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1984 is a novel written by George Orwell. The novel, published in 1949, takes place in 1984 and presents an imaginary future where a totalitarian state controls every aspect of life, even people's thoughts. The state is called Oceania and is ruled by a group known as the Party; its leader and dictator is Big Brother.

Winston Smith, the central character, is a thirty-nine year old man living in London. He secretly hates the Party and decides to rebel by starting a diary in which he reveals his rebellious thoughts. Through keeping a diary, Winston commits thoughtcrime and knows that one day he will be discovered by the Thought Police and probably killed.

Winston is fascinated by "proles," the lowest class in the social hierarchy of Oceania. They are the only group allowed to live freely without heavy police surveillance. He befriends Mr. Charrington, the prole owner of a junk-shop, who shares his interest in the past and life before the rule of Big Brother.

At work, a dark-haired girl who works in another department approaches Winston in the corridor. She pretends to fall and hurt herself. When he helps her up, she slips a piece of paper into his hand. It says "I love you." Winston is surprised and disturbed by this because any sexual relationship between Party members is strictly forbidden. Nevertheless, he is intrigued. They secretly arrange to meet in the country. He begins a love affair with the girl, who finally introduces herself as Julia. They have to be very cautious and meet in places that aren't watched: a clearing in the woods, an old church. Winston and Julia eventually rent the room above Mr. Charrington's junk-shop as a long-term private place for the two of them.

A member of the Inner Party, O'Brien, finds an excuse to give Winston his home address, an unusual event. Winston, noticeably excited, has always believed O'Brien may not be politically orthodox and could sympathize with his hatred of the Party. Winston and Julia go to see O'Brien and he enlists them into the Brotherhood, a secret organization dedicated to fighting Big Brother. He arranges to give Winston a copy of "The Book," a document that contains the truth about Big Brother and the development of the super-states. Winston and Julia go to their room above the junk-shop to read the book. The Thought Police burst in to arrest them and they discover that Mr. Charrington is a Thought Police agent. They are taken separately to the Ministry of Love. There, Winston learns that O'Brien is in fact an orthodox government agent and has deliberately tricked him. O'Brien takes charge of the process of "re-integrating" Winston, torturing and brainwashing him until he fully believes in the Party and its doctrines. As the final step of this process, Winston is forced to betray his love for Julia, and his feelings for her are destroyed.

Winston is released to live out his final days as a broken man. Soon, the Thought Police will execute him. Winston has submitted completely and loves Big Brother.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Spencer</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Hara Yannas</td>
<td>Julia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Dutton</td>
<td>O’Brien</td>
<td>Stephen Fewell</td>
<td>Charrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Coates</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Christopher Patrick Nolan</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Porter</td>
<td>Syme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandi Symonds</td>
<td>Mrs. Parsons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Headlong Theatre

Headlong makes exhilarating theatre for audiences across the UK. A touring company with a big imagination, we interrogate the contemporary world through a programme of fearless new writing, re-imagined classics and potent twentieth century plays.

Via a combination of bold artistic leadership and the championing of visionary artists we are able to create spectacular work with the highest possible production values. By positioning the next generation of theatre makers alongside artists of international standing, Headlong ensures it consistently creates work that is bold and original.

In recognizing the potential for technological innovation—through creative partnerships and the development of innovative online content—Headlong continues to establish itself as a company for the digital age.

http://headlong.co.uk/
How paying close attention to the appendix in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* led co-creators Duncan Macmillan and Robert Icke to rip up the theatrical rule book.

It’s not enough that Winston Smith knows in his heart of hearts that the world he’s living in is monstrous – and that he hates it. He needs to write those thoughts down, give vent to his thought-crimes. But who is he writing for? Almost from the moment he puts forbidden pen to precious paper, he senses that his gesture of individualistic defiance, his lonely groping after some kind of sanity, is futile:

“In front of him there lay not death but annihilation. The diary would be reduced to ashes and himself to vapour. Only the Thought Police would read what he had written, before they wiped it out of existence and out of memory. How could you make appeal to the future when not a trace of you, not even an anonymous word scribbled on a piece of paper, could physically survive?”

