

**Conspiracy, Agential Angst and Resistance in
Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* and Ray Bradbury's
*Fahrenheit 451***

KRITI SHRESTHA

SUPERVISOR

Charles Ivan Armstrong

University of Agder, [2021]

Faculty of Humanities and Education Department of
Foreign Languages and Translation

Abstract

This study explores how powerful institutions influence the lives of individuals in the post-war American society as presented in two novels: Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* and Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*. It focuses on the interpretation of the psychological angst of the characters, their realization of external influences and resistance for the sakes of freedom and individuality. To critically analyze the issue of agential anxiety, this study mainly draws upon Timothy Melley's concept of conspiracy which he views as a manipulation of the populace without their knowledge. The larger institutions in the society strategically produce oppressive discourses and a restrictive sense of normativity, and hence are detrimental to individual autonomy and the integrity of personality. The feeling of loss of autonomy causes intense anxiety and agency panic in individuals. Thus, individuals are required to perceive themselves as antithetical to institutional systematization and stand out from the collective identity to defend their interior self and retain full agency. Reasoning and resistance to the manipulative scheme of larger institutions prove to be the remedies.

Acknowledgements

I sincerely extend my gratitude to my supervisor Dr Charles I. Armstrong, for his encouragement and constructive advice. I am highly grateful to him for his amicability, constant guidance, inspirational personality, enlightening discussions, and consistent availability, whether via cellphone or email or social networking sites.

I am highly indebted to my parents, Ram Prasad Shrestha, Janaki Shrestha, and my siblings for their perpetual inspiration, affection, and support to complete this research.

I want to thank my fellow master student and my dear friend Hasan for his encouraging words and for making my university life worth a memory.

Eventually, my heartfelt thanks go to my husband, Ramesh Timsina, for his constant encouragement. Thank you so much for making me believe in myself and my abilities to complete this Master thesis. It would not have been completed without you continuously pushing me towards my goal.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
1. Introduction: Conspiracy, Agency-in-Crisis, and Quest for Personhood	1
1.1 Theoretical Approach: Conspiracy, Agency Panic and Resistance.....	7
2. <i>Catch-22</i>: Individualism under Conspiratorial Threat	17
2.1 Conspiracy, Victimization and Anxiety.....	20
2.2 Military, Manipulation and Annihilation of Self.....	31
2.3 Milo’s Syndicate: Capitalism Overrides Nationalism	35
2.4 Resistance in <i>Catch-22</i>	38
3. <i>Fahrenheit 451</i>: A Society under Surveillance	47
3.1 Media, Manipulation and Deindividuation.....	57
3.2 Resistance in <i>Fahrenheit 451</i>	63
4. Conclusion	70
Works Cited:	74

1. Introduction: Conspiracy, Agency-in-Crisis, and Quest for Personhood

Individualism has long been a key value of American life, developing into ideas of the unbound freedom of the individual. This notion relies on the coherent and rational self of an individual, who is fully responsible for his destiny. However, due to rise in mass media and mass culture, the notion of absolute freedom was put under increasing pressure in the twentieth century. Particularly, the world wars brought a massive challenge to the integrity of self. The integration of self in the postwar American society has become a bone of contention among the theorists and it has continued to be so up to the present date. Individualism has been shaped, reshaped, and challenged by different ideologies throughout human history. Leo Braudy argues that “the threat to personal order had come from history, a history that swept us first into World War I and then into World War II” (L. Braudy, 2013, p. 85). L. Braudy believes that world wars were the historical contexts from which the whole idea of the personal integrity of individuals entered into a crisis.

The twentieth century saw a rise in corporate and bureaucratic power, which tended to tame the diversity and the uniqueness of individuals. Individualism was in constant peril in the twentieth century. As A. V. Ramana points out, the twentieth century “has been described as an age of anxiety and despair as various kinds of regimentation makes man suffer a terrible isolation and meaninglessness in his very existence” (Ramana, 1992, p. 3). Ramana further claims this age saw “the tyranny of social, cultural, bureaucratic institutions which victimizes the individual, crushes the human personality and disfigures the image of a man stripping the voice of self” (Ramana, 1992, p. 4). Although individuality has often been abridged, my thesis claims that it is still possible to regain individuality. For that to happen, an individual first needs to realize the loss of agency, then must resist the larger institutions by treating the institutional normativity as the enemy. In this sense, resistance is the way out to achieve individuality. Such abridgement of individual agency and the dissolution of self into a vast social structure, alongside individual resistance against these processes, are the predominant themes that I am going to address in Joseph Heller’s *Catch-22* and Ray Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451*.

Catch-22 and *Fahrenheit 451* are influential works that concern the individual’s struggle against the intrigues and the manipulation of governmental authority in postwar American society. Don DeLillo, in his novel *Running Dog* (1978), views the postwar period as “the age of conspiracy” and “the age of connections, links, secret relationships” (DeLillo,

1978, p. 111). Both Heller and Bradbury present institutional conspiracy in their narratives and suggest that every individual has an ethical responsibility to act against the conspiratorial web of society. Alberto Cacicedo argues that: “to be ethical requires that one develops Swift’s indignation against the injustices of the world . . . against the complacencies that lead to depravity and world war” (Cacicedo, 2005, p. 358). However, rather than mere ‘indignation’, my research will utilize, among various frameworks, Foucault’s concept of resistance to fight back the institutional restrictions and fulfil the individual’s ethical responsibilities towards themselves.

Individuals in the postwar time are entangled in structures formed by various power agencies; visible and invisible. Though individuals live under constant threat of surveillance and control in the postwar society, my thesis claims that an individual in this time can overcome this bizarre situation by fulfilling his moral responsibility. An individual’s moral responsibility includes his responsibility of using reason to distinguish conspiratorial stratagems of manipulation and falsification of reality. Reasoning first leads an individual into confronting reality and then unties him from his incurred tutelage and false beliefs. It urges an individual to fulfil his ethical duty to himself by acting against different kinds of regimentation.

The individual’s feelings of insufficiency in the face of powerful regulatory institutions makes him extremely anxious. Nonetheless, Frederick R. Karl writes: “For those who find the given life nauseating, frustrating and demeaning . . . *Catch-22* provides, at least temporarily, a moral, affirmative way out” (Karl, 2009, p. 22). An individual’s full agency is dependent on freedom. While an individual is under institutional control, he needs to maintain a watchful and skeptical attitude against such institution to keep his self and agency intact. He has a moral duty to think, reason, and act against the injustices and unwanted power exertion on his self.

The themes of agential crisis and anxiety constitute significant common ground for *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451*, even though they are set in different times and societies. Heller presents the wartime authoritarian military which, Ramana asserts, “created a dread of death among men . . . with a sense of doubt, despair and fear” (Ramana, 1992, p. 2). Similarly, Bradbury, for his part, shows an autocratic government that censors the written words. According to Emrah Atasoy, this government considers books “to be possible threats causing fear and anxiety” (Atasoy, 2015, p. 408); however, the situation is precisely the opposite. Instead, people in Bradbury’s imaginative society feel anxiety because they are not permitted to read the books.

Catch-22 is a shockingly nonconformist novel, reacting against the restrictive normativity of the military, written by Joseph Heller (1923-1999). Heller is one of the most celebrated American novelists of the twentieth century. Although he began writing this novel quite a bit earlier, in 1953, it was published in 1961. In his writings, Heller always picks up social evils and excoriates them to disillusion the readers. As in his other novels, *God Knows* (1984) and *Something Happened* (1974), he satirizes and critiques contemporary American society in *Catch-22*. Notably, in the latter novel, he denounces bureaucratic institutions such as the military, which deliberately limits individuals' freedom to reason and make independent choices. Humor, satire, and ironies are Heller's favorite literary devices utilized to unfold and mock society's follies. The use of witty remarks, absurdism, and vivid imagery makes his work more effective. Regarding his use of humor as a significant rhetorical device, Susan Braudy writes that "Heller uses humor to lure audiences into confronting reality" (S. Braudy, 1968, October, 14, p. 42). Humor is Heller's weapon to magnetize the readers' attention and unpack the social problems.

Heller has meticulously presented individuals' discontent with the controlling influence of corporate structures in postwar American society. Commenting on Heller's works, the critic David M. Craig writes: "His novels work out variations of the same pattern: the world presses in on his characters as inexorably as a coiling boa constrictor and they, battered and bruised, yearn for freedom and possibility" (Craig, 1986, p. 238). Craig claims that Heller often uses a similar structural pattern in his works, despite thematic variation. He believes that Heller usually structures his works around characters who are entangled in the conspiracy of different social systems. However, Craig tries to devalue Heller's characters as mere dreamers of freedom and passive recipients of restrictive discourses. I disagree with this perspective and will argue that a character such as John Yossarian in *Catch-22* does not merely 'yearn for freedom' and yield to the system; instead, he fights for his liberty. He successfully shatters the fetters of institutional restrictions and asserts his individualism. His rebellious disposition points to the ethical necessity for an individual to resist oppressive social structures.

Heller's real-life experience of flying "60 combat missions as a bombardier with the U.S. Air Force in Europe" (Britannica, 2019, December, 8) during the Second World War is reflected in *Catch-22* through the main character, Captain John Yossarian. Although many war novels were published after the Second World War, Nelson Algren, a notable novelist and critic, has called *Catch-22* "the best American novel to come out of World War II" (Algren, 2009, p. 10). He further states that "Below its hilarity, so wild that it hurts, *Catch-22*

is the strongest repudiation of our civilization” (Algren, 2009, p. 10). Heller’s profound understanding of bureaucratic institutions like the military, which he finds crazy and directed to ravage the human spirit, is illuminating. Another critic, Richard Locke has labelled this novel as “the great representative document of our era, linking high and low culture” (qtd. in Woo, 1999, p. n. pag.). Hence, it can be argued that the novel is a representation of postwar American society in general. While Heller has set *Catch-22* in the context of World War II, the thematic reach of the novel is not exhausted by World War II; instead, that is merely the setting of the story. The novel is set during the time when America was fighting the war for the pride of the nation, according to an ideology that captivates and confiscates the individuals’ liberty and free-thinking.

Like Heller’s *Catch-22*, *Fahrenheit 451* by Ray Bradbury (1920-2012) is another celebrated American work of fiction. This dystopian novel was first published in 1953. *Fahrenheit 451* is a critically acclaimed work widely read across the globe. Bradbury envisions an imaginative American society where books are systematically outlawed by the bureaucratic mechanisms of the government. The fire brigade’s book-burning acts are deliberate schemes of the authoritarian government to expunge individual differences and dissenting ideas. The contemporary historical situation of McCarthyism and the Cold War in the early 1950s in America massively influenced Bradbury in his writing of *Fahrenheit 451*. As Jack Zipes puts it, Bradbury “was obviously reacting to the political and intellectual climate of his times” (Zipes, 1983, p. 183). People were terrorized by the book banning culture of McCarthyism, which directly conflicted with the American values of individualism and freedom of thought. Bradbury critiques the political situation during the 1950s and gives the readers a glimpse of the then authoritarian society through his novel.

Bradbury was a well-known author and screenwriter. Together with *Fahrenheit 451*, his other masterpiece, *The Martian Chronicles* (1950), earned him a reputation as one of the foremost science fiction novelists. He published within different subgenres of the novel, such as fantasy, horror, and mystery. Generally, Bradbury critiques cultural decadence and warns about the imminent threat to human civilization in his works. He also writes against the thought-controlling agencies of a technocratic society. Bradbury satirizes corrupted governmental bureaucracy and anti-intellectualism, which drive society and individuals towards totalitarianism and identity crisis, respectively. Irony, sarcasm, and imagery are literary devices he uses to disclose the hidden reality behind society’s systems. His efforts won him great acclaim: his visionary narrative of *Fahrenheit 451* has been extolled everywhere and received the Pulitzer Prize of special citation in 2007. Barack Obama, the

44th president of the United States of America, has openly lauded the impact of Bradbury's narratives in American culture. He believes that "Ray Bradbury's gift for storytelling reshaped our culture and expanded our world" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 50th Anniversary ed.). Bradbury's portrayal of authoritarian technocratic American society in the novel demonstrates that an individual's subjectivity is under the manipulation of larger social bodies such as educational institutions, media, and the firehouse in the novel. Bradbury's characters are either restricted or punished for their engagement in reasoning, reading, or publishing. Hence, individual agency is in danger as Bradbury's fictional characters suffer from a lack of autonomy.

Fahrenheit 451 is set in a distant future in an unnamed city of America. In a broader sense, American culture and society in the postwar period, which David Mogen writes, "a sterile and poisonous culture cut off from its cultural heritage" (Mogen, 2007, p. 62), provides the setting for this novel, too. The rising culture of mass control facilitated by government agencies such as the fire brigade is presented in the novel as a conspiracy against liberal individualism. Guy Montag, a principal character in the novel, is a fireman who initially gets pleasure from burning books. However, after his encounter with the individualist Clarisse, Montag becomes disillusioned with the government's restrictive normativity and starts resisting conformity.

This study will address how individuals were under the influence of multitudes of external power structures in postwar America. It will explore how these powerful structures influence individuals' lives and abridge their autonomy and agency in postwar American society, as presented in Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* (1961) and Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* (1953). Both novels were published after World War II. Consequently, these novels are referred to as postwar novels dealing with similar issues of agential crisis, paranoid subjectivity, anxiety, and conspiracy. The term 'postwar' seems to signify an unspecified time after World War II. As both novels respond to the historical and political conditions of the cold war, McCarthyism, and the rise of mass media after the war in America, this thesis tentatively covers the years from 1945 to 1965 as the relevant historical context for the study of *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451*. In both novels, the governmental authorities are inclined to control and curtail individual freedom through state apparatuses. These powerful agencies are predisposed to reduce individuals into collective entities. Hence, individuals are entangled in the conspiracies of diverse social bodies. They suffer a lack of autonomy and agency due to a restrictive sense of normativity produced by these bureaucratic structures. Such institutional systematization also creates a sense of anxiety among people. Through deeper analysis of the

principal characters, this study claims that individuals can overcome and outwit such conspiracies by resisting through counter-schemes. Resistance enables individuals to be freer and reclaim their lost subjectivity. The protagonists in both texts will be shown to be vigilant and resistant to “institutional normalization” (Melley, 2000, p. 36) and the furtive goals of society’s dominant power structures. Hence, my study claims that characters in *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451* in postwar America need to treat repressive state apparatuses such as military and the firehouse as their enemies. Instead of being loyal to such institutions, they must resist their manipulating influences and restrictive normativity to defend or repossess the integrated self, diminished agency, and freedom.

Moreover, this study uncovers the dangers of conformity to the systems that deploy the coercive weapon of mind-control to manipulate the individuals. It further spotlights how the panic-stricken protagonists in these novels create conspiracies of their own to free themselves from the clutches of victimizing state authority. It explores how their respective schemes against the powerful institutions both correspond to and differ from each other. The protagonists in both texts suffer from the control of external forces. They make plots to fight back against the governmental authority as a survival strategy and to assert their individuality. Finally, this study examines whether the created counter-conspiracies help them regain their lost agency and freedom.

The narratives of *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451* focus on the tension between power structures and nonconformist protagonists. Both novels present the seminal issue of deindividuation in postwar American societies. They have also incorporated concerns about conspiratorial discourses and their byproducts such as agency panic, paranoia, and the manipulation of the self. They mainly deal with individual agency, identity, and volition in the postwar era, all of which are under the influence of giant and influential social networks. Although these texts have been widely interpreted as depicting the tyranny acted upon individuals by the government, this study will further our understanding of them by providing a close inspection of the relevant conspiracies along with the issues of agential crisis, paranoid subjectivity, anxiety, and the manipulation of the self. My research is concerned with the psychological dimensions more than the physical pain in the aftermath of war and censorship. Timothy Melley’s theoretical conceptions of ‘agency panic’ and ‘postmodern transference’ developed in his book *Empire of Conspiracy: The Culture of Paranoia in Postwar America* (2000) will be used to critically analyze discursive practices, rhetorical power structures and their psychological effects of agency panic, anxiety, and the manipulation of the self in postwar America.

So far, I have introduced *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451* along with their thematic concerns. This chapter has discussed the problem of the individual's agential crisis in postwar time and presented the central focus of this thesis. The following chapter will at first briefly discuss the historical background of conspiracy thinking in relation to individualism. Subsequently, the chapter will present Timothy Melley's concepts of conspiracy, agency panic, and paranoia which will be followed by Michel Foucault's idea of resistance. Together, these concepts will provide the theoretical framework of this research. Also, the chapter will examine the relationship between the concepts of agency panic and postmodern transference considering the characters in the two novels.

1.1 Theoretical Approach: Conspiracy, Agency Panic and Resistance

Conspiracy theories thrived in America in the early twentieth century when there was an unprecedented boom of corporate society, media, new technologies, and bureaucratic agencies. These theories have continued to shape the socio-political course of the country up to the present day. The original concept of American individualism was challenged after the emergence of modern technocratic and corporate communities. Individualism became the core American ideology in the nineteenth century, drawing the influences mainly from New England Puritanism, Jeffersonianism, and Emersonian self-reliance (Lukes, 2020). American individualism envisions that personal freedom precedes collectivism. Individuals are free to think and act as per their wish, which should not be constrained by the norms of collective bodies. The nineteenth-century political thinker Alexis de Tocqueville, while describing American democracy, finds an American proclivity of turning to the self as an ultimate source of truth. He further defines individualism as "a mature and calm feeling, which disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellow" (Tocqueville, 2019, p. 98). Tocqueville argues that an individual should turn to himself and break away from the collectivity. Similarly, self-reliance is at the center of American individualism, which encourages individuals "to imagine that their whole destiny is in their own hands" (Tocqueville, 2019, p. 507). One of the key nineteenth-century developers of these ideas, Ralph Waldo Emerson, argues that "society everywhere is in conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members" (Emerson, 2015, p. 129); therefore, an individual must be nonconformist to be true to himself. An individual should listen to his heart and use his reason to stand out from the mass. Emerson advises that "A man should learn to detect

and watch that gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within, more than the lustre of the firmament of bards and sages” (Emerson, 2015, p. 127). An individual should be guided by his intuition, not by tuition.

American individualism underwent a crisis in the twentieth century and thenceforth due to burgeoning mass manipulation of more massive and powerful institutions, a phenomenon which Timothy Melley calls ‘conspiracy’ (I will return to Melley’s definition of conspiracy a little later). Conspiracy in the traditional sense can be traced back to antiquity. Traditionally, a ‘conspiracy’ denotes a secret plot planned by a group of people to achieve an evil end. Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries defines conspiracy as “a secret plan by a group of people to do something harmful or illegal” (“Conspiracy”). This sort of conspiracy has been in practice in American society since its establishment. Peter Knight argues that conspiracy arrived in America along with the disembarking of the first English settlers. He further claims: “The fear of conspiracy was a prominent feature on the mental maps of the first English settlers in the New World” (Knight, 2003, p. 1). Jesse Walker corroborates this idea, stating: “The fear of conspiracy has been a potent force across the political spectrum, from the colonial era to the present” (Walker, 2013, p. 8). He believes that Americans have always been petrified by the narratives of unseen hands behind political affairs. Both Knight and Walker find that conspiracy thinking dates back to the colonial era and has been operational in American society since then.

Several historical events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries gave rise to conspiracy thinking in the United States. During the early and mid-nineteenth century, conspiracies centered around the political arena in America. Mark R. Cheatham believes that “conspiracies flourished in the 1820s and 1830s when modern-day American political parties developed, and the expansion of white male suffrage increased the nation’s voting base” (Cheatham, April 11, 2019). Many Americans during the 1830s to 1850s believed that Catholic immigrants to the United States were not devoted to American values but were loyal to the pope’s authority. Conspiracy theorists viewed Catholic immigrants’ loyalty to the pope’s authority as “a vicious plan to undermine the democracy of the United States” (Knight, 2014, p. 8). The plan was allegedly devised by the pope and the monarchs from Europe so that the people in their countries would not demand the rights enjoyed by the American people. If we move on to twentieth-century conspiracies, Cheatham claims there is continuity from how, allegedly, “NASA faked the moon landing to suspicions about the U.S. government’s complicity in the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Americans love conspiracy theories” (Cheatham, April 11, 2019). Over time, major political incidents in America like

the Civil war and its aftermath, the assassination of Kennedy, the moon landing, the so-called Zionist Occupied Government, the 9/11 attack and the Obama presidency escalated mass doubt about government's complicity with unseen forces. These historical events have thus contributed to a paranoid style of thinking in general populace. Conspiracy theories seek to explain the hidden reality behind such suspicious incidents. Therefore, Melley argues that "conspiracy theory arises out of radical doubt about how knowledge is produced and about the authority of those who produce it" (Melley, 2000, p. 13). In other words, conspiracy theory questions the authenticity of knowledge and seeks to interpret the coded message presumed to exist behind it.

In addition to the mentioned historical events, the New Deal in the 1930s brought about a radical centralization of power in the United States, which "facilitated monopolies and the union militancy" (Eggertsson, 2012). The New Deal was an economic reformation program in the USA administered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the Great Depression. The centralized state of power in the New Deal tends to curb individual freedom and construct collective identity through the prescription of normalizing regulations. It worked in opposition to the traditional political philosophy of America. Traditionally, many Americans believed that there should be the least possible interference of the government in the economic pursuit of individuals and society. The New Deal embraced a new economic policy and allowed the government to control and regulate economic affairs (Britannica, 2021). It stands against the traditional sense of American individualism, particularly President Herbert Hoover's 'rugged individualism.' The 'rugged individualism' believes in self-reliance than in the government's intervention.

