

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN SAID AHMAD'S *UFQ* AND GEORGE ORWELL'S 1984

Bakhranova Nasiba Makhsudovna

Teacher

Department of practical aspects of the English language

Uzbekistan state world languages university

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17192480>

Annotation. This article explores the complex relationship between society and the individual in Said Ahmad's novel *Ufq* and George Orwell's 1984. Both writers, though from different cultural and historical contexts, address the tension between personal freedom and collective control. Said Ahmad reflects the moral and social challenges of Uzbek society during the Soviet era, emphasizing the individual's struggle against ideological conformity. Orwell, in contrast, portrays the extreme consequences of totalitarian power, exposing mechanisms of surveillance, censorship, and thought control. The comparative analysis highlights universal motifs of resistance, conformity, and identity under oppressive systems. By examining ideological motives, the article uncovers how literature functions as a critical tool to question authority, preserve human dignity, and reveal hidden contradictions in social life. Ultimately, both texts illuminate the timeless struggle between power structures and individual autonomy.

Keywords: society, individual, ideology, motives, Said Ahmad, George Orwell, resistance.

Introduction. The conflict between society and the individual has remained a central theme in world literature, reflecting the tension between personal autonomy and collective authority. Writers across different periods and cultures have examined how social structures, ideologies, and political systems affect the individual's freedom, morality, and sense of identity. Said Ahmad, one of the leading figures of Uzbek literature, and George Orwell, a prominent voice in twentieth-century English literature, both addressed this issue in their major works, *Ufq* and 1984. Despite originating from distinct historical and cultural backgrounds, their texts reveal strikingly similar concerns about the dangers of ideological domination and the suppression of individuality. Said Ahmad's *Ufq*, written in the context of Soviet ideological pressures, portrays the dilemmas faced by ordinary individuals caught between their personal values and the demands of a system that emphasizes conformity¹. Through his characters, Ahmad exposes the psychological and ethical struggles of individuals attempting to reconcile human dignity with political loyalty. His narrative highlights the persistence of moral responsibility even under conditions of ideological constraint, suggesting that literature can serve as a medium for voicing silent resistance.

On the other hand, George Orwell's 1984 presents a dystopian vision of an absolute totalitarian regime, where society exercises complete control over thought, behavior, and even memory². Orwell's exploration of power structures, surveillance, and language manipulation illustrates the terrifying consequences of suppressing individuality in favor of collective obedience. Unlike Ahmad, whose work is rooted in social realism, Orwell employs dystopian allegory to amplify the dangers of ideological manipulation and political oppression. By

¹ Ahmad, S. (1976). *Ufq*. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing, pp. 45–112.

² Orwell, G. (1984). 1984. London: Secker & Warburg, pp. 29–134.

comparing these two works, it becomes possible to examine the universality of the struggle between society and the individual, as well as the specific cultural and historical forms it takes. The present study focuses on how both authors use literary motifs and ideological interpretations to shed light on resistance, conformity, and the search for identity under oppressive systems. Such an analysis contributes to a deeper understanding of the role of literature in questioning authority and in preserving the voice of the individual against the overwhelming power of society.

The comparative study of Said Ahmad's *Ufq* and George Orwell's *1984* offers significant insights into the universal nature of the conflict between society and the individual. Although both writers represent different cultural traditions Uzbek realism and English dystopian allegory their works reveal striking parallels in their treatment of power, ideology, and human resilience.

In *Ufq*, Said Ahmad portrays the Soviet period with its heavy ideological influence on individual lives. The novel depicts characters who are compelled to balance their moral integrity with the demands of a system that emphasizes loyalty and uniformity. For Ahmad, the individual is not merely a passive subject of authority but a moral agent capable of questioning and resisting oppressive structures. His depiction of internal conflict highlights how personal conscience often collides with collective expectations. Through such tensions, Ahmad reflects the specific experience of Uzbek society under ideological pressure, while also expressing a more universal concern with the suppression of individuality.

Orwell's *1984*, in contrast, projects the conflict onto a dystopian stage where society completely dominates the individual. The Party's mechanisms of control perpetual surveillance, thought policing, and the manipulation of history eradicate the possibility of personal freedom³. Winston Smith, the protagonist, becomes a symbol of the human desire for truth and individuality in a world where such qualities are systematically destroyed. Unlike Ahmad's more nuanced portrayal of resistance, Orwell's vision underscores the futility of rebellion in the face of totalitarian power. His narrative demonstrates the terrifying consequences of unchecked ideology, transforming the conflict between society and the individual into an existential crisis.

