that we change our habits. When two of the clones ask “why people would want [them] treated so badly in the first place,” the answer they receive is that people’s “overwhelming concern was that their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neurone disease, heart disease,” and that they rationalized the system through avoidance, convincing themselves that the clones “were less than human, so it didn’t matter” (263). Yes, we do not have clones, but we do live in a world where even the smallest attempt to mitigate things like anthropomorphic climate change is refused if it requires people to sacrifice

anything. These are the constraints placed on *A Clockwork Orange*, no matter the version, and they will be further explored in later chapters.

Knowing that *A Clockwork Orange* is a dystopian work and what that means, however, only helps to frame the research done into the socio-cultural contexts, discourses, and rhetoric that surround each work; it does not provide any evidence itself. Fitting within the expectations of CDA, evidence for these contexts will come from historical and cultural artifacts and understanding, especially the works themselves. By examining the discourse of these works we are able to draw parallels to real world events and larger socio-cultural discourses. To examine the interplay between the social discourses of each work (the exigencies and “real” discourses contextualizing each work) and the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse (the “constructed” discourse instantiated by the creation of the novel and furthered by its adaptations), we will need to look at historical, cultural, and political events and discourses and examine the encoded responses to these constructs in the works themselves and track any changes across time, location, language, and medium.

Overview

Each of the following chapters will be dedicated to one of the chosen works, moving in chronological order: *A Clockwork Orange* (Burgess, 1962), *A Clockwork Orange* (Kubrick, 1971), and *Clockwork Orange* (translated by Krege, 1997). “Dedicated” is used loosely here because, although each work will stand at a chapter’s core, other evidence and even other works need to be brought for examination to fully understand the interplay between the works’ internal discourse and the larger external discourses of each work’s respective society at the time. Additionally, despite setting each of the three works at the core of the following chapters, the literary works themselves are not the true focus; the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse is the focus

and they are merely examples of said discourse. It is because of this discourse-heavy focus that the chronological ordering is necessary. As each new work is created, their contribution to the discourse can have rippling effects on the form that the internal or external discourses take and can even determine changes in form.

Because we are looking at works produced by people of various socio-cultural backgrounds, there is some difference in the way each work constructs its world and characters, and, therefore, different evidence will inform the CDA of each. All of the chapters have a section to examine the contexts in which the works exist, a section to examine how the world and characters are used to encode larger discourses, and a section to show how the internal and external discourses are shaped, if at all. Chapters three and four, however, will have to take into consideration what differences are encoded into the chosen adaptation and translation, each with its own special considerations. Kubrick's film adaptation, for example, is based on the first American version of the novel, meaning that the film, like the American novel, does not include the final redemptive chapter from Burgess's original novel (Burgess, x-xiii).

Any "change" shifts the discourse slightly, but note that neither the CDA of the film, nor the CDA of the German translation will be concerned with fidelity, or how faithfully they try to match the original. Kubrick, like all film makers who adapt non-audio-visual works into film, must take into consideration what should and should not be included, avoided, and extended, in addition to having to determine how the included information is presented. These considerations do not even fully take into consideration Kubrick's socio-cultural conditioning. Further exploration of the film adaptation can be found in chapter three.

Translations require similar considerations as the film adaptation, but translators do not simply translate words, they must translate meaning. There are various methods for doing this,

but this will be discussed in chapter four. A particular issue for translating this novel from English into German is that German, unlike Modern English, has retained the t/V distinction, meaning that speakers must consider the level of familiarity or formality between them and their interlocutor when addressing them with “you,” through the use of the informal *du* and formal *Sie* (Brown and Gilman 264-5, 267). English historically marked this distinction with the informal *thou* and the formal *you*. Because German maintains this distinction, while English does not, any time a Nadsat-speaker uses *thou*, a translator will have to choose to ignore this use or express what they understand to be the meaning or intention of the word in another way. A German translator must also choose whether to use *du* or *Sie* for all instances of “you” in the English text, cementing a variety of factors including the speaker’s intent, power structures, and more. This is only one of the many considerations Krege makes in the translation, which are further explored in chapter four.

CHAPTER 2. BURGESS'S 1962 NOVEL, *A CLOCKWORK ORANGE*

Dystopian works, with their desire to expound upon the social fears of their time, are careful to examine and encode the discourses around them into themselves. Although it differs somewhat from those of its famous dystopian predecessors, *1984* and *Brave New World*, in that it does not focus so overtly on a totalitarian government and the oppression of the common people, the society of *A Clockwork Orange* is still dystopian. Barton explains that the societies in dystopian works are not simply “imaginary, sick or dysfunctional,” characteristics easily attributed to societies in works that are not traditionally thought to be dystopian (e.g. those from religious stories or mythologies), but, rather, dystopian works distinguish themselves because they are familiar and “are reminiscent of contemporary society,” being “reflections of our own societal fears” (7). Regardless of the prominence of the governmental system in *A Clockwork Orange*, the societal fears that it portrays are products of an early 1960s British mindset and culture and the discourses they create. To examine these discourses and their presence in the novel, we must first understand the socio-historical contexts in which Burgess was writing.

Exigencies and Discourse

It is, of course, not possible to point to one event and claim that it alone is the exigency that prompts a work: events do not exist in a vacuum; rather they respond to their own exigencies and take part in their own discourses. Likewise, it can be difficult to separate an exigent event from the discourses that surround it, and these difficulties are compounded when the response to these events is not immediate. Because of this interconnection, both the exigencies of Burgess writing *A Clockwork Orange* and the discourses surrounding them will be looked at together. In an attempt to show what Burgess is responding to in the creation of *A Clockwork Orange*, we will look to the Nadsat-speaker discourse community and the fictional world in which they exist.

By looking at the content included in the novel and matching the events, setting, and characterizations to those of our world, we can establish links that plausibly suggest certain exigencies, while rejecting others. As many significant events occurred in the United Kingdom and Europe during the 30s – late 50s, only those which I found to be relevant are included here.

We must first start with the knowledge that WWII, during which Burgess served in the Royal Army Medical Corps and the Army Educational Corps (The International), ended less than twenty years before he wrote *A Clockwork Orange*. Burgess spent much of his time after the end of WWII up until 1959 working as an educator in England and British Malay, ending only when he collapsed from a suspected brain tumor and was discharged from the British Colonial Service (The International). Burgess's experiences in the military, with youth, and in education helped to shape his novel, but these experiences also existed inside a larger context. WWII changed the power structure of the world. With the end of WWII came the Cold War, a nuclear arms race between "The West" and the USSR, and growing anti-communist and anti-Soviet sentiments in Britain; by 1948, England was deep into its own "red scare" (Jenks 48), meaning a paranoiac fear of the country being taken over by communists who were hiding among the citizens. Additionally, by 1953 the end of the Korean War had come without an ideological victory over the communist North Korea and with the release of British prisoners of war, who seemed to have been abused before and during their captivity (Hennessey 244-5). These events would help to shape the political and social discourse of the time and cemented the climate in the western world as one of capitalism vs. communism. Capitalists were the "good guys," the west, and communists, the USSR, were the enemy.

Outside of wars and communism, Britain had seen an increase in problematic youths, especially young men in the 1950s and 1960s, termed delinquents, and Burgess was no stranger

to violent young men either, his wife having been beaten by a gang of American soldiers in 1944 (The International). Wills explains that the 1950s saw an increase in the idea that young male delinquents could be reformed, rather than punished, so that they could be reintegrated into a society that they had failed and from which they had been cast out (175). Such attempts at reformation had little consideration of the benefit to the delinquent, however, but rather focused on “restoring the harmony of a quasi-mythical social body” in an attempt to reclaim “delinquents 'for the nation'” (Wills 176, 159), although the rhetoric surrounding such “reformation” tried to imply otherwise. Wills explains:

In the 1950s, the project of reforming male delinquents centred around the notion of *mens sana in corpore sano* (a healthy mind in a healthy body), which involved ideals such as strength of character, emotional independence, restrained heterosexuality and disciplined work ethic. (159).

These core values reflected the more conservative political mindset at the time, with Winston Churchill becoming prime minister in 1951 and conservative leadership maintaining control throughout the 50s (Past Prime Ministers). We can also see the focus on national identity and “patriotism” in their efforts to reform delinquents for the good of the United Kingdom.

What constituted a problem youth was not just restricted to young men who expressed violent or asocial tendencies, however. Because this focus on youth action and their adequate integration into society took place during the “red scare,” there were also young men who were targeted because of their affiliation with or sympathies toward communist groups, including the high-profile case of a scout named Paul Garland. Before we can look at this “Garland event,” however, we should understand some of the background. Joining the Scout Movement in the United Kingdom was almost a sort of voluntary “reformation,” meaning that its goals and those

of the delinquent reformers matched up very well. Mills explains that the Scout Movement was a youth movement that spawned from earlier institutions “that aimed to foster ideas of patriotism, morality and good citizenship” and was established by concerned or influential individuals to offer young people training in citizenship and moral values (430). The Scout Movement was, therefore, an extension of conservative and nationalistic ideology. Additionally, there was a fear of subversive social conditioning, with the concept of behaviorism becoming more widespread. Behaviorism is the belief that all behavior is driven by stimuli and that no internal mechanisms such as psychological factors have any effect on said response (Lecas 393), but there are varying schools, such as B. F. Skinner’s purely mechanical theory. From his experiments with the so called “Skinner box,” Skinner, according to Lecas, proposed that “behaviour is totally and mechanically determined by the history of his positive and negative reinforcements” and rejected the concept of freewill (395). Such psychological theories of nature vs. nurture spread to the public, establishing rhetorical tools and starting discourses on why we do what we do. Combining the idea that we are indoctrinated into our behavior with the Scout Movement’s function as a symbol of the United Kingdom’s power and the UK’s history with the “red scare,” it is understandable that many in power saw communist scouts as a realistic danger, and this is where scouts like Garland come into play.

Garland was a member of both the Bristol Scout Group and the Young Communist League (YCL), and when this dual involvement became public knowledge, he was dismissed from his Scout Group. Garland, however, was adamant that the YCL and scouting were perfectly compatible with one another, appealing his decision to the point that Parliament discussed the matter. Garland’s dismissal was upheld, with many Lords insisting that he was part of a larger conspiracy to upend British society, comparing him and other members of the YCL to infectious

diseases and parasites, and pointing to the communist state of China as proof that communism and atheism were unequivocally linked. During this media frenzy, much misinformation was being spread and published throughout the country and beyond. By the time everything was done, Garland's story would be featured on the cover of TIME (Mills 435-9).

While the preoccupation with Garland's communist ties is expected due to the "red scare," the focus on atheism may not be as obvious. While many Americans will understand that religion was a major factor in how people viewed the world in the 1950s, this fear of atheist ideology is a little more complex in the UK, especially since, unlike in the United States, the concept of "separation of church and state" is not so clear. To explain why this separation is so complicated, we must first understand two things: 1) the UK is made up of multiple member states: England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, and 2) the Church of England is a state church, meaning a church presiding over and interconnected with a political state. The Church of England has no direct affiliation with the UK, being the state church of the member state of England and not of the entire UK, but they are indirectly connected through Queen Elizabeth II, who is the ruling monarch of both the UK and of England, meaning that she is also the head of the Church of England (Bonney 69). Queen Elizabeth II, like all English monarchs, ascends to the throne through a coronation where they must swear to "maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant reformed religion" (Bonney 72). This muddled connection between the queen (representing the state) and Christianity means that being an atheist in the UK at this time carried connotations of being against the state, even if these sentiments were not said openly. In this way, atheism was seen as incompatible with patriotism and therefore did not match with conservative sentiments at the time.

I have talked about conservatism at the time but have yet to define it, and that is, in part, because the Conservative party in the 1950s had many ideological overlaps with the Labour government that came just before them, differing mainly in their focus on anti-communism and reduction of government control on capitalistic interests, or consumerism. Before Churchill's Conservatives reclaimed power in the government in 1951, Prime Minister Atlee of the Labour party, who came into power at the end of WWII in 1945, had been quite busy. Atlee "nationalized one fifth of the British economy," including railways and power plants, created popular welfare programs like social security and the National Health Service, established national parks, limited land development, and set regulations for childcare and reformatories (Past Prime), and while many of these were popular, his time as prime minister was also marked by rationing and a shortage of goods (Absolute History). The Conservative party did not come into power with the intent to remove the "welfare state" (Past Prime), however; they instead focused on presenting "an image of future material abundance based on de-control, choice and the liberalisation of the market," which was something the growing middle class were very interested in (Bonney 161).