He doesn’t know it but his words do survive, after a fashion. Orwell is explicit that they do. Nineteen Eighty-Four doesn’t simply run in the “real-time” of Winston’s experience—the birth of his rebellion culminating in his inevitable destruction— it’s also a remembered time. As Duncan Macmillan and Robert Icke astutely observe, as soon as you grasp the importance of the appendix, you have to regard the novel in a different light. It’s not some disposable organ, it’s integral.

Though “The Principles of Newspeak” only runs to some 4,000 words, and has the sheen of something academic, arid and extraneous, it crucially reframes the action. In a sense it at once cancels out and future-proofs the “prophetic” aspect of the story by thrusting it into the past, making it a historical document...
...Winston’s vantage-point is 1984, or thereabouts, whereas the anonymous author of the post-script could be writing at any point up to or beyond 2050, the moment Oldspeak was to have been superseded by Newspeak. The appendix yields fascinations about a totalitarian state’s control of language—and by extension thought. It also affords final flourishes of grim humour (“Ultimately it was hoped to make articulate speech issue from the larynx without involving the higher brain centres at all. The aim was frankly admitted in the Newspeak word DUCKSPEAK, meaning “to quack like a duck””). Above all, though, its primary achievement is to reduce the reader’s ability to be certain about the narrative.

Recalling his initial approach to the Orwell estate for the stage rights, Icke explains: “I remember saying quite forcefully at the start, ‘I think the appendix is the most important bit. I think it’s structurally the thing that defines the whole… I don’t know how you can adapt this novel if you don’t touch the appendix. I don’t know what it means.’” He continues: “It’s a book that’s about unreliability… and Orwell puts something at the end that a lot of people hilariously and ironically haven’t bothered to finish. One of the things the novel really thinks about is the status of the text, and what text means—and whether text can have any authority when it has been messed with. How can you trust words to deliver any information?”

Who is giving us Winston’s story, and why? As the director further elaborates: “From the moment you read, “It was a bright cold day in April,” you’re reading the book with somebody else, because that person has footnoted it and written you an appendix, so there’s another reader in your experience of the novel at all times.”

Does this sound like an over-complication? Worrying where the book stands in relation to the appendix actually consolidates our appreciation of its sophistication. Icke and Macmillan’s approach—which brings the act of reading centre-stage, so that the story is being pored over, anticipated, responded to and enacted - pulls off a theatrical correlative to double-think, a state of contrary interpretation. We are rendered as disorientated as the protagonist by the dream-like stage action. As Icke suggests: “This could be the future that Winston imagines when he starts to write the diary. It could be us thinking about Orwell. Or it could be the people who write the appendix… looking back at the primary text of Orwell’s novel or Winston’s diary.”

The final word goes to Duncan Macmillan: “I think the over-riding thing was: how do we find a theatrical form for the prose form of what Orwell is doing?… How do we achieve double-think, how do we deliver the intellectual argument, and also can we take along a 15-year-old who has never read the book while satisfying the scholar who has read this book 100 times? And once you’ve seen it and go back to the book, is it all still there…?” He asserts with calm confidence: “I think we’ve ended up being incredibly faithful to the book.” Having seen their remarkable, risk-taking, mind-expanding version when it premiered in Nottingham last year, I’d double-vouch for that.

**DISCUSSION**

How does 1984 connect to what is happening in the world in 2016? Are the novel and play more true to the year 1984, to 2016 today, or to a future one hundred years from now?
After the revelations made by the American information analyst Edward Snowden about the operations of the American National Security Agency (NSA), and of its UK equivalent Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ), many have claimed that we live in a present that closely resembles the nightmare scenario of Nineteen Eighty-Four.

Indeed the details about the Prism program of collecting, storing and analysing information about millions of Internet users in their daily interactions with social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, and even online video games such as Angry Birds, casts an alarming picture of the degree of intrusion by state security agencies in our digital lives.

Never has it been so clear that the extent to which those very digital services and tools we associate with our personal freedom and sociability are also a means through which our actions can be monitored, our behavior scrutinized and sanctioned – the intensity and systematic character of which has no historical precedent.

In the world of neoliberal capitalism, and a society dominated by gigantic corporations rather than by totalitarian governments, surveillance is not an operation forced upon us by a police state. Rather it is an activity, the success of which entails some degree of reluctant and unconscious cooperation on our part, a sort of half-hearted consent and indifference from those who are subject to surveillance.