Etymologically, 'conspiracy' is derived from the Latin word 'conspirare' which, according to Merriam Webster Dictionary, means 'to breathe together' or 'to join in an unlawful agreement' ("Conspire"). In this sense, a conspiracy evokes an image of a nefarious deed planned together secretly. This meaning persisted for a long time. However, over time, there has been a marked shift in the meaning and the understanding of the concept of conspiracy. Unlike the traditional definition, Melley identifies the new traits that conspiracy has acquired in postwar America:

the new model of 'conspiracy' no longer simply suggests that dangerous agents are *secretly* plotting against us from some remote location. On the contrary, it implies, rather dramatically, that whole populations are being *openly* manipulated without their knowledge. (Melley, 2000, p. 3)

This new type of conspiracy is no longer hatched in darkness and operated covertly; instead, it is the result of manipulation of individuals who have not acknowledged it yet. But this manipulation or influence by the external force is deliberate. It is intended to reduce human agency to achieve collective or institutional goals. Melley writes: “the postwar model of conspiracy . . . is dependent upon a notion of diminished human agency” (Melley, 2000, p. 3). Such an understanding of conspiracy includes mass control, where individuals become less autonomous, even to the point of becoming brainwashed subjects.

This study critically analyzes how the set of social structures and discourses presented in Heller’s *Catch-22* and Bradbury’s *Fahrenheit 451* have constrained individuals’ autonomy and agency. The abridgement of personal agency and the dissolution of self into more massive agencies are the major themes of these novels. Yet, resisting collective identity, an individual can free his beleaguered self. My research is largely based upon Timothy Melley’s theory of conspiracy - particularly the concepts of agency panic, paranoia, and postmodern transference - to interpret these novels. As developed by Melley, the concept of agency panic deals with the anxiety of being controlled by the constraining normativity of various social bodies. He defines agency panic as “intense anxiety about an apparent loss of autonomy or self-control – the conviction that one’s actions are being controlled by someone else, that one has been ‘constructed’ by powerful external agents” (Melley, 2000, p. 12). Diminished agency and manipulation of subjectivity make the individuals in question extremely anxious and paranoid. The feeling of insufficiency and being controlled by externals forces engenders agency panic. The constraints of an autocratic institution prevent an individual from exercising his freedom and asserting his full agency. The realization of such control and victimization generates anxious feelings and paranoia on the part of individuals. Melley distinguishes his own use of the term ‘paranoia’ from its traditional meaning. In a traditional sense, paranoia is considered a pathology associated with the recurrence of fear and distrust. Melley attributes paranoia as the “extremely self-defensive posture(s)” (Melley, 2000, p. 11) that can occur when individuals are exposed to structures that subordinate their agency. Paranoia, in other words, is an individual’s defensive response to the constraining regulation of external force.

Melley’s concept of agency panic simply demonstrates a state in which an individual feels a loss of autonomy, whereas his concept of paranoia is a ‘defensive’ posture of self. To free an individual from external power exertion, realization of loss of agency and protective position of self is not enough; instead, it needs a radical resistance against the controlling restrictions of the larger body the individual associated with. Therefore, my research couples

Melley's ideas with Foucault's theory of resistance which provides a space to strike back and liberate an individual from external control.

Anxiety is often considered a negative state of mind; hence, it is generally expected to be controlled or subdued. It is merely viewed as a problematic consequence of social interactions. However, my approach differs from the view that sees anxiety only as a pathological symptom. Social conditions are not solely constitutive of human psychology: it is constituted and reconstituted by both material and ideational forces. Anxiety is not merely a pathological symptom, but it is desired for action. The positive aspect of anxiety can be viewed as "an emotion which engenders [an] information-seeking and problem-solving" attitude (Panu, 2020, p. 12). Anxiety makes an individual aware of his condition, and further it can lead to the solution. In other words, it can activate indignation and resistance to bring change in the existing social relations and lead to reclaiming freedom.

In both novels, some characters do not feel anxiety and do not realize the confiscation of their autonomy. They have never faced up to the authority that subordinates them. They are just transformed into a collective body; hence, they cannot realize their autonomous and distinct personality. Anxiety is the desire to overcome an individual's repressive state, as David Barlow posits: "Without anxiety, little would be accomplished" (Barlow, 2004, p. 9). Contrary to the characters who have internalized the organizational goal as their own, characters who have suffered agency panic in the novels are anxious about their present existence. They have responded in varying degrees to the authority, which undermines their freedom. Thus, when the individuals are under the constraints of collectivity, anxiety is required to realize the diminished agency and resist the restrictive norms of society.

A powerful and more massive social body manipulates and controls individuals. The vast nexus of the corporatized body hollows out the individual's self and constructs a new breed of humanism, which is less autonomous and is embodied in the corporate body. It has also given rise to the postmodern concept of a 'self' constructed from the outside. Defining the postmodern notion of self, Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein write:

In the context of the postmodern, the idea of the self as a central presence dissolves and is replaced by the radicalization of what Derrida (1978) calls 'play of difference,' whose objects are ontologically enlivened and deadened by floating signifiers, eclipsing substantiality. (Gubrium & Holstein, 1994, p. 685)

The concept of the postmodern self is not unified and centrally present but is constructed from the outside and through an interplay of differences. In opposition to such a view, the concept of agency panic believes in a liberal self which is defined as an "individual as a

rational, motivated agent with a protected interior core of beliefs, desires and memories” (Melley, 2000, p. 14). This variant of individualism is termed as ‘possessive individualism,’ a typical model of personhood derived from the Enlightenment. The imposed external control and restriction of freedom create anxiety and fear in individuals. The safeguarding of the liberal self demands resistance against collectivism. Melley argues in the same vein that the protection of self and individuality is made possible “by urging individuals to treat large systems as ‘enemies’, resisting their demands for corporate identity and collective behavior” (Melley, 2000, pp. 48-49). He clearly states that the self can still be restored to the integrated state even in postwar time. Individuals need to relate antagonistically to the larger bodies and avoid identifying with them.

In the postwar period, American politics, art, literature, and culture have been often viewed from the perspective of conspiracies. Contrary to the historical contextualization provided earlier in this introduction, Melley argues that the development of governing conspiracy narratives stem “from a sense of diminished humanity” (Melley, 2000, p. 11). Rather than scrutinizing historical incidents such as the assassination of President Kennedy, Watergate, and the Cold War, he instead focuses on the individual’s feeling of insufficiency to impact meaningful social activities. Conspiracy theories help to understand how an individual’s self is manipulated by a web of powerful, more massive systems. They also unfold the unwanted and coercive external influences over individuals. Don DeLillo states that “all conspiracies begin with individual self-repression” (DeLillo, 1978, p. 183). According to DeLillo, individuals who become the victims of conspiracies function to fulfill the goals of collective bodies repressing their own selves. Self-repression is the consequence of manipulating external agents that limit individuals’ freedom and control their behavior. The subjection of self to collectivity produces desired organizational behavior reducing individual agency and uniqueness. It also undermines the individual’s ethical responsibility to himself.

In his later work on government, Foucault argues that resistance is a prerequisite to free an individual from the ‘submission of subjectivity.’ He points out the need for a new form of subjectivity and writes: “the target today is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are... We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries” (Foucault, 1982, p. 216). To liberate the repressed self, an individual ought to refuse the imposed subjectivity. Therefore, understanding the relationship between society and individuals is to see the individuals in opposition to society.

Due to the emergence of ‘postindustrial society’ or ‘post-civilization’, individual subjectivity has been under enormous leverage of new social and economic order. This new order is beyond the individuals’ control. Consequently, the appearance of diverse forms of control systems in the postwar time has produced “a new breed of individual who is less autonomous”¹. Many critics who rise to defend liberal individualism argue against the postmodernist concept of self. As discussed earlier, postmodernists claim that the individual self is constructed by its interaction with external social bodies. Melley sees this concept as capitulating individual agency to the larger societal networks, which he calls postmodern transference. Individuals suffering from postmodern transference submit their liberal self to collectivity as Melley argues:

they displace it into new hosts . . . into more massive agencies, ‘intelligent’ systems, and ‘autonomous’ social networks. The desire to find some kind of integral, bordered, and willful entity is everywhere in our nature. They simply transpose the liberal subject into a giant body, a powerful system with all of its unity, intentionality, and internality intact. (Melley, 2000, p. 187)

As a theoretical concept, postmodern transference views that an individual internalizes himself as a part of a social body and work for its collective goal. Conversely, an individual’s realization of him being manipulated and controlled by powerful social networks makes him feel agency panic as anxiety about his loss of self-control becomes intense. Thus, agency panic and postmodern transference are closely related because an external force controls an individual in each situation. However, whether agency panic or postmodern transference is taking place is distinguished by an individual’s reaction to such controlling force. In agency panic, an individual reacts to detach himself from a collective goal of such structure. In contrast, an individual transposes his self to the influencing structure and takes the collective goal of that structure as his own in postmodern transference.

Most often, according to this view, the powerful and larger institutions like the military, media, or state apparatuses create conspiracies to accomplish their goals. Consent is manufactured through ideological manipulation and prescribing constraining rules. For Melley, the larger institutions “further their own interests through a sense of their ‘manipulation’ and ‘victimization’ by some pernicious form of their social control” (Melley, 2000, p. 11). Regarding the working of larger institutions, Melley’s argument actually shares common ground with recent Marxist theories on how state apparatuses function by means of

¹ “Abridgement of Human Agency in Postwar America: A Comparative Study of Heller’s *Catch 22* and Levin’s *The Stepford Wives*”. EN-409 The Literature of Conspiracy and Paranoia (2018, Spring). (This thesis is partly based on my ideas developed in a school exam).

both ideology and violence. Ideology does not present the totality of reality. It gives a one-sided story, which people believe to be the truth; thus, it influences people and deceives them. As a false belief system, ideology works as a part of state conspiracy that largely manipulates the masses. In the Marxist sense, ideology is “a set of beliefs with which people deceive themselves; it is a theory that expresses what they are led to think, as opposed to that which is true; it is false consciousness” (Cranston, 2020). The government channelizes its ruling ideology through different state apparatuses. The French philosopher Louis Althusser has extended and added an ideological dimension to Marxist theory, by conceiving of the state as a repressive apparatus. The Marxist classics consider the state as “a ‘machine’ of repression, which enables the ruling class to ensure their domination over the working class” (Althusser, 2002, p. 92). They argue that the state functions through its repressive apparatuses like police, army, prison, and court. Althusser revisits this descriptive Marxist theory and adds a new dimension through his account of repressive state apparatuses (RSA). His new conception concerning state apparatuses is called ideological state apparatuses (ISA), which he defines as “a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions” (Althusser, 2002, p. 96). Althusser has listed the ideological state apparatuses such as religious ISA, political ISA, communication ISA, educational ISA, family ISA, legal ISA, trade union ISA and cultural ISA. Both RSA and ISA operate by ideology and violence. However, Althusser makes a distinction between them by their predominant features: “the Repressive State Apparatus functions ‘by violence’, whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses function ‘by ideology’” (Althusser, 2002, p. 97).

If we return to Melley and the American context, he claims that brainwashing is another coercive maneuver typically deployed by the totalitarian states to foster “unthinking discipline and robotlike enslavement” (Melley, 2008, p. 146). Oppressive discourses are used to control individuals’ social behavior and make them work for the institutional goal. Regarding the concept of brainwashing, David Seed writes: “the unity of the self is ruptured by a dissociation of inner from outer, of mind from body, so that the individual becomes a machine” (Seed, 2004, p. 29). Seed argues that brainwashing alienates an individual from himself. It is an ideological form of indoctrination, which creates a ‘false consciousness’ similar to the Marxist idea. It vacates individuals and instils a new belief which Joost A. M. Meerloo claims makes “conditioned zombies out of people” (Meerloo, 1956, pp. 52-53). It makes individuals so submissive that they can hardly think and act as per their will.

Conspiracy is in close conjunction with power. It is created either to prolong the dominance over others or to be free from others' control. Powerful agencies in society often construct conspiracy to exert their desirable influence and sustain their hold over the masses. However, power is never monolithic and merely a means of oppression over the disempowered. It does not merely flow from the top. Instead, Foucault, in his seminal work *The History of Sexuality* (1978), writes that "where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (Foucault, 1978, p. 95). There is always room for resistance since power bears it within. Thus, the conspiracy which is created by power is always likely to meet with resistance. As discussed before, Melley's concept of paranoia merely assumes the defensive attempt of self against the external influence; thus, paranoia lacks the room for striking back and revolting against the conspirators to regain diminished agency. In opposition to such a perspective, my analyses will draw on how Foucault envisions resistance as co-existent with power along the following lines:

Just as the network of power relations ends by forming a dense web that passes through apparatuses and institutions, without being exactly localized in them, so too the swarm of points of resistance traverses the strategic codification and individual and it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. (Foucault, 1978, p. 96)

Foucault articulates that the network of power contains 'points of resistance', and the realization and consolidation of such points can lead to revolution. To reclaim lost agency, resistance against the conspiracy of existing power is unarguably required. Therefore, Foucault's concept of resistance will be used to complement Melley's concept of agency panic and paranoia, since it provides individuals with space for acting against the strategic codification of systems. This concept of resistance foregrounds that seemingly powerless individuals can also create counter-conspiracies as they exert resistance and combat the manipulative bodies of power.

The theoretical conceptions discussed above will help understand how conspiracy manifests itself in the two novels, *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451*. The introduction of this thesis has explored how these theoretical concepts such as conspiracy and resistance are interrelated and can contribute to show the way to liberate the individuals from the submission of subjectivity. The rest of this thesis will unfold as follows: Chapter two will depict how the military and transnational syndicate of Milo Minderbinder in Heller's *Catch-22* conspire against the characters, including the protagonist, Captain John Yossarian. In its

second part, that chapter will explore how the military as an organization manipulates individuals to mould them into brainwashed subjects, restricting their autonomy. A concluding part will observe the resistance strategies that some of the characters adopt in *Catch-22*. The next chapter will discuss the agential crisis of the characters presented in *Fahrenheit 451*. It will first analyze the operations of surveillance and censorship of an autocratic government which paralyzes individuals' free thinking. The second part of the chapter will explore how state apparatuses function to manipulate and deindividuate the characters. Subsequently, the last part of this chapter will conclude with Montag's fight for his autonomy.

Specifically, chapters two and three will discuss whether the protagonists, including some other minor characters, have been successful in their journey of achieving their autonomy. The concluding chapter of this thesis will compare and contrast two novels in terms of apparent similarities and dissimilarities between the two novels. By examining the resistance strategies of protagonists, the thesis demonstrates the possibility of freeing one's individuality from the controls of external influences. The conclusion will also examine whether the counter-conspiracies created against the totalitarian rule help the characters reclaim their lost agency.

2. *Catch-22*: Individualism under Conspiratorial Threat

Joseph Heller, one of the most notable American novelists of the twentieth century, has published many novels that satirize war, bureaucracy, American society, and political life. Most importantly, Heller deals with the theme of individuality through his absurd characters who seek to assert their individuality by any means possible. His best known satirical novel *Catch-22* presents a bleak image of postwar American society. The novel mainly occurs on European territory, particularly near the Italian coast of the Mediterranean Sea, where Yossarian, an American airman, and his Air Force squadron are stationed on the island of Pianosa. Heller portrays the military as an allegory of postwar American society that saw a massive decline in individual autonomy and humanity. In the novel, the military is presented as a debased institution that limits the soldiers' agency and freedom. The bureaucratic structure of the military, as imagined in the novel, produces what William Whyte calls "the organization man" (qtd. in Melley, 2000, p. 50), who is "ideologically conditioned subjects" (Melley, 2000, p. 51). The military treats a soldier just as an appendage to the collectivity. It demands certain corporate behaviors from soldiers under its utterly restrictive norms. The struggle against the military undergone by Yossarian, the protagonist in the novel, forms the core of the novel. Hence, most of the events are presented from his point of view. The conflict arises when he refuses to identify himself with the military's collective identity. Yossarian frees himself by fleeing to Sweden at the end of the story.

Catch-22 has received a plethora of positive critical responses; however, some critics, including Harold Bloom, have harshly criticized Yossarian's desertion of the war effort on the grounds of morality. Bloom argues:

Yossarian's war ends with his departure for Sweden, a desertion that Heller presents as a triumph, which it has to be, if the war as aptly characterized by Heller's parodistic cast of con-men, schemers, profiteers, and mad commanders. War is obscene, necessarily, but the war against Hitler, the SS, and the death camps was neither World War I nor the Vietnam debacle. Heller isolates the reader from the historical reality of Hitler's evil, yet nevertheless the war against the Nazis was also Yossarian's war. (Bloom, 2009, p. 2)

Bloom finds Yossarian's military desertion during war to be an irresponsible and escapist move. He also blames Heller for picturing war as obscene and detaching the readers from the historical fact of Hitler's tyranny. Here I would argue that Bloom fails to comprehend that *Catch-22* is not really about World War II. He implicitly charges Heller's novel for being anti-war and anti-patriotic. But the novel's thematic concern is not World War II; instead, as

other critics have pointed out, that conflict is just a backdrop. *Catch-22* is all about American society after the war, a period when individuals suffered a pronounced lack of autonomy. Yossarian's desertion of war is not treasonous and unethical. It is motivated by his wish to assert his individuality and freedom. By trying to assert his individuality, he is acting ethically to himself. Yossarian's running away from the war is not an act of deception in relation to his squadron, nor has he gone to Sweden to plot against his own country. Rather it is an act of taking charge of his life and turning to the morality of individualism.

In the novel, Heller presents the military as an allegorical representation of post war American society. The military as an institution produces restrictive regulations to subdue individuals' freedom and identity. Along with the rise of new technologies, the new values emerging in postwar American society cause pervasive anxiety in individuals. Olivia Chirobocea-Tudor argues that Heller's *Catch-22* is:

a resourceful allegory of the post-war American society with its new values, the rise of technology, loss of spirituality, and prevalence of shallowness and materialistic needs, escalated by the advent of television and popular culture, which gave way to a loss of individual identity in a world more and more devoid of fundamental meaning. (Chirobocea, 2018, pp. 65-66)

Contrary to Bloom's understanding of *Catch-22* as a narrative about World War II, Chirobocea argues that this novel is an allegory of postwar American society where new values emerge and bring challenges to individual identity and personal integrity. She foregrounds that the development of such values produces a new breed of individualism stripping off human attributes and making individuals more generic and pliant.

M.H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham define allegory as a narrative "in which the agents and actions, and sometimes the setting as well, are contrived by the author to make coherent sense on the 'literal', or primary, level of signification, and at the same time to signify a second, correlated order of signification" (Abrams & Harpham, 1999, p. 5). The military in the novel stands for the American society where individuals are not free to make choices. They have become manipulated subjects who are controlled by social bodies. Larger institutions like the military take individuals as a part of collectivity and means to achieve an institutional goal at the expense of individual identity and agency. The military controls the soldiers and furthers its operations by the values of patriotism, courage, and glory. The soldiers in the novel are manipulated by these principles and are dictated by the military authority.

American soldiers hardly encounter enemy soldiers in the novel because Heller's primary concern is not to present the war between the American army and its enemies.

Chirobocea argues that Yossarian and his fellow soldiers, who have “engaged in a real war with an official enemy, the Germans, are in fact harassed, bullied and have their physical and mental states threatened by a surprisingly familiar enemy, their very own commanding officers and the entire American army with its abusive practices” (Chirobocea, 2018, p. 68). This means that Yossarian is fighting two wars: one with the official enemy, the Germans, and the other with his own superior officers. In this sense, the Germans are portrayed as the “Enemy Outside, who plots outside the community’s gate” (Walker, 2013, p. 16) while the superior officers are portrayed as “Enemy Within” which Walker defines as “comprising villainous neighbors who can’t easily be distinguished from friends” (Walker, 2013, p. 16). However, Heller mainly intends to illustrate Yossarian’s war to protect his self from self-seeking leadership and the collective insanity of the military bureaucracy he serves. That is why the novel hardly presents combat of American soldiers against enemy soldiers, concentrating rather on Yossarian’s war to free himself from the authoritarian rule.

The first chapter of Heller’s novel – “The Texan” -- sets up the narrative’s entire mood, spotlighting the fact that “we live in an age of distrust and deteriorating spiritual values” (Heller, 2011, p. 46). Captain John Yossarian does not assimilate himself with the military ideologies and resists bureaucratic control of his life. Nonconformism begins explicitly with Yossarian’s attempt to escape the military’s conspiratorial and irrational rules to lead his life on his own terms. Nonetheless, only a few characters notice that ideological indoctrination and constraining regulations have abridged individual autonomy in the military. Such a realization of being controlled and conspired by external power causes agency crisis. Characters such as Yossarian, Doc Daneeka, Major Major and Orr have realized that they are under the military’s control but cannot desert it because of the military’s restrictive norms. They try to free themselves from the Army’s clutches and try to assert their individualism in different ways. The realization of agency panic makes an individual a paranoid subject who tries to defend his self and regain the lost agency; thus, he becomes a non-conformist. Contrastingly, some other characters like Colonel Cathcart, Captain Piltchard and Captain Wren do not acknowledge their agential crisis. They simply transpose their selves to a new host, the military and act as ordered. Military idealism thoroughly influences them. They take the collective identity of the Army as their own and are committed to achieving its goals. This chapter will explore the causes behind the characters’ feeling of agency panic. Furthermore, I will also present how bureaucracy functions to create ‘organization men’. Most importantly, this chapter will examine the struggle of the characters

who resist the military and the resistant strategies they adopt to assert their autonomy and individuality.