During the 1950s, the middle class in the UK had grown to about fifteen to twenty million people and had proportionally "more money than they had ever had before," according to historian Suzanne Lipscomb (Absolute History). UK citizens wanted to spend their money, now that wartime restrictions were being lifted, and seemed to be no longer willing to wait for what they wanted. Lipscomb explains that there was a sort of "do it yourself" craze, due in part to the difficulty in finding tradesmen, who were helping to rebuild cities after the war, and that consumers were buying more appliances than ever, which made their lives easier and also shortened the amount of time spent on housework and chores (Absolute History). This refusal to

wait combined with the end of food rationing in 1954 would change the very culture of the UK, only becoming a concern when enough people began to die from the conveniences that they filled their lives with (Absolute History). UK citizens were now consumers first and foremost, who considered convenience and speed more important than regulation.

The real-world events and discourses surrounding Burgess as he wrote were a mishmash of fears of communism, behaviorism making its way to the populace, and an increase in consumerism and conservatism, but there is one more factor we must look at: dystopia. I have already defined the two key aspects of dystopia, as it pertains to works of literature and film, in chapter one, but we also need to understand what dystopian works at the time were saying and how they interacted with their own exigencies and discourses, so that we might understand Burgess's decision to use this genre for his novel. Perhaps one of the main aspects that drew Burgess to this genre was the content matter that it addressed. Hammond describes dystopian literature from 1945-1989 as an "expressly Cold War literary mode" that was "reluctant to engage with [any other topic]," explaining that the subject matter of political ideology goes back even further (664). Because of the political climate at the time and Burgess's own experiences, it seems that dystopia's obsession with the Cold War and politics made it an excellent candidate genre for *A Clockwork Orange*. One particular work, however, had a huge influence on the works that followed it, Orwell's *1984*. *1984*, despite Orwell's insistence that it targeted authoritarianism and not any particular nation state, was seen as a rallying cry against communism and the USSR, becoming an "ideological superweapon" (Hammond 665-6). People no longer just saw political ideology in dystopian works, they began to look for the hidden critiques against particular governments.

This is the genre and background that Burgess is writing in and in which he created his fictional Nadsat-speaker discourse community and the world in which they live. Knowing what may have influenced Burgess's writing and what he could be addressing is only part of a CDA, however. We must look at how Burgess responds to these exigencies and how he attempts to fit into one or more discourses and the discourses he himself creates. To do this, we will look at both the techniques Burgess uses to construct his novel and its contents and how the characters navigate the discourses created for them.

This fear of young "delinquents" and the desire to transform them into model citizens, combined with Burgess's own experiences with violence, such as his wife's assault in London (*The International*), provide the rest of the context for the creation of the fictive Nadsat-speaker community, again with lexical evidence. Nadsat has a high number of violent terms and the activities that surround the speech community center on performing violent acts. It is not enough to see the origin of the Nadsat-speaker community, however; we must also look into the dialog presented in the novel to examine how these identities are constructed and what role said identities play in the larger social power dynamics.

Techniques and Power

By choosing to publish a dystopian work, Burgess, intentionally or not, made two decisions: he would be taking part in and using the already established discourse and rhetoric surrounding the dystopian genre, and his contribution to the discourse would be made publicly available, meaning that it could further shape the discourse or genre. Because he was writing in the dystopian genre of the time, Burgess needed to create a fictional world where the discourses and exigencies that he was responding to were taken to the extreme, especially those that were related to the Cold War and political ideologies. Burgess, however, decided to take it further than

simply creating metaphoric representation of governments; he also created a representative people—Nadsat-speakers—and an argot. It is in this fictionalized group that Burgess realizes the novel's dystopian elements, not in the world, as is typical.

The world of *A Clockwork Orange* is one where the government appears to have full control over its citizens, but Burgess is careful to present this world organically through background imagery and commentary from those living in it. By his doing this, the reader is never directly confronted with much of the political discourses encoded into the work. This is a departure from many of the influential dystopian works that came before him, where the narrator would explain the intricacies of their world throughout the novel, creating rather transparent allusions to real world ideologies, governments, or people. An example of this “in your face” description can be found in Orwell's *1984*. In the first chapter of the novel, we learn that there is a governmental agency called the “Ministry of Truth,” who serve to manipulate reality through the spread of lies, propaganda posters are inescapable, devices that constantly spy on you are in every room, privately writing anything negative about the government will get you killed, and there exists a “Thought Police” to make sure no one is committing *thoughtcrime* (1-20). In contrast, Burgess builds his world more subtly; we see snippets in Alex's descriptions and asides: Alex lives in a “Municipal Flatblock” painted with murals of naked workers who were “stern in the dignity of labour” (35); Alex offhandedly remarks that there is a law that those capable of working must work (40); there are “Statemarts” (40), government-run newspapers (148), a “Municipal Power Plant” (18), and a “Statefilm,” (22); and prisons are being cleaned out for “political offenders” (102). Most of these examples are mentioned once, with only a few being mentioned two to four times (particularly Alex's house), and with no further explanation. This indirect and offhanded description allows Burgess to blur the line between Atlee's policies

and communism, as it is unclear whether Alex lives in an extension of Atlee's "welfare state" or in a future Britain that fell to the USSR.

Although Burgess draws correlations to the USSR subtly in his creation of the novel's world, he does make more directly obvious connections, especially through Nadsat, which has many terms derived from Russian. Readers would be aware of the Russian influence on Nadsat, even if they had no knowledge of Russian. When Alex is pushed to the point of style shifting into his Nadsat dialect, Dr. Branom explains to Dr. Brodsky that Nadsat is made up of "Slav," "gipsy talk," and "rhyming slang" (129). By including this conversation in the novel, Burgess makes sure that the reader forms a connection between the fictional Nadsat-speakers and the schemata they attach to the Russian language and to the Roma people living in the UK. Although the connotations associated with the Roma people color the way readers interact with the text, the connection to Russian brings with it all of the knowledge that the reader associates with the USSR, the ongoing Cold War, and the "red scare" and encourages them to project these assumptions and fears onto Nadsat-speakers. In this way, Burgess is using the power of the contemporary rhetoric and discourses surrounding him to heighten fears and legitimize his choice to use the dystopian genre.

Aside from using the discourse and rhetoric associated with the anti-communist mentality of the time, Burgess addresses the discourses surrounding delinquents, reformation, and behaviorism by stressing that the experimental Ludovico treatment is a means of reformation and not intended to be a punishment. Alex does many reprehensible things in the first chapter of *A Clockwork Orange*, ultimately landing him in prison for murder, and it is clear to the reader that Alex is not a model citizen, he is a criminal and a delinquent. In prison, Alex is transferred to undergo the Ludovico treatment, during which time he is subjected to psychological torture and

conditioning to make him averse to violence—both committing and being the victim of violent acts (113-8). This conditioning is seen as a way to reform criminals, rather than having to keep them in prison as punishment for their crimes (104-5). Burgess relies on all of the discourses aforementioned, but also uses the power inherently associated with science to give validity to the experiments carried out.

This is pitted against the religious and ideological objections of the chaplain and the fear of delinquents of the reader. This connection to the discourse of delinquents and their reclamation for the state is further shown, although indirectly, through the actions against and the inquiries posed to Alex while he is being “reformed.” Dr. Branom shows an interest in Alex’s physical health before he undergoes Ludovico’s Technique (109), and Branom and Brodsky explain music as an “emotional heightener,” which shows the Ludovico treatment to cause an aversion not only to violent action, but also to strong emotion (128). Combined with the discharge officer’s preoccupation with Alex’s career prospects (123) and Alex’s inability to initiate sexual contact after receiving the treatment (142-3), the connections between delinquents and the constructed Nadsat-speaker community become even more apparent.

Because Burgess obscures much of the world that he has created, the times that he directly addresses the social fears that he relies upon to construct his novel are much more visible and poignant. These occurrences of direct address often come from self-inserts such as the prison chaplain and the author, Alexander. Throughout the second part of *A Clockwork Orange*, the one voice who stands in moral opposition to the use of the Ludovico treatment is the prison chaplain, often arguing that the treatment denies free will. His final statement of opposition comes after Alex has fully undergone the treatment. During a presentation of Alex’s transformation, where he is abused and sexually stimulated, the chaplain yells out, “He ceases to be a wrongdoer. He

ceases also to be a creature capable of moral choice,” to which Dr. Brodsky rebuffs, “We are not concerned with motive, with higher ethics” (140-1). In a similar vein, the writings of Alexander, which are kindly read aloud to us by Alex, call into question the imposition of “laws and conditions appropriate to a mechanical creation” on humans, which he deftly links to God (25). Burgess uses the power associated with religion to accost the actions of the state, posing an interesting choice between the two, when in our reality the British state and English religion are effectively one and the same. This also places the concept of morality on the side of religion, should the two entities be separated.

Allegory also plays an important role in prompting the reader to make desired associations with the material. One example of this use of allegory is in the names of the two locations where Alex breaks in while out with his *droogs*: “HOME” and “Le Manse” and the people who live in them. The victims depicted living in HOME are isolated from the rest of the world and do not seem to be particularly wealthy, but they do own a home, making them a representation of the middle class. The victim living in Le Manse, in contrast, is said to be very wealthy and seems to be detached from the reality of the world around her: The couple in HOME are skeptical of Alex’s claims that his friend is hurt and are aware of the danger that they could pose, but the old woman in Le Manse refuses to open the door because she thinks that Alex is a salesman come to sell her some things that she has no need for (64). The old woman represents the upper class (made directly evident to the reader when she says to Alex, “Wretched little slummy bedbug, breaking into *real* people’s houses”), and it is telling that only Alex’s crimes against her are punished (68, 81). This encodes the British discourse around socio-economic class into the novel.

Alex is able to employ these socio-cultural systems through his stylistic use of register as a form of power in his interactions with these victims of home invasion. When Alex is attempting to gain entrance to the two houses, he employs two similar, yet distinct registers: one a “real gentleman’s” register and the other “refined like” (23, 64). Note that neither register attempts to establish Alex as more powerful than his interlocutors; rather, the registers that he chooses are attempts to match power to create solidarity. This type of power negotiation is seen in the distinction between the two registers, although subtle. The idea of “gentleman” could, of course, refer to the upper class, and would allow for the creation of an even more powerful identity, but when compared to what Alex actually says, is revealed to mean “polite” or “non-Nadsat.” The “refined” register, however, is clearly based on Alex’s assumptions about the type of people who live in mansions. Although neither of these victims truly fall for his act, the reader does, thanks in part to Burgess’s obfuscation.

Because the original novel did not include a glossary for Nadsat like many of the new versions do, the reader can only rely on Alex to provide explanation and their growing familiarity to the argot over time. By obscuring much of the novel behind Nadsat and subtly encouraging the reader to learn the new vocabulary gradually, they are slowly inducted into the discourse community (see chapter one for an explanation of what makes a discourse community). Although the reader will have familiarized themselves with some of the criteria, such as genres and participatory mechanisms, they are only able to actively, albeit in their mind, participate through having a shared vocabulary and goal. While the vocabulary is clear enough, it is true that, hopefully, most readers will not find the “goals” of assault and rape to be palatable. This, however, is another obfuscation. We see later in the novel that the true goal is to break free from the systems of power and control in their lives when Alex is willing to give up his acts of

violence to maintain the ability to listen to and express himself through music, particularly non-pop genres (126-30).

Because of this slow induction into the Nadsat-speaker discourse community and the reliance on Alex, the reader also slowly forms a deeper bond with Alex, further forcing the Nadsat-speaker identity onto the reader. Alex shows solidarity through his use of “brother” as a term of address and can even overemphasize his bond to the interlocutor through the affixation of “my.” Most commonly Alex uses the overemphasized term of “my brothers,” beginning on page one and going all the way to the final page, with the reader serving as interlocutor to Alex’s narrative. Through constant reminder that he is at the same level or in the same group as we, the readers, are, Alex slowly gains more and more social clout, and thus becomes more relatable, especially after he is himself victimized. We see similar in-narrative uses of the address “brother” as a way of constructing a sympathetic identity throughout the novel, and Alex almost explicitly tells the reader that he is doing so when, after succumbing to Ludovico’s Technique, he calls us his “brothers and only friends” (134). In this way, Alex is attempting to create the reader’s identity for them, something that we cannot really do, not being able to speak for ourselves in the narrative.