Naturally, none of us would wilfully accept having our personal details controlled by state authorities. But we frequently accept online consent forms that allow companies like Facebook and Google to store enormous amounts of information about our everyday interactions, allowing them to use the data to conduct sophisticated market research and wage-targeted advertising campaigns that aim at micro-niches of consumers.

This is the ‘pact with the devil’ that we have struck with digital corporations. We have accepted the practice of giving away our personal data in exchange for free services, fully knowing (unless we were completely naïve) that these services would use our data to make money. What we did not realise was that this arrangement with corporations would also be one with the state security agencies, which want to use our data for very different reasons.

In the past, surveillance agencies would have autonomously collected information about their suspects. Now, agencies such as the NSA and the GCHQ act as parasites on the information economy, capturing data collected by commercial enterprises for their own marketing purposes, and turning it into a means of surveillance. We are exposed to surveillance precisely by virtue of our choices – or better by virtue of our illusory choices, such as the acceptance that we expressed when we press the “yes” button to accept a digital service’s terms and conditions. We have become the consenting surveilled, people who by accepting the system of Internet communication and its “free” economy, have ended up unwittingly accepting the surveillance of state security agencies.

We are entangled in part because we desire to be exposed, because we want to share our lives with distant others, expressing our everyday activities, our successes and our disgraces, our happy moments and our sad times. When we post on Facebook, when we Tweet, when we comment on a YouTube video, we should never forget something that was very clear to Winston in front of his telescreen: the machine does not only transmit; it also receives.

Or – to adapt this proposition to the case of social media – whatever we write, whatever we do, will not be seen just by its intended receivers, but also by other parasitical receivers, who want to know about what we do. If we are lucky, this is to sell us products and services; if we are unlucky, it could be to lock us in jail.

**DISCUSSION**

Are you conscious when you post something to Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, or Snapchat that someone is watching your content other than your intended audience? How does your awareness or lack of awareness impact what you post? Have you ever experienced feedback to your social media presence that was unintended?

How do you feel knowing that the government can access your phone records and track your use of social media?

What freedoms and privacy are you willing to give up and what freedoms are you unwilling to lose?

When is violation of personal privacy necessary and when is it not?

**Dr. Paolo Gerbaudo** is a lecturer in Digital Culture and Society at King’s College London. This article was commissioned by and is reprinted courtesy of Headlong Theatre.
A Conversation with Duncan Macmillan and Robert Icke

What drew you to 1984 in the first place?

We were interested in looking at big important canonical texts whilst asking the questions: Why are these texts important? Are these texts still important? What have they got to say? There is a 15 year old boy in me who gets really bored in period dressed productions of classic plays. Just because everyone says it's a classic doesn’t mean anything. If it is boring it’s still boring. One of the things we’ve talked about a lot is wanting to be able to allow young people access. Theatre is in competition with a lot of great stuff. We spend our time watching Mad Men, The Wire, The West Wing and video games. There is a real desire to want to be current in that conversation and to want to be able to say to young people who come that we can deliver them a live experience that is as fizzy and exciting and immediate as they might find their Grand Theft Auto 5 session. That’s the aspiration.

What aspects of the novel did you find most important when adapting it for the stage?

I think the appendix is the most important bit. Structurally, the appendix is the thing that defines the whole novel. I don’t understand how you can adapt this novel if you don’t touch the appendix and the footnote which is on page 3 ‘New speak was the official speak of Oceania. For further information see appendix.’ Orwell put something at the end that a lot of people hilariously and ironically haven’t bothered to finish. One of the key moments of the novel itself is Winston not bothering to finish the book that is going to tell him the secret of the world. And one of the things the novel really thinks about is the status of the text and what text means and whether text can have any authority when it’s been messed with. Can you trust words to deliver any sort of information?

We wanted to make the show have a psychological pressure that started when the curtain went up and when we spat it back out at the end and the harsh lights came up again you felt like you’ve been under this tight pressure for the whole thing. This is the reason it doesn’t have an interval.

How did you approach the framework and structure of the play?

One of the questions we set ourselves early on was how do you stage double think? The novel is very successful at putting forward two contradictory ideas and never resolving which one is the right one. Which many people find frustrating about the novel and we’ve always found really exciting.