2.1 Conspiracy, Victimization and Anxiety

The military and the transnational ‘syndicate’ of Milo Minderbinder are the soldiers’ enemies in the novel. They create a conspiracy to influence individuals, reduce their autonomy, and produce ‘organization men’. The soldiers are manipulated in such a way that they fail to see their conditioning. The constraining rules and continuous surveillance, limiting the freedom to think and act independently, are identical to what Melley defines as a conspiracy. It is not a secret plot that operates from a remote location. Rather, it is a result of the oppressive influence of powerful institutions in society. The military and Milo’s transnational syndicate are huge institutions that control the life and death of the soldiers, thereby causing anxiety and agency panic in them. They are predisposed to create brainwashed subjects through propaganda, manipulation, victimization, and coercion.

In *Catch-22*, Heller satirizes bureaucracy, religion, and capitalism to demystify the vested interests of such powerful agencies in a society that is indifferent to the individuality and the autonomy of individuals. The title of the novel is itself significant for the study of conspiracy. The phrase ‘Catch-22’ has entered the Oxford English Dictionary, signifying “an unpleasant situation from which you cannot escape because you need to do one thing before doing a second, but you need to do the second thing before doing the first” (“Catch-22”). The soldiers in the novel are caught in such a situation that they cannot return home even though they fulfil their duty of combat missions. How the soldiers are enmeshed in the military rule is presented as follows in the first mention of catch-22 in the text:

There was only one catch, and that was Catch-22, which specified that a concern for one’s safety in the face of dangers that were real and immediate was the process of a rational mind. Orr was crazy and could be grounded. All he had to do was ask; and as soon as he did, he would no longer be crazy and would have to fly more missions. Orr would be crazy to fly more missions and sane if he didn’t, but if he was sane he would have to fly them. If he flew them he was crazy and didn’t have to; but if he didn’t want to he was sane and had to. Yossarian was moved very deeply by the absolute simplicity of this clause of Catch-22. (Heller, 2011, p. 52)

Catch-22 here encapsulates an entrapment of words or rules that urges everyone’s participation in the mission indefinitely, hence, is the main source of character’s anxiety. This quote dramatizes that the clause of catch-22 allows the soldiers to quit the missions if they are crazy. A crazy soldier such as Orr is not obliged to fly any more. Orr might be crazy, and

this means there is a possibility for his being grounded, but whosoever calls himself crazy and does not want to go to combat anymore is no longer crazy but sane. And the rule says that those who are sane must fly missions. If someone is ready to fly more missions, he is crazy. The catch neither lets an individual be sane nor insane. This simple but circular entrapment of Catch-22 has extremely depressed Yossarian because this clause provides no choice for him to escape the mission. Like Yossarian, some other characters are also infuriated because of such crazy and illogical rule of Catch-22. In this sense, Catch-22 is a means to limit soldiers' freedom and a scheme to keep them in the mission disrespecting their right to return home.

The novel meticulously presents the deindividuating effects of the military. As a repressive state apparatus, the military manipulates soldiers in mass, victimizes them, and imposes corporate behaviour. The so-called 'Soldier in white', Doc Daneeka and Mudd are the characters that suffer deindividuation most acutely in the novel. Lieutenant Schmulker is commonly called Soldier in white. Soldier in white stands for the symbolic death of individuality in the military. He is burnt all over; hence, his whole body is bandaged and "encased from head to toe" (Heller, 2011, p. 192). Due to the absolute anonymity of this character, even his presence ignites conspiracy theories and makes people nervous in the hospital ward.

Lieutenant Schmulker is changed into the Soldier in white as he is "constructed entirely of gauze, plaster and a thermometer" (Heller, 2011, p. 192). He has lost his personality and true identity as a Lieutenant and is recognized instead merely as Soldier in white. When he is at first brought to the hospital, he is almost immobile. His bodily immobility symbolizes how he has been under the control of military authority that does not let him move around freely. His loss of identity and the deprivation of physical movement stand for the psychological wound of loss of agency. In the hospital, Yossarian asks Nurse Cramer: "How the hell do you know he's even there?" (Heller, 2011, p. 194). This question raises skepticism about whether there is an individual inside the bandage and gauze. Dunbar further clearly reiterates what Yossarian has meant to express; "There is no one inside . . . they have stolen him away . . . and left those bandages there" (Heller, 2011, p. 419). This implies that the bureaucracy has hollowed out and deindividuated him. In other words, one can see the Soldier in white inside the white gauze and plaster; however, since he can do nothing with his volition, he is there physically encased in gauze and plaster but is absent in terms of his individuality. Yossarian further states to Nurse Cramer that "You don't even know if it's really him" (Heller, 2011, p. 194). The soldier in white has become what Melley

calls a 'bureaucratic individual' and lost his real identity as Lieutenant Schmulker. His name is just mentioned once throughout the novel, but he is often referred to as Soldier in white. This is how his identity is denied in the novel. Besides, he is further compared to inanimate things like "an unrolled bandage with a hole in it or like a broken block of stone" (Heller, 2011, p. 192) – objects which do not have volition and subjectivity. Whoever does not follow his volition and act for it is no longer himself. That is why the soldier inside the gauze and plaster is just flesh with imposed corporate identity. Soldier in white's situation represents almost all the soldiers' situation in the squadron: they are all constructed from the outside, and their agency has been denied.

The treatment of Soldier in white in the hospital exhibits how the human body has been reduced to a humanoid robot under the bureaucratic structure of the army. Two jars of fluid are used in his treatment: "When the jar feeding the inside of his elbow was just about empty, the jar on the floor was just about full, and the two were simply uncoupled from their respective hoses and reversed quickly so that the liquid could be dripped right back into him" (Heller, 2011, p. 195). This demonstrates that the human body has been reduced to a machine that merely processes things fed to it without any alteration. Here, the postwar individual is made a machine that simply produces whatever it is infused with. The repressive social body effaces the essential human function of creativity and human reasoning capacity.

An individual panics due to its victimization by a larger body. Victimization of the self is lucidly reflected in the character of Doc Daneeka in *Catch-22*. This character feels uprooted from his private medical practice due to the war. However, he has not surrendered his self to the military service. Unlike other characters in the novel, Doc Daneeka has understood the catch well and realized that his self is in peril. He is also the first to explain what catch-22 is to Yossarian; thus, he knows well how military controls the soldiers. He then starts refuting collective identity to regain his freedom. He clearly states that he does not want to be locked up in others' troubles: "I know a lot of people are going to have to suffer for us to win it. But why must I be one of them?" (Heller, 2011, p. 36). Doc Daneeka does not want to associate himself with the military and risk his life for the sake of the nation and its people. He always prioritizes his own existence and freedom over everything else. He clearly states, "I don't want to make sacrifices" (Heller, 2011, p. 36). Doc Daneeka here represents radical individualism. Radical individualism is the bedrock of individual liberty and democratic society. But, it contains a grave pitfall that is radical individualism undermines collective endeavor for social changes. Doc Daneeka seems to be extremely selfish in the novel; however, his commitment to individualism arises after he loses his faith

in the military as an institution. The reasons behind his loss of faith in military are its self-seeking leaders and arbitrary regulations. His love for individuality is also presented in his health consciousness: “He brooded over his health continually and went almost daily to the medical tent to have his temperature taken” (Heller, 2011, p. 36). He is overly sensitive and anxious regarding his health, a state of mind caused by the fear of losing his life in the war.

Heller criticizes the absolute reliance of the ‘bureaucratic individuals’ in official reports. Due to the reliance on official reports, the soldiers do not trust their empirical knowledge. Bureaucratic rationalization is an irresistible force that makes individuals believe in the official record rather than their own common sense. This is demonstrated in the novel mainly by the War Department’s declaration of Doc Daneeka’s death – an event that is hilarious since he is still actually alive. Doc Daneeka requires to fly to Rome in a training mission each month to collect his flight credit. But he “hated to fly. He felt imprisoned in an airplane” (Heller, 2011, p. 37); therefore, he manages to add his name in the flight log without actually flying in one of the missions. On one occasion, he bribes Yossarian to name him as a passenger in a plane and the plane subsequently crashes. Sergeant Knight sees the plane going down and laments to Yossarian that Doc Daneeka is still in the plane, but Daneeka is standing right next to Knight and insists to him that “I’m right here . . . I’m not in the plane” (Heller, 2011, p. 390). Knight does not believe in his own senses, however, relies upon the official record and mourns for losing Doc Daneeka, who is alive and standing beside him. The oddest thing about this incident is that soldiers in the squadron subsequently treat him as if he were dead. Melley states that the consequence of bureaucratic rationalization is “the transfer of human decision-making capacities to an external and abstract set of rules and procedures” (Melley, 2000, p. 70). It makes individuals thoughtless and automatonlike. For instance, one of the enlisted men tells Daneeka: “the records show that you went up in McWatt’s plane . . . You didn’t come down in a parachute, so you must have been killed in the crash” (Heller, 2011, p. 392). This man is so reliant upon the official report that he is not ready to believe that Doc Daneeka is still alive even though he is talking to him.

The official declaration of his death and the notification sent to his wife - “KILLED IN ACTION” (Heller, 2011, p. 393) - not only distorts reality but also ostracizes Doc Daneeka from his family, friends, and the military. He can no longer practice medicine, nor can he be a part of the mission. The official report has detached him from his ordinary course of life. He is a living dead. According to the military record, Doc Daneeka does not exist in the world, though he is still in the squadron. Hence, he is forced to live an absurd life. Like

Doc Daneeka, Mudd is another character who has an odd ontological status in the novel. He is generally referred to as 'the dead man in Yossarian's tent'. He was killed in a mission the day he arrived in the squadron. He had been sent to a mission before his name got official entry. The bed assigned for him, and his belongings remains in Yossarian's tent because, officially, he never joins the squadron. It is highly ironic that Doc Daneeka, who is alive, is treated as if he were dead, while Mudd, who is killed in action, is considered to be living in Yossarian's tent. The official records blind the characters so that they do not trust their own senses. Melley argues: "the problem is not simply that characters cannot escape the 'iron cage' of bureaucracy; it is that they have no conception of such a cage and thus no desire to escape it" (Melley, 2000, p. 71). This is how official misrepresentation distorts reality and produces 'bureaucratic individuals.'

Moreover, Heller anatomizes how both the life and death of the soldiers are devalued and ruled by bureaucratic reasoning rather than their choices. Mindless and self-seeking leadership in the military is responsible for the abridgement of soldiers' autonomy and agency. Because of some of the officers' hidden interests, the soldiers are obliged to risk their lives every moment, even after the Allies have won the targeted missions. The soldier is required to fly only forty missions as the general rule of Twenty-seventh Air Force Headquarters. However, Colonel Cathcart, an officer in charge of Yossarian's squadron B-25, keeps raising the number of missions to be promoted as a general putting the soldiers' lives in danger. He is a "valorous opportunist" (Heller, 2011, p. 370) who strives to "be a general so desperately" (Heller, 2011, p. 217). This is a part of the novel's intra-military politics, whereby the officer seeks to get promoted to a higher position. There is an intensification of the anxiety felt by Yossarian and other bombardiers in the novel because "they knew from bitter experience that Colonel Cathcart might raise the number of missions again at any time" (Heller, 2011, p. 31), disregarding the general rule of "Twenty-seventh Air Force Headquarters, who insisted on only forty missions as a completed tour of duty" (Heller, 2011, p. 33).

The military, which has controlled soldiers' lives, is embroiled in conspiracy. There are multiple conspiracies among the officers. The intra-military power plot particularly follows a feud between General Dreedle and General Peckem. General Dreedle is an officer-in-charge of the whole wing to which Yossarian's squadron belongs, whereas General Peckem is just a special operation officer within the wing. Although Peckem is subordinate to Dreedle, he interrupts the arrangement of the tents in General Dreedle's wing with a directive demand that "all tents in the Mediterranean theatre of operation are to be pitched along

parallel lines with their entrance facing back proudly toward the Washington Mountain” (Heller, 2011, p. 30). This infuriates General Dreedle since it is not General Peckem’s business. This jurisdictional dispute is resolved by ex-P.F.C. Wintergreen, a mail clerk in the Twenty-Seventh Air Force Headquarters, who favours General Dreedle. Still, this rivalry does not end here.

General Peckem is always trying to dominate General Dreedle with various stratagems. To reclaim the lost power and status, General Peckem “began sending out more U.S.O. troupes than he had ever sent out before and assigned Colonel Cargail himself the responsibility of generating enough enthusiasm for them” (Heller, 2011, p. 30). General Peckem’s politics of sending more U.S.O. (United Service Organizations) staff is revealed when he moves his headquarters to Rome and begins to “scheme(d) against General Dreedle” (Heller, 2011, p. 30). Sending U.S.O. troupe is an ace played by General Peckem to replace General Dreedle from his position.

In his plot to regain his lost status, General Peckem considers Colonel Scheisskopf just as “substantial equipment and supplies that would contribute to the prestige of his position and increase his striking power in the war he had declared against General Dreedle” (Heller, 2011, pp. 365-366). Colonel Scheisskopf is passionate about holding parade training for soldiers overseas; thus, he implores General Peckem to let him continue the parade training. Colonel Scheisskopf’s stupidity is suggested by his name ‘Scheisskopf’, a German word, which means ‘shithead’. His character is well portrayed as stupid and “a shit-for-brains promoted up the ranks through a series of bureaucratic errors” (Melley, 2000, p. 76). Also, his obsession with parade makes him contemptible in the squadron. General Peckem, who is in a race for power and status, is very cautious about stifling the possible protests in the organization. He therefore tells Scheisskopf that they “don’t have enough men in our own organization to make up much of a parade, and the combat units would rise in open rebellion if we tried to make them march. I’m afraid you’ll just have to hold back awhile until we get control” (Heller, 2011, p. 368). Instead, General Peckem makes it clear to Colonel Scheisskopf that “Our immediate goal” is “DREEDLE” (Heller, 2011, p. 370).

At the beginning of the novel, Yossarian completes forty-four missions but still is not sent home. He does not want to serve any longer in the force after realizing that his autonomy and agency are at stake and at the officers’ mercy. Doc Daneeka informs Yossarian that “The colonel wants fifty missions” (Heller, 2011, p. 24). Like Yossarian, other bombardiers who have already completed fifty missions feel powerless and controlled by their superior as the number of missions continually rises. This is the point where soldiers mainly feel agency

panic in the novel. Since Towser is responsible for making the decision of sending the soldiers home, they visit his office. They “were men who had finished their fifty missions . . . They worried and bit their nails. They were grotesque, like useless men in a depression” (Heller, 2011, p. 30). The soldiers’ wariness and continual wait for the decision of being sent home show how the military denies individual freedom. The soldiers have been reduced to gloomy, useless and depressed puppets. They feel lack of agency because they cannot go home although they have completed the required tour of duty; thus, they are depressed. For instance, Havermayer discloses to Yossarian how the prospect of flying more missions makes him depressed: “You know, I’m not too happy about flying so many missions anymore either. Isn’t there some way I can get out of it, too?” (Heller, 2011, p. 461). Havermayer is worried and looking for a way to get out of the war. Lack of agency and fear of death augments the anxiety among the soldiers.

Yossarian’s anxiety is augmented by the fear of losing his life in an untimely and meaningless manner. He thinks that “death was irreversible, he suspected, and began to think he was going to lose” (Heller, 2011, p. 398). Yossarian feels that he cannot survive through each mission he joins. Yossarian’s existential angst is further symbolized by the fact that he is living with the dead in his tent: “I’ve got a dead man in here with me. His name is Mudd” (Heller, 2011, p. 399). ‘Mudd’ symbolizes ‘mud’ or ‘dust’ which is the brutal reality that the man must become after death. It also alludes to the biblical verse “. . . for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (Genesis 3:19, KJV): i.e., that man is created out of dust and has to return to dust after the death. The belongings of Mudd always remind Yossarian that he may die untimely. Yossarian is constantly agonized by this fear of death.

Similarly, Yossarian has been traumatized by the death of a young gunner, Snowden, who died in his arms. The grotesque image of entrails spilling over his own uniform and all over the floor often haunts Yossarian. He is disillusioned by the fact that an individual who cannot protect his self from the external influences is like a trash: “Snowden had spilled all over the messy floor. It was easy to read the message in his entrails. Man was matter, that was Snowden’s secret. . . . The spirit gone, man is garbage” (Heller, 2011, p. 504). The spirit here is compared to the self of an individual. From Snowden’s death, Yossarian extracts the underlying message that an individual’s life is meaningless if he fails to protect his self. When an individual surrenders to the collectivity, he deprives himself from freedom and puts himself under the control and dictation of external force.

The deadly scene of war recurrently haunts Yossarian’s mind and becomes projected in an unpleasant dream of his: “soon dreamed that he was fleeing almost headlong down an

endless wooden staircase” (Heller, 2011, p. 414). The dream shows intense anxiety of Yossarian who feels insecure and hence wants to flee the endless combat missions. The ‘endless wooden staircase’ is quite comparable to the combat missions he has to fly endlessly in the squadron. He is trapped in catch-22 and is forced to fly more missions. He sees no end to the war, which thus are like the staircase in his dream. Yossarian’s dream also reveals his unsatisfied desire for running away from the ever-increasing combat missions.

Yossarian gets injured in the Ferrara mission and he is taken to hospital where Nurse Cramer reprimands him for not taking care of himself. She reprimands Yossarian that he does not care whether he loses his leg. But the defiant Yossarian retorts that it’s his self and his leg whether he cares or not. Yossarian has tried to assert his right over his body, but to his shock, Nurse Cramer states that “It certainly is not your leg! That leg belongs to the U. S. government. It’s no different than a gear or bedpan. The Army has invested a lot of money to make you an airplane pilot, and you’ve no right to disobey the doctor’s order” (Heller, 2011, pp. 335-336). Nurse Cramer’s statement demonstrates how the U. S. government treats its soldiers as military machines or war materials. They are not considered as emotional beings or individuals; instead, they are dehumanized and treated like bedpans - the objects. They do not belong to themselves but to the government, which treats them as just an appendage to the war planes. Yossarian thinks it is his body, so he has the right to do whatever he wishes to do according to his own interest. But Nurse Cramer unveils the truth of how the soldiers are considered as objects like ‘gear or bedpan’. Since the government invests in making him a pilot, he has no right to disobey the military and is obliged to follow the doctor’s instructions.

Major Major is a mediocre but dismal character in the novel. He has had a troubled childhood and is unhappy with modern technology. He has been the victim of a faulty computer system that changed his identity in the birth certificate. Similarly, “Major Major had been promoted by an I.B.M. machine” (Heller, 2011, p. 99). His promotion and identity in the birth certificate show how machines in modern society control individuals. He cannot correct the erroneous alterations of computer, and therefore suffers throughout his career. He is powerless to control the strange fate that befalls upon him. However, he is such “a flagrant non-conformist” (Heller, 2011, p. 98) that he goes against these forces by forging Washington Irving’s name on official documents “with his left hand to elude identification” (Heller, 2011, p. 95). He sometimes uses T.S. Eliot’s name to forge the official documents, in “an act of . . . rebellion for which he knew afterwards he would be punished severely” (Heller, 2011, p. 107). His forgeries symbolize his denial of the identity imposed upon him

by digital machine and the military. So, forging is actually Major Major's way of resistance: he chooses to be someone else rather than being called Major Major.

The problems of agency and identity crisis are also evident in the presentation of the female characters in the novel. Females are portrayed more as sex objects than faithful companions to their male counterparts. They are merely described as subordinate to male 'patriots', particularly as prostitutes and housewives. Such presentation of female characters subtly creates a situation where females come across as insignificant members of the society who cannot contribute to the military and, by extension, the nation. Instead, their relationships and professional life are defined by their relations with the male characters. Many female characters are unnamed in the novel. For instance, Nately's whore is identified with her relation to Nately. Her identity is denied. She is recognized by her profession and her relationship with Nately. Thus, they are presented as almost irrelevant to the plot of the story. No single female soldier is mentioned in the military; instead, females are portrayed as objects available to appease heterosexual men's sexual desire. The way in which female characters are the victim of the male gaze is presented in exemplary fashion in this sentence: "Her breasts were pointy and large in the thin white sleeveless she wore that squeezed each contour and flowed outward smoothly with the tops of her enticing hips" (Heller, 2011, p. 330). Male voyeurism empowers males and positions females in a subordinate position, just to be looked at.

The subjection of women continues in the hospital. On occasion, male patients overpower nurses. For instance, Nurse Duckett is seen more as a sexual object than an intelligent professional. She is pictured as "a tall, spare, mature, straight-backed woman with a prominent, well-rounded ass, small breasts . . ." (Heller, 2011, p. 337), who becomes the victim of sexual abuse in the hospital ward. Yossarian stealthily puts his hand between her knees and suddenly brings it under her dress, and Dunbar grabs her by the bosom. Nurse Duckett has been the victim of the male gaze, which treats her as an object of desire. There is no respect for her work or her professionalism; instead, she is mistreated like a whore.

The absence of female characters in the military and their derogatory representation only as sexual objects deprives them of their agency. There are numerous examples in the novel where women earn their living by selling themselves to please men's sexual desires. For instance, there is the mention of an unnamed woman in chapter twenty-six who readily works as a prostitute: she "climbed five steep flights of stairs to sell herself to the group of satiated enlisted men, who had girls living there all around them" (Heller, 2011, p. 329). The girl climbing steep stairs symbolizes the girl's struggle to sell herself to the men in a

patriarchal society. Contrary to the girl, the men on the fifth floor suggest the enlisted men's superiority as individuals able to treat the women as objects for pleasure. The female's readiness to sell herself to the male clients is quite comparable to the enlisted men who transpose their selves readily to the military for the deceptive appeal of glory and success.