Comparatively, Alex’s use of the address “sir” marks his deference to his interlocutor’s power, often in an attempt to prevent punishment or better his circumstances. Most commonly, Alex uses “sir” with those who have some direct institutionalized power over him, such as those administering his Reclamation Treatment, Branom and Brodsky, and his post-corrective officer., P. R. Deltoid. Alex only uses “sir” in reference to Branom and Brodsky when he is undergoing intake for his treatment, a betterment of circumstance where Alex is attempting to create an identity that is cooperative, and when he realizes that he is being conditioned against music as

part of Ludovico's Technique, extreme duress that Alex wishes to end (109, 130). Similarly, Alex's use of "sir" with P. R. Deltoid is in response to the threat of punishment, going so far as to respond with "Thank you very much, sir, that was very kind of you, sir, thank you," when Deltoid spits in his face and tells Alex that he will speak against him in court (77). Even if he knows that there is little to no hope, Alex's attempts to construct a subservient identity and to acknowledge his lack of power shows that he understands that sympathy can be used as a tool to get what he wants.

Alex comes off as manipulative and charismatic, but because he is not often successful in his endeavors, he also seems immature, and this is intentional, as seen in Burgess's explanation of the novel's structure. Burgess intentionally divided *A Clockwork Orange* into twenty-one chapters subdivided into three parts of seven chapters each with the intention of symbolizing maturity and "adult responsibility," noting that at the age of twenty-one "you got the vote" at the time (Burgess X). Each of these sections also begins with a pattern of repetition, helping to anchor each part while also linking it to the others. The first chapter of each part begins with the sentence "'What's it going to be then, eh?'" which is then repeated around three times, breaking up Alex's narrative description which always begins with a detailed list of his clothes (3-6, 85-8, 147-50). Aside from part two, where the last usage of the phrase is explained as the prison chaplain addressing all of the prisoners (88), it is unclear who, if anyone, is actually posing the question, or whom they are addressing. The reader becomes familiar with this repetitive question, using it to ground themselves in each new part, making it all the more jarring when the final chapter, chapter seven of part three, begins the same way (200-1). This subversion of expectations forces the reader to read more carefully and sets up the final chapter as more of a beginning than an end, mirroring Burgess's desire that we see Alex as moving into maturity.

Shaping the Discourse

Now that we have looked at some of the exigencies that may have prompted Burgess to write *A Clockwork Orange*, the discourses he was taking part in, and how he tried to encode this into his novel, we can look at what exactly Burgess says about these discourses and how he hopes to shape them. Before we look at how he tries to shape the discourse, we should note that *A Clockwork Orange* “sold poorly, with most reviewers baffled by Burgess’s linguistic inventiveness, and disturbed by its violence,” although it did become “an underground hit” (The International). This means that any effects it had on the major discourse was minimal at best. We can see further evidence of this in how few people were writing about *A Clockwork Orange* at its release compared with the number of people (ten times as many) writing about the same phrase after Kubrick’s adaptation (Google Books Ngram Viewer, search term “a clockwork orange” case insensitive). With that said, what does Burgess say?

Burgess, through his many levels of obfuscation, tries to make the reader look to the meaning of what is being said rather than just the words. This is especially important in political rhetoric, which can often hide the speaker’s true meaning behind the selected words and phrases. Burgess’s use of this obfuscation also, therefore, matches with this rhetorical device, meaning that he borrows its symbolic power to change the way he creates a dystopia. This shirking of dystopian genre expectations suggests that he is calling for a change in the way that the genre is presented, and it seems to have been successful. We find examples of building worlds through characterization in more modern dystopian novels like *Never Let Me Go*, where the clones, and the reader, are said to have been “told and not told” about the realities of the world that they live in (82). This is, perhaps, one of Burgess’s greatest contributions to the discourse.

On the topic of more “real world” discourses, Burgess makes the following claims with his novel: freedom of choice is vital to our humanity, true reformation comes from choice and maturity, behaviorism cannot fully explain the human condition, and political ideologies are not as distinct as we assume them to be. The first three of these claims are all linked to the ideas put out by behaviorists like B. F. Skinner, who claim that human behavior is nothing more than the response to external stimuli. Through Alex’s torture, here using pathos to create sympathy, Burgess says that this is not true. Alex may no longer commit acts of violence, but his conditioning does not stop him from the desire to commit these acts. We humans are, Burgess argues, creatures given free will by God (ethos) and it is only through choice and maturity that any real change can occur in our propensity for delinquency. This argument also rebukes the trend at the time to “reform” delinquents against their will.

In regard to the last statement Burgess makes with his novel, political ideologies are less clear than we pretend they are, we see Burgess’s conflation of communism and Atlee’s “welfare state.” The public fear of communism at the time seems irrational to some extent, considering that many of the policies of governmental control were so popular that not even the Conservative Churchill dared to remove them. This blurring of political ideologies is only possible because of the obfuscation created by Burgess’s consistent worldbuilding organically through his characters and encourages the careful reader to critically think about the assumptions that we make and the information that we believe, rather than simply accepting rhetoric at face value. This is not to say that Burgess wants his reader to become communists, as evidenced in his construction of the Nadsat-speaker community, but rather that he wants them to ask whether it is communism or authoritarianism that they truly fear.

The negotiation of power and construction of identity that happens in every discourse is not always a battle between two forces attempting to subordinate the other, it can be complex and relative to the situations and people involved in said discourse. By using critical discourse analysis, we can examine how all of these factors come into play and how these factors can affect our perception of those around us. In his attempts to capture the societal fears of his time, Burgess created a fictive argot, Nadsat, and the discourse community of speakers who use this argot, fossilizing the fears of communism and violent delinquents in his narrative. As a Nadsat-speaker, Alex is terrifying not just because Burgess embedded the fears of Cold War Britain into him; he is terrifying because, despite knowing the horrible things he has done, we still sympathize and, to some extent, relate to him.

CHAPTER 3. KUBRICK'S 1971 FILM ADAPTATION

Stanley Kubrick's film adaptation of *A Clockwork Orange* takes the discourses established by Burgess in the original novel and filters them through his American culture, building on and adapting them based on the discourses relevant to him and the unique exigencies that prompted him to create his adaptation. In much the same way that we looked at the socio-cultural contexts in which Burgess found himself around the time of his novel's publication, we must look to Kubrick's world. How does America of the 1960s to early 1970s differ from the UK of the 1940s through the early 1960s, and what events helped to shape that culture? I should note that Kubrick did move to England in 1961 ("Biography"), meaning that many of the American events would not have had a direct impact on him, but there still appears to be some relevance in his work. This is because Kubrick still had been raised in America and, despite his moving to England, still had connections to America, such as his parents and many of his business partners. Kubrick, at least at the time he was creating his film adaptation, was even asked whether he considered himself British, having have lived in London for around seven years at the time of the interview. His response to this question is a simple "not at all" (Gelmis). Kubrick saw himself as an American living in the UK, meaning that he still considered himself more culturally aligned with America.

Exigencies and Discourse

Although Kubrick's adaptation was released almost ten years after the original novel, the Cold War, which helped to shape the novel, was still ongoing. Tensions were worsened, in fact, by at least one major event: the Cuban Missile Crisis. The Cuban Missile Crisis took place in 1962, when it was discovered that the USSR had placed nuclear missiles in Cuba as a retaliation against America's attempted invasion of the island in 1961 (United States). This information led

to America's blockading Cuba, which would normally be declared an act of war, and a barely averted nuclear launch, due in part to the increased tensions (United States). Eventually the matter of the Cuban Missile Crisis was resolved, although tensions would remain high until 1967, when President Reagan established a formal détente with the USSR (United States). As can be expected from these events, there was still an underlying anti-communist air about the western world, including America, and this was not helped by the continuation of the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War was a proxy war between the capitalist America and the communist USSR and China that was fought by supplying aid and resources to the South Vietnam and North Vietnam factions respectively (United States). The Vietnam War continued through détente, ending in 1975 (United States), and was seen as a loss on the part of America.

Americans at this time, unlike Burgess's British contemporaries, were not all pleased with or invested in a hopeless war fought over ideological differences: enter the "hippies." Hippies were a nonviolent youth counterculture movement in America starting around the 1960s. Miller explains that the core of the hippie ethos "argued that America needed a sweepingly new ethics appropriate to an age characterized by never-ending global power struggles, technocracy, urbanization, environmental catastrophe, and new psychedelic chemistry," but also acknowledges that there was no centralized agreed-upon ethic which bound all hippies (XII-XV). Despite any difference in opinion about how they should accomplish their goals and what those goals should look like, there was a common thread shared among all hippies: the "simple withdrawal" from traditional American society, with withdrawal being anything from isolation from this society in communes to protests that aimed at dismantling it (Miller XVIII). The hippie movement stemmed from the dissatisfaction many young people felt with the systems that governed the lives of the American people, from religiously oppressive mores to systematic

racism that prevented true equality. The enemy of the people was “the Establishment,” and it needed to be replaced with a system that they could trust to be fair (Miller XVII).

This dissatisfaction or distrust in the government is echoed in another major event: the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in 1963. As part of his bid for reelection, Kennedy, along with his wife and vice president, was going through Dallas, Texas in an open motorcade, when he was shot and killed (Library of Congress). The event shook America, with misinformation and confusion spreading among many. Although Lee Harvey Oswald was the only person reported by the government to have shot the president, there were rumors that there was another gunman and that the government was trying to hide the truth from the American people (Library of Congress). Americans believed in their government, but they did not fully trust it.

This time in American history was also marked with two major political efforts from the government: the “war on poverty,” a Democratic ideal, and “law and order” policies, championed by the Republican party. The “war on poverty” was an attempt to lift all Americans out of poverty through social and political action, and, at around twenty-five percent, the number of Americans in poverty was very high (Dybska 3). Enacted by President Johnson as an extension of the efforts of President Kennedy, the declaration of the war on poverty was an attempt to tackle the cause of poverty, and Johnson felt that addressing poverty was not just as simple as addressing unemployment. In his declaration, Johnson says:

Our chief weapons in a more pinpointed attack will be better schools, and better health, and better homes, and better training, and better job opportunities to help more Americans, especially young Americans, escape from squalor and misery and

unemployment rolls where other citizens help to carry them. Very often a lack of jobs and money is not the cause of poverty, but the symptom (qtd. in Dybska 3).

Acknowledging poverty and the difficulties that it caused in a “first-world” country like America and attempting to address them with social programs was the political rhetoric from the left at the time.

The political right had another target in mind for their attacks: crime. Violent crime was high in America throughout the 1960s, and Americans were beginning to become more concerned with their own safety than any other political issue. Between the years of 1963 and 1968 “the murder rate had almost doubled,” and the Democratic party’s insistence that such numbers were statistical errors left many victims feeling ignored, especially minorities, who were the target of much of the violence (Flamm 1-2). The conservative Republican party “maintained that the national government should assume a major role in the local fight against violence and disorder,” meaning that the benefit of society override the rights of the individual, which Flamm explains stood in opposition to the party’s roots, and this helped to get them elected into office, with around twelve million Americans abandoning the democratic presidential candidate in 1968 for Richard Nixon (2-3). There seemed to be a tacit acceptance of authoritarian governmental control in exchange for perceived safety, which reflects the topic of control vs free will we saw in chapter two.

American responses to the violence at the time and the racial tensions that underlie them were not always so authoritarian, however. In the afterwar period in America, there was a trend of racial integration in communities, although it was not until 1968 that the Fair Housing Act was enacted, making it illegal to segregate neighborhoods along the lines of race (Bell 170). This racial integration was seen as unacceptable by the white neighborhoods that saw an increase in

people of color, especially black Americans, moving into their previously racially homogenous communities. All across America, white Americans were targeting and attacking black Americans in an effort to keep them out or to force them to move, causing riots in many major cities (Kruse 4-5). As an example of some of the widespread violence, Bell discusses Detroit, Michigan, saying, “In Detroit, between the end of World War II and 1960 there were more than two hundred incidents of harassment, stoning of houses, arson, and physical attacks directed at blacks moving to white neighborhoods” (36). Violence was not just limited to instances of black Americans moving into predominately white neighborhoods, however; there were race riots in many major east coast cities in 1964 (Dybska 6). This violence was related to the push back against the Civil Rights Movement occurring at the same time, which advocated for full legal rights for black Americans, and ultimately resulted in the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Bell 169-70). This racial divide was more tangible and more discussed than that of a class divide, an issue more commonly addressed in British works. Although Kubrick did not include any people of color in the main cast of his adaptation, any discourse about the rights of a citizen will bring with it the schemata attached to the recent passage of the Civil Rights Act, and it is possible that acts of violence could conjure up images of the attacks and riots against the activists fighting for Civil Rights.