The aspiration was always to be like the appendix and the footnote. Because the footnote comes at the start and the appendix goes at the end. So it is a framed novel. The novel itself exists in a frame that reads it contextually backwards. When you read Goldstein’s book, your eyes go with Winston’s eyes but from the moment you read ‘It was a bright cold day in April’, you’re reading the book with somebody else because that person has footnoted it and written you an appendix. So there is another reader in your experience of the novel at all times. It’s a third person novel but it also has odd access to Winston’s subjective thoughts which O’Brien also has. The framing device comes out of a very close reading of the novel. Once we understood what the appendix did we got quite obsessed with the fact that the adaptation had to manage that.

We realise that Goldstein probably doesn’t exist as a literal person, neither does Big Brother. In which case if you have actors playing them then you’re saying this is a literal universe. That’s not accurate to what the book is trying to say. So it was trying to provide a frame where the characters are not necessarily literally there. You have to set up a space which might be imaginary. There was a post-show discussion about whether Winston in scene 1 is a guy in a book group imagining his way into George Orwell’s novel in 1984 or whether he is...
...Winston Smith imagining an imaginary future or if there are a lot of people in the room who then imagine Winston Smith. The status of who is dreaming and where that ends up seemed to us to be so important to try and capture some of the subjectivity that Orwell achieves in the novel. That you can never quite be sure whether this is real, dreamed or remembered.

Many argue that Nineteen Eighty Four is an unstable novel as Orwell’s feverish completion of the book in his almost dying days allows holes to creep in. However, in your production, are you arguing that these holes stand up because if you look closely enough the dream state is foreshadowed in even quite minor details?

That’s right. The holes are often perceived as being the weaknesses of the play but I think they are the bits you want to stage. I really felt this about the novel. That’s the exciting stuff. We looked at the contradictions in the novel. For example, the fact that we are introduced to Julia as thought police and then Winston switches to saying that she’s not thought police and we never really get a payoff to whether she is or she isn’t. An early provocation that we gave each other is that if the party is going to fall it is because there are people like O’Brien high up in the inner party who are members of the brotherhood. The party does fall. So does that suggest that O’Brien might actually be brotherhood after all and Winston is just a terrible radical? He is not radicalised properly. He doesn’t finish the book.

There are feelings that Nineteen Eighty Four is a prophecy of a self-destructive mission foretold. There are no surprises because the surprises in a sense were there if you spotted them. Would you agree with this notion?

Yes. Which is why O’Brien keeps saying to him – ‘You know this already. You’ve always known about this. You know the answer to that question already.’ One of the things we talked about at the start was the theory that the whole novel happens on the duress in room 101. So you’re seeing strange flashbacks to things that have already happened, which explains the fevered quality and the ambiguities.

Someone could retrospectively view the entire play as having taken place in room 101 in terms of what we do with the staging and design at that point. Also, O’Brien’s voiceovers and sound effects we hear in room 101 are used earlier on in the performance. This also contributes to how you stage double think.

It is also important to us that the book that they discuss could be Winston’s diary, it could be Orwell’s novel, and it could also be Goldstein’s book.

How did you approach the adaptation process?

I think the overriding thing was how do we find a theatrical form for how complicated this is? How do we achieve double think? How do we deliver the intellectual argument? We were always talking about the audience. Can we take along a 15 year-old who has never read the book? And can we also satisfy the scholar who has read this book a hundred times and can it stand up to re-reading? I think we have ended up being incredibly faithful to the book.

I feel your responsibility is to whoever is in the room that day and to the person who wrote it originally and you’re trying to connect the audience and the world of now with whatever the text is. If the text is worth looking at there will be a way of bridging that gap whilst remaining honest and being truthful to both parties. I think it is profoundly dishonest to do the blue overalls April the 4th version of 1984 because what it doesn’t deliver is so much of the complexity which is what we found so exciting.

**DISCUSSION**

Are words a reliable system of communication? How do you know when words are unreliable? Are there some circumstances when you trust texts or sources and when you do not? Why?

Is the play real, dreamed, or remembered? Is Winston real or is he a figment of someone else’s imagination? Is Winston imagining a fictional story or he is remembering what really happened to him?