The external imposition over the free spirit is a way of suppressing or controlling others' agency. Nately, who falls in love with a whore in Rome, feels embarrassed by her nude appearance in front of his fellow soldiers and of their licentious gaze at her body. It is not odd for Nately's whore to walk naked in front of other soldiers. However, Nately treats her as his possession and warns her not to go out of the room without clothes. He insists to her: "I'm the man, and you have to do whatever I say. From now on, I forbid you ever to go out of the room unless you have all your clothes on" (Heller, 2011, p. 409). Nately's male ego gets hurt as she walks disrobed in front of others. Here, he tries to influence her disposition and profession of prostitution disallowing her to go out naked.

Beside the denied agency and identity of female characters in the novel, *Catch-22* also presents how Colonel Cathcart's propagandist movement does not allow for religious freedom in the force. Colonel Cathcart wants to exploit Christian prayer before each mission (bombing run) to be in the limelight and be promoted. He wants the Chaplain to conduct the prayer in the briefing room to get his photos published in the *Saturday Evening Post* newspaper. Colonel Cathcart's motive behind conducting the prayer is to divert public attention from his malignant deed of sending soldiers to the dangerous battle unnecessarily. The chaplain points out the problem in conducting prayer that there may be both atheists and believers in the briefing room. Cathcart immediately denies this possibility and asserts: "There are no atheists in my outfit" (Heller, 2011, p. 222). He believes that it is un-American to be an atheist; thus, for him, the American soldiers must be Christian. However, some soldiers in the squadron have faith in other religions than Christianity. Similarly, Yossarian is an atheist who often shows his disbelief in God. Colonel Cathcart's religious attitude reveals there is no space for individuals who do not share his religious belief: "I'm not going to disrupt our religious services just to accommodate a bunch of lousy atheists. They are getting no special privileges from me. They can stay right where they are and pray with the rest of us" (Heller, 2011, p. 223). It is hilarious that atheists are not asked to stand aside during the prayer; instead, they are forced to pray with Christians.

Heller presents the military as an endless labyrinth where soldiers get trapped. It dehumanizes the soldiers and gradually corrupts their morality. Chaplain Tappman is one of the main characters in the text through whom Heller communicates that the military threat is

not just limited to injuries and deaths but also to people's faith. Military activities and warfare have created terror, corrupting the reasoning of those involved and instilling a 'virtue of glory' instead of humanity. The Chaplain is humble, humane, and friendly to everyone in the squadron. Officers' and soldiers' attitude and behaviour in the war have immensely affected the Chaplain. He begins to question the existence of God due to the apparent disarray of the world. The Chaplain is so distressed "in a world in which success was the only virtue" (Heller, 2011, p. 307). Heller critiques the idea of success that comes at the expense of others' lives. The Chaplain finds such success to be unethical and devoid of humanity and spirituality. He is occupied by complex and tormenting ontological questions such as these: "Was there a single true faith, or a life after death? . . . Did Adam and Eve produce daughters" (Heller, 2011, p. 308). These questions show how the Chaplain's religious faith has wavered and withered; however, he always finds "the question of kindness and good manners" (Heller, 2011, p. 308) vital. Since he finds himself outcast and lonely in the squadron, he is always looking forward to being reunited with his family: "The chaplain loved his wife and children with such tameless intensity that he often wanted to sink to the ground helplessly and weep like a castaway cripple" (Heller, 2011, p. 311). He feels helpless due to the control exerted by the military over his life. He fears that he may not be able to go back home and live with his family again. This uncertainty torments him.

The Chaplain defies Colonel Cathcart's request to conduct prayer in the briefing room. Consequently, the Chaplain is arrested by the government's men as per the colonel's order. The unfair treatment of the Chaplain by the government's men here shows the functioning of the repressive state apparatus by force as argued by Althusser. The Chaplain is taken to an unknown place and into a dark cellar for questioning. He is arrested without issuance of a warrant, although he did nothing wrong. The men from the government do not know what crime he has committed, but under the colonel's influence they are just trying to make a case and prove him guilty. They charge the Chaplain for "being Washington Irving and taking capricious and unlicensed liberties in censoring the letters of officers and enlisted men" (Heller, 2011, p. 442). He panics much out of fear: "He was powerless. They might do whatever they wish to him, he realized; these brutal men might beat him to death right there in the basement" (Heller, 2011, p. 436). He is rendered so powerless and panicky that he feels his life is at the mercy of the men representing the government. The military that represents repressive state apparatus in the novel coerces soldiers to follow the authority by force. It victimizes the soldiers, provides generic identity, and snatches their agency.

2.2 Military, Manipulation and Annihilation of Self

In the novel, the military bureaucracy uses several thought control techniques such as manipulation, coercion, and propaganda. Propaganda is the deliberate and systematic effort to manipulate the general populace. It is the purposeful dissemination of information that disorients people from the real intent of the propagandists. It intends to manufacture consent creating Melley's 'bureaucratic individuals', "whose desires and ideas seemed indistinguishable from corporate propaganda" (Melley, 2000, p. 50). The military in the novel has always attempted to produce a lack of agency, barring the soldiers' reasoning and rational thinking. For instance, it is seen in Colonel Cargail's speech to the soldiers in the squadron: "Now, men, don't misunderstand me. This is all voluntary, of course. I'd be the last colonel in the world to order you to go to that U. S. O. show. . . and that's an order!" (Heller, 2011, p. 32). Although Colonel Cargail addresses that it is voluntary to participate in U. S. O. show, he concludes his speech with an order for everyone's presence at the show. Hence, the soldiers do not have authority to decide whether to go or not, they are just obligated to join.

Colonel Cargail chooses very manipulative and coercive words to send the soldiers to watch the U.S.O. shows. He arouses the soldiers' emotion with patriotism: "Men, you're American officers. The officers of no other army in the world can make that statement. Think about it" (Heller, 2011, p. 32). He strives to move them with the collective identity of 'American officers.' Colonel Cargail urges the soldiers not to act against the institutional norms of American military. He wants them to be quiet, obedient, and submissive. Melley opines that paranoid perception is required not to be deceived by organizational manipulation of such a kind: "collectives, organizations, and groups, despite their deceptively pleasant appearance, must be recognized as the true enemies of the individual" (Melley, 2000, p. 56). The U.S.O. entertainment show seems to be organized for the amusement of the soldier. However, the U.S.O. amusement troupe is just a military leadership strategy to push the soldiers forward into more dangerous battles, with the underlying motivation being the individual leaders' wish to attain a higher rank in the military.

The educational session (briefing session) is yet another instance of propaganda presented in the novel. Clevinger conducts the educational session two nights a week in Captain Black's intelligence tent. The soldiers are allowed to raise questions on these occasions. Towards the end of one of these sessions, the despondent Yossarian wants to know why people are trying to kill him and kill each other. Therefore, he asks: "Where are

the Snowdens of yesteryears?” (Heller, 2011, p. 39). ‘Snowden’ stands for the soldiers who were killed in the war in the past years. This question raised by Yossarian alludes to François Villon’s French ballad ‘Ballades des dames du temps jadis’. The line from Villon’s ballad, ‘but where are the snows of yesteryear?’ emphasizes the brevity and fragility of life (Mattix, 2013). Snowden’s horrendous death in the combat mission symbolizes how the soldiers are victimized and destined to die in the military. The question that Yossarian raises about Snowden’s death is unanswerable on the moral ground, and that causes the officers to formulate a new rule. According to the new rule, a soldier can ask only one question. Under the command of Colonel Cathcart at the headquarters, Colonel Korn “succeeded with the rule governing the asking of questions,” leading to a situation where “the only people permitted to ask questions were those who never did” (Heller, 2011, p. 40). The military authority is so oppressive that it limits the soldiers’ freedom of asking questions and expects them to be just obedient. This restriction silences the soldiers, making them ‘bureaucratic individuals.’ It exposes that the military bureaucracy’s motive is to make machines out of people who cease to think and reason.

Many practices are going on in the squadron that effectively make pawns out of soldiers. The Glorious Loyalty Oath Crusade is an exemplary committee that makes the soldiers take an oath for every activity they are involved in. They must sign “a loyalty oath to get their pay from the finance officer” (Heller, 2011, p. 130) and to eat their food in the mess hall. The soldiers are supposed to be served by the administrators, but they are bullied, insulted, and harassed about all day by one after the other. Captain Black opines that it is essential “to keep them pledging” (Heller, 2011, p. 131). The loyalty oath-taking functions to produce corporate loyalty in soldiers and to prolong control over them. When the soldiers voice objections, Captain Black replies that “people who were loyal would not mind signing all the loyalty oaths they had to” (Heller, 2011, p. 131). It shows that who objects signing it is labelled as disloyal to American military.

Control and influence are at the heart of the superior officers. Colonel Cathcart wants to get rid of Yossarian and send him home. Yossarian’s refusal to fly more missions has become an obstacle in controlling other soldiers. Cathcart states that “they’ll be easy enough to discipline and control when you’ve gone” (Heller, 2011, p. 490). He feels that other soldiers can be troublesome as long as Yossarian is there. He knows that Yossarian will become an exemplary rebel, and other soldiers may follow in his footsteps. That is why Colonel Cathcart and Colonel Korn offer Yossarian that they will send him home with promotion if he cooperates and indicates his affection to them. Other characters like Milo

Minderbinder and Major Danby also try to influence Yossarian to serve the nation in need. Milo calls Yossarian's refusal "disloyal to his squadron and embarrassing to his superiors" (Heller, 2011, p. 464). He further blames Yossarian for the deterioration of morale: "The country was in peril; he was jeopardizing his traditional rights of freedom and independence by daring to exercise them" (Heller, 2011, p. 464). Milo accuses him of being disloyal to his superiors and the country. Colonel Cathcart sends Major Danby to persuade Yossarian. He tells Yossarian that "you must try not to think" that officers are cashing in on human tragedy, but "You must think only of the welfare of your country and the dignity of man" (Heller, 2011, p. 510). Yossarian does not subscribe to the manipulation of patriotism anymore.

In the novel, the military's propagandist and manipulative tactics as an organization are to produce corporate loyalty from its members. Several characters in the novel have effaced their self and individual interests for the sake of the military and its goals. The displacement of individual self for the intentionality of larger agencies or systems is what Melley calls 'Postmodern Transference'. In it, an individual readily grasps the organization's collective goal they belong to as their own. Melley writes: "They simply transpose the liberal subject into a giant body, a powerful system with all of its unity, intentionality, and internality intact" (Melley, 2000, p. 187). Individuals, in Postmodern Transference, cannot differentiate individual subjectivity, goals and their unique existence from the collective 'self' of the social networks or institutions.

Captain Piltchard and Captain Wren are prime examples of soldiers who have internalized their military mission as their own goal of life and seem to enjoy flying more missions. In other words, they have been moulded to be submissive in order to carry out the missions in the manner dictated by the authorities. Captain Piltchard and Captain Wren are described as "inoffensive" and "subservient" (Heller, 2011, p. 167) operation officers. They have already flown more than a hundred combat missions, and still, they "begged nothing more of life and Colonel Cathcart than the opportunity to continue flying them" (Heller, 2011, p. 167). Therefore, these captains in the squadron are transformed into being mere parts of the organization's self – the military. Captain Piltchard and Captain Wren have annihilated their selves to fulfil the institutional goals: "They conducted their duties humbly and reticently, with a minimum of fuss, and went to great lengths not to antagonize anyone" (Heller, 2011, p. 167). The individuality of these characters is also denied rhetorically in the novel. All the chapters are named after a single character. In contrast, chapter fifteen is named after two characters 'Piltchard & Wren,' reinforcing the collectivity. Captain Piltchard

and Captain Wren are not portrayed and described individually; instead, the common characteristics mentioned above are attributed to them.

Like many characters in the novel, Havermeyer is a scapegoat of conformity to the military system. He, who “never took evasive action . . . is the best damned bombardier” (Heller, 2011, p. 33). He is a good example of Postmodern Transference since he is a proficient shooter who never takes any evasive action. He has lost his self and conforms to the chain of command, risking his life. Havermeyer works so hard to be the best shooter that he even keeps shooting mice at midnight. This shows how profoundly he has been influenced and manipulated into the act of killing. He is ready to carry out any mission and order given to him. As a robot, he completes the assigned task without any objection. Havermeyer can be contrasted with the non-conformist and individualist hero Yossarian. During Yossarian’s raid on Bologna, he pretends that the intercom is not working, and as a result he convinces his pilot to return without attacking Bologna. He commits deception to disobey the commanding officers. Yossarian is not worried about being demoted; instead, his sole motivation is his wish to come out of it alive. He values his life, his individuality; hence, he contemplates that his fear is healthier than Havermeyer’s proficient shooting on targets.

The theme of McCarthyism can be observed in *Catch-22* as Heller writes that we live in an age of distrust. Joseph R. McCarthy, a Republican Senator of Wisconsin, made reckless charges of disloyalty in governmental agencies and “succeeded in creating a culture of fear, distrust, and disunity in postwar America” (Hauzer, 2010, p. 314). The imagined society in the novel is projected as insecure for liberal individualism. Major Major was sharp in his study of English History during his university days. He did so well at the state university that “he was suspected by the homosexuals of being a Communist and suspected by the Communists of being a homosexual” (Heller, 2011, p. 98). His brilliance was either feared or labelled as paranormal. His studying of English history over American history is taken as a subversive action. “*English* history! roared the silver-maned senior Senator from his state indignantly. What’s the matter with American history? American history is as good as any history in the world!” (Heller, 2011, p. 98). Major Major is feared as disloyal to America. Thus, F.B.I. (Federal Bureau of Investigation) opens a case against him and pursues him secretly. Jesse Walker’s concept of the ‘Enemy Within’ is helpful here. Walker defines the ‘Enemy Within’ as “comprising villainous neighbors who can’t easily be distinguished from friends” (Walker, 2013, p. 16). It is a shocking revelation that five of six people living in a farmhouse that Major Major calls home become F.B.I. agents. He has never imagined that he is being spied on by F.B.I. agents whom he considers to be his friends. Through this account

of Major Major's story, Heller shows how McCarthyism created mistrust and paranoia, where the secret federal agents were continuously spying individuals. Such a claustrophobic atmosphere causes fear and anxiety in the individuals.

2.3 Milo's Syndicate: Capitalism Overrides Nationalism

Syndicate, in general, is a self-regulating company formed to carry out an enterprise which shares cost and profit to its members. M&M Enterprises in the novel is a multinational company which truly represents capitalism. It is solely owned by a mess hall officer Milo Minderbinder. *Catch-22* not only critiques the highly corporatized military but also dramatizes the dangers of a transnational syndicate run by Milo. Milo is a cunning officer and a genius entrepreneur who has refracted the military regulations for his profiteering motives. James Harold argues that Milo's syndicate couples "private industry and military power" (Harold, 2007, p. 158). He has successfully decoded the military catch and has utilized military facilities for his multinational business. Through Milo's syndicate, Heller satirizes the ethics of capitalism, which disregard humanity for the sake of economic gain. Capitalism, which has penetrated the lives of many characters, is also presented as a conspiracy in the novel. Individuals in the society depicted are, either one way or another, influenced and victimized by capitalist culture.

Heller makes a parody of a famous statement made by Charles E. Wilson's, the secretary of Defense in the USA in 1953: "What is good for General Motors is good for the country"². As the head of General Motors, a multinational company, Wilson justifies that financial gain for a company is also good for the country. Heller mocks his justification through the character of Milo. Likewise, Milo, who runs a transnational syndicate in the national military, believes that "what's good for the syndicate is good for the country" (Heller, 2011, p. 267). He becomes an influential international community personality: Mayor of Palermo and Cairo, Caliph of Baghdad, Assistant Governor-General of Malta and even considered a living god of corn, rice, and rain in many African nations. When he visits these places, a holiday is declared along with an elaborate parade for his welcome. At one stage in the novel, Milo is court-martialed for treason because he makes a deal with the German military, an enemy at war, to attack the American military base where he serves. The attack results in the death of many officers and soldiers.

² Playboy Interview: Joseph Heller. *Playboy*, June 1975. In: Joseph Heller and Adam J. Sorkin: *Conversations with Joseph Heller*. University Press of Mississippi, Jackson 1993, ISBN 0-87805-635-1, pg. 150.

Nonetheless, due to his transnational syndicate's incredible profit, Milo hires an expensive lawyer who convinces the jury at the court-martial. The lawyer claims that it is capitalism which has made America a great nation. He argues that when Milo's syndicate makes an incredible profit, it also contributes significantly to the country's economy. Through his massive power and wealth, Milo "equates profit with patriotism" (Britannica, 2011). The wealth the syndicate generates is enough to justify the bombing of the American base in Pianosa at the expense of lives. Milo is absolved when he discloses to the congressional committee the capital he made through the syndicate. Here, it seems Milo is not under the control of the military, rather the whole nation and international communities are under his control. Melley argues that Milo governs the Military-Industrial Complex, which "override both military and national interest" (Melley, 2000, p. 77). The Military-Industrial Complex signifies a combined power between government's defense apparatuses and a defense industry which produces benefit for both sides. This term was introduced by the American president Dwight Eisenhower who was concerned about the "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" (qtd. in Fallows, 2002, p. 46), which he called the Military-Industry Complex. There is a danger of this coalition between state and arms industry which can just work for their vested interests and not for the interest of national security. Therefore, *Catch-22* points to the danger of the Military-Industrial Complex, which valorizes wealth over lives, security, and the freedom of the people.

Unlike other soldiers, Milo has exclusively worked in his own interest through capitalism. He has amassed money and power through his black-market ventures. This quote suggests how Milo has overpowered all the military ideals and exploited them for his own designs:

The planes were decorated with flamboyant squadron emblems illustrating such laudable ideals as Courage, Might, Justice, Truth, Liberty, Love, Honor and Patriotism that were painted out at once by Milo's mechanics with a double coat of flat white and replaced in garish purple with the stenciled name M&M ENTERPRISES, FINE FRUITS AND PRODUCE. (Heller, 2011, p. 290)

Milo often uses military planes for his business. More importantly, he has replaced military ideals such as patriotism, truth, justice, and courage with his own commercial brand: M&M ENTERPRISES, FINE FRUITS AND PRODUCE'. Yossarian believes that "Milo was a jerk; but he also knew that Milo was a genius" (Heller, 2011, p. 291). Milo is a genius and individualist in the sense that the military has snatched individual freedom, and Milo, in turn, has put the military under his capitalistic feet: "Right before their eyes he had transformed his syndicate into an international cartel" (Heller, 2011, p. 291), with his enterprise and ideal.

Milo's business has prospered internationally during the war, "since Milo did have freedom of passage everywhere" (Heller, 2011, p. 293). Through Milo, Heller criticizes materialism and reveals how the world is in the grip of capitalism.

Milo has pursued his interest in free enterprise controlling the black-market. He persuades his fellow soldiers to contribute by stating: 'Everyone has a share' (Heller, 2011, p. 266). Nonetheless, the two 'M' in Milo's M&M Enterprises stand for Milo Minderbinder, and the ampersand cannot hide that it is solely a one-man venture. He wants the soldiers to be loyal consumers and purchase the goods perpetually supplied through his cartel as the larger organizations always demand a corporate form of behavior. 'Everyone has a share' resembles the capitalistic advertising promise that everyone deserves to have a particular product. But only the traders reap the benefit from such false promises. Not only the military and Milo's syndicate but also the nation in general demands particular social behaviors from its citizens. Melley radically argues in the same line that the country demands "its male citizens sacrifice their lives in order to preserve its identity" (Melley, 2000, p. 64). Thus, the restrictive and manipulating norms of society mostly seek to generate certain behaviors from individuals to further society's goals.

There are many examples of conspiracies and exploitation caused by Milo's syndicate in the military. Once, Milo purposefully uses G.I. soap to poison the food at his mess hall. It is not an accident, but a deliberate plan to harm the soldiers. Heller hurls his satire at the conspiratorial web of capitalism which exploits the consumers like a leech irrespective of political ideology. Capitalism transcends patriotism and national interest for the financial gain as in the case of Milo's deal with Germany to bomb American military base.

Heller satirizes the greed and rampant selfishness of entrepreneurs through the character of Milo. As a representative of capitalism, Milo grows his business at the expense of compassion, morality, and humanity. Milo is committed to his self-interest irrespective of his alliances. Yossarian also privileges his own interest above everything else, however, he does not victimize others for his gain. Contrastingly, Milo does not consider anyone to be friends unless he generates profit from them. Rainer Zitelmann claims that the interest of an entrepreneur is not driven by greed. He asserts that "this self-interest is curbed by the fact that only the entrepreneur who prioritizes other people's needs can be successful" (Zitelmann, 2019). Milo's moral deficit and callousness in killing his own airmen presents the best possible critique of Zitelmann's argument of empathy as a driving force of capitalism, in the sense that Milo is guided by greed and selfishness and yet is successful. The principle that

instead guides Milo is “greed . . . is good, greed is right” (Stone, 1987), the line uttered by Gordon Gecko in the movie ‘Wall Street’ (1987).

Milo owns a multinational corporation in the military, controlling all kinds of goods and services. He has traded with countries from all around the world, irrespective of whether or not they are America’s enemies. Milo uses the military planes for his business. The military planes with goods arrive every day from London, Liberia, and Karachi on behalf of Milo’s business. Milo was previously bound by nationalistic ideology, but now he has ruptured it through a capitalistic venture which has a sole aim: profit. Along these lines, Walter James Miller argues that *Catch-22* is “an attack on the military-industrial complex of World War II” (W. J. Miller, 1982, p. 238). Milo shows no compassion for people, rather he treats them as objects to be traded for economic turnover. His brilliance in making a ploy for money is mainly seen in the Orvieto highway bridge. His arrangement for the allies to blast the highway bridge in Orvieto and his plan to defend it by Germans with anti-aircraft help him to make profit from both sides. Milo’s greed in the Orvieto blast costs Mudd his life on the same day he joins the squadron. For Milo, wealth is more important than the life of his squadron comrade.