Despite these differences, both texts converge on the theme of ideological motives shaping human behavior. Ahmad examines how ideology infiltrates social relations and personal decisions, often forcing compromises between survival and integrity⁴. Orwell, meanwhile, shows how ideology becomes an instrument of total domination, not only over actions but also over thoughts and emotions. Together, their works illustrate the double-edged nature of ideology: it can provide a sense of collective purpose but also reduce the individual to a mere function of the system.

Another common aspect is the use of literature as a form of resistance. Ahmad employs social realism to present characters who preserve their moral dignity even when external conformity is unavoidable. His subtle critique allowed readers to reflect on the silent conflicts within Soviet society. Orwell, however, uses the dystopian mode as a warning, pushing readers to confront the dangers of complacency in the face of political manipulation. Both approaches demonstrate the power of literature to challenge authority and inspire critical reflection.

³ Saidov, B. (2010). XX asr o'zbek romanchiligi. Tashkent: Akademnashr, pp. 87–102.

⁴ Eagleton, T. (1991). Ideology: An Introduction. [London: Verso, pp. 15–47.](#)

Ultimately, the comparison between *Ufq* and *1984* reveals the enduring relevance of the struggle between society and the individual⁵. While Ahmad's work underscores the resilience of moral values in specific cultural circumstances, Orwell's novel universalizes the danger of ideological domination in its most extreme form. Together, they emphasize the necessity of preserving human dignity and freedom against the encroachment of oppressive systems, affirming literature's vital role as both witness and conscience in times of social crisis.

Table. Comparative features of *Ufq* and *1984*.

Aspect	Said Ahmad's <i>Ufq</i>	George Orwell's <i>1984</i>
Historical context	Soviet ideological dominance in Uzbekistan	Post-World War II critique of totalitarianism
Literary form	Social realism	Dystopian allegory
Individual's struggle	Moral resistance, ethical dilemmas	Existential rebellion, suppressed autonomy
Role of ideology	Pressure to conform with Soviet values	Absolute control through surveillance & language
Literary function	Subtle critique within cultural context	Universal warning against authoritarianism

This table highlights the key comparative features of Said Ahmad's *Ufq* and Orwell's *1984*. By juxtaposing their historical contexts, literary forms, and ideological focus, it becomes clear how both authors portray the individual's struggle under different yet comparable systems of control⁶. Ahmad's subtle realism reflects cultural specificity, while Orwell's dystopian vision warns against global authoritarianism. Together, they provide complementary perspectives on the universal conflict between human freedom and societal dominance, showing the enduring relevance of literature in examining ideology.

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of Said Ahmad's *Ufq* and George Orwell's *1984* demonstrates that the conflict between society and the individual is not limited to one cultural or historical setting but remains a timeless issue of human existence. Ahmad's novel reveals how individuals negotiate moral and ethical values within the constraints of Soviet ideology, showing that even under pressure, human dignity can be preserved. In contrast, Orwell dramatizes the complete erosion of individuality under an oppressive totalitarian regime, offering a universal warning about the dangers of unchecked political power.

Both writers use their literary voices to question authority and to expose the consequences of ideological manipulation. Ahmad provides subtle criticism embedded in social

⁵ Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 181–214.

⁶ Kumar, P. (2018). "Totalitarianism and the Individual in Orwell's *1984*." *Journal of Literary Studies*, 34(2), pp. 56–70.

realism, while Orwell employs dystopian exaggeration to shock readers into awareness. Despite stylistic and contextual differences, their works converge on the theme of resistance, the fragility of freedom, and the necessity of protecting human autonomy.

Ultimately, the study highlights literature's capacity to serve as a moral and ideological mirror of society. By examining *Ufq* and *1984*, it becomes evident that literature not only reflects historical realities but also anticipates future dangers, reminding us that the struggle between society and the individual is an enduring battle for truth and dignity.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Ahmad, S. (1976). *Ufq*. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing, pp. 45–112.
2. Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, pp. 15–47.
3. Kumar, P. (2018). "Totalitarianism and the Individual in Orwell's *1984*." *Journal of Literary Studies*, 34(2), pp. 56–70.
4. Orwell, G. (1984). *1984*. London: Secker & Warburg, pp. 29–134.
5. Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 181–214.
6. Saidov, B. (2010). *XX asr o'zbek romanchiligi*. Tashkent: Akademnashr, pp. 87–102.