What is true and what is fiction in the production (or is this even a question we can answer?)
“The novel has a very particular aesthetic and atmosphere. Finding a way to create Winston’s world, which has such a lot of detail in it, felt like a real challenge. I wanted to create a blandness and a timeless quality, as well as acknowledging the fact that the action might be entirely, or in part, subjective: happening inside Winston’s head. Both the space and the costumes are made to feel generic – somewhere in the 20th century and referencing various periods from the moment of the novel’s composition onward, allowing us to see a future that is somehow drab, retro, futuristic and weirdly characterful.”

Julia
We wanted Julia to feel slightly intimidating – harsh and unfeminine yet very simple. She wears a red belt to reference the sash her character wears in the novel.

Mrs Parsons
She’s almost a generic 20th century mother – her look has warmth and knitted textures.
Designing a Dystopia

Credit: Early costume images for 1984 by Chloe Lamford

O’Brien
We looked to historical figures, primarily the German communist politician Erich Honnecker: his striking spectacles and neat suit were a real key towards finding the character. The suit, with its double-breasted cut, is vintage.

Charrington
The quintessential idea of an archaic feeling, he also has little details like spectacles, fingerless gloves, and a watch chain, and is very textured in terms of different wools and layers.

Syme
A real mix of vintage styles, he feels somewhere between the ’60s and the ’80s. The more austere polo neck and slightly uncomfortable colour palette felt right for this character.

This article was commissioned by and is reprinted courtesy of Headlong Theatre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ANTI-SEX LEAGUE</strong></th>
<th>Organisation advocating celibacy among Party members and the eradication of the orgasm. In Airstrip One, love and loyalty should exist only toward Big Brother and the Party.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOODTHinker</strong></td>
<td>A person who adheres to the principles of Newspeak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIRSTrip ONE</strong></td>
<td>A province of Oceania, known at one time as “England” or “Britain.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INNER PARTY</strong></td>
<td>Oceania’s political class, who enjoy a higher quality of life than general Party members. They are dedicated entirely to Big Brother and the principles of Party rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIG BROTHER</strong></td>
<td>The dictatorial leader of the Party, and its cofounder along with Goldstein (see Goldstein, Emmanuel). Life in Oceania is characterised by perpetual surveillance and constant reminders that “Big Brother is watching you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINISTRY OF LOVE (ALSO MINILUV)</strong></td>
<td>Oceania’s interior ministry, enforcing loyalty and love of Big Brother through fear, oppression and thought modification. As its building has no windows, the interior lights are never turned off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE BROTHERHOOD</strong></td>
<td>An underground network founded by Emmanuel Goldstein, an original member of the Inner Party. Goldstein turned on Big Brother and was one of the few to escape during the revolution (see also Resistance, Emmanuel Goldstein.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINISTRY OF PEACE (ALSO MINIPAX)</strong></td>
<td>The defence arm of Oceania’s government, in charge of its military.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACKWHITE</strong></td>
<td>The ability not only to believe that black is white, but to know that black is white and forget that one has ever believed the contrary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINISTRY OF PLENTY (ALSO MINIPLENTY)</strong></td>
<td>The part of Oceania’s government that manages the economy. It oversees rationing and maintains a state of poverty, scarcity and financial shortage while convincing the population that they are living in perpetual prosperity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOUBLEPLUS</strong></td>
<td>An example of how comparative and superlative meanings are communicated in Newspeak. “Plus” acts as an intensifier, and “double” even more so. In Newspeak, “better” becomes “plusgood” and even better is “doubleplusgood.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINISTRY OF TRUTH (ALSO MINITRUE)</strong></td>
<td>The Party’s communication apparatus, by which historical records are amended in keeping with its approved version of events. (Winston Smith works here.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOUBLETHINK</strong></td>
<td>The ability to hold two contradictory beliefs in one’s mind simultaneously and accept both of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWSPEAK</strong></td>
<td>The official language of Oceania. Designed to make thoughtcrime impossible, its vocabulary gets smaller every year, asserting that thoughtcrime cannot be committed if the words to express it do not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACECRIME</strong></td>
<td>Any improper expression that carries the suggestion of abnormality or of something hidden. A nervous tic or unconscious look of anxiety could be a punishable offence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCEANIA</strong></td>
<td>One of three superstates over which Big Brother exercises totalitarian rule. Its neighbouring territories are Eurasia and Eastasia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOLDSTEIN’S BOOK</strong></td>
<td>Referred to simply as “The Book,” Emmanuel Goldstein’s record is a compendium of all the heresies, of which Goldstein was the author and which circulated clandestinely here and there. <em>The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OLDSPEAK</strong></td>
<td>The version of English preceding Newspeak. In Newspeak, words that represent politically incorrect ideas are eliminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PARTY
The general population of Oceania, comprising middle class bureaucrats and other government employees, comprising approximately 13% of population. There is a huge gap between the standard of living of Inner and Outer Party members. Outer Party members have very little possessions, and almost no access to basic consumer goods. All Outer Party members have a telescreen in every room of their apartment.