Similarly, Milo’s inhumanity is seen in his plot of selling Egyptian cotton coating with chocolate. Milo’s syndicate nearly collapses when he invests excessively in Egyptian cotton. Therefore, he plans to sell real cotton as cotton candy which is likely to make people sick. Yossarian warns him against this deceitful business as it causes health issues for the people who consume it. Milo himself reveals that he became ill after eating cotton candy with real cotton. Yet he is determined to profit from this cotton candy business.

2.4 Resistance in *Catch-22*

Resistance is always embedded in power. Power in the military has controlled soldiers and created submissive beings out of them. Besides, it has also produced resistance from the individualistic characters. There are many examples of resistance against the oppressive and controlling power exertion of officers in Yossarian’s squadron. Many characters in the novel are under the manipulation and dictation of the military and Milo’s syndicate. However, some characters have acknowledged that the Army, as an institution, influences them to control and curb their autonomy. The characters who have realized the institutional restrictions try to resist against the military and Milo’s syndicate to achieve their self-renewal.

Yossarian, a quintessential non-conformist, objects to his incorporation into a social body that manacles his freedom. He recognizes the military as his real enemy that coerces him to sacrifice his life. Minna Doskow states that Yossarian “struggles against a hostile establishment and the codes it maintains for controlling the society it rules” (Doskow, 1967, p. 186). Melley theorizes that the individuals need to see larger institutions as their enemies to regain their autonomy. However, it is tough to distinguish the enemy as it consists of hostile men and deceptively benevolent systems. Such systems strive to include an individual as a component to further its corporate goal. Therefore, an individual must disengage himself from the social body, “unmask its false benevolence, reject its cybernetic ideology, and treat it as an enemy” (Melley, 2000, p. 63). Yossarian fights to dissociate himself from his collective identity of military and its irrational rules that restrict his agency and freedom.

The story of *Catch-22* is centered on the anti-social characteristics of Yossarian, who struggles to protect himself chiefly from the officers of his squadron headquarters rather than German foes in the war. Yossarian’s anxiety persists due to his awareness of the ‘Enemy Within’. He comprehends that the military as an institution systematically produces constraining principles such as Catch-22, which states, “they have a right to do anything we can’t stop them from doing” (Heller, 2011, p. 467). Although Yossarian encounters Germans a few times in the war, he “views the actions of his own leaders as threats equally hostile and deliberate as those presented by the German forces” (Melley, 2000, p. 65). Yossarian is stymied by the irrational rules of Colonel Cathcart because he believes that Colonel Cathcart has imperiled his life for his self-interest, i.e. promotion. Milo’s act of dealing with Germans to bomb his squadron and poisoning food are also villainous. Thus, the enemy for Yossarian “is anyone who is going to get you killed, no matter what side he’s on” (Heller, 2011, p. 143), and that involves both Milo and Colonel Cathcart. To live longer, Yossarian believes that the identification of the real enemy is essential.

Yossarian feels a threat to his life from the people around him. His individualism matters more than anything else for him. He “has antisocial aggression” (Heller, 2011, p. 21) since he realizes they are “conspiring to kill him” (Heller, 2011, p. 23). Yossarian tells Clevinger, an officer in his squadron: “Every one of them . . . are trying to kill me” (Heller, 2011, p. 19). Clevinger denies it - “No one is trying to kill you” - and explains: “They are shooting at *everyone* . . . trying to kill everyone” (Heller, 2011, p. 19). Clevinger tries to persuade Yossarian that Germans shoot at the Allies as an enemy group, as their fire is not directed at Yossarian as an individual. Clevinger’s way of viewing an individual soldier as a member of the American military undervalues the individual’s agency. He does not recognize

an individual soldier as an autonomous body; instead, he takes the soldier just as an indistinguishable constituent of the military body. The collective identification with the military is the source of threat for the soldiers as the whole unit is under attack. Yossarian does not refuse that war targets others in his squadron, but it also includes him. Thus, he sees the military itself as an enemy. He realizes that soldiers suffer due to their association with the larger military body. Yossarian declines to identify himself as a component of the military's collectivity as it endangers his life and sees the attack is also directed to him personally. He believes that his first duty is to protect himself and denies sacrificing his life for his country to win the war. Being exhausted by the continual rise in the number of missions, Yossarian admits to officer Major Major that "I don't want to fly milk runs. I don't want to be in the war anymore" (Heller, 2011, p. 118). He has a clear stance that he does not want to serve in the military and be involved in the killing games of war; rather, he is looking for an alternative way out.

Yossarian strives for various stratagems not to involve himself in war but to flee from it. He understands that the Army, a massive and powerful institution, has influenced and victimized him, controlling his life. He is always committed to breaking the military's conspiratorial snare, which limits his freedom and agency. Yossarian's scheme against the military spans from faking illness to denial for eating fresh fruits and deserts. Since he is vexed by the meaninglessness of the ongoing war and is terrified by the fear of untimely death, he decides to "spend the rest of the war in the hospital" (Heller, 2011, p. 8). Thus, he feigns his ailment of having "a pain in his liver that fell just short of being jaundice" (Heller, 2011, p. 7) because he has learned very well that acting against the military is the only survival strategy that helps to protect his free will and the individual self. Yossarian's faking of illness has a dual purpose. On the one hand, it circumvents his duty of a bombardier and on the other, it is a severe blow to the institutional rationality, mainly to the medical profession. The hospital as an institution always verifies whether an individual is healthy or not, but Yossarian has created a situation where the hospital can neither prove him ill nor discharge him. The doctors believe that "it wasn't quite jaundice. If it became jaundice, they could treat it. If it didn't become jaundice and went away, they could discharge him" (Heller, 2011, p. 7). This state of indecisiveness among the doctors is created by Yossarian in a fashion that has a direct resemblance to *Catch-22* produced by the military authority. Howard Jacobson argues in the same vein that "It makes perfect sense of nonsense that they are rendered impotent, doctors who cannot doctor" (Heller, 2011, p. 523). Yossarian's fake ailment is a counter-conspiracy against the military's conspiracy.

Yossarian's refusal to eat the fresh fruits and desserts that Doc Daneeka prescribes is also deliberate. He does not want to keep his liver healthy; therefore, he says, "No, fruit is good for my liver. That's why I never eat any" (Heller, 2011, p. 70). Here, Yossarian's denial of eating and curing his liver is a well-planned plot to be admitted to hospital and not to fly more missions as long as possible. There are many instances in the novel in which Yossarian tries not to follow the military commands. Despite being a leading bombardier of his squadron, Yossarian does his best not to bomb Bologna. He "took hold of the colored wires leading into the jack box of the intercom system and tore them loose" (Heller, 2011, p. 161) during his mission to Bologna. He does this because he does not want to go too nearer to the target. Hence, he makes his aircraft's intercom system dysfunctional to avoid the mission and come back to the squadron airbase. Since he cannot communicate with other bombardiers in the mission, he orders his pilot to turn back the plane. His subordinate officer Kid Sampson "turned the plane away from the formation in a wide, graceful arc and headed toward the airfield" (Heller, 2011, p. 163).

Moreover, his observation of sprouting mushrooms on the way to the beach is comparable to the observation of the battlefield. He sees a number of "mushrooms the rain had spawned poking their nodular fingers up through the clammy earth like lifeless stalks of flesh" (Heller, 2011, p. 165). The 'lifeless stalks of flesh' here are Yossarian's memory of dead soldiers on the battlefield whose limbs and flesh get blown by the bombs and ammunition. As the war is still going on, he envisions that the death toll will be rising. Regarding the growth of mushrooms, he feels that "There were thousands of swarming as far back into the underbrush as he could see, and they appeared to swell in size and multiply in number" (Heller, 2011, p. 165). Here, the mushrooms which swell in size and number represent the growing number of dead people caused by warfare. Yossarian's detachment from the spooky and dead-like mushroom implies his unwillingness to involve in the war and military service.

As we saw before, Yossarian is deeply moved by the death of Mudd, who "was killed before he even got into the squadron" (Heller, 2011, p. 302). Bereaved Yossarian finds that the collective identity of the military is responsible for Mudd's death. Therefore, he develops an aversion to his uniform and walks around naked. Coming back to the squadron airfield from the Bologna mission, he relaxes in his cot undressed: "He felt much better as soon as he was naked. He never felt comfortable in clothes" (Heller, 2011, p. 164). The 'clothes' here stand for the military uniform and to be disrobed is to get rid of military responsibilities. It is in a sense is to rebel against the military authority to affirm individual freedom. Yossarian

firmly asserts: “I don’t want to wear uniform anymore” (Heller, 2011, p. 299). He realizes that the uniform robs individual identity and imposes military ideals over individual subjectivity.

Similarly, when a soldier is killed in his plane over Avignon and bleeds on his uniform, Yossarian realizes the cost one has to pay for wearing a uniform, and he “swears he’s never going to wear a uniform again” (Heller, 2011, p. 250). His commitment not to wear the uniform is also seen in his reception of a medal from General Dreedle. He receives a Distinguished Flying Cross without wearing clothes. Yossarian responds to General Dreedle’s inquiry why he does not wear a uniform by asserting his love for individualism, stating that it is because he does not want to. Although Yossarian is not free from all the military’s responsibilities, he as a non-conformist and individualist who relentlessly defies the code of wearing a uniform.

Yossarian rebels against the military system in every possible way. Being an internment authority, he “had already begun plotting an emergency heading into Switzerland on every mission he flew into northernmost Italy” (Heller, 2011, p. 355). In order to elude the war, he has even thought of “scheming with some pilot he trusted to fake a crippled engine and then destroy the evidence of deception with a belly landing” (Heller, 2011, p. 355). Besides, Yossarian’s attempt to see himself in opposition to the collectivity is evident in the parade administered by Scheisskopf. Everyone marches ahead, but “YOSSARIAN MARCHED BACKWARD” (Heller, 2011, p. 450). Yossarian’s backward movement in the march reflects his attempt to separate himself from the collectivity.

After Nately’s death, Yossarian “refused to fly anymore” (Heller, 2011, p. 450) missions. His denial to fly more mission at this point suggests his complete break with the chain of catch-22. Instead, he cruises to Rome with Milo. Nately’s death, and corrupted state of humanity, which he observes in Rome, causes Yossarian to break up the fetters and save his individuality. McDonald and Moseley state that Yossarian, after the death of Snowden, starts his journey to “become an active individual, asserting his right to autonomy, and striving to influence rather than be directed by events” (P. McDonald & Moseley, 2012, p. 57). He feels that someone “had to do something sometime. Every victim was a culprit, every culprit a victim, and somebody had to stand up some time to break up the lousy chain of inherited habit that was imperiling them all” (Heller, 2011, p. 465). Motivated by a personal sense of morality, Yossarian decides to be that ‘somebody’ and free himself from the clutches of the military bureaucracy.

Yossarian's refusal to fly more missions is a serious blow to squadron officers like Colonel Cathcart and Colonel Korn. That is why Colonel Korn rebukes Yossarian for misleading the soldiers: "The men were perfectly content to fly as many missions as we asked as long as they thought they had no alternatives. Now you've given them hope" (Heller, 2011, p. 483). As discussed earlier, Yossarian's denial impedes the squadron's operation in a usual manner, revealing the officers' real intent. Also, he has become a model for other soldiers who may emulate him and disobey the chain of command. Colonel Cathcart bursts into anger and calls Yossarian "a disgrace to your uniform" (Heller, 2011, p. 486). Invocations of patriotism and bravery are the best weapon to manipulate the soldiers in the military. However, Yossarian remains unmoved by Colonel Korn's question: "Won't you fight for your country?" (Heller, 2011, p. 486).

Yossarian is resolute to free himself from the controls of authority and the choking environment of war. His anxiety increases to the level of utmost distrust and paranoia. While marching in the parade, Yossarian keeps spinning to make sure no one could sneak into it. Similarly, he keeps "his hand on his gun butt constantly" because "Every sound to his rear was a warning, every person he passed a potential assassin" (Heller, 2011, p. 450). Yossarian is suspicious of everyone around him. Clevinger finds Yossarian paranoid as he has "an unreasonable belief that everybody around him is crazy, a homicidal impulse . . . an unfounded suspicion that people hate him and are conspiring to kill him" (Heller, 2011, p. 23). However, Yossarian is not paranoid in a pathological sense; instead, his self-protective paranoia is "a *reasonable* response to both war and organizational culture" (Melley, 2000, p. 65). An individual requires anti-social attitude and hyper-individualism for his freedom from the collective insanity of the military bureaucracy presented in the novel. Yossarian's 'unfounded suspicion' enables him to recognize the military bureaucracy as a dangerous enemy. His paranoia is an uncompromising form of individualism. Yossarian sees that the war is aimed at him personally as discoursed before.

After an unsuccessful attempt to subjugate Yossarian, Colonel Korn and Colonel Cathcart decide either to court-martial him for deserting duty and travelling to Rome without a pass or to send him home with promotion if he cooperates. Both choices are unfavorable for Yossarian. Hence, instead of choosing promotion and returning home safe, Yossarian takes a third way. He decides to "Desert. Take off. I can turn my back on the whole damned mess and start running" (Heller, 2011, p. 508). Following Orr's path, Yossarian deserts the military and flees to war-neutral Sweden. Apparently, Yossarian's refusal to safe home return is anti-social decision. Nonetheless, going back home with a promotion and leading a civilian life as

per the instruction of Colonel Cathcart would, in a way, be to conform to the military organization. Although it is easier for him to cooperate with Colonel Cathcart and go home after two weeks, he does not want to act upon others' script. Instead, he wants to make his own choice and assert his freedom by fleeing to Sweden. By this choice, Yossarian is trying to free his self from demonic powers in control. Doskow states that Yossarian's soul "can achieve salvation by recognizing evil and resisting or overcoming it" (Doskow, 1967, p. 186). Doskow finds Yossarian's flight to Sweden to be his strategy to resist the forces marshalled against him.

Yossarian refuses to be the vehicle to fulfil the Military's goal any longer. He wants to be the master of himself and does not want the bureaucratic rationalization to influence his desire. Yossarian says: "I've been fighting all along to save my country. Now I'm going to fight a little to save myself. The country is not in danger anymore, but I am" (Heller, 2011, p. 510). Yossarian has significantly contributed to saving his country by flying seventy combat missions. Since the war is already won by the Allies and his country is not in danger any more, Yossarian "merely *abandons* his social commitments" (Melley, 2000, p. 68) by going to Sweden. He is on a combat mission of saving his self and individualism: "From now on I'm thinking only of me" (Heller, 2011, p. 510). This is the boldest and the most individualist decision Yossarian has ever made.

Some critics argue that Yossarian's desertion of the military and flee to war neutral Sweden is an act of cowardice, an unethical and unpatriotic escape from the war. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Bloom criticizes Yossarian's departure to Sweden as immoral and deception to his country. Nonetheless, Yossarian's escape is not motivated by greed but by the rationale of protecting himself. It is indeed "the primordial gesture of the American hero, vital for sustaining his individualism" (Tanner, 1971, p. 79). Yossarian renounces all the comforts, rewards, and hero's homecoming for the sake of his free soul. Walter R. McDonald denounces the position of critics who have labelled Yossarian as an escapist; instead, he finds Yossarian to be a radical individualist who rebels against the military's existing power exertion:

There is in American fiction a tradition of heroes who 'take off', or who renounce ease, or who deny themselves pleasure in quest of individual rather than conventional fulfilment. This radical individualism – absurd, perhaps, or ascetic – shows Yossarian at the end of the story to be not a cop-out, but one of the man rebels in a tradition of rebels. (W. R. McDonald, 1973, p. 14)

Both choices offered by Colonel Cathcart give no room for individuality and freedom; thus, Yossarian "leaves rather than be comfortably tamed and returned as a hero to the civilized

States” (McDonald, 1973, p. 14). He gives up the luxuries offered and chooses to be free. Yossarian distinguishes morality toward the self from the morality toward the organization and prioritizes the former: “I’m not running away from my responsibilities. I’m running to them. There’s nothing negative about running away to save my life” (Heller, 2011, p. 516). For him, those who are not doing anything to save their lives and individuality are not fulfilling their responsibilities. Deserting the war is strategic, a way to defy the authority. Yossarian’s denial to cope with authority is evident when he says: “let the bastards thrive, for all I care, since I can’t do a thing to stop them but embarrass them running away” (Heller, 2011, p. 517). For Yossarian, ‘running away’ is the way of making his own choice, not choosing the options offered.

Other characters like the Chaplain also resist the military’s restrictive norms. The Chaplain, by his disposition, is meek and humble. However, after going through a false allegation, he gathers courage and begins to protest the military’s follies. Primarily, the Chaplain raises a voice against the unequal treatment of the soldiers. To Colonel Korn, he says, “Sir, it just isn’t right to make the men in his group fly eighty missions when the men in other groups are being sent home with fifty and fifty-five” (Heller, 2011, p. 444). His remark reflects how the value of justice in American society has been deteriorated. Chaplain Shipman is the only character in the novel who directly speaks against the injustice of the arbitrary increase of combat missions.

To sum up, this chapter has shown that Heller’s *Catch-22* presents an individual’s war to protect his individuality from the collectivity and Milo’s syndicate. The central theme in the novel is loss of subjectivity and annihilation of self into larger body. Yossarian, along with other soldiers, has been the victim of ‘institutional conspiracy’ in the military, which abridges their individual autonomy and agency. My analysis has revealed that the abridgement of individual agency has made them act either subtly or radically against the controlling institutions. From the outset of the novel, Yossarian, the protagonist of the novel, has realized the existing conspiracy in the military and resisted to achieve his self-reliance. He has created several strategies to struggle against the controlling authority to free his self. At the end of the novel, he is able to depart for Sweden, in an act which Yossarian himself considers to be the fulfilment of his ethical duty to remain free from institutional control of the military. Hence, the novel teaches its readers to be critical and resistant to the larger institutions which control individuals one way or the other.

Nevertheless, the novel also presents some characters who have not realized the conspiracy and worked to fulfil institutional goals. My analysis has shown how the novel has

presented the military as a controlling institution. Characters such as Captain Wren and Captain Piltchard have not realized that they are under the influence of the military. They have completely effaced their self to the self of the military. Thus, my analysis has revealed that the individuals need to resist through counter-schemes to protect their selves and overcome the institutional conspiracy.

3. *Fahrenheit 451*: A Society under Surveillance

Ray Bradbury presents a futuristic post war American society governed by the state's autocratic vision in his dystopian novel *Fahrenheit 451*. He introduces a bleak picture of an imaginary American society where books are banned and burnt as sources of dissension and disharmony. The state authority holds that literature is the source of emotions and intellectual differences; therefore, it causes unhappiness among the people. Bradbury meditates on the lives of individuals under the restrictive and manipulative norms of this repressive government in his novel. Surveillance and filtration of the information are the government's strategical schemes of manufacturing consent and hegemonic domination in this society. The story revolves around the protagonist Montag who works as a fireman. Inversely, his job is not to extinguish the fire but to burn books. However, Montag's perception of the world changes with the progress in the story. Montag realizes that the firehouse he works for limits his freedom and agency. Thereafter, he fights against this governmental agency to reaffirm his individual agency.

The individuals are manipulated and victimized by the state authority in the novel. They are made to believe that books are evil and contain nonsense. This is the conspiracy created by the government to prohibit the books and to eradicate the conflicting ideas which can detect the flaws in the system and revolt against it. The state restricts the knowledge and reasoning of the individuals and makes them busy with media consumption. As Bohanon and Hutson argue, technology like television is "mind-dulling government-run media being a linchpin in maintaining a totalitarian society" (Bohanon & Hutson, 2009, p. 25). Under the government's influence, media largely contribute to the state ideology manipulating the citizens. The authoritarian government in the novel is an allegorical representation of the despotism of modern American society, which has exploited state apparatuses and attempted to shape the people into thoughtless subjects. In a fictional society presented by Bradbury, surveillance and censorship through the firehouse, school and media significantly contribute to the government's conspiracy of maintaining the status quo. The use of state apparatuses to control and manipulate the populace in the novel is a conspiracy in Melley's sense. Melley views mass manipulation by a powerful institution as a conspiracy. It is essential for an individual to act against collectivity since the "monolithic conception of 'society' obviates the need to conceptualize particular interests" (Melley, 2000, p. 10) within that collective system.

Many of Bradbury scholars have analyzed *Fahrenheit 451* as a dystopian novel simply because of the novel's dealing with themes such as censorship and deprivation of individual liberty (Bloom, 2007; Cusatis, 2010; Eller & Touponce, 2004; Seed, 1994, p. 302). Building upon these themes, my study explores how state apparatuses deprive individuality through manipulation, ideology, and conspiracy. Through deeper analysis of the protagonist, along with some other prominent characters, I will claim that institutional conspiracy prevails in the imaginary society of Bradbury, where citizens are under constant surveillance through divergent channels and discursive practices. My study will suggest that the individuals need to consider the state apparatuses as enemies to achieve their individuality. The study further exposes the counter-conspiracy schemes adopted by the characters to achieve their autonomy.