In addition to all of these events and discourses swirling around America at the time, the 1960s saw a relaxation of censorship codes that had been purportedly intended to protect the American viewing public, but which really were mainly a way to force conservative and Christian socio-cultural values on people producing works at the time. In the early twentieth century, several states had enacted laws that censored what could and what could not be shown in films, affecting around forty-one percent of Americans directly, and likely many more

indirectly, as filmmakers were not likely to make multiple cuts of the same film (Wittern-Keller 3-4). Many cases would appeal to the Supreme Court attempting to strike down these laws and various morality codes as hindering the free speech of filmmakers, but from 1915 to 1952, the Supreme Court found film to be outside the scope of free speech, meaning that these codes and laws were perfectly legal (Wittern-Keller 7-10, 13). Even after this decision, however, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) still had almost complete control over what films were screened in theaters across America until about 1966, despite not being a governmental agency, and they still rate films today (Wittern-Keller 12, 14). This loss of power and embarrassment from constant legal battles caused the MPAA to become laxer on what they would and would not screen, and filmmakers took advantage of these weakened regulations, including Kubrick.

Also due to censorship, Kubrick, being an American, did not have easy access to the British version of Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*; rather he had the American version. Normally there would be little difference, if any, between an American and a British version of a novel—possibly some spelling changes—but the American version of the novel, *A Clockwork Orange*, only had twenty chapters: the twenty-first chapter had been removed (Burgess X-XI). Kubrick, then, is basing his film adaptation on an already adapted novel. As mentioned in chapter two, the twenty-first chapter was a redemptive chapter for Alex, showing that he had grown weary of being a member of the Nadsat-speaker community and the actions they partook in. Alex reaches maturity in the twenty-first chapter and without chapter twenty, we are left with a manipulative and dangerous Alex who cannot wait to get out of the hospital to begin terrorizing people again (Burgess 198-9). Burgess explains the decision to cut the twenty-first chapter as being made by his New York publisher, who felt that Americans did not want a character like Alex to change

because they “could face up to reality”: human character is set and unbending, and some people are just evil (Burgess XII-XIII). We see then that the British idea that “reforming criminals and delinquents is possible” is not a major part of American discourse, especially at the time that Kubrick began adapting the novel into his film.

Techniques and Power

Because Kubrick’s adaptation is a film and not a novel, he is able to use some techniques that are not available to a printed medium, namely visual effects and sound effects. Even these categories can be further broken down into *mise en scène*, costuming, cinematography techniques, score, and general sound effects. We will also need to look at how Kubrick chooses to portray characters when adapting them to the film. Finally, we will look at what removals, additions, and/or changes Kubrick makes to the source material, but we should be aware that the point of such analysis is not to determine fidelity, or whether the adaptation “accurately” represents the source material. That the adaptation is different is not as important as how it is different. It is obvious that some material will need to be changed or adapted to fit into the genre of the new medium, but the influence that power structures have on the selection of change and the way these changes respond to the film’s exigencies and discourses do merit analysis.

Costuming, in particular the clothing that Alex wears, is an important tool in encoding power structures and discourses into the film. McDowell, who plays Alex, explains that he had quite a bit of input in the look of the droog uniform: The white outfit is simply his “cricket gear,” which Kubrick really liked the look of, and a bowler hat that McDowell chose “because it symbolized the city and respectability, and [he] just wanted to give a real (screw) you to the establishment” (qtd. in Germain). Combined with his cane, Alex is clad in the symbols of the “establishment” and, as such, introduces classism into the discourse of the film. Aside from this

example of classism, there do not appear to be any other overtly obvious times it is evoked, possibly because the costuming decision was that of McDowell, who is British.

When Alex is taken into prison, he is wearing a suit and tie, and it is in these clothes that he is returned to the outside world when he is released. This differs from the novel, where Alex states that the clothes he is wearing when incarcerated and released are his typical droog uniform (Burgess 147). This may not seem like much of a costuming decision, but it changes the way we view the Alex. Alex in the novel still went through trial and sentencing, but the clothes that he seems to have worn through all of it are the clothes he wears when out performing his acts of violence, leading us to assume that these are the clothes he chose to wear to his arraignment (85-6). The film Alex, in contrast, not only has other sets of clothes, something we also see when he goes to the record store, but also knows when it is and is not appropriate to wear his various outfits. This does not seem to be from any greater ability on the part of the film Alex to adapt to those around him. Kubrick's Alex, much less likely to effectively move in and out of registers than Burgess's, is beholden to the social constructs in place: evening clothes for the evening, a suit for court, and a mod outfit when going out in the daytime.

Kubrick also chooses Alex's costume carefully for the time he spends incarcerated. During this time, Alex wears a dark suit with a red armband on his left bicep, possibly to denote his special status as chaplain's helper. This costume is very reminiscent of Nazi uniforms, and the connotations associated with Nazis are then applied to Alex and possibly the state, seeing as how this is their uniform. The uniform serves to link Alex's time in prison to the disgust we feel when presented with the atrocities committed by the Nazis, thus constantly reminding the viewer that Alex has done horrible things, and he deserves to be in prison. By including this Nazi

imagery, Kubrick is also able to encode the discourse of “racist violence” into the film without having to directly address it, i.e. have Alex or the droogs attack a person of color.

Aside from the clever costuming, Kubrick takes great care in setting up each scene. McDowell explains that Kubrick spent “five days” changing out the furniture in the room for the scene where the author’s wife is raped, just trying to get it to look how he wanted (qtd. in Daniels). What information, then, is present in the scenes? Many of the scenes have sexual imagery in them, although only one scene is this directly addressed—Alex’s home invasion of the film’s version of Le Manse. This scene opens with the older woman doing yoga poses that put her in suggestive positions from the audience’s point of view in a room filled with paintings of women in various positions, all of which pointedly highlight their genitals. Taking this sexual theming further, when Alex attacks this woman, he does so with a large sculpture of a penis and testicles, as opposed to the novel’s Alex, who uses a small silver statue of a woman (67,69). Kubrick includes these examples of harmless yet overtly sexual imagery to talk to the power of the MPAA and to respond to the discourse of sexuality in film and the exigency of the relaxing of censorship. He punctuates this with Alex’s murdering the woman with the giant penis, blending sex and violence in a way that is completely ridiculous, almost as if pointing out the hypocrisy in refusing to show the human body while accepting violence.

Mise en scène is not just choosing the items in the scene, though; it is any way that the mood is set, meaning that we should also look at how Kubrick obscures the information that we see through cleverly blocking out what we see and speed of playback. During the murder scene with the older woman and the rape scene of the writer’s wife, Kubrick brings us right to the edge of each respective act, but changes perspective and scenes to prevent us from witnessing what actually happens. In the murder scene, for example, when Alex brings the penis down onto the

woman's head, the camera shifts from a third-person perspective to Alex's perspective, to the woman's perspective, and finally to a zoom in on a painting of a woman's distorted face that flashes in and out with the painting of her body. This implies that Alex hit her more than one time, but we do not know for sure because Kubrick does not allow us to see. He takes the adrenaline rush we get from the scene and its music and cuts us off before the climax. We are left wondering why we were repulsed at the idea of watching the woman being beaten but also wanted to see the violence in action. Similarly, the rape of the woman has a lot of lead-up to it: Alex and the others tie up the man and his wife, slowly cut her clothes off, take off their necessary clothing, and then lean in to the camera (in the husband's perspective) and tell us to "Viddy (watch) well." There is a palpable fear that we will have to watch this woman be assaulted during the long pause on the man's face Kubrick makes us endure, and then the scene shows the woman from the chest up for just a moment and then moves on to another scene. Kubrick knows what we fear and how to manipulate us with that fear; he plays on the puritan American's fear of sexuality and shows that there are multiple levels. These sexual youths are a counterculture to be feared, not the hippies.

The aforementioned use of playback speed further highlights Kubrick's attempt to incorporate the discourse surrounding sexuality at the time. In the scene where Alex has consensual sex with two women, Kubrick speeds up the sexual encounter to the point that it becomes a parody, despite the three people involved seemingly having sex multiple times. There is nothing particularly pornographic about it. This comical mood is further set by the scene's musical score, the William Tell Overture Finale, a high-speed orchestral piece, giving the scene an almost "Benny Hill" feeling. Had Kubrick instead used the footage at a normal speed, there is little doubt that, even with the relaxed regulations, his film would not have been approved below

an X rating. Kubrick is both testing the bounds of the genre in this new, freer film industry and at the same time setting them, shaping what can and cannot be done in wide release films.

Kubrick maintains the element of obfuscation prevalent throughout the work, but where Burgess employs this to slowly ease the reader into the world and the Nadsat-speaker discourse community, Kubrick blocks out information to increase our sense of unease. Two examples of this can be seen in Kubrick's use of panning and zooming. In the scene where Billyboy and his droogs are preparing to rape a woman. Kubrick begins the scene looking at a painting of a vase of flowers which is part of a mural that wraps around the upper part of the wall of the building we find ourselves in. Slowly, the camera pans lower and lower, until around twenty seconds into the scene when we see the gang and the woman, and it is at this time, we hear "Right, get her clothes off." During the slow pan, we hear the woman crying out exasperatedly "No" and "Stop," but because we cannot see what is happening, we fill in the information gap with any number of horrible things this woman could be going through. Kubrick makes it clear that he has the power to control what information we receive and when.

The second instance of this is the very beginning of the film when Kubrick presents twenty-seven seconds of a pure red screen, which then gives way to a title card for the film studio, a card for Kubrick, and a card for the name of the film. When Kubrick finally releases us from this uncomfortable red wall, we see only a close-up of Alex eerily staring at us at forty-seven seconds into the film, where we stay for almost another twenty seconds. We then sit in relative silence, with only the unsettling music, while the camera zooms out to reveal the Korova Milkbar, and Kubrick establishes the world. Kubrick does not want us to be comfortable in this world, and he accomplishes this with his opening and other techniques which remind us of the control he has over what we see.

Many of these techniques are used to control the mood or tone of the film, while only subtly talking to any one discourse, and this is something Kubrick also does through characterization. Look at how P. R. Deltoid, Alex's post-corrective officer, is portrayed in the film, especially the scene where he comes to visit Alex at home. Deltoid is sitting on Alex's parents' bed waiting for him to get up. When Alex finally comes by, Deltoid forces Alex to sit beside him on the bed, slowly wrapping his arm around Alex and pulling him down to lie next to him, ultimately ending when he strikes Alex on the genitals (and all of this while Alex is in nothing but his underwear). There is an underlying implication that Deltoid is sexually abusing Alex and possibly others in his charge. The system is corrupt and using young people. Deltoid is never confirmed to be an abuser and is, therefore, never punished, despite Alex's punishment for sexual assault, showing the system to be biased and unfair.

Alex's characterization is also important, as it differs from the novel. As mentioned in chapter two, the novel's Alex is a clever and charismatic young man with a penchant for trying to manipulate his environment to get what he wants while standing out from society. The film's Alex is subtly different; yes, this Alex is manipulative and charismatic, but he certainly does not seem to be clever and adaptive; rather, he is sarcastic and flippant, and this Alex is also a participating member of his society. A striking illustration in how these two versions differ is in the aforementioned scene where Deltoid spits on Alex. In the novel, Alex responds to Deltoid spitting on him by saying, "Thank you, sir, thank you very much, sir, that was very kind of you sir, thank you" (77). Alex hopes to show deference to Deltoid to get him to help prevent him from going to prison, knowing that trying to place Deltoid on the same or lower level as himself would only make matters worse. The film Alex, however, simply pauses for a moment, almost stunned from the spit, wipes part of it from his lips, smirks, and throws his handkerchief to the

side. His facial expression is almost a challenge to the system, seemingly saying, "Have it your way." He clearly is not too upset by his impending imprisonment. We see this time and time again throughout the film: during his intake at the Ludovico treatment facility, Alex mockingly over-replicates the pageantry of the official overseeing his transfer; he acts as if his intake into prison is comical; and he responds with, "You're absolutely right, sir," when the Minister of the Interior claims that prisoners probably enjoy punishment. Alex in the film is also prone to singing "popular" songs, such as when he is raping the writer's wife, and is a member of the Church of England (Intake Scene), while the novel's Alex finds popular music distasteful (46-7) and does not even know who Jesus is (66). This Alex could really be any teenager; he does not think any further than the moment and does not consider the consequences of his actions, and because Kubrick does not include the twenty-first chapter in the film, he remains stuck in his immaturity.