RESISTANCE
The revolutionary group said to have been led by Emmanuel Goldstein in an uprising against the Party. Every ill of society is blamed on this group, which may or may not exist.

ROOM 101
A room in the Ministry of Love where thought criminals are taken.

SEXCRIME
Having sex for enjoyment. In Oceania, the only approved purpose of sex is procreation for the Party.

TELESCREEN
Two-way screens installed in the homes of all Party members to broadcast information and ensure constant surveillance. There is no way to control what is broadcast, only its volumes, and the screen cannot be turned off.

THOUGHTCRIME
All crime begins as a thought, therefore all crime is thoughtcrime. A person who has committed thoughtcrime is a thought criminal, even before committing the act itself. Thoughtcrime is “the essential crime that contains all others in itself.”

THOUGHT POLICE
Law enforcement department designed to detect mental political transgressions.

TWO MINUTES’ HATE
A daily broadcast showing instances of thoughtcrime. Every day, citizens are required to watch and participate in yelling insults and hatred at Oceania’s enemies.

UNGOOD
The opposite of good.

UNPERSON (ALSO UNWRITE)
The process of altering and erasing records in order to eradicate someone from cultural memory. Once unpersoned, an individual’s previous existence can be denied.

YOUTH LEAGUE
Group for children in which membership is mandatory. Members’ primary task is to monitor the activities of their parents.

DISCUSSION
What happens in a world where Blackwhite thinking is prevalent? What about Doublethink?

What is the relationship between Inner and Outer Party members? Are there any groups of people today who have a similar relationship?

Is our language today closer to Oldspeak or Newspeak? Why? What are examples of ways we use language today that are similar to either Oldspeak or Newspeak?

Is there such a thing as Thoughtcrime in 2016? If so, how is it regulated? If not, what is preventing Thoughtcrime from being possible?
1984 opens with the line ‘A diary’. The audience witness Winston making a diary entry.

Part 1
Write a diary entry as though you were Winston Smith in the moment he first thinks of creating his diary. Talk about how he felt in this moment. This could be done as a homework exercise and then developed in the classroom using the development activity in Part 2.

Part 2 – Development
Using the diary entries in Part 1, think about developing the writing as a monologue for performance. You may find this character questionnaire useful to build a strong identity for your character.

Ask the class to think about the setting for their character:
- Where are they when they perform their monologue?
- How soon after the event is it?
- How are they feeling?
- What will happen next?

Part 3 – Extension
If you have time you might find hot seating to be a useful technique.

Hot Seat – You will need a single chair set up in the middle of a semi-circle. The class will have an opportunity to ask questions to a character from the group. The aim is to help the actor think deeply about the character behaviors and motives that they might not have considered yet. Start by asking the group to work in pairs to discuss a list of potential questions for the characters with their partner. They may ask the same to all characters or think about a variety of questions.

This works best with an example from the teacher, so when the questions are prepared, take the “hot seat” and introduce yourself in character inviting questions from the audience. Be sure to remain in character for the entire time spent in the “hot seat.”

Once demonstrated ask for a volunteer who is confident enough to sit in the hot seat as the character and field further questions. Set a time limit for both the character and the questioners, and if at any point the character wants to stop questioning, they may get up out of the chair.

Further Development
Why not try putting the hidden and non-typical characters in the hot seat, such as the father/mother of a character, his/her best friend? What do the reactions of these characters tell us about the main character, or protagonist?