The autocratic regime presented in *Fahrenheit 451* uses its state apparatuses to surveil and repress the individual differences and prolong its reign. The characters in the novel are controlled and manipulated mainly through firehouse, media, school, technology, and architecture which are pivotal mechanisms deployed by the state to make people conform to the ruling class ideology. The state authority is predisposed to eliminate discord to create uniformity and 'happiness' in society. It uses various stratagems of manipulation, coercion, and violence to "maintain the perpetuation of the dominant ideology" (Koç, 2015, p. 110). The state systematically restricts individual freedom and agency to mitigate the chance of revolution. Therefore, characters such as Captain Beatty, Mildred, Clara Phelps, Black and other people in the society depicted have been reduced to manipulated subjects. They do not see any discrepancy between their own individual self and the collective intentionality of the state. Thus, they become the subject of postmodern transference. However, the protagonist Guy Montag and other characters such as Clarisse McClellan, Faber, Granger, and the 'Book People' realize the state's conspiracy and resist its robotizing influence to preserve their selves and autonomy. The conflict between individuality and exterior power exertion of the state mechanisms provides the basis for the novel's plotline. In the following, I will briefly analyze how surveillance and censorship restrict people's freedom of reasoning in the novel. This will be followed by a discussion of the state's scheme of ideological indoctrination and physical domination. I will also delineate how propaganda contributes to propagating the 'happiness' ideology of the state. Finally, I shall focus on some of the characters' strategies to resist the state's manipulation and repression.

Bradbury shows that censorship and surveillance are pernicious to the democratic values of society. They cripple people's autonomy, curiosity, and creativity. They are meant to 'discipline' and punish individuals who do not conform to the state's ruling ideology.

Surveillance creates fear, anxiety, and alienation in individuals because of them being watched. The state's relentless surveillance influences and controls people's behavior. Also, it demands particular forms of behavior from individuals. Surveillance tends to produce docile subjects who conform to society's disciplinary values and thereby lose their individuality. *Fahrenheit 451* illustrates the state's deception through surveillance and censorship, which subjugates the people's independent thinking and subjectivity. Abdol Hossein Joodaki writes: "Surveillance is one of the instruments or mechanisms of power for imposing norms. It attempts to monitor, scrutinize and control the way we behave, talk, hear, or see and interpret our worlds and surroundings" (Joodaki, 2015, p. 7). The state continually monitors the characters and penalizes those who own books. It restricts reading books as a source of conflicting ideas and disharmony.

It is relevant to discuss Jeremy Bentham's concept of 'Panopticon' here. The panopticon is a penal house built in a circular shape. It is compartmentalized into many cells with a watchtower at the center (J.-A. Miller & Miller, 1987). This inspection-house is built in such a way that the warden can see all the inmates without being seen. The fear of being constantly watched leads to the inmates' gradual change in behavior and regulation over their acts. Similarly, in *Fahrenheit 451*, the firehouse functions as a panopticon that keeps gazing at people's activities. Firemen, who ceaselessly surveil people, are the watchdogs deployed by the government. They discourage people from owning and reading books. The firemen penalize people torching books or entire house (if necessary) if they are found to be possessing the books. Regarding the effect of a panopticon, Michel Foucault argues: "He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself . . . he becomes the principle of his own subjection" (Foucault, 1977, pp. 202-203). The subject of surveillance internalizes the constraints set forth by the authority and begins to act accordingly. People in this society are always under the surveillance of different state apparatuses. Therefore, most of the characters in the novel do not possess and read books; instead, they inform the firehouse immediately if they find other people owning any books.

The title of the novel, 'Fahrenheit 451' refers to the temperature at which the firemen burn down papers. People in society are made to believe that books are negative influences; hence, they should either be banned or burnt. In order to disseminate the 'happiness' ideology of the state, the authority reproduces the propagandist proclamation that books are the evil causes of discontent. Guy Montag, the protagonist of the novel, reveals that it is "against the law" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 15) to possess books and read them, in response to Clarisse's query

if Montag “ever read any of the books you burn” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 15). People are prohibited from reading, and they are relentlessly under the surveillance of the government. The people in Bradbury’s society are made to believe that books should no longer exist, since “None of these books agrees with each other” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 52); therefore, they celebrate burning books. People come out of the houses, gather at a place, and watch fire lighting the books with enthusiasm. It is like a carnival for them. Once the firemen start burning the books, no one extinguishes the fire to save the books.

Technology is a crucial means of surveillance in the futuristic American society Bradbury envisions in *Fahrenheit 451*. People are continuously monitored by the firemen and the ‘Mechanical Hound’, an electronic beast made out of copper wires, batteries, memory and olfactory capacity. It is a watchdog of society that represents the government’s control over people. This robotic animal is compared to a dog which the firehouse deploys to inspect and catch fugitives: “The Mechanical Hound slept but did not sleep, lived but did not live in its gently humming, gently vibrating, softly illuminated kennel back in the dark corner of the firehouse” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 35). The description of the Mechanical Hound here shows that it is neither dead nor alive, neither inanimate nor animate. The ‘kennel’ reminds the readers of a dog. This robotic watchdog is programmed to hunt fugitives through its capacity to smell and track down people. Garyn G. Roberts argues that the Hound “is a perverse modernization of the old firehouse dog” (Roberts, p. 28). He also believes that it “is programmed by the firemen, the gatekeepers of morality, to seek out and destroy” (Roberts, p. 28). The Mechanical Hound is an electronic device designed by the firehouse to spy on people. Describing the Mechanical Hound to Montag, Beatty reveals: “It just functions. It’s like a lesson in ballistics. It has a trajectory we decide for it. It targets itself, homes itself, and cuts off” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 38). The Mechanical Hound is equipped with anesthetic needles that attack individuals who violate society’s codes and contradict the state authority. It injects its prey with an anesthetic so that they do not run away anymore. For instance, the Mechanical Hound has been agitated by Montag’s possession of books and has growled and threatened him many times. The firehouse is so vigilant about the people’s suspicious activities, including firemen themselves, that “all of those chemical balances and percentages . . . are recorded in the master file downstairs” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 38). It shows that the firehouse processes personal data and record individuals’ chemical balances to snoop on them quickly.

Even though the Mechanical Hound has its memory and olfactory sense and can target its victims automatically, it is not a thinking machine. The government’s sole motive here is to reduce people into docile and unthinking machine-like subjects; thus, the

government cannot let the machines think like humans. The Mechanical Hound “doesn’t think anything” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 39) but performs as per the data supplied. It is a technological tool of surveillance and enforcer of government’s regulations. The Mechanical Hound creates fear in people through its surveillance and punishment. It obliges people to comply with the government’s ‘happiness’ ideology.

In the novel, the government continuously keeps records of individuals and their engagement in various social activities. It is impossible to be out of the eyes of the government: “Any man’s insane who thinks he can fool the government” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 42). For instance, talking about Clarisse and her family with Montag, Beatty reveals how government directly supervises individuals and keeps all their records:

Clarisse McClellan? We’ve a record on her family. We’ve watched them carefully . . . We had some false alarms on the McClellans, when they lived in Chicago. Never found a book. Uncle had a mixed record; anti-social. The girl? She was a time bomb. The family had been feeding her subconscious, I’m sure, from what I saw of her school record. She didn’t want to know *how* a thing was done, but *why*? (Bradbury, 2008, p. 79)

People in this society are deprived of privacy and individual lives. The government has gone so far as to monitor Clarisse, who is interested in knowing ‘why’ something happens, unlike other students in school. The government expects the students to be involved in sports and watch the televised lessons without asking any questions. It focuses on how they should learn and behave in school. It works to manufacture the consent of growing children, shaping their behavior in the desired form. Clarisse fails to conform to the school’s codes because of her interest in the ‘why’ factor. Thus, she is considered to be anti-social. Students who only focuses on ‘how’ are likely to produce the desired behaviour, hence, are considered as social. Contrarily, interest in ‘why’ factor ruptures the perceived social boundary and threatens the ruling ideology. The cruelty of government is manifested when Beatty states: “Luckily, queer ones like her don’t happen, often. We know how to nip most of them in bud, early” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 79). Clarisse is run over by a car and is killed. If a warning does not work, the government can make people disappear.

The government in the novel is so restrictive and oppressive that people are not allowed to walk freely in the city. Walking in the urban space is a rhetorical act. It creates, alters, and recreates the signification of the things one encounters on the way. Michel de Certeau defines “walking as a space of enunciation” (Certeau, 1984, p. 98). He argues that walking “manipulates spatial organization” and “creates shadows and ambiguities” (Certeau,

1984, p. 101) within the system. Strolling is a way of recreating meaning and redefining the self of individuals. Thus, the delight of walking is to “divert and displace meaning in the direction of equivocalness” (Certeau, 1984, p. 100) in its ambiguous disposition. Aimless strolling in the city space is a rebellious strategy that does not conform to the codes of prohibition. In the novel, Clarisse reveals that her “uncle was arrested . . . for being a pedestrian” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 17). Since walking around is unlawful, Montag gets surprised when he finds Clarisse roaming around on the lawn and asks, “What are you doing out so late wandering about?” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 13). The authority does not want people to go out. The authority fears that people may become curious and thoughtful, observing the natural phenomena that may inspire them to rebel against the norms established. Heinz Paetzold explores the aesthetics of walking in the city and argues that it inspires imagination and reasoning. He states city strolling “consists in the activity of poeticizing what we come across. We invest in our power of imagination. We try to attribute meaning to the changing phenomena around us” (Paetzold, 2013, p. 3). The characters like Clarisse and her uncle who stroll around the park and city streets engage in imagination and rationalization of the phenomena that occurs around them. Hence, they resist the government’s conspiracy of robotizing individuals.

Bradbury also presents the dichotomy between driving and walking in the novel. Since walking can spark a fire of imagination and reasoning in the characters, the government promotes high-speed driving in the streets. Driving, on the one hand, reflects the car-centered consumerist life of American society. On the other hand, driving prevents city strolling, reducing the chance of poeticizing, and rationalizing the changing phenomena. Thus, slow driving is also considered a crime in Montag’s society. Clarisse says: “My uncle drove slowly on a highway once. He drove forty miles an hour, and they jailed him for two days” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 16). Driving slowly, the state believes, allows time to observe changes in nature and provokes individual to think: Hence, it is made unlawful.

The state ideology equates ‘happiness’ with ignorance and uniformity. Similarly, the state presented in the novel believes that the dominant power structure can be preserved and prolonged by eradicating conflicting opinions. It further upholds that the individuals’ pacification through continuous entertainment and distortion from realities makes political change less likely to occur. The state has circulated a false belief that books are the source of all disharmonies, conflicts, and unhappiness in society. The endorsement and propagation of ‘happiness’ ideology by the state authority is propagandist in nature.

Most of the characters have imbibed the government's 'happiness' ideology in *Fahrenheit 451*. It has distorted the real sense of happiness. True happiness comes from within. For this, individuals must be free from impositions and influences. Entertainment programs in television, loud music, and speeding cars are the external temptations to turn individuals away from reality. Happiness for the government is something devoid of contradictions. Society guarantees 'happiness' to those who do not question but rather comply with the system. The state urges that books must be excluded from society.

Captain Beatty, an antagonist in the narrative, is the chief of the firehouse who keeps every record of firemen and people of the society. He represents an autocratic ruler of the state and devotes himself to enforce the state ideology of 'happiness' by burning books. He is also a complex character. Beatty leads the firemen to burn the books though he once read and memorized many books. He considers books to be conspirators because books "turn you on when you think they are backing you" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 139). He is a perfect example of 'Postmodern Transference'. He is not cognizant of his own conditioning and individual identity; instead, he readily conforms to the state ideology and acts as "a disciplining force that restores wayward gone firemen to 'normalcy'" (Pundir, 2017, p. 176). The firehouse stands for the repressive state apparatus, whereas Beatty as a firehouse chief works to 'discipline' people through both violence and ideology.

Beatty tries to persuade Montag that the act of burning books is right. He stresses that the books contain nothing believable but only fictitious and meaningless stories that provoke conflict in the people. So, the only solution to maintain peace and harmony in society is by banning and burning books. He explains: "Colored people don't like *Little Black Sambo*. Burn it. White people don't feel good about *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Burn it" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 78). These books contain ideas antithetical to each other. *Little Black Sambo* is racist in its depiction of black people, whereas *Uncle Tom's Cabin* threatens the supremacy of whites; thus, they are likely to raise the hatred and ill sentiment in American society. Beatty, who is guided by book-burning ideology, believes that books and intellectuality make the system dysfunctional. That is why all the books available must be burnt to maintain 'happiness' in society. This is how the system in *Fahrenheit 451* attempts to control people's freedom of expression and stifle their voices. The government here discourages intellectual curiosity and the thirst for knowledge to mould unquestioning subjects. Beatty makes clear that the government is predisposed to create sameness: "we must all be alike. Not everyone born free and equal, as the constitution says, but everyone *made* equal. Each man the image of every other; then all are happy, for there are no mountains to make them cower, to judge

themselves against” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 77). Sameness eliminates the distinctiveness of individuals and deprives them of individual identity.

School, in the novel, functions as a mechanism of sanctioning ideas and indoctrinating children. It is an ideological state apparatus. The primary concern of the school Clarisse enrolled in is not to teach; instead, to restrict intellectual enterprise and critical thinking. The school shapes the students’ brains the way the government wishes. The government wants to exhaust the creativity and tame the curiosity of the children in the novel. Beatty, in conversation with Montag, unfolds the government’s politics of lowering the age limit for the kindergarten children: “The home environment can undo a lot you try to do at school. That’s why we’ve lowered the kindergarten age year after year until now we’re almost snatching them from the cradle” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 79). Since the family environment profoundly impacts the children, the government is working to snatch a child from the cradle to write its own script on the blank sheet of children’s minds. Althusser argues that the educational institution has replaced the church in its functioning of ideological indoctrination. He writes: “what the bourgeoisie has installed as its number-one, i.e. as its dominant Ideological State Apparatus, is the educational apparatus, which has in fact replaced in its functions the previously dominant Ideological State Apparatus, the Church” (Althusser, 2002, pp. 103-104). School, which systematically contributes to the reproduction of the dominant state ideology, is the first-choice ISA of the ruling class.

The purpose of the school where Clarisse studies is to emphasize “More sports for everyone, group spirit, fun, and you don’t have to think . . . organize and super-organize super-super sports. More cartoons in books. More pictures. The mind drinks less and less” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 75). Clarisse’s description of school activities shows that her school is inclined to instill the students with superficial things and exhaust their mind. She further mentions the school activities: “An hour of TV class, an hour of basketball or baseball or running, another hour of transcription history or painting pictures, and more sports” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 41). School, in general, is supposed to be an academic space for intellectuality, socialization, and progressive development of students’ creativity and inquisitiveness. Instead of sharpening students’ innate talent, Clarisse’ school is committed to exhaust their minds. Althusser finds that the functioning of the school as systematic epistemic violence because “no other ideological State apparatus has the obligatory (and not least, free) audience of the totality of the children in the capitalist social formation, eight hours a day for five or six days out of seven” (Althusser, 2002, p. 105). Althusser opines that the obligatory

presence of children in school facilitates the repressive regime to infuse its ruling ideology in them.

Clarisse, a non-conformist character, does not want to go to school because it only exhausts the students physically and mentally. The school focuses on athletics and sports, preventing students from thinking or involving themselves in purely academic things. She adds: “They run us so ragged by the end of the day we can’t do anything but go to bed or head for a Fun Park to bully people around” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 42). The school is committed to engaging the students in activities that do not require critical thinking. Clarisse, who loves to interact with her friends and teachers, is ironically labelled as ‘anti-social’. The students are just placed together in front of the teacher who appears on the television. They are restricted to talk to each other. They are not allowed to ask questions but are expected to listen passively: “they just run the answers at you, bing, bing, bing, and us sitting there for four more hours of film-teacher” (Bradbury, 2008, pp. 41-42). The teaching method is specially programmed so that the students do not get a chance to exercise their cognitive faculties. There is no presence of a human teacher with whom the students could ask questions. Clarisse dislikes this teaching method which does not allow her to interact with the teacher. Indeed, what the school calls ‘anti-social’ is social, and the silence they are promoting in the school is anti-social.

The government’s autocratic rule in the novel is largely dramatized through the firehouse, which stands for the repressive state apparatus. The firehouse works to maintain ‘peace’ and ‘happiness’ in society. Like the military, the firehouse can use physical force to suppress dissenting ideas and the free spirit of individuals. The firemen sometimes use their power to fight and burn the book owner alive. The story of *Fahrenheit 451* is about Montag’s quest for knowledge and individual freedom. However, in the beginning, Montag serves as a committed fireman, “a member of the state apparatuses which enforces such prescriptions by destroying the books which might counteract the solicitations of the media” (Seed, 1994, p. 227). Seed argues that the firehouse, a governmental apparatus, prescribes firemen to destroy books so that the content fed by media does not contradict the books. The official slogan of the firehouse reveals how the firemen are deployed to burn the books every day. Montag asserts: “It’s fine work. Monday burn Millay, Wednesday Whitman, Friday Faulkner, burn ’em to ashes, then burn the ashes” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 15). The slogan’s phrase, ‘then burn the ashes’, demonstrates that the government decrees the firemen to completely destroy the books and double-check them.

Montag is influenced by the book-burning discourse and works avidly as a fireman at the beginning of the story. Seed claims that he is like a 'robot' (Seed, 1994, p. 227) who follows the instructions given to him and burns a lot of books. Books that contain conflicting ideas contradict the purpose of media. Media in the text are used to distract people from their engagement in intellectual and rational activities. It brainwashes people and makes them zombies who cannot reason. For Montag, "It was a pleasure to burn" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 9) books. He takes pride in his job of burning books. He is pleased to wear the uniform and likes the smell of kerosene that is required to burn books. He is blinded by the state ideology and is an exemplary fireman with his "black hair, black brows, a fiery face, and a blue-steel shaved but unshaved look" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 46). He is presented as a humanoid robot who never has thought about real happiness and freedom until he encountered Clarisse, a seventeen-year witty girl.

There are a series of incidents of manipulation in the novel. Montag begins to reason the socio-cultural practices of repression. He starts enjoying natural phenomena like rain, lawn and wind after he meets with Clarisse. Beatty knows that Montag has turned away and begun reading books. Even after knowing Montag's interest, Beatty tries to influence Montag by stating: "The important thing for you to remember, Montag, is we're the Happiness Boys, the Dixie Duo, you and I and the others. We stand against the small tides of those who want to make everyone unhappy with conflicting theory and thought" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 81). Beatty reminds Montag of his responsibility to fight against the theories that contradict the state ideology and to ensure the contentment of the masses. He attempts to persuade Montag through his knowledge of the books. Beatty, who leads the firemen to burn down the books, ironically quotes several authors such as Sir Philip Sydney, Alexander Pope, and Dr Johnson to Montag. He warns Montag not to fall into books' temptation. To manipulate Montag, Beatty quotes Dr Johnson: "He is no wise man that will quit a certainty for an uncertainty" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 138). In his attempt to lure Montag to continue working as a fireman, he states, "Stick with the firemen, Montag. All else is dreary chaos" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 138)! Beatty's intention in quoting these authors is revealed by Faber, a retired professor, who tells Montag that "He's muddying the water" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 139).

Moreover, Beatty warns Montag not to hold and read the books. His warning alludes to the biblical story of the forbidden tree of knowledge. The biblical narrative of Genesis recounts the story of Adam and Eve, who eat the fruit from the forbidden tree. God in the following verse forbids them to eat fruit from the tree of knowledge, "And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the

tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shall not eat of it” (Genesis 2:16-17, KJV). In punishment for defying his command, God exiles Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. Beatty acts like a God on behalf of the regime he works for and restricts all people, including firemen, from getting knowledge from books. Books here stand for the tree of knowledge and Clarise and Montag as Eve and Adam, who in temptation taste the knowledge from books and discover society’s follies. Beatty does not want the general populace to read books and be informed about the evils of society. Montag, inspired by Clarisse, reads the books and rebels against the government’s restriction. Therefore, both the characters are outcasts from society and are punished. The politics behind the forbidden knowledge is to deprive people of accessing objectionable information and reduce their interest and trust in such information.

3.1 Media, Manipulation and Deindividuation

In *Fahrenheit 451*, mass media such as television, radio, and billboards function to influence and transform people into unthoughtful subjects. They bombard the characters with vacuous details and distract them from the events of the real world. The autocratic state sanctions ‘the truth’ and circulates the desired content to the consumer. Television as mass media belongs to what Althusser calls the ideological state apparatus. Under the control of state bureaucracy, media “serve the end of dominant elite” (Herman & Chomsky, 2005, p. 1), controlling the populace. In the novel, television functions to manipulate people in two distinct ways. Firstly, it keeps viewers busy with fictional dramas, restricting individuals from acquiring knowledge and using their cognitive faculties. Bradbury criticizes the pernicious influence of television through the character Faber, who states television is so dangerous that “It grows you any shape it wishes” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 109). In other words, television brainwashes and produces the desired behavioral changes. Television, in *Fahrenheit 451*, is used to create propaganda, which distracts viewers from reality, and disseminates state ideology.

Propaganda, by nature, is political, which spreads misleading information and influence the masses. Regarding the role of mass media, Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky argue: “It is their function to amuse, entertain, and inform, and to inculcate individuals with the values, beliefs, and codes of behavior that will integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society” (Herman & Chomsky, 2005, p. 1). According to this view, a key aspect of the dangerous influence of the media is its implantation of beliefs and norms in individuals, which makes them ‘organization men’. In other words, media deindividuate individuals.