Additional changes that result from the adaptation and which are relevant to the discourses presented here are the changing of character ages, the inclusion of the prison intake scene, the addition of homosexuality to the discourse, and the change of Nadsat from an argot to an easily understandable slang. The majority of the characters in the film have been aged-up for the film adaptation. Alex and his droogs are around fifteen in the novel (81, 209) and the two women he has sex with in the novel are actually ten-year-old girls (47), as is the girl that Billyboy's gang are trying to rape. Kubrick has little control over the choice to change the ages for his film: child pornography laws prohibited him from depicting minors sexually, even if fictionalized, and it is doubtful that graphic depictions of child-rape would have been acceptable to any viewer. Likewise, even the use of young-looking actors that are adults but portrayed as younger would also be unacceptable.

The only scene, aside from the final dream-like fantasy that closes the film, added to the adaptation is that of Alex's prison intake. Because of this, we should ask ourselves what purpose does it serve? We see a ridiculous amount of bureaucracy and too many people doing the job of one or two officers. Alex is told to stand behind a white line while lightly emptying his pockets for the officers, and while doing this, one officer shouts the names of the items that Alex has taken out of his pockets to another officer, standing directly next to him, so that he may record them. Alex then moves to another station where a third officer collects Alex's clothing, again shouting out the names of the items to the recorder, while a different officer questions Alex and physically inspects him. The inspecting officer also one of the added allusions to homosexuality, although it is not so covert here. The officer, while inspecting Alex's rectum, asks him the question "Are you now, or have you ever been a homosexual," blustering out the word homosexual, as if he can barely even say the word. We also see the discourse of homosexuality in Deltoid's interaction with Alex, as well as the scantily clad assistant to the writer in the final part of the film, Julian. The government's response to the rise in youth violence is overly complicated, wasteful, and misfocused.

Finally, we have the change to Nadsat, from an exclusionary argot to a slang that everyone seems to understand. As noted in chapter two, those not in the Nadsat-speaker discourse community have difficulties understanding Nadsat, requiring explanation. Alex is even careful to explain some of the terms to the readers so that they can be slowly initiated into the discourse community. In the film adaptation, Alex does not clarify words with asides, nor does anyone seem to have difficulties understanding him. The bum that Alex assaults in the first action scene of the film even uses a Nadsat word himself, "cutter," with no prompting from Alex or his droogs. Deltoid and Dr. Branom, in the Deltoid-Alex bedroom scene and the Branom-Alex

post-session scene respectively, fully understand terms like “millicent,” “viddy,” and “horrorshow.” This makes it clear to the viewers that they are watching a fictionalized world that they are not a part of, as everyone that we see can understand this foreign speech just fine, while the viewer is left having to use context and visuals. This is a break from one of the discursive techniques of the novel, and with no clarification that Nadsat is based on Russian, most of the anti-communist connotations are lost.

Shaping the Discourse

Kubrick takes the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse created by Burgess and blends the discourses relevant to him together with it. Two major features of the discourse that Burgess establishes remain in the film adaptation, being core to the work itself: the oppressive government’s trying to control the populace and the violent youth culture. However, these are transformed along with the novel. In chapter two, we saw that the people writing about *A Clockwork Orange* increased over tenfold after Kubrick released his film, meaning that unlike Burgess’s original, this instance of the discourse serves as the base for many adaptations and translations, with the novel as ancillary. How then does Kubrick shape the discourse?

Alex is a much more relatable character in the film, not in the sense that we see ourselves in him, but in that we can see Alex in the people around us, especially in America at the time Kubrick was making the film. Alex is a typical teenager in all sorts of ways: he wears fashionable clothing, listens to music, likes to hang out with his friends, has a cocky attitude about things he knows nothing about, sees himself as right, and flippantly disregards any responsibility for his actions. The only thing that sets Alex apart from the teenagers that we encounter in our daily lives is that Alex is a murderer and a rapist, who gets enjoyment from the

suffering of others. Kubrick has changed Alex from a representation of hidden communism and free will to a stand-in for youth in general.

Kubrick also takes Burgess's claim that reformation is not possible without maturity and the desire to change and cuts it down to simply "reformation is not possible." By not including the final chapter in the film, Alex closes out the film with the ominous threat of "I was cured alright," after the failure of the Ludovico treatment to have any real lasting effect. Kubrick instead instills the discourse with the idea that "law and order" may be necessary to curtail crime, but it is not possible in a corrupt system where bureaucracy hinders the process and the police are filled with those who need to be punished. He does not, however, advocate attacks on the ideologies of the youth (possibly a nod to hippies), as we see no real change when Alex has his favorite music taken from him. He still wishes to enact violence, he simply cannot at the time. A further political transformation to the discourse is the shift from anti-totalitarianism to the more specific anti-Nazism/fascism. With all of the Nazi imagery in the film used to address authoritarianism, the film strongly encourages the viewer to pull in connotations associated with Nazis throughout the film. Because fascism and authoritarianism are a part of the connotations we ascribe to Nazis, the viewer is prone to expand these connotations to the government or anything else that could fit into the schema. This changes the Minister of the Interior from a stand-in for any quasi-authoritarian regime when he mentions things like needing room in prisons for political prisoners to a stand-in for Nazism, further exacerbated by Alex's uniform while in prison.

Aside from directly political statements, Kubrick also adopts some changes to the discourse related to control, although it is in self-constructed systems of control. By including so much sexual violence, nudity, and sex in the film, Kubrick pushed back against the MPAA's

seemingly arbitrary rules. The film itself is a statement for freedom, but unlike Burgess's discourse of free will versus control, it is one of free speech versus censorship. The discourse shifts to become one of throwing off all of the systems that limit or oppress us. It forces us to ask ourselves why we impose the restrictions that we do and not others, and it asks Americans directly "Why violence, but not nudity?"

CHAPTER 4. KREGE'S 1997 GERMAN TRANSLATION

Krege's translation of *A Clockwork Orange* differs in Kubrick's adaptation in that it is limited to the goals of translation. Munday explains that since the 1950s and 1960s, translation has had the goal of translation "equivalence," although even this is not clear, as we must consider what "equivalence" actually *is* (59). Equivalence is so complicated and discussed that Munday dedicates an entire chapter (chapter three) to defining what it is and is not. To put it briefly, translation should seek to translate the meaning and cultural contexts when possible, rather than simply translating word for word with no care taken to address difficulties that the persons interacting with the translation may have. An example of this is in the episode "#6" of the Japanese cartoon, *Pop Team Epic*, where the Japanese tactical board game pieces from *shougi* are translated into *chess* equivalents in the subtitles. The English-speaking audience, who are not familiar with game-pieces with names that translate into "dragon king" or "dragon horse," are presented with the names of more familiar chess pieces. Krege, as a translator, cannot change the overall plot and cannot add or remove scenes like Kubrick, but despite these limitations, we can still see how he might affect the discourse and how the discourse may vary in Germany.

Exigencies and Discourse

Perhaps one of the biggest factors in all of the discourses surrounding *A Clockwork Orange* from the 1980s to today is, in fact, Kubrick's film adaptation, possibly even more so than the original novel. As opposed to the poor sales of Burgess's novel, Kubrick's adaptation had a larger following (see chapter two and chapter three respectively for more precise figures), and if a person is familiar with only either the novel or the film, they are much more likely to have knowledge of the film. We can see the influence of Kubrick's adaptation on every translation and adaptation that has come since, by looking at elements such as structure, visuals,

content, etc. Although there have been many adaptations between the film and Krege's translation, we will only look at those that may have had some influence on his interpretation or on the culture/discourse in which his translation was produced and presented.

Oddly enough, one of the most significant adaptations of *A Clockwork Orange* on German culture, especially youth culture, in the post-Kubrick discourse was a 1988 rock album by Die Toten Hosen titled *Ein kleines bisschen Horrorschau* (A Little Bit Horrorshow), especially the song "Hier kommt Alex" (Here Comes Alex). The album itself was the result of Die Toten Hosen working with Theater Bonn to produce a stage adaptation of *A Clockwork Orange*, where Die Toten Hosen would set the mood for certain scenes with rock songs (Maack, translation mine). "Hier kommt Alex" was a hit in Germany and is well known today: Maack sums up how widespread it is, saying that "today even every single bank employee can yell along to 'Hier kommt Alex,'" but what exactly is it that entered into the shared cultural knowledge when this song spread? To answer that, we will need to briefly look at the lyrics of the song.

"Hier kommt Alex" establishes the world of *A Clockwork Orange* for the rest of the album and was clearly the opening song for the stage adaptation. Its first verse complains about a "world in which people only live" and explains that all society does is work, here the German Nadsat word "*roboten*," and watch television in the evenings (Die Toten Hosen, translation mine). The verse moves on to give us some hope that this mechanical life of only working and consuming can be broken: "a few youths are frustrated," "they group up in small gangs/ go together on the prowl." At this point in the song, the initial soft vocals become shouting and the lone, soft guitar becomes harsh and is accompanied by the full band. The refrain is a simple, albeit catchy:

Hey, here comes Alex!

Curtains up—for his horrorshow.

Hey, here comes Alex!

Curtains up—for a little bit (of) horrorshow.

The refrain calls back to both the song and album titles and incorporates a dual meaning for the Nadsat term “horrorshow,” using its literal English meaning of “horror show” and the Nadsat meaning of “great” or “wonderful.” The next two verses emphasize the violence of the Nadsat-speakers, or “Droogs,” with lines including their celebration of “destruction, / violence and brutality,” the contentment they get from the suffering of their victims, and the reality that “there is no longer anything that could stop them/ in their merciless rage.” By the time we get to the last verse, we directly see the “next victim” cry out to God, “Why haven’t you done anything?” We see that, although the song clearly lays out their violence and sadism, the Nadsat-speakers are not given any direct blame; rather they are presented as symptoms of corrupt and ineffectual systems in which they live: their society and religion.

It is true that “Hier kommt Alex” helped to bring this angry frustration against the systems in place into the wider social consciousness, but it did not start the discourse; the release of *Ein kleines bisschen Horroschau* merely expanded the discourse of the German youth counterculture to the rest of Germany in a way that was socially acceptable. Punks, the German youth counterculture at the time, were very different from Kubrick’s contemporary American hippies. Marcus tells us that the punk movement was “a response to unemployment, to middle-class lifestyles, ethics, and privilege, and to cultural boredom,” originating in England and embodying “the negation of social norms, of cultural aesthetics, and of the self, with an ever escalating shock therapy” (qtd. in Simpson 129). Punks wanted to rebel against society and often

did so in disruptive or destructive ways. The lead singer of Die Toten Hosen, Campino, who considered himself a punk at the time, recalls that when he first went to see Kubrick's film adaptation, it was not with the intent to watch it; he and his friends were going to do one of their regular activities: entering crowded theaters, shouting "Fire!" at some point in the film, and spraying the room with fire extinguishers (qtd. in Maack). Chaos and destruction, not violence against innocent people, is what most German punks were all about. When Germans in 1997 read or watched adaptations of *A Clockwork Orange*, it is likely that some of the associations with punks would come into their mind. For the "Establishment" Germans, this may not have changed how they interact with the text, but for punks, Alex was not some young delinquent performing nonsensical acts of violence; he was them.

Punks saw themselves in Alex, even if they did not agree with everything that they saw him doing in Kubrick's film and the novel translations. Campino says that for punks, *A Clockwork Orange* was "an absolute cult classic," "It was our film" (qtd. in Maack). He and other punks went to theaters to see the film many times and took every opportunity to quote the film, and Campino himself "wore steel-toed Doc Marten boots for ten years straight" to match the "Droogs" in the film. Even if only a handful of German punks went as crazy for *A Clockwork Orange* as Campino and his community of punks, his obsession with the film and his interpretation of Alex is the one that spread, due mostly to the success of *Ein kleines bisschen Horrorschau*. Although Campino and his cohort mimicked the Nadsat-speakers they saw, they did not emulate all aspects of Nadsat-speaker culture. As previously stated, German punks were more concerned with destruction of property and sowing chaos than real violence. When asked about whether punks would do the things Alex did Campino says, "We would lay into stuff like streetlights, telephone booths, and cars. We would have never attacked some random guy just

passing by. That was completely against our ethics” (qtd. in Maack). Campino and the others found Alex to be “brilliant” and “charismatic” but also “twisted” and “inhuman.” They may have sympathized with Alex, but they “never really would have wanted to be like him” (qtd. in Maack).

Punks were not the only aggressive youth movement in the German cultural consciousness; there was also the Red Army Faction (RAF). The RAF was a soviet-aligned terrorist group that carried out bombings and other attacks in the 70s and 80s, having killed thirty-four people by the time it was dissolved (Scribner 1-2). The RAF was clearly very different from their punk contemporaries, but their connection to the USSR means that reading a fictional story about violent youths with a tenuous connection to Russia was not very fictitious to Germans in 1997; that was history. To make these connotations more likely to be drawn, Scribner explains that the RAF created their own sub-dialect distinct from other German dialects around them (2), and this is similar to Nadsat.