Expand
- You may try expanding the character questionnaire to discuss the setting of 1984.
- Is the performance set in the future that Winston imagines when he starts to write the diary?
- Is the play set in a date in the future e.g. 2050 or 2084 looking back at the text and imagining Winston?
- Is the entire performance performed retrospectively from Room 101?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Where does your character live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who does your character live with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where is your character from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How old is your character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which time period is your character from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What does your character look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Who else is in your characters life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What kind of childhood did he or she have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is your characters role in their community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How does your character deal with conflict and change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What is your character most afraid of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is your characters goal or motivation in this story or scene?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These activities originally appeared in Headlong Theatre’s 1984 Resource Pack.
Classroom Activities

Exercise 2. Protest: THOUGHT CRIMINAL

It is difficult to imagine what it must be like to not be allowed to speak, or even think, your mind.

Part 1
Ask a volunteer to talk about a subject they feel passionately about. Once they have decided on the subject, have the group brainstorm words associated with that subject. Pick your top five and write them on the wall. Now ask the volunteer student to talk for two minutes on their subject without using any of the listed words or even giving the impression they are thinking those words. If they do, the other students must sound a buzzer or shout 'THOUGHT CRIMINAL'. How did that feel for the volunteer? What was it like to not be able to speak freely? What did it make him/her want to do?

Part 2 – Extension
You could extend this exercise by creating a physical representation of protest. Place a chair at one end of the room. Have the group decide what the protest is about. The chair now represents this. Ask for a volunteer. The aim for this person is to reach the chair, stand on it, and shout aloud what they are protesting about. Now ask the other students (the censors) to create different obstacles to physically stop that person from getting to their destination. No touch allowed. Does the person succeed? What tactics did they use? How did they find this? How did they feel if/when they were eventually heard? Remind the students that protest doesn’t have to be in the form of a march – in the play Winston uses the power of writing and free thought as a medium to share his views. As a further extension, you could have students write an article on a subject that they feel passionately about.

Exercise 3. Debate: Ethical Surveillance in Journalism

Ethics in journalism are regularly under the microscope in today’s media, with high profile cases under the spotlight. Start as a class by discussing one or more of the following cases to ensure understanding. Detailed research into these topics might be given as homework. Have a debate about the ethical ramifications of each.

- Watergate
- Mike Daisey’s report on This American Life
- Rolling Stone and Billboard leaking music
- Gamergate
- Wikileaks
- Brian Williams fired from NBC Nightly News
- Journalists ransacking the home of San Bernardino terrorists

Additional information about these cases and more can be found at: http://www.spj.org/ethicscasestudies.asp
For more about the top ethics in journalism cases of 2015 visit: http://blogs.spjnetwork.org/ethics/

The Society of Professional Journalists (SJP) is an advocacy organization that has been improving and protecting American journalism since 1909. Their code sets standards for ethical behavior. Read the Code of Ethics from the SPJ at https://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp. Then, explore one of these essay topics.

1. Is it the responsibility of the reader to regulate the press by not buying newspapers that are unethical? Why or why not? If not, whose responsibility is it to enforce standards of ethics?

2. What are the challenges inherent in differentiating between fact and opinion? Are there any areas where the boundaries blur?

3. Should average citizens know about the private lives of public figures? Is it in the public interest to know the private details of notable public figures such as politicians, athletes, and celebrities? Why or why not?
In the US, as a democratic country, we take our rights to freedom of speech for granted. In contrast, the play creates a world with extreme censorship and surveillance laws that if broken could present individuals with fatal consequences. 1984 deals with the ideas of censorship and surveillance throughout, mainly through the presence of the party.

The play presents a world in which everyone is constantly under the surveillance of Big Brother. The following exercise, entitled Paranoia, aims to engage participants in what it feels like to be watched by many people at one time, and the effect of surveillance on your behavior.

**Practical Exercise: Paranoia**
This exercise is a more complex variation of the popular ‘wink murder’, whereby two participants need to find ‘secret code’ to communicate with each other to defeat another ‘detective’.

For this exercise, you will need paper and a pen. Have enough pieces of paper for each person in the group. Number these pieces of paper (i.e. if there are 14 group members including yourself then numbers 1 all the way up to 14). Fold each sheet or place face down. Each member of the group should take one number. They should memorize this and keep it a secret from everyone else in the group.

1. Ask group members to stand in a circle; ask one volunteer to stand in the middle of the circle and call two numbers out, neither of which can be their own number.