Montag's wife, Mildred, epitomizes how media have influenced and brainwashed individuals to make zombies out of them in this society. Bradbury presents an account of the fictional government's utmost strategic control and deindividuation through Mildred's characterization. Her robotic portrayal is meant to be representative of the majority of people living in this modern electronic society. Mildred is the best example of postmodern transference, in how she is wholly addicted to media in the forms of 'Parlour' and 'Seashell'. Parlour in the novel is a form of wall-size interactive television technology, while the Seashell ear-thimble is wireless radio technology. Bradbury's imagination of these new technologies appears to be inspired by Alduous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932). In particular, 'Soma', a biological, medical, and psychological technology in the *Brave New World* (Huxley, 1998) somehow resembles with 'Parlor' and 'Seashell' in its functioning. These technologies in both novels work to control characters, who are "consistently manipulated and conditioned by the omnipresent technology and pharmaceutical stimuli" (Švec, 2020, p. 32). Like Mildred's parlour and sleeping pills, soma produces happy hallucination and distracts from the present reality.

Mildred has her 'Parlour' in all three walls of the room, and she is completely immersed in this horrible chamber of the digital world. Her eyes are always glued to the wall. She isolates herself from her real human feelings and rationality by watching television clowns and plugging her ears with Seashell ear-thimbles, which stream music all the time. She is fully loaded with vacuous external information that deprives her of exercising reasoning. She does not think and become curious about anything in her surroundings. She hardly communicates with her husband since she is emotionally shallow and numb. Instead, she keeps interacting with her 'family', the three-dimensional fictional wall, and acts out her scripted part in the virtual world. Montag wants to have kids, but Mildred never cares about having a family. In a conversation with Clarisse, Montag expresses his exasperation as follows: "Well, my wife, she . . . she just never wanted any children at all" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 40). Mildred is so engrossed in the virtual world that she loses her reason to differentiate reality from illusion. She refers to the 'parlour' as "my family" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 65) when Montag on one occasion asks her to close it off. In reality, she has no family as she neither wants to have a baby nor has an emotional attachment with her husband. Besides, Mildred insists that Montag must buy a new fourth wall-television. This implies that Mildred is being fully brainwashed into the virtual world. She has no sense of being a wife and a human individual.

The appearance of Mildred also reminds readers of a humanoid automaton. She looks paranormal in her appearance. Her unusually white-powdered face, colorless lips, chemically burnt hair and stiff body, give the impression more of a humanoid robot than a human being. Her staring at the walls and her emotionless frigidity all contribute to her robotic appearance. After she takes thirty sleeping pills, her appearance is even less lively and even more robotic:

Her face was like a snow-covered island upon which rain might fall, but it felt no rain; over which clouds might pass their moving shadows, but she felt no shadow. There was only the singing of the thimble-wasps in her tamped-shut ears, faintly, in and out of her nostrils, and her not caring whether it came or went, went or came (Bradbury, 2008, p. 21).

Her nostrils, which are inhaling and exhaling air, are the only evidence that she is human and still alive. Even though she is unconscious, special ‘thimble-wasps’ are feeding her brain.

There is also another instance in the novel that shows how technology has hollowed out an individual. When Mildred takes an overdose of thirty sleeping-tablets, the machine operators arrive with some equipment. They use two machines that “pumped all of the blood from the body and replaced it with fresh blood and serum” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 23). The emptying of the blood from the body and infusing it with the fresh blood are symbolic. It suggests a similar mental process: that of the digital media, which first evacuate the brain and then fill it with brand new ideologies. Mildred in this regard can be compared to the Soldier in white, a character in *Catch-22*. The treatment of both Mildred and the Soldier in white involves similar process of emptying fluid from the body and refilling it. This process symbolizes deindividuation of body and manipulation of human mind. Mildred and her friends have internalized the state ideology and conformed to the book banning propaganda. When Montag turns off the ‘parlour’ and reads ‘Dover Beach’ to Mildred and her friends, they are shocked to see a fireman reading a book. They hate Montag and notify the firehouse about his reading. Mildred is so manipulated that she does not hesitate to go against her husband.

Mildred hardly feels for others. Her bland announcement of Clarisse’s death is an example of this. Besides, she is also emotionally numb to her husband. Once she, at midnight, leaves Montag alone in the bed. Montag is worried and gets up to look for her. He stops by the kitchen and finds her there:

Toast popped out of the silver toaster, was seized by a spidery metal hand that drenched it with melted butter. Mildred watched to the toast delivered to her plate.

She had both ears plugged with electronic bees that were humming the hour away.

She looked up suddenly, saw him, and nodded. (Bradbury, 2008, pp. 27-28)

The machine appeases Mildred's appetite, and her brain is fed by 'electronic bees' humming in her ears. She is so mechanical that she just reads Montag's lips and nods her head. When she speaks, she has mostly monosyllabic communication with Montag. Her responses are disinterested and callous.

Mildred is immersed in virtual reality. She states: "Well, this is a play comes on the wall-to-wall circuit in ten minutes. They mailed me my part this morning . . . They write the script" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 30). She is busy all day long with interactive television on her walls. Digital media dissociate Mildred from the real world and control her real emotions. Aldous Huxley comments on Bradbury's novel: "A society, most of whose members spend a great deal of their time ... in the irrelevant other worlds of sport and soap opera ... will find it hard to resist the encroachments of those who would manipulate and control it" (qtd. in Schmerl, 1959, pp. 40-41). Huxley uncovers the state politics of employing media to detach people from social and political awareness. Mildred acts via external dictation, internalizing a scripted life which she never thinks of resisting. She appears to be happy, but manipulation has taken her away from her real self. She, in reality, is not pleased: "But that was another Mildred, that was a Mildred so deep inside this one, and so bothered, really bothered, that the two women had never met" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 69). Media and discourse have constructed seemingly happy people. However, a seemingly happy self is not the real one. There is a vast discrepancy between the interior self and the self-constructed by exteriority. She is not given the freedom to speak her mind; instead, the script is sent to her. She is expected to answer "I sure do" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 30) in response to "Do you agree to that, Helen?" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 30). She is not provided with any choice to disagree. It is all designed by the autocratic regime in the text to deny freedom of thought and agency to perpetuate the governmental reign and control on individuals' minds.

Digital manipulation is a recurrent theme of the novel. Bradbury dramatizes the issue of media propaganda in *Fahrenheit 451*. Mass media like television, radio, and billboard have helped to spread the idea that books are evil and must be destroyed. Media have turned characters into dullards. They have been distracted from important issues like politics with relentless telecasting of entertainment programs. The repetition of the same useless message makes characters indifferent to the politics and conflicts of society. Consequently, some characters begin to believe in vacuous and superficial messages circulated by the media. For instance, Mildred and her friends Clara Phelps and Ann Bowels talk about politics in

Mildred's electronic chamber. They put forth their views about the presidential election, but they opt to choose a president based on candidates' appearance and name. They do not argue about the political agenda of the presidential candidates. This conversation demonstrates that their inability to reason. Faber discloses the adverse effects of television technology on the masses: "The television is 'real'. It is immediate, it has dimension. It tells you what to think and blast it in. It *must* be right. It *seems* so right. It rushes you on so quickly to its own conclusions your mind hasn't time to protest" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 109). The television makes imaginary things real and vice versa. Characters like Mildred take it as real and fail to understand the media's purposeful design to manipulate people.

The government's manipulation of the truth is revealed when it uses media and technology in chasing Montag and faking his death towards the end of the story. The mechanical hound chases Montag, and the whole city watches this televised chase that ends with the black screen and the audio announcing Montag's death. Actually, as Montag wears Faber's old clothes and disguises his scent, the mechanical hound cannot chase him anymore. Police in the chasing helicopter also loses sight of him as he avoids the searchlight in the darkness and dives into the river. Granger, the leader of 'Book People', talks to Montag and reveals how the government schemes and manipulates mass through the televised show. He says, "They're faking. You threw them off at the river. They can't admit it. They know they can hold their audience only so long. The show's got to have a snap ending, quick . . . So they're sniffing for a scapegoat to end things with a bang" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 190). The government fakes Montag's death by killing a homeless man. The government does so to save itself from the humiliation of losing its prey. It makes the innocent homeless man a scapegoat and announces that "The search is over, Montag is dead; a crime against society has been avenged" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 192). The government uses television and propagandizes the official 'truth' regardless of the actual event. Besides, the government's telecasting misinformation of Montag's death is strategic to create fear in people. The government wants to spread the message that acting against state ideology is punishable by any means.

Bradbury makes a critique of consumerism culture from Faber's point of view. He points out how technology has reduced humanity and God's grandeur into entertainment objects. He ruminates: "Lord, how they've changed it in our 'parlours' these days. Christ is one of the 'family' now" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 106). He further wonders "if God recognizes His own son the way we've dressed him up" (Bradbury, 2008, p. 106). The sanctity of God has been defiled. God's image has been manipulated and reduced to the status of a

recreational object produced by the culture industry. The culture industry is an entertainment industry which reproduces mass culture “infecting everything with sameness” (Horkheimer, Adorno, Jephcott, & Noeri, 2020, p. 94) and “populates the inner world of people by making them believe the existing social order can satisfy all their desires and needs, by dictating what those needs are” (Dainow, 2014, p. 4). The culture industry creates desires through advertisements and produces ‘must have’ goods. The novel features a high-speed car called ‘beetle’, which can reach up to 130 mph. These cars symbolize consumer culture. The government in the novel believes that consumerism makes people happy. That is why Mildred expresses her joy to Montag when driving the ‘beetle’ at the speed of 95 mph. The giant billboards on the way work to distract people from natural beauty and produce desire for consumer products.

Uniformity is central to the government’s ideology of ‘happiness’ in the novel. The government believes that the ideology of happiness helps to eradicate passion, rebelliousness, and violence. It prescribes certain parameters in the construction of houses to create aesthetic uniformity. Architectural control tends to homogenize the diversity and the buildings’ interior and exterior to create uniformity. The constraints in the structure of the building symbolize that the government is watching over every house and the people living in those houses. Referring to her uncle, Clarisse unravels the government’s rationale behind the uniform architecture as follows:

No front porches. . . . there used to be front porches. And people sat there sometimes at night, talking when they wanted to talk, rocking, and not talking when they didn’t want to talk. Sometimes they just sat there and thought about things, turned things over. . . . the architects got rid of the front porches because they didn’t look well. But . . . that was merely rationalizing it; the real reason, hidden underneath, might be they didn’t want people sitting like that, doing nothing, rocking, talking; that was the wrong *kind* of social life. People talked too much. And they had time to think. So they ran off with the porches. (Bradbury, 2008, pp. 82-83)

There used to be porches in the building in the past, but the government decides to demolish them. The authorities do not want people to sit idle, observe outside views, talk, and think. All these activities are supposed to be a ‘wrong *kind* of social life’ as it contradicts the social behaviour the government works to produce from its citizens. The government works to create harmony in social behaviour in which an individual should be an unthinking and a passive recipient. There is also uniformity in the interior of the houses presented in the novel. The living rooms of most of the houses have screen-walls making the interior of houses

similar. David Seed writes: “One of Montag’s earliest realization in the novel is that his house is exactly like thousands of other. Identical therefore capable of substitution, it can never be his own” (Seed, 1994, p. 229). The identical living units in the city remind Montag of the loss of diversity.

3.2 Resistance in *Fahrenheit 451*

Restrictions with regard to owning and reading books in *Fahrenheit 451* symbolize the denial of intellectual reasoning and freedom of expression, which are the pressing issues the characters engage with. Some characters such as Montag, Clarisse, Faber, Granger, and the ‘Book People’ comprehend the government’s propagandist and autocratic stratagems and resist its robotizing manipulation. They have realized that book banning, and relentless media streaming are forms of distraction that the government uses to reduce people to unthinking beings. This realization makes them treat the state apparatus as their enemy. That is why they resist the repressive norms of the state to regain their individual freedom.

Influenced by the ‘happiness’ propaganda of the state, Montag shows a servile attitude to the system of conformity and censorship at the beginning of the novel. As a fireman, he enforces the government’s norm of eradicating society’s contesting ideas by destroying books. However, Montag is the most developed character in the novel, who turns against the state authority, rebels against to achieve his agency, and contributes towards the revival of book-reading culture. After his encounter with the fearless Clarisse, he begins to understand the conspiracy of the government and the loss of his individual agency. Rafeeq McGiveron argues that Clarisse acts as a mirror not only for Montag but also for society (McGiveron, 1998, p. 283). Clarisse is like a mirror to Montag in the sense that “she has no ideological agenda. For the most part Clarisse does not interpret or offer suggestions; she merely draws Montag’s attention to facts he should already understand” (McGiveron, 1998, p. 284). Clarisse’s question to Montag, “Are you happy?” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 17) works as a mirror inspiring Montag to contemplate and reflect upon whether he is actually happy with his life. He begins to question himself in the quiet room, “Am I *what?* What does she think? I’m not?” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 17). Montag broods over his plight and has an epiphany that he is not happy in a real sense.

Montag discovers that society is prohibitive and repressive. Thus, it is in opposition to the bliss of nature and the spirit of freedom. Montag looks upon his life and his cold, loveless conjugal bond. He imagines his bedroom with twin beds where his wife would be “stretched

on the bed, uncovered and cold, as a body displayed on the lid of a tomb, her eyes fixed to the ceiling” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 20). His loveless life is juxtaposed with that of the McClellans. Montag is lured by the light and lively conversation of the McClellans. The realization of his meaningless family life and his job for a despotic government turns him into despair. He feels guilty for burning books and seizing others’ autonomy and happiness. He then explores his ‘self-consciousness’ (Bradbury, 2008, p. 45) and starts hiding and reading books.

Clarisse can be interpreted as Montag’s wisdom, which is in a constant battle with his ignorance and the false belief infused in his mind. Clarisse works as a catalyst in Montag’s journey towards individuality and helps him think independently. She bets Montag does not know that there is “dew on the grass in the morning” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 16). It makes him think but he “couldn’t remember if he had known this or not, and it made him quite irritable” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 16). Montag has been so mechanical in the last decade of his life that he was just busy burning books. He enjoyed neither the beauty of nature nor the real happiness that his soul longs for. Clarisse is also compared to “the dial of a small clock” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 18), which reminds Montag of the hours of swiftly passing darkness and “moving also toward a new sun” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 18). It is a projection of Montag’s psyche, which now quickly passes through ignorance to knowledge. Clarisse refracts Montag’s spiritual light to himself and shows him his “innermost trembling thought” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 18):

Darkness. He was not happy. He was not happy. He said the words to himself. He recognized this as the true state of affairs. He wore the happiness like a mask and the girl had run off across the lawn with the mask and there was no way of going to knock on her door and ask for it back. (Bradbury, 2008, pp. 19-20)

Through his conversations with Clarisse, Montag understands that the propagandist ‘happiness’ is just a mask. The government’s politics of ‘happiness’ is a means to cover up the anguish and anxiety of people. Montag realizes that he is unhappy deep down his heart. The images of light and darkness which stand for happiness and discontentment are recurrently used in the text. Clarisse McClellan’s house “was so brightly lit this late at night while all the other houses were kept to themselves in darkness” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 26). The quote implies that the only happy family in this society is that of the McClellans. The other people in society are just wearing a mask of ‘happiness’ but are discontent in reality. Montag begins to make sense of the government’s conspiracy when he realizes that he is not happy. Montag’s way of perceiving the government’s ‘happiness’ ideology becomes noticeable as Mildred notices: “The man is *thinking!*” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 29). To think and seek for logic

behind phenomena, in a real sense, is to rebel in the novel since thinking is strategically discouraged in this society.

Furthermore, Montag begins to reason why firemen are all modelled as “mirror-images of himself” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 46). All the firemen look alike, which symbolically conveys the message that each fireman is shaped in the same way psychologically. Uniformity in the firemen’s appearance makes Montag realize the firemen’s conformity to the ruling ideology and absence of his individuality and identity. Montag begins to see the firehouse as his enemy and denies his collective identity as a fireman. While he previously was a submissive and exemplary fireman, Montag now reflects on “how it would feel . . . to have firemen burn *our* houses and *our* books” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 46) and shares his emotion with Beatty. Montag thinks in opposition to the way he has been trained and indoctrinated. Montag’s questioning his own job and expressing his doubt to the chief authority is a sign of resistance. In the firehouse, he observes the “wall with the typed lists of a million forbidden books . . . leapt in fire” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 47). Suddenly he realizes that they should not have burned those books, and “a cool wind started up” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 47) in his mind. It is simply the wind of change – a change in his attitude towards books, job, and society. Clarisse has sparked a fire inside Montag’s mind, enlightening him and inciting him to ask: “Didn’t firemen prevent fires rather than stoke them up and get them going?” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 47). Montag detests his job of burning books and comprehends that firemen’s real job is to preserve things from the fire.

An old woman’s self-immolation with her books is another example of rebellion against the authorities. The old woman denies the state’s regulation of banning books. She is a book martyr who says, “I want to stay here” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 53) in the fire. She does not want to leave the world of wisdom and knowledge symbolized by the books. She is the first human victim of firemen, whose “accusing silence” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 50) makes Montag feel guilty. For her, books are inseparable from human life; thus, she immolates herself in a stack of books, not wanting to live in the phony world of mass media and manipulation. She asserts her individualism in the sense that she does not let the firemen dictate her life. Her choice of disregarding conformity “was spoiling the rituals” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 50) for the firemen. Besides, she can be read as a character who demonstrates how important books are in human life.

Montag undergoes an immense change in his attitude towards books after his encounter with the old woman. He becomes guilt-ridden, admitting: “We burned a thousand books. We burned a woman” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 66). Formerly, he used to love the smell of

kerosene, now the “odour of kerosene made him vomit” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 66). The old woman’s self-immolation further arouses curiosity in Montag. Montag reasons that “There must be something in books, things we can’t imagine, to make a woman stay in a burning house” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 68). That is why his hand “plunged the book back under his arm, pressed it tight to sweating armpit” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 51). Montag’s act of hiding books and carrying them to his house is against the law. Nevertheless, he dares not only to keep the books but also to read and quench his thirst for knowledge. His psychological transformation has begun to be manifested in his actions as he argues with Beatty and steals a book for reading. His psychic metamorphosis can be observed in the following extract:

Last night I thought about all the kerosene I’ve used in the past ten years. And I thought about books. And for the first time I realized that a man was behind each of the books. A man had to think them up. A man had to take a long time to put them down on paper. And I’d never even thought that thought before. (Bradbury, 2008, p. 68)

Montag realizes that he must preserve and reproduce books instead of lighting them up in a fire as he did in the past. This realization transforms him from a book destroying fireman to a rebellious book preserver. Although Beatty threatens to burn the books in Montag’s possession, Montag tells his wife that he “can’t burn these” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 86). He now is on a mission to print and reproduce the books and freeing himself from the firehouse’s control.

Like Clarisse, Faber and Granger function to disillusion Montag from his false belief in ‘happiness’ and incite him towards overt resistance. Faber is living an exiled life for forty years and has a great reverence for literature which he believes “stitched the patches of the universe together into one garment for us” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 108). Faber feels guilty for not resisting the state’s despotic regulation of books and literature. He has been so scared of the repressive government that he has not been able to raise his voice against society’s misconduct despite being an intellectual academic. He now denigrates himself for his “terrible cowardice” that did not let him protest earlier in life. However, he still believes in the integrity of the self and serves as Montag’s conscience in opposition to Beatty’s negative influence. Faber has invented a fabulous two-way radio technology that helps to forward the plan of revolting against institutional repression by reproducing the books available.

Montag ardently works on a counter-conspiracy, which involves spreading books and knowledge to reinstate literate and humanistic society. This, of course, involves many challenges since possession of the books is unlawful. Still, Montag wants to get more books

and reproduce them with the help of Faber. Faber argues that mere reproduction of books cannot change the current repressive environment; instead, “somehow the fireman structure itself could be burnt” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 111). He also reminds him that it involves a risk. However, Montag is so resolute that he is ready to die for the good cause. He says that it is “the good part of dying; when you’ve got nothing to lose, you run any risk you want” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 110). Montag’s statement here invokes the Marxist ethos of a revolution that the have-nots have the world to conquer but just a chain to lose. Montag feels that the state has implanted a false consciousness in his mind, thereby snatched his self and made him alien to himself. He wants to fight against the state’s ‘happiness’ ideology by freeing himself from this incurred tutelage and regaining his self.

Outraged by the government’s repressive policy, Montag begins to overtly rebel in the later part of the story. He disappoints his wife Mildred and her two friends who watch television in Mildred’s ‘parlour’. Montag “reached inside the parlour wall and pulled the main switch. The images drained away as if the water had been let out from a gigantic crystal bowl of hysterical fish” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 122). He wants to stop the brainwashing streaming of interactive television and tries to make their leisure time productive. To the women’s shock, he instead begins to read them ‘Dover Beach’, a poem by Matthew Arnold. Montag’s reading of ‘Dover Beach’ is significant. The poem depicts the decadence of humanity and religious faith in the modern world, which appears in Montag’s society too. His interest in reading demonstrates a clear development in his character. Fernanda Luisa Feneja interprets the growth of Montag’s character as “a path of self-knowledge, of discovery and of growing awareness – of himself, of other people, of society, of what man has made of man” (Feneja, 2012, p. 17). Montag’s choice of reading hints at his ability to revolt against the authority and right the social evils. His desire to read is further seen when he decides not to go to work one night but read books instead. Beatty knows it and warns Montag of his deviation.