Although we have been talking about the German discourses and exigencies that could have impacted Krege’s 1997 translation, from the end of WWII until 1990 there was no one German state; there were two. As a result of the treaties enacted at the end of the war, Germany and the city of Berlin were split into four parts, each under the control of a different nation: the United States, France, the UK, and the USSR. The three divisions under US, UK, and French control would form the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), more commonly known as West Germany, and the USSR section would become the separate German Democratic Republic (GDR), also known as East Germany. During this separation, the two Germanies would come to form their own identities, have their own discourses, and navigate their own ideologies: the FRG was capitalist, and the GDR was communist. There are too many events that created many

different discourses and which prompted so many other events to really discuss in detail here, but the most major event is that of the creation of the Berlin Wall, which divided East and West Berlin. The Berlin Wall was only one of many other walls and border control measures implemented by the GDR government, but the Berlin Wall is unique in that it became a symbol of German division, prompting discourses and exigent events in both the FRG and the GDR. Its symbolic power was so strong that the destruction of the Wall in 1989 made any attempts to prevent reunification impossible: to Germans, and indeed the rest of the world, after the fall of the Wall, Germany was whole again.

One year after the reunification of Germany, the USSR would completely dissolve, and the Cold War would come to an end. This means that Germans like Krege now lived in a completely different world than the one that prompted the original novel and even the one of Kubrick's adaptation. Compounding this was that 1997 is not that far removed from the German reunification, and Germans were still navigating what it means to be one people again. You cannot simply merge two cultures back together overnight, especially with almost fifty years of independent cultural development inside two different political ideologies. This different world was also shaped by cultural movements that are uniquely German, specifically *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (coming to terms with one's own past).

Vergangenheitsbewältigung is, at its core, a type of critical remembrance, rather than passively thinking back on the past. Fritzsche explains it well, saying that *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is the use of memories, especially culturally shared memories, as "critical tools of self-reflection" (29). This is deeply ingrained in the German ethos as a result of Germany's actions during WWII, particularly the Holocaust. Fritzsche claims that its connection with German culture stems from the way Germany used narratives as part of their historicization

after WWII (29). Because *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is woven into the fabric of German identity, any media produced or consumed in Germany with links to the past will be filtered through it: “There is a general acceptance of the idea that German history cannot rest, and this...creates the basis for a self-reflective and critical appraisal of the past” (Fritzsche 38).

One last effect to consider from the fall of the wall and the unification of a Germany that had close ties with America and England and a Germany with close ties to the USSR into one Germany is that of language familiarity. Most Germans, especially younger Germans, living in a reunified Germany would be familiar in some degree with either English or Russian, and possibly both (Kuntz; Maack). Because Nadsat is a combination of a Cockney rhyming slang, Russian, and registers like baby talk, translating the Nadsat in the novel into German would leave options including these: leaving everything as is, choosing another language to use as the base for Nadsat-Russian, and using a German dialect as the basis for Nadsat-Cockney. This may seem like a non-issue, but every decision affects the way the reader interacts with the translation and what power structures are enforced. Leaving everything “as is” means that the reader may not be as oblivious to what is happening in the earlier parts of the novel, as the reader might be able to correlate some, or all, of the Nadsat they read to the languages they know (see chapter two for how the original novel uses Nadsat to hinder the reader). Using another dialect of German as the basis for the Nadsat-Cockney could translate the original intent behind the use of Cockney rhyming slang, if the intent is to make the argot eerily familiar, but would inadvertently push all of the connotations associated with Nadsat-speakers onto the dialect group selected. Using another language would do much the same to another group, but it would also be difficult to match the intent behind using Russian as the language of the violent youth groups: the Cold War was over, the “red scare” was gone, and the USSR was no more. Krege chooses to maintain

the Russian base for the argot and also leaves the English mainly untouched, which I explore in further detail in the following section.

Techniques and Power

As mentioned in chapter one, German requires for any translation of “you” from English to be turned into either the formal *Sie* or informal *du/ihr*. This does not take into consideration any archaic forms of address, but luckily, they do not show up in Krege’s translation. To help understand Alex’s representation in the novel, both in how he tries to construct his identity and in how he is perceived by others, we will first need to look at how he addresses others and how they, likewise, address him. Remember, the informal terms of address do not always denote that you are close to the person you are addressing, just as the formal is not something used in formal settings. The formal address is used to denote distance and respect but is never used with intimates and is only used with strangers in special circumstances, such as in server/customer situations, but not always. Even native German speakers struggle with when to use formal and informal “you” in their daily lives, with a simple Google search of “*siezen oder duzen*” (to use formal you or to use informal you) resulting in complex charts and guides for when to use which you and how to know when you can officially transition from one to the other, sometimes with conflicting information. Despite this, we can still look at when Alex uses the formal or informal “you” and examine the power structures he encodes when he does so.

We see that Alex initially uses *Sie* when trying to gain access to his older victims (the older woman in Le Manse and the writer’s wife), but that he is quick to shift to *du* when he transitions to abusing them (29, 30, 70, 73). Krege’s Alex, like Burgess’s, tries to be a social chameleon, using more polite speech to convince his victims that he is no harm to them and then dropping his social mask when he no longer needs it. For Alex’s face-to-face victims he gives no

pretense of politeness, using *du* immediately with the man coming out of the library, even going so far as to address him as “my brother” (13), despite the man’s age and unfamiliarity with them. Alex uses *du* here for much the same reason he uses *Sie* with his other older victims, to exert a sort of power. By being so familiar with the man while out at night, the man surely knowing that delinquents are about at night, is immediately unsettling. His other face-to-face victims are not so disturbed by his use of *du*, however, considering that they are ten years old (54). Here Alex is merely using the form of address expected and helping to create a sense of comfort and familiarity.

Alex is also particular with his terms of address for those who hold power over him. Alex uses *Sie* with Deltoid, the prison chaplain, the Minister of the Interior, and the doctors overseeing his Ludovico treatment (Krege 47, 99, 127). Rarely do we see instances where he shifts into addressing these people with *du*, but when he does, we can look at what Alex hopes to achieve by doing so, if anything. When Alex shifts from formal to informal with Dr. Branom and Dr. Brodsky, we see that he is under distress, and he is insulting them. Compare “Ausschalten, ihr krachnigen Schufte, ich halt’s nicht mehr aus!” (Turn it off, you grahzny villians, I can’t take it anymore!) with “Sie machen irgendwas, damit mir schlecht wird” (You are doing *something*, to make me ill) (130, 133). Both of these are addressed to the doctors in the same scene/chapter, but the first uses the informal, while the second uses the formal. The insult is caused by Alex’s realization that he is also being conditioned against music, something he views as a core aspect of his identity, while the other is an answer to a question asking for clarification. Because Alex is thinking about his response, he falls back into the use of *Sie*, hoping that it will get him more clout in the social interaction. Alex’s use of *du* with the Minister of the Interior is, however, not the result of any immediate distress. Alex instead seems to be using *du* aggressively, much like

when he interacts with his victims. When he is told to be more respectful, he responds with “Jarbels, bolschig dicke Jarblotzkis dir und den deinen!” (Yarbels, bolshy fat yarblockos to you and yours!) (203). It seems that *du* is Alex’s natural state for everyone, only shifting to *Sie* when he feels he might benefit from doing so, not out of any real respect. This use of “you” helps to establish Alex as bucking social norms.

Since the original novel’s Alex uses *thou* quite a bit to color Alex’s speech, but German still uses *du* today, looking at how Krege chooses to translate these parts provides insight, as he will need to determine what function the use of *thou* serves and recreate it in his version of the novel without simply translating it. We can look at two examples to establish a precedent for how Krege approaches this, comparing the original to the translation. Most instances seem to be ignored in translation, especially when the use of *thou* appears with other archaisms, such as when Alex and his droogs attack the writer and his wife. Burgess writes, “If fear thou hast in thy heart, O brother, pray banish it forthwith” (25), which Krege translates almost exactly into, “So du im Herzen Furcht trägst, verbanne sie fortan” (30), translating *thou* into *du* and moving the “O brother” to the previous sentence. Other times, Krege replaces *thou* with statements of familiarity, such as when Alex lashes out in pain after going through a round of Ludovico treatment. Burgess writes, “Shut it, thou” (120), which is transformed into “Schnauze, mein Freund!” (Shut it, my friend) (125). In this way, Krege maintains Alex as someone on the fringe of social expectations but changes the context for his distance. Alex is not using archaisms as part of Nadsat; he is lashing out harshly and then calling those he lashes out against friend, even when he is doing so reflexively. This Alex does not fully understand how discourse is expected to be carried out and must think on the complex social structure he is navigating to perform his role well.

There is also a change in Alex's use of archaisms. In the original novel, archaisms such as *thou* and the ever-popular appending of *-eth* to the ends of words is a normal part of Alex's speech when he is speaking in Nadsat, but they are not present in the speech of other Nadsat-speakers, meaning that this is not a requirement of membership, but rather a unique part of Alex's idiolect. Krege expands Alex's use of archaic and poetic speech beyond that of the original Alex. One example of this is, again, when Alex is assaulting the writer and his wife. Burgess writes, "'It's a book,' I said. 'It's a book what you are writing'" (25), which Krege turns into, "'Mich dünkt, das ist ein Buch,'" sagte ich. 'Ein Buch, woran du schreibst'" ("Methinks it is a book," I said. "A book, what/which you are writing") (31). Alex here is supposed to style shift to his standard dialect, and by using archaic speech, Krege establishes that said speech is Alex's dialect.

Alex, in Krege's translation, uses fewer Nadsat terms than his original counterpart. Most of this is in narrative sections, but Krege is careful to not fully erase the Nadsat. In the final chapter, Alex says that the "wind was sharp like a nozh" ("scharf wie ein Nosch") (Krege 211), which matches the original (Burgess 206), but the rest of the Nadsat is replaced. Burgess writes on the same page about "lewdies," "rozzes," "viddy[ing]," "millicents," which Krege turns into "Leute," "Polizisten," "sah," and "Bullen" (people, police officers, saw, and "cops" respectively). None of this is outside of the knowledge of a German reader, as all of the words except "Bullen," which is everyday slang, are standard German. This further removes some of the difficulty the reader has in understanding Alex, making him more like Kubrick's "could be anyone" Alex without fully committing to it. This could be because Krege cannot allow the reader to draw their own conclusions as to what the limited Nadsat terms mean from the context of what they see because everything they are presented with comes as narrative from Alex.

Krege would have to vastly change Alex's narrative voice and speaking voice to accomplish something similar to what Kubrick does, but cannot do so and remain faithful to the novel.

Most of the Nadsat that is left in the novel is transliterated to German from, it appears, the Russian root forms and not the English pronunciation. We can see this in words like "Tschelluffjek" (Albrecht 220), "Jastik" (220), and "Geteuse" (Krege 25), which map onto Burgess's "chelloveck" (5), "yazhick" (140), and "dratsing" (19) accordingly. Aside from the changes made to the Russian-originating words, Albrecht's glossary shows that there are no major changes to words of English origin, again with some exceptions to make the words read easier, such as "Scharries" (223). The one notable exception to these rules is "horrorshow" (220). This word remains unchanged like we would expect for an English word, but the origin is the Russian word for "good." This allows the connotation of "horror show" to remain, but also reminds the reader of Kubrick's film, further establishing it as the discourse's base.

Because this translation is in German, we must also consider the changes in connotations for the readers and how power structures may have affected the way Krege addresses the material, if at all. To start with, we can look at how Krege tries to establish the government presented in the book as Soviet in some way and avoids establishing the world as existing in a completely fascist state like during Nazi Germany. It should be noted that the German prison system is different than its American and, at the time, British counterparts: in German prisons, prisoners have private rooms and are afforded more freedom and responsibility ("Life of a Prison"). This difference means that Krege has to translate something that seems unlikely in the current Germany using words which may lack all of the connotations present in the English version. Krege translates the word "cellmates" (Burgess 97) to "Zellengenosse" (cell comrades) (103). The use of "Genosse" here carries connotations of the USSR, as this was the term used in

Germany for addressing members of the communist party. The word “bunk” (Burgess 97) poses a different problem, due to the aforementioned single occupancy rooms of German prisons. Krege chooses the word “Koje” (103), which does translate to a type of bunk, but it is more of a nautical term, according to *Duden* (“Koje, die”), or simply a colloquial term for bed, meaning that it brings odd connotations that the English lacks and loses some of the connotations of overfilled prison cells that “bunk” could bring. Regardless of how pervasive the overcrowded state of the prison is, Krege makes sure to associate it with communism and the GDR.