2. The two people who have had their numbers chosen need to secretly find each other and swap places before the person in the middle can jump into their place. If they manage it then the person in the middle has to go again (or you can just ask for another volunteer anyway). The people who haven't had their numbers chosen can pretend to be about to move or do other actions like distracting the person in the middle to make the person in the middle extra paranoid. After each go get everyone to select a new number, so people get a different number each time.

3. After everyone has had a go in the middle, discuss the following with the group.
   - What was it like being in the middle?
   - What was it like being on the outside?
   - What was it like having your number chosen?
   - What sort of things were you looking out for when you were in the middle?
   - What was it like constantly being watched?

4. You can talk about paranoia, and relate it to surveillance as everyone is being watched, and there are certain signals, people have to do things in secret to avoid being seen, people get paranoid in the middle.

What's the relationship between being watched and being paranoid? Can you think you're being watched when you aren't? What kind of feelings does that give you? When else do we feel like we are constantly being watched? When else do we feel paranoid?
Questions for Discussion

Pre-show

1. Which characters from the novel do you expect to be featured in the play? What are the most important traits of each character’s personality that you would expect an actor would need to portray?

2. What are the most significant events from the novel? Describe what a set and props need to look like to capture the scene. Describe what an ensemble of actors would need to convey to make the event successful.

Post-show

1. How closely did the production follow the story of the novel? Which events were highlighted more than you expected? Were any events left out? How did the production change your ideas about the story told in the novel?

2. Do the novel and the production share similar themes? Are some themes featured in the production more than in the novel or vice versa? Does the production make the same statement about these themes as the novel?

3. Did you find the production compelling? What about the story, characters, or design did you connect with or find unable to connect with? Did you feel the production addressed ideas you experience in your everyday life? Why or why not?

4. From whose viewpoint were we watching the play? How was the audience asked to feel about on stage events? Were we watching through Winston’s mind? Were we watching as Big Brother? Were we a government spy like O’Brien? Why? Support your opinion with specific moments from the production.

5. Do you recognize the propaganda of hate that Big Brother uses to control its citizens? Have other groups in history used similar tactics? Do you see anything like this happening in the U.S. today?

6. Dystopian novels like The Hunger Games, the Divergent series and The Giver have become increasingly popular in the last decade. Why do you think that is?

7. Do you think a dystopian nation or world like the one in 1984 is possible? Why or why not?

8. Do you believe that thinking about committing a crime is as bad as the crime itself? Should it be a punishable offense? Why or why not?

9. Do you believe the U.S. government should have the right to listen to our calls, search our homes, or review our online activities? Why or why not? Where would you draw the line?

10. With so much of our lives online, we are constantly debating freedom of information versus privacy. What are the pros and cons of the digital world we live in today?
The phrase “theatre etiquette” refers to the special rules of behavior that are called for when attending a theatre performance.

Above all, it is important to remember that the actors on stage can see and hear you at the same time you can see and hear them. Be respectful of the actors and your fellow audience members by being attentive and observing the general guidelines below:

Before you go:

- Cell phones aren’t part of the sound design of this production. It can be very distracting, not to mention embarrassing, when a cell phone goes off during a performance. The lights from cell phones and other electronic devices are also a big distraction, so please no text messaging. Please turn all electronic devices off completely.

- We’re sure that you would never stick your gum underneath your chair or spill food and drinks, but because this theatre is so new and beautiful, we ask that you spit out your gum before entering the theatre and leave all food and drinks in the lobby or the coat check.

- We don’t want you to miss out on any of the action of the play, so please visit the restroom before the performance begins.

During the performance:

- Please feel free to have honest reactions to what is happening on stage. You can laugh, applaud and enjoy the performance. However, please don’t talk during the performance; it is extremely distracting to other audience members and the actors. Save discussions for intermission and after the performance.

Thoughts about the importance of being an audience member from Shakespeare Theatre Company Artistic Director Michael Kahn

“When you go to the theatre, you are engaging with other living, breathing human beings, having an immediate human response. In the theatre you sense that all of this may never happen again in this particular way.

As a member of the audience, you are actually part of how that’s developing—you have a hand in it … You are part of a community where you are asked to be compassionate, perhaps to laugh with or grieve as well as to understand people, lives and cultures different from your own.”