Towards the end of the novel, the fire alarm rings at Montag’s house. He then is forced to set fire to his own house and is placed under arrest by Beatty. Aggravated by Beatty’s humiliation, the rebel consciousness of Montag gets activated, and Montag burns Beatty to ashes with a flamethrower: “one continuous pulse of liquid fire on [Beatty],” after proclaiming, “We never burned right” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 154). Montag’s action of burning Captain Beatty with a writhing flame can be interpreted in two ways. First, it shows that he has become able to reason because he says, “we never burned right”, and then burns Beatty. Second, he frees himself from institutional duties and responsibilities, which allows him his

autonomy. The incident of burning Beatty is also epiphanic as Montag sees the firehouse as his enemy that has reduced his agency for years. Furthermore, Montag achieves individuality by burning Beatty “since it indicates man’s fight for freedom and dignity under oppression. Montag’s murder of Beatty stands for his revolt against the government since Beatty is represented as the champion of its principals,” (Kuo, 2010, p. 13). Montag’s expression after Beatty’s murder is very thoughtful. He thinks, “Beatty, . . . you’re not a problem now. You always said, don’t face a problem, burn. Well, now I’ve done both. Goodbye, Captain” (Bradbury, 2008, p. 157). The lines above clearly show that Montag is no longer a brainwashed subject controlled by the state apparatus. Instead, he has become a thoughtful individual who has an ability to reason.

After knocking other firemen and destroying the Hound, he limps to Faber’s house. He willingly challenges the authority and easily outsmarts a new Mechanical Hound and a police helicopter by escaping with Faber’s clothes. Montag’s psychological transformation is always symbolized by his acts that occurred in the story. His drinking of wine symbolizes Montag partaking in Eucharist, which consecrates and regenerates his spirit. Likewise, Montag’s diving into the river and coming out to the other shore to escape the state’s hunt alludes to the baptismal ceremony of Christianity. It also symbolizes his spiritual rebirth. Montag’s regeneration is already anticipated, as indicated by the phoenix’s symbol in his uniform earlier. He succeeds in freeing himself from the controlling schemes of the despotic government. Following Faber’s instruction, determined Montag becomes a part of the ‘Book People’ at the end of the story. In the leadership of Granger, ‘Book People’ is committed to preserving books through this dark age. This group hopes to rebuild the civilization by memorizing the books since the government cannot erase human memory. This community’s goal is to protect the books and reproduce them when the status quo is challenged.

In summary, this chapter has shown that Bradbury’s novel presents an individual’s journey from an ignorant, book-burning fireman to a rebellious book lover. The protagonist, Montag’s struggles against the firehouse, a state apparatus, to achieve his agency by deserting his job. His desertion reveals his firm determination to save the books instead of burning them. This chapter has uncovered that censorship and surveillance through media and technology function as governmental strategies to repress individuality, intellectuality, and diversity. The oppressive rule of state apparatus influences the characters’ autonomy in the novel. Hence, Montag rebels to overthrow the firehouse and free himself from its regimentation. In addition, my analysis has shown that the individuals in this society are manipulated and brainwashed with a governmental ideology of so-called ‘happiness’. It has

also shown that one has to resist robotizing manipulation of the government's apparatuses to attain autonomy. Montag's escape from the domineering government makes him a changed person and provides him with the possibility to be himself. Nonetheless, the analysis has also revealed the effect of a repressive system that makes some of the characters lack the passion for knowledge and imagination. The characters, such as Mildred, Mrs. Phelps, Mrs. Bowles, and the firemen, fail to understand the government's conspiracy. They conform to state ideology and become its victims. Through the character of Montag, Bradbury questions whether a society devoid of external control can still exist. In particular, my analysis has exposed the failure of society in maintaining absolute supremacy and totalitarian regime and has pointed to the optimism of democratic society where individuals are free to make their own choices.

4. Conclusion

This study has explored that the characters in Joseph Heller's *Catch-22* and Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* are under the influence of the state apparatuses in fictional postwar American society. The repressive operations of governmental authority in these novels limit individuals' freedom, manipulate and reduce them to puppets. This creates an agential crisis in the characters. However, both protagonists, Yossarian in *Catch-22* and Montag in *Fahrenheit 451*, embark on a journey of rebellion when they begin to look themselves in opposition to the collective goals of military and firehouse, respectively.

My analysis of *Catch-22* and *Fahrenheit 451* has shown that both novels deal with the similar cultural environment of McCarthyism in postwar America. McCarthyism in these novels creates anxieties of loss of autonomy and agency in the characters. It was committed to infiltrate communists and pursue individuals using secret services. As discussed before, F.B.I. in *Catch-22* suspects Major Major being a communist and spies on him. Major Major was a brilliant student who took English History at university. His interest in English history over American history is feared as disloyalty to America. Similarly, the chaplain is charged and is arrested by the government men. He is accused of several misconducts of which F.B.I. does not know yet. The government men work to make a case against him. The mistrust and unwarranted charge against Major Major and the chaplain present the issue of McCarthyism in *Catch-22*.

Similarly, Bradbury's imagination in writing *Fahrenheit 451* was triggered by repressive norms of McCarthyism in general and, particularly, by the censorship in books in schools and public libraries. M. Keith Booker claims that this novel "responds to the cultural environment in America in the early 1950s" (Booker, 1994, p. 127). The operation of the firehouse in *Fahrenheit 451* to burn and ban the books foregrounds the state's censorship in information. The firehouse functions to create loyalty and conformity to the American government in the novel. It alludes to the State Department in America during McCarthyism, which blacklisted many books and burned them. The U.S. Information Service Libraries were accused of circulating communist books and promoting their activism in the country and overseas.

Heller and Bradbury have both raised an important issue concerning language and its relation to an individual's freedom. Both the novels show that the repressive government restricts the reasoning of individuals through the control and manipulation of language. However, they have presented this issue differently. Authority in *Catch-22* has produced

various ‘catches’ (two of them have been addressed in my analysis), which create constraints and do not let an individual be free. Thus, ‘catch-22’ as a circular trap of language functions as an enemy in *Catch-22*. When Yossarian realizes its linguistic entrapment, he learns to defy ‘catch-22’ through lying, forging a signature and “detach(ing) language from truth” (Seed, 1989, p. 35). By contrast, the government in *Fahrenheit 451* is devoted to eradicating books that deliver messages to its citizens by means of language. The books communicate with the readers through language, which makes them carriers of knowledge and rationality. That is why the books are banned and burnt to avoid diversity from the fictional society of *Fahrenheit 451*. In this way, language has become a tool to detach characters from reality. There is a striking resemblance between Yossarian and Montag in understanding the message conveyed in language. Yossarian in *Catch-22* cannot decipher the meaning of ‘catch-22’, and later he understands it with Doc Daneeka’s explanation. In contrast, Montag in *Fahrenheit 451* seeks help from the retired English professor Faber to comprehend the meaning of the books he reads.

Catch-22 and *Fahrenheit 451* deal with the theme of war; however, the characters in these novels perceive the war differently. The war in *Catch-22* is presented as the source of anxiety among the characters. The novel implicitly presents Germany as the enemy in the war. The characters are painfully scared of losing their lives because of the mindless bureaucratic leaders in the military who prolong the war even though the Allied force already won the war. The protagonist and some other characters are always trying to escape the war. Conversely, the war is always looming over Montag’s unnamed city. Nonetheless, there is no clear indication of an official enemy in comparison to *Catch-22*. The war in *Fahrenheit 451* is presented as a source of optimism rather than anxiety. Protagonist Montag and the ‘Book People’ believe that the war is essential to disrupt the societal degeneration caused by state repression, surveillance, and censorship. They hope to rebuild the societal values with their knowledge after the destruction of the existing social structure. More importantly, this study has excavated that both novels have presented the protagonists’ war against collectivity. Yossarian in *Catch-22* fights against the military, whereas Montag in *Fahrenheit 451* combats against the firehouse. They both realize the collectivity and institutional normativity to be enemies of an individual’s attempt to achieve freedom and autonomy. Mindless characters in both novels succumb to the war because they cannot think for themselves. But the protagonists Yossarian and Montag reject the collective ideals, escape the war, and assert their individuality.

The military in *Catch-22* and the firehouse in *Fahrenheit 451* are the repressive state apparatuses that have fundamentally functioned as the enemy of the protagonists. Both institutions involve restrictive norms and physical violence to manipulate and victimize the characters. They deny individuals' agency and autonomy. Many characters fall into the manipulative intent of these apparatuses and transfer their selves to the collectivity in both novels. It is a conspiracy to manipulate the mass without their consent. Media, power, and discourses manufacture consent in the characters, hence, produce the 'postmodern transference'. Captain Piltchard and Wren in *Catch-22* and Mildred and Clara in *Fahrenheit 451* are examples of 'postmodern transference' who do not see their distinct individual existence apart from their compliance with the collective body. Instead, they exhibit the behavior demanded by these institutions. Captain Piltchard and Captain Wren readily wait to fly more missions despite the threat to their lives, whereas Mildred and Clara keep consuming media feeds, dissociating themselves from day-to-day activities and family responsibilities. Through the presentation of these characters, Bradbury and Heller have demonstrated the prevailing reality of the postwar American society, where people were constantly working to fulfil the institutional goal without acknowledging the manipulative and repressive stratagems of the state apparatuses.

Contrastingly, Yossarian and Montag become rebellious due to their realization of a moral obligation to their selves and society. Both the protagonists become disillusioned about their individual essence, mainly because of the incidents of deaths in the novels. Snowden's death in the Avignon mission causes Yossarian to realize that a man without the spirit is just matter which by extension means a man without an integrated self is alien to himself. It also reveals the terror and absurdity of war and intensifies his fear of death. Similarly, the witnessing of the death of an old woman who immolates herself in a stack of book haunts and makes Montag realize the importance of the book and individual's freedom. Colonel Cathcart is against the self-interest of Yossarian in *Catch-22*, whereas Montag has to engage with Beatty in *Fahrenheit 451*. Although both of them struggle against the governmental organization, the ways they resist differ from each other.

The military in *Catch-22* and the firehouse in *Fahrenheit 451* function to control thoughts and limit individual's freedom and agency. The most crucial parallelism between these novels is the way the protagonists treat the state apparatuses they are associated with. Both Yossarian and Montag work ardently for the organizational goal of the military and the firehouse, respectively, until they discover the loss of agency and freedom caused by bureaucratic controls. Yossarian's realization of his diminished agency makes him plot

against the military and its catches. His schemes include faking illness, refusing to wear uniform, and escaping the war and fleeing to Sweden. Like Yossarian, Montag has not realized the governmental conspiracy at the beginning of the novel, although he has already served for more than ten years. At that point, he is a manipulated subject who works to fulfil institutional goals. However, he starts realizing the conspiracy when he comes in contact with Clarisse, who helps him see the ongoing practice from a different perspective. If Clarisse ignites the spark in Montag to see things differently, it is only after an old woman's immolation that Montag understands the value of books. He then comes to realize state conspiracy.

Although both Yossarian and Montag understand the conspiracy that limits their freedom, there is a difference in the way they come to understand it. On the one hand, in Yossarian's case, his anxiety is the main reason for realizing the conspiracy in the military. Contrastingly, Montag comes to realize the conspiracy with help from other such as Clarisse, the unnamed old woman and Faber. However, after this realization, he also creates counter-schemes like Yossarian. His counter-schemes against the state apparatus, which has limited his agency, involves stealing a book, reading it, asking a favor from Faber to understand the book's content, working to reproduce the books. Nonetheless, the most vital action that Montag does is to burn Beatty, the head of the firehouse. Montag's act of burning Beatty with a flamethrower clearly shows his rebellious nature and his hunger for achieving his individuality. Concerning individualism, Yossarian and Montag differ from each other. Yossarian appears to be humanist who defies to comply with Dobb's plan to kill Colonel Cathcart, his enemy and rather flees to Sweden. He believes that Cathcart has right to live too. Montag kills Beatty for his freedom. Unlike Yossarian, Montag becomes far more radical in his endeavor to achieve his individuality.

Interestingly, in search of their individuality, both Montag and Yossarian have to desert the place where they have been living. As we saw before, Yossarian has flown to war-neutral Sweden while Montag has left the unnamed city and joined the 'Book people' in another city. Heller and Bradbury provide an optimistic ending to their respective novels. Both try to articulate that it is possible to regain lost agency and fulfil our ethical responsibility towards ourselves if we can disassociate ourselves from the collectivity. They present protagonists who are resisting the state apparatuses and have been able to regain their agency to a certain degree. Through their protagonists, Heller and Bradbury have anticipated optimism in postwar American society, which can give hope for people to rebel and fight for their individuality in other places and other times.

Works Cited:

- “Catch-22”. Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/catch-22?q=catch+22>
- “Conspiracy”. Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/conspiracy>
- “Conspire”. Merriam Webster Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/conspire>
- Abrams, M., & Harpham, G. G. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* 7th Edition. In: USA: Holt.
- Algren, N. (2009). The Catch. *Bloom’s Modern Critical Interpretations: Joseph Heller’s Catch-22–New Edition*, 9-11.
- Althusser, L. (2002). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes towards an Investigation. In (pp. 85): Monthly Review Press.
- Atasoy, E. (2015). Impediment to Knowledge and Imagination in Ray Bradbury’s Dystopian Novel, Fahrenheit 451. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 55(1), 399-414.
- Barlow, D. H. (2004). *Anxiety and Its Disorders: The Nature and Treatment of Anxiety and Panic*: Guilford press.
- Bloom, H. (2007). *Bloom’s Guides: Ray Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451*. New York: Chelsea House.
- Bloom, H. (2009). *Joseph Heller’s Catch-22*: Infobase Publishing.
- Bohanon, C. E., & Hutson, W. A. (2009). *The Economics of Ray Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Private Enterprise Education (APEE).
- Booker, M. K. (1994). *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport, Connecticut, US: Greenwood Press.
- Bradbury, R. (2008). *Fahrenheit 451*. London: Harper Voyager.
- Braudy, L. (2013). 3. Realists, Naturalists, and Novelists of Manners. In *The Harvard Guide to Contemporary American Writing* (pp. 84-152): Harvard University Press.

- Braudy, S. (1968, October, 14). Laughing All the Way to the Truth. *New York Magazine*, 1(28), 64. Retrieved from https://books.google.no/books?id=cuICAAAAMBAAJ&pg=PA41&lpg=PA41&dq=laughing+all+the+way+to+the+truth/new+york+magazine&source=bl&ots=PuPyemPujE&sig=ACfU3U2I7XweKpOh4h8KL_itUuKaia5oDA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiA862OpsDnAhW0AxAIHchhCKIQ6AEwAHoECACQAQ#v=onepage&q=laughing%20all%20the%20way%20to%20the%20truth%2Fnew%20york%20magazine&f=false
- Britannica, E. (2011). Milo Minderbinder. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Milo-Minderbinder>
- Britannica, E. (2019, December, 8). Joseph Heller. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Joseph-Heller>
- Britannica, E. (2021). New Deal. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/New-Deal>
- Cacicedo, A. (2005). " You must remember this": Trauma and Memory in Catch-22 and Slaughterhouse-Five. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 46(4), 357-368.
- Certeau, M. d. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. California: University of California Press.
- Cheatham, M. R. (April 11, 2019). Conspiracy Theories Abounded in 19th Century American Politics. *Smithsonian Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/conspiracy-theories-abounded-19th-century-american-politics-180971940/>
- Chirobocea, O. (2018). WHO IS THE ENEMY? THE BLURRED LINES OF HISTORY IN JOSEPH HELLER'S CATCH-22. *BAS British and American Studies*, 24(24), 65-76.
- Craig, D. M. (1986). CLOSURE RESISTED: STYLE AND FORM IN JOSEPH HELLER'S NOVELS. . *The Centennial Review*, 30(2), 238-250. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/23738715
- Cranston, M. (2020). Ideology. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/ideology-society>
- Cusatis, J. (2010). *Research Guide to American Literature, 1945-1970* (Vol. 6). New York: Facts on File.
- Dainow, B. (2014). Frankfurt Meets Hollywood: Adorno and Horkheimer's" The Culture Industry. *National University of Ireland. Maynooth*.
- DeLillo, D. (1978). *Running Dog*. New York: Knopf.

- Doskow, M. (1967). The Night Journey in Catch-22. *Twentieth Century Literature*, 12(4), 186-193.
- Eggertsson, G. B. (2012). Was the New Deal Contractionary? [Abstract]. *American Economic Review*, 102(1), 524-555.
- Eller, J. R., & Touponce, W. F. (2004). *Ray Bradbury: The Life of Fiction*: Kent State University Press.
- Emerson, R. W. (2015). *Ralph Waldo Emerson : The Major Prose*.
- Fallows, J. (2002). The Military-Industrial Complex. *Foreign Policy*(133), 46-48.
- Feneja, F. L. (2012). Promethean Rebellion in Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451: the Protagonist's Quest. *Amaltea. Revista de mitocrítica*, 4, 1.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Trans. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1994). Grounding the Postmodern Self. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 35(4), 685-703.
- Harold, J. (2007). The Ethics of Non-Realist Fiction: Morality's Catch-22. *Philosophia*, 35(2), 145-159.
- Hauzer, K. (2010). Ambiguity and the Grotesque: History, Humor, and McCarthyism in Joseph Heller's "Catch-22".
- Heller, J. (2011). *Catch-22* (50th Anniversary Edition ed.). London: Vintage Books.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2005). *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon.
- Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T. W., Jephcott, E., & Noeri, G. S. (2020). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*.
- Huxley, A. (1998). *Brave New World* (1932). London: Vintage.
- Joodaki, A. H. (2015). Supervision Without Vision: Post-Foucauldian Surveillance in Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451. *IUP Journal of English Studies*, 10(4), 7.

- Karl, F. R. (2009). Joseph Heller's *Catch-22: Only Fools Walk in Darkness*. *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations*, 21.
- Knight, P. (2003). *Conspiracy Theories in American History: An Encyclopedia* (Vol. 1): ABC-CLIO.
- Knight, P. (2014). Plotting Future Directions in Conspiracy Theory Research. In (Vol. 29, pp. 345-369). Berlin, Boston: Berlin, Boston: DE GRUYTER.
- Koç, E. E. (2015). Subject and State: Ideology, State Apparatuses and Interpellation in Fahrenheit 451. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies*, 7, 107-133.
- Kuo, J.-J. (2010). The Rule of the 'They-Self' and the Awakening to an Authentic Life in Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451. Retrieved from <http://ir.tajen.edu.tw:8080/handle/310904200/711>
- Lukes, S. M. (2020). Individualism. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/individualism>
- Mattix, M. (2013). Great Lines: "April is the Cruellest Month". *First Things*. Retrieved from <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2013/04/great-lines-april-is-the-cruellest-month>
- McDonald, P., & Moseley, C. W. R. D. (2012). *Reading Catch-22*. Penrith: Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks, LLP.
- McDonald, W. R. (1973). He Took Off: Yossarian and the Different Drummer. *CEA Critic*, 36(1), 14-16.
- McGiveron, R. O. (1998). "To Build a Mirror Factory": The Mirror and Self-Examination in Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, 39(3), 282-287.
- Meerloo, J. A. M. (1956). *The Rape of the Mind: The Psychology of Thought Control, Menticide, and Brainwashing*. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company.
- Melley, T. (2000). *Empire of Conspiracy: The Culture of Paranoia in Postwar America*. United States of America: Cornell University Press.
- Melley, T. (2008). Brainwashed! Conspiracy Theory and Ideology in the Postwar United States. (103), 145-164. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/27669224
- Miller, J.-A., & Miller, R. (1987). Jeremy Bentham's Panoptic Device. *October*, 41, 3-29.

- Miller, W. J. (1982). *Joseph Heller's Fiction. American Writing Today* (Vol. 2). Washington D. C.: Forum Series.
- Mogen, D. (2007). *Fahrenheit 451 as Social Criticism* (H. Bloom Ed. Vol. Bloom's Guides: Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451). New York: Chelsea House.
- Paetzold, H. (2013). The aesthetics of city strolling. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 11(1), 23.
- Panu, P. (2020). Anxiety and the ecological crisis: An analysis of eco-anxiety and climate anxiety. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 7836.
- Pundir, A. (2017). A Foucauldian Study of Power Structures in Fahrenheit 451. *Literary Herald*, 3(1).
- Ramana, A. V. (1992). *Quest for Freedom in Joseph Heller's Novels: A Study*. (Doctor of Philosophy). Acharya Nagarjuna University, Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/126804>
- Roberts, G. G. Some Social and Cultural Context for Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451. *Critical Insights*, 27-36.
- Schmerl, R. B. (1959). Aldous Huxley's Social Criticism. *Chicago Review*, 13(1), 37-58.
- Seed, D. (1989). *The Fiction of Joseph Heller: Against the Grain*. New York: St. In: Martin's Press.
- Seed, D. (1994). The Flight from the Good Life:" Fahrenheit 451" in the Context of Postwar American Dystopias. *Journal of American Studies*, 28(2), 225-240.
- Seed, D. (2004). *Brainwashing: the fictions of mind control: a study of novels and films since World War II*.
- Stone, O. (Writer). (1987). *Wall Street*. In E. R. Pressman (Producer). United States: 20th Century Fox.
- Švec, L. (2020). *Posthumanism in Modern Fiction Analyzing the Posthuman in Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go, Huxley's Brave New World, and Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451*. University of Zadar. Department of English.,
- Tanner, T. (1971). *City of Words: American Fiction 1950-1970*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Tocqueville, A. d. (2019). *Democracy in America. Volume 2*. New York: New York: Nova Science Publishers, Incorporated.
- Walker, J. (2013). *The United States of Paranoia: A Conspiracy Theory*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Woo, E. (1999). Joseph Heller, Author of 'Catch-22,' Dies. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1999-dec-14-mn-43915-story.html>

Zipes, J. (1983). "Mass Degradation of Humanity and Massive Contradictions in Bradbury's *Vision of America in Fahrenheit 451*" (E. S. Rabkin, J. D. Olander, & M. H. Greenberg Eds. Vol. No Place Else : Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Zitelmann, R. (2019). The Driving Force of Capitalism is Empathy, Not Greed. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rainerzitelmann/2019/09/02/the-driving-force-of-capitalism-is-empathy-not-greed/?sh=2db3dfed67aa>