Despite these attempts to establish communist themes, the connotations that come with the idea of experimenting on imprisoned people for the good of society clearly bring with it any associations the reader has about the Nazis, including *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. Alex is shown many films while undergoing his Ludovico treatment, including Nadsat-speakers attacking and raping people and war footage of Imperialist Japanese and Nazis committing atrocities (Krege 131-2, 136, 138). Of particular note, however, is that Alex’s greatest reaction comes during one of the Nazi scenes. Alex says that he was forced to watch Nazi officers line up emaciated prisoners in a concentration camp against a wall, shoot them, and then drag more away to be beaten while they screamed (Burgess 127; Krege 131-2). Krege translates this faithfully but adds in a crucial detail that brings with it images of the mass burials and piles of bodies left after the murder of over six million people: “ghastly [naked bodies] were stacked in the gutter” (gräßliche [nackte Körper] am Rinnstein gestapelt wurden). This small detail encodes the work with some *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and makes the scene so much more vivid. Because of this encoding, the scene can almost be read as forcing *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* onto Alex as part of his treatment. He is no longer just being conditioned against acts of

violence; he is now being conditioned against Nazism, rather than given the material and asked to critically think on it, as is more traditionally the concept of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

Further inclusion of Nazi related discourse through the connotations that German readers bring with them is the appropriation of culture to serve their needs. True, this is a part of the actual novel, but the way that German readers would approach this is different than those of English-speaking readers, again due to *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. The Nazis were very keen on claiming art and culture to serve their needs as a way of legitimizing their rule over Germany and their attempts to conquer Europe (Watt 871-2). Because of the government's appropriation of classical music to meet their own ends, and because this usage "corrupts" the art that is used, meaning that Alex cannot stand to hear the music without becoming sick, we can draw parallels to the Nazis and their "corruption" of the art they associate with them. An example of this is the Swastika, whose origin everyone seems to be aware of today. This symbol was, and still is, used as a symbol of Buddhism, yet we are repulsed and angered by the sight of it, despite knowing its other usage. Because Kubrick's film, with all of its Nazi symbology, establishes the discourse before Krege, the translation again aligns with the anti-Nazi contexts of the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse.

We can also see that Krege's translation is affected by Kubrick's adaptation through the way Alex is referred to in prison. In the film, Alex's name is taken from him, and he becomes "six **double**-five three two one" (Prison Intake Scene; emphasis added), having one fewer number than Burgess's original of "6655321" (86). Krege does not remove a number like Kubrick; rather Krege's reference to Kubrick is much more obvious to anyone who has seen the film. When Alex initially tells us that his name has been taken and replaced with a number, it matches Burgess's exactly, "6655321" (92), but when any character addresses him, we are

presented with “sechsechsdoppelfünfdreizwoeins” (sixsixdoublefivethreetwoone) and not the numerically written 6655321 (95; emphasis added). Burgess never writes out the number in the original, using only the numerals “6655231” (89), so we see that Krege is recognizing the cultural power of Kubrick’s adaptation over that of the novel by making sure that the reader will read Alex’s prisoner number in a manner similar to the way it is presented in the film. We are also able to determine that Krege has, indeed, watched the film, as he would be unable to have made this connection otherwise.

Shaping the Discourse

Because this is a translation, it is not possible for Krege to have as much control on the discourse as someone creating an adaptation, being limited in what he can do. Despite this limitation, we do see that Krege’s choices affect the way we interact with his instance of the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse, and although, we cannot say for certain whether the publication of his translation of the novel is the exigency that prompts others to take part in and add to the discourse, we can still look at how he shapes this instance and what that might mean. Also note that we cannot be sure whether any of the decisions outside of translation choices were made by Krege, and even his translations would likely have gone through an editor for approval. Regardless of these uncertainties, we will assume that this instance of the discourse is the result of Krege’s efforts.

Krege, or the publisher, includes a six-page glossary of Nadsat terms at the end of the novel by Katy Albrecht. Including this with the translation means that the reader can understand Alex from the very beginning, if they are willing to put in the little effort required to flip back and forth to the glossary. The reader no longer relies on Alex to slowly initiate them into the Nadsat-speaker discourse community and, because of this, could potentially never become a part

of the community. Similar to Kubrick's changes to Alex, the way the reader relates to Alex is different. He is no longer someone on the same level as us, despite his trying to woo us with calls of "O my brother"; he is a character in a fictional world. It is true that German readers at the time, especially those in what was the GDR, would be able to understand Alex with little issue, but any others will now have the tool of the glossary. Every time that we pause the story to look up a term to recontextualize what we are reading, we are reminded that we are doing just that—reading. We are taken out of the story when we encounter Nadsat terms we do not understand, rather than being pulled in, as in the original. This breaks an expectation of dystopia. A dystopian work should be believable to the point that it engrosses you, but now *A Clockwork Orange* straddles the border.

Additionally, it is clear from all of the references and inclusions in the translation that Krege wants to maintain the discourse surrounding anti-Nazism established by Kubrick. We see that Krege does try to encode the work with the idea that the state is communist in some way, but because of the connotations of authoritarian regimes for the whole of Germany, he must accept that his work will talk to both communism and Nazism. This is important and a Nazi state and a communist state are both historical realities to Germany: the "Third Reich" and the GDR. Krege's choice in the way some of the translations come across tries to incorporate the idea of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into the novel. The work loses some of its dystopian "edge" because of this, but that is not a bad thing for a reader who has grown up in a culture nurtured on the realistic depictions of the aftermath of people like the Nazis (*Trümmerliteratur*) and the strong desire to reflect on their past. Combining these socio-cultural discourses into the originally British novel over thirty years from the original publication changes the message from "never" to

“never again.” Germans do not need to imagine what could happen if an authoritarian government took over the nation - they lived it.

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

The Discourse Today

We have explored how the authors who create instances of the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse incorporate the power structures and discourses around them in an attempt to shape those discourses or create new ones, such as when Burgess created his novel. Popularity and how widespread a particular instance of the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse is seem to determine the weight that it carries in the overall discourse of *A Clockwork Orange* and the larger discourses surrounding it, as we see in Krege's translation, which uses imagery and rhetoric from Kubrick's film adaptation, despite being a translation of the original novel. These instances of this discourse are not endpoints for the discourse, of course, and so to see how they have withstood the test of time, meaning whether the shape they left the discourse in is reinforced or reimagined by later creators' taking part in the discourse, we must look to the way that *A Clockwork Orange* is used today. This will, however, not be a conclusive study of these instances of the discourse, but an overview.

Firstly, we must look at whether the *A Clockwork Orange* continues to be a discourse or medium of discourse today, and luckily, the answer to this is very easy to find. A Google search for "A Clockwork Orange" returns, as of 19 March 2020, 31.5 million web results and over one million videos. There is even a Wikipedia page dedicated to cultural references of *A Clockwork Orange* that is divided into eight separate content sections, ranging from "Fashion" to "Video Games" ("List of Cultural"), and it does not even list them all. So, *A Clockwork Orange* remains, but does its discourse? From the references to *A Clockwork Orange* we see today, it is obvious that Alex is now the most used rhetorical element, specifically McDowell as Kubrick's visualization of Alex. Simply doing a Google Image search of "A Clockwork Orange" results in

image after image of Alex as portrayed by McDowell: there are posters of Alex, stills from the movie that feature Alex centrally, artwork that features Alex, and Alex action figures, and what few of the results are not Alex are recreations of scenes featuring Alex or homages to Alex. Alex no longer seems to be just a young man abused by systems of authoritarian control; Alex is a cultural icon and a symbol for all of the oppressed, but he is also a symbol of pop culture at this point.

Alex as a pop culture icon does not seem to retain much of the discourse established by those who came before the works of today. When he is not being used as a general symbol of pop culture itself, often as a reference to film, these versions of Alex seem to just be a way of encoding “bad boy” or “teenage rebellion” onto the work or person using the symbol. For an example of the “bad boy” usage, we can look to the 1992 Halloween episode of *The Simpsons* where the character Bart is dressed as Kubrick’s Alex for Halloween (Maack). Anyone familiar with *The Simpsons* knows that Bart is a young troublemaker and delinquent, and his costume here seems to be nothing more than an acknowledgment of this to the audience. There is no deeper connection to discourses of control versus free will or rebellion against oppression: Bart is a delinquent; Alex is a delinquent. Similarly, we have the use of Alex’s image as a way of “shouting out” to the pop culture icons that came before us. Rihanna’s costume in her video for “You Da One,” as an example of pop culture reference for the sake of reference, is heavily influenced by Alex’s iconic outfit. Again, there is no statement aside from “*A Clockwork Orange* is cool, and I look like Alex, so I am cool.” When you listen to the lyrics of her song, the connection between Alex and the song can even be a little off-putting, considering it is a love song, and Alex is a rapist.

In contrast to these uses of the symbol of Alex, we have the Alex who stands for counterculture and the oppressed. We can see, just looking at the Wikipedia article for cultural references, that both popular genre bands and many punk and rock bands like to use imagery or references to *A Clockwork Orange* and Alex. What makes rock and punk bands stand out from those of more popular genres is that they are not just using Alex as a means to reference pop culture, although there is, no doubt, some degree of this in their intention; they are embracing the symbolic meaning of outsider that exists within Alex and *A Clockwork Orange*. Marilyn Manson's video for his song "Tattooed in Reverse," uses Alex for his rebellious and violent connotations. Manson is dressed much more similarly to Alex than Rihanna is in her video for "You Da One" and appears beaten, and the lyrics of the song support the statement that he is trying to make with Alex's imagery. The song's refrain is "I'm unstable, I'm not a show horse/ I can't be bridled, of course" and the line "fuck your Bible and your Babel" is repeated in many verses. This Alex stands against outside of the systems our society holds important, such as religion, and openly says to the viewer, "You can't control me." We see, then, that while popular culture has appropriated and diluted the meaning attached to *A Clockwork Orange*, countercultures have rallied behind the rebelliousness and free will attached to the discourse, although neither of these uses seem to have retained any political meaning outside "screw society."

For the most part, however, we can apply Horkheimer and Adorno's concept of "culture industry" to the way Alex and *A Clockwork Orange* are used in the entertainment industry today. Although there are various aspects to the idea culture industry, the most prevalent aspect here is that of stripping away the meaning from art until all that is left is consumer marketability. Horkheimer et. al. explain this concept thusly:

For consumers the use value of art, its essence, is a fetish, and the fetish—the social valuation which they mistake for the merit of works of art—becomes its only use value, the only quality they enjoy. In this way the commodity character of art disintegrates just as it is fully realized. Art becomes a species of commodity, worked up and adapted to industrial production, saleable and exchangeable... (128)

The image of Alex is used to reference a popular film; the film's message and the context in which the film and the character exist is meaningless to their inclusion in works of pop culture. When works such as these do include Alex or *A Clockwork Orange*, they are not doing so to take part in the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse, nor are they using the established discourse as a means of legitimizing another discourse. These works are merely scavenging tokens of consumerist value from the art, leaving all of the meaning behind. This is, of course, not true of all of the aforementioned examples where Alex is used: Marilyn Manson uses Alex as a symbol of counterculture and nonconformity. Even this use, however, take only one or two of the encoded elements into consideration when appropriating the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse.

This is not to say that all of the political meaning has been stripped from Alex and, therefore, the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse. We still see Alex used to make a stand against the ideals of Nazism, as solidified by Kubrick, and an example of this, oddly enough, is in the German soccer fan group "Droogs 99," who are quite clear about their interpretation of *A Clockwork Orange* and how they incorporate this into their own discourse community. One of the core tenets of Droogs 99 is that their members not just be against racism, but also protest and fight against racism and racists. This fan group uses iconography of Alex all throughout their website, when they go to events, and in their costuming. For them, Alex is a symbol against hatred, as evidenced in a button of Alex beating up a white nationalist surrounded by the words

“Good night white pride.” Alex, thanks to Die Toten Hosen, is still a punk in Germany and has maintained Kubrick’s discourse.

Despite the appropriation of Alex and *A Clockwork Orange* by the “culture industry” today, we see that some of the original meaning still remains and that this discourse has been incorporated into group identities. “How strong is this remaining discourse” is, however, not a simple question to answer. The main culture has left nothing but the general feeling of delinquent/bad boy to its interpretation, which is in-line with Kubrick’s reinterpretation of Alex: Alex is a bad person because that is just who he is and is incapable of reform. There is no meaningful context to their use of Alex, however, and the more lucrative countercultures (e.g. major rock music bands/labels) are not much better at authentically using the elements from the discourse, simply adding “who is against the mainstream society” to their use of the delinquent/bad boy interpretation. While the subcultures, such as Droogs 99, do seem to maintain most of the discourse’s meaning and continue to use and shape the discourse, they have little social power. All of this culminates in the answer “Yes, the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse still exists and is being used, but it is, for the most part, stripped of either meaning or power, depending on who is choosing to use it.”

This Research and the Future

The original intention for this paper was to do a discourse analysis of the fictional argot Nadsat as presented in the original work, Kubrick’s adaptation, and a German translation. This, however, requires much more specialized research than was possible at the time and is, therefore, beyond the scope of this paper. Further difficulties arose in trying to connect the multiple parts of the paper together as I learned more about translation theory and adaptation studies. These are the major reasons that my research goals shifted to look at the overall discourse into which *A*

Clockwork Orange fits by looking at each of the works as instances of the discourse, meaning that I was now moving into the territory of a critical discourse analysis. Knowing this, I decided on the questions listed in chapter one as a guide to see how the discourse formed and morphed over time and culture. Because of the shift to looking at the whole discourse of *A Clockwork Orange*, I was not able to look as closely at Nadsat as originally intended. The research I conducted here is also fairly broad, serving as more of an overview of the discourse itself and examining how its forms shifts, with little in-depth analysis into particular characteristics of the internal parts that help to construct the discourse, choosing to look at the meta-level factors in play.

This paper shows that there is value in looking at critical literature, such as dystopian works, as part of larger discourses. While it is true that every work is influenced by the social structures and culture that exist at the time of its creation, regardless of whether it is produced purely for financial gain or with the intention of making a statement, works that are intended to respond to these exigencies offer the chance to see how an author tries to shape these discourses and how this newly created or shaped discourse carries forward through time. We see that Burgess encodes much of his British culture and the political rhetoric and fears of his time into his novel, *A Clockwork Orange*, and that this work serves as an entry point for other authors who want to respond to their own unique cultures and histories in ways that overlap with what Burgess has established. By using this novel as a base, the authors are recognizing the inherent value in the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse and the instances of this discourse that existed before them, modifying it over time. By looking at these changes, we can see how different cultures, times, languages, and media affect the original discourse and are able to explore what this might

mean in larger contexts. We see, then, what values these authors hold, what they fear, what they want to impart on the world, and more.

Because my research changed so much over the course of this paper, I am able to make many recommendations for future research that uses these or other works in the *A Clockwork Orange* discourse or intends to look at other literature as a discourse within a larger socio-cultural discourse. I have chosen to include some of the research possibilities that prove most interesting to me and possibilities that could continue my work here. I provide a small explanation below, but first list them here: 1) a CDA/DA of Alex's speech within a single work or across multiple works, 2) a comparison of the American and "global" versions of the novel and how they shape and are shaped by cultural values, 3) an exploration of how this discourse has been appropriated by various culture industries, and 4) using the methods from this paper to explore the discourse of the dystopian genre or other literary discourses.

While researching, it was clear that Alex is not actually a good representative for the Nadsat-speaker discourse community. Alex does use the Nadsat argot and perform a Nadsat-speaker identity, but his idiolect is distinct from the other instances of Nadsat-speakers. This difference means that we must conclude that either Alex or his "droogs" have unique features to their language, setting them apart from the rest. As Alex's speech includes all of the features of the other Nadsat-speakers, of which there are three, with additional idiosyncrasies, we must accept that he, and not they, is the "atypical" for the group. Looking into which features are shared, which are distinctly "Alex," and how Alex and the others interact with each other and outsiders would be a good starting point for a CDA/DA of Alex, varying mostly in the focus/approach.

For the research prompt of looking at the American and Global versions of the novel, most of the focus would be on the exclusion of the twenty-first chapter from the American version. It would be possible to look at just the American and British versions, but this could be expanded to look at various translated versions, as well. Some areas to look at would be how the differences in the novels correlate to culture or power structures, how these differences propagate these structures, how the readers interact with the texts, and how readers interact with a film that seems to be missing a chapter. This would be similar to the contents of this paper, but more focused, looking at only one difference.

The research possibility of how culture industries appropriate this discourse would simply be an extension of this paper's conclusion. Research for this could compile influential/successful appropriations of the discourse and look at what remains of the discourse, if anything. A core body of work for this research would be the discourse surrounding Horkheimer and Adorno's "Culture Industry," exploring how the discourse is diluted into tropes and clichés for the sake of profitability and consumerism. It would be interesting to see what tropes exist, tracing their origins to particular works, and to compare tropes across cultures.

In a similar vein to looking at culture industry appropriation, the use of this paper's methodology to explore literary discourses would be an extension of this paper. Looking at the shaping of the dystopian genre and how individual works attempt to respond to and shape discourses would follow this paper's structure closely, although it would be important to see how the genre is shaped by those authors who use it. By looking at these changes, we can examine the genre itself as a type of discourse, or at least think of the authors as part of a larger "dystopian writer" discourse community. Each change or refusal to use a convention of the genre reshapes it to the needs of the authors and changes it for the authors who will come. It could also prove

interesting to see how these changes correlate to scholarly definitions of dystopia: what *must* remain for it to still be a dystopian work? With so many options for possible future research, I suppose the real question is simply “What’s it going to be then, eh?”

WORKS CITED

- Absolute History. "The Simple Mistakes That Killed 1950s Homeowners." *YouTube*, 15 March 2019, www.youtube.com/watch?v=EauvwU2iWFI.
- Aidinlou, Nader Assadi, et. al. "Ideology, Change & Power in Literature and Society: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Literary Translations." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, vol. 3, no. 6, 2014, pp. 260-271.
- Albrecht, Katy. "Glossar der Nadsat Sprache." *Clockwork Orange*, Anthony Burgess, Heyne, 1997.
- Barton, David, and Tusting, Karin. *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power, and Social Context*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Bell, Jeannine. *Hate Thy Neighbor: Move-In Violence and the Persistence of Racial Segregation in American Housing*. NYU Press, 2013.
- "Biography." *Stanley Kubrick*, Deutsches Filminstitut & Filmmuseum, www.stanleykubrick.de/en/biografie-biography. Accessed 16 March 2020.
- Bonney, Norman. *Monarchy, Religion and the State: Civil Religion in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and the Commonwealth*. Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. Norton, 1962.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." *Style in Language*, edited by T. A. Sebeok, MIT Press, 1960, pp. 253-76.
- Daniels, Hunter. "Malcolm McDowell and Leon Vitali Talk *A Clockwork Orange* on the 40th Anniversary." *Collider*, 18 May 2011, www.collider.com/malcolm-mcdowell-leon-vitali-interview-a-clockwork-orange. Accessed 24 Feb. 2020.
- Die Toten Hosen. Lyrics to "Hier kommt Alex." *Die Toten Hosen*, 1988, www.dietotenhosen.de/diskographie/songs/hier-kommt-alex.

- Droogs99*. Droogs '99 Frankfurt, www.droogs99.de/main/index.htm. Accessed 19 March 2020.
- Dybska, Aneta. "Where the War on Poverty and Black Power Meet: A Right to the City Perspective on American Urban Politics in the 1960s." *European Journal of American Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, Dec. 2015.
- Flamm, Michael W. *Law and Order: Street Crime, Civil Unrest, and the Crisis of Liberalism in the 1960s*. Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Fritzsche, Peter. "What Exactly is *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*? Narrative and Its Insufficiency in Postwar Germany." *German Memory Contests: The Quest for Identity in Literature, Film, and Discourse since 1990*, edited by Anne Fuchs et al., Boydell & Brewer, Camden House, 2006.
- Gelmis, Joseph. "An Interview With Stanley Kubrick (1969)." Excerpt from *The Film Director as Superstar*, Doubleday and Company, 1970. *Visual Memory*, www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0069.html?LMCL=S7OuBy. Accessed 30 March 2020.
- Germain, David. "McDowell's Cricket Gear Inspired 'Clockwork' Thug." *Washington Times*, 19 May 2011, www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/may/19/mcdowells-cricket-gear-inspired-clockwork-thug. Accessed 24 Feb. 2020.
- Hammond, Andrew. "'The Twilight of Utopia': British Dystopian Fiction and the Cold War." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 106, no. 3, 2011, pp. 662–681.
- Hennessey, Thomas. *Britain's Korean War: Cold War Diplomacy, Strategy and Security 1950-53*. Manchester University Press, 2015.
- Horkheimer, Max, et al. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited*. Harper Perennial, 2004.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Never Let Me Go*. Vintage Books, 2005.

The International Anthony Burgess Foundation. The International Anthony Burgess Foundation, 2019, www.anthonyburgess.org.

Jenks, John. *British Propaganda and News Media in the Cold War*. Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

"Koje, die" *Duden*, Bibliographisches Institut, 27 April 2020, www.duden.de/node/80816/revision/80852. Accessed 19 March 2020.

Kubrick, Stanley, director. *A Clockwork Orange*. Warner Brothers, 1971.

Kuntz, Lieselotte A. "Das sprachliche Repertoire Jugendlicher." *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1985, pp. 259-269.

Krege, Wolfgang, translator. *Clockwork Orange*. By Anthony Burgess, Heyne, 1997.

Kruse, Kevin M. *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism*. Princeton University Press, 2005.

Lecas, Jean-Claude. "Behaviourism and the Mechanization of the Mind." *Comptes Rendus - Biologies*, vol. 329, no. 5-6, Elsevier SAS, 2006, pp. 386–97.

Library of Congress. "John F. Kennedy Assassinated." *Today in History - November 22*. www.loc.gov/item/today-in-history/november-22/.

"Life of a Prison Guard." *Germany Today*, Deutsche Welle, 8 Jan. 2014, www.dw.com/en/life-of-a-prison-guard/av-17346862. Accessed 19 March 2020.

"List of Cultural References to *A Clockwork Orange*." *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*, Wikimedia Foundation, Inc, 4 Feb. 2020, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_cultural_references_to_A_Clockwork_Orange. Accessed 19 March 2020.

- Maack, Benjamin. “‘Wir fühlten: Das ist unser Film.’” *Spiegel*, 11 June 2011, www.spiegel.de/geschichte/40-jahre-a-clockwork-orange-a-949384.html#. Accessed 16 March 2020.
- Manson, Marilyn. “Tattooed In Reverse.” *YouTube*, 22 March 2018, www.youtube.com/watch?v=gNTIOZ3jJJo.
- Miller, Timothy S. *The Hippies and American Values*. Univ Tennessee Press, 2012.
- Mills, Sarah. “Be Prepared: Communism and the Politics of Scouting in 1950s Britain.” *Contemporary British History*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2011, pp. 429 - 450.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 4th ed., Routledge, 2016.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. Signet Classics, 1950.
- Past Prime Ministers*. Her Majesty’s Government, www.gov.uk/government/history/past-prime-ministers. Accessed 16 March 2020.
- Rihanna. “You Da One.” *YouTube*, 23 Dec. 2011, www.youtube.com/watch?v=b3HeLs8Yosw.
- Scribner, Charity. *After the Red Army Faction: Gender, Culture, and Militancy*. Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Simpson, Patricia Anne. “Germany and Its Discontents: Die Skeptiker’s Punk Corrective.” *Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 34, no. 3, Dec. 2000, pp. 129–40.
- United States Department of State, Office of the Historian, Foreign Service Institute. *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations*. history.state.gov/milestones.
- Watt, Roderick H. “‘Wanderer, Kommst Du Nach Sparta’: History through Propaganda into Literary Commonplace.” *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 80, no. 4, 1985, pp. 871–883.

Wills, Abigail. "Delinquency, Masculinity and Citizenship in England 1950-1970." *Past & Present*, no. 187, 2005, pp. 157–185.

Wittem-Keller, Laura. *Freedom of the Screen: Legal Challenges to State Film Censorship, 1915-1981*. The University Press of Kentucky, 2008.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer, eds. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2001.

VITA

WILLIE WALLACE

- Education: M.A. English, East Tennessee State University, Johnson
City, Tennessee, 2020
- Certificate: TESOL, East Tennessee State University, Johnson
City, Tennessee, 2020
- B.A. Foreign Language: German Concentration, East Tennessee
State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, 2017
- Public Schools, La Follette, Tennessee
- Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University, College of
Arts and Sciences, 2018-2020
- German Teacher, Upward Bound at ETSU; Johnson City,
Tennessee, Summer 2018/Summer 2019
- Contract German Instructor, Distinguished Professionals Education
Institute; Knoxville, Tennessee, 2017-2018
- Honors and Awards: Excellence in Teaching Award, 2018
- Christa Thyson Hungate Endowment for Excellence in German,
2016