

Odsjek za anglistiku

Filozofski fakultet

Sveučilište u Zagrebu

DIPLOMSKI RAD

Surveillance in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Književno-kulturološki smjer: Engleska književnost i kultura

Kandidatkinja: Nevena Lovrinović

Mentorica: dr. sc. Iva Polak, doc.

Ak. godina: 2013./2014.

Contents

Introduction - Utopia Gone Wrong	3
The Dystopian Turn	4
Surveillance and Control in <i>Brave New World</i>	7
Biological Surveillance and Control	10
Surveillance and Control of Emotions	14
Religion	20
Prospects for Change	24
Surveillance and Control in <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	24
Surveillance and Control of Language	27
Surveillance and Control of Thought	30
Panoptical Surveillance	36
Big Brother and the Reminders of Surveillance	39
Control of Emotions	40
Prospects for Change	47
Conclusion	47
Works Cited	50
Abstract	54

Introduction - Utopia Gone Wrong

The worlds of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are considered horrible. What they have in common is that they are governed by strict rules and characterized by absolute obedience of their citizens to their totalitarian governments. The aim of this paper is to analyse the characteristics of totalitarianism in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and to show how the surveillance system is constructed in the two works, what the differences are and what the similarities. The first part of this paper will deal with the construction of surveillance in *Brave New World*. It will show that, here, surveillance is much more than "the systematic monitoring of people or groups in order to regulate or govern their behavior" (Monahan 498) - it is a complex system of control comprising many different elements including systematic monitoring. The life of individuals or groups of individuals starts with biological surveillance - they are programmed to behave predictably as machines. During their lives, this predictability is supported by different means of control that will be discussed in detail. The second part of the paper will deal with surveillance in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* which comes much closer to the classical definition of surveillance than the surveillance of *Brave New World*. It consists of audio-visual supervision, and is also aided by some supporting means of control. It will be argued that although both systems are totalitarian and their ultimate goal is to preserve themselves, they serve a completely different means: the aim of one is absolute wellbeing of the population, and the aim of the other, absolute concentration of power in few individuals. In spite of the fact that *Brave New World* is based on the idea of creating an ideal society, the society it depicts is in reality undesirable, unacceptable, and even terrifying - it is 'ideal' because it has sacrificed the human aspects of humanity. Although it has achieved absolute happiness for its people, it is not a utopia. On the other hand, it is a dystopia to the same

degree as the terror and nightmare of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Both novels depict dystopian alternative realities and belong to the realm of utopian literature i.e., the subgenre of dystopian novel.

The Dystopian Turn

Utopian literature is a hybrid genre which has from its very beginning constantly been in the process of change. It is defined by its specific narrative structure:

[...] it normally pictures the journey (by sea, land or air) of a man or woman to an unknown place (an island, a country or a continent); once there, the utopian traveller is usually offered a guided tour of the society, and given an explanation of its social, political, economic and religious organization; this journey typically implies the return of the utopian traveller to his or her own country, in order to be able to take back the message that there are alternative and better ways of organizing society. (Vieira 7)

The genre incorporates elements of both high and popular tradition as well as the traditions of classic (Plato) and Judeo-Christian thought. The term *utopia* was coined in the early sixteenth century by Sir Thomas More. He created a neologism by fusing the Greek words *ouk*, meaning *not*, and *topos*, meaning *place*. In addition, to indicate that the word is a toponym, More added the suffix *ia*. Thus, *utopia* means *non-place* and being a place called *No place* contains semantically both affirmation and denial (Vieira 4), as is explicitly stated in the full edition of More's *Utopia*, in a poem by Anemolius, poet laureate and nephew to Hythloday by his sister:

'No-Place' was once my name, I lay so far;

But now with Plato's state I can compare,

Perhaps outdo her (for what he only drew

In empty words I have made live anew

In men and wealth, as well as splendid laws):

'The Good Place' they should call me, with good cause. (117)

This duality creates a tension based on the affirmation of a possibility and the negation of its fulfilment – a paradox that is never resolved (Vieira 6). With time, 'Utopia' has come to denote a literary genre and to refer to texts written before and after More and to the tradition of thought based on alternative solutions to reality (Vieira 5). Its "defining principle is egalitarianism [...] all citizens are equal—rights, property, privilege—[...] all sources of envy and conflict are eliminated; desires are satisfied because no unreasonable desires develop" (Rothstein 5). In order to make this kind of order possible, the alternative societies are often regulated by strict laws, "rules that force the individuals to repress their unreliable and unstable nature and put on a more convenient social cloak" (Vieira 7). The more perfect the utopia, the more stringent the controls are (Rothstein 7).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a shift in the utopian paradigm occurred. The optimistic tone of utopias and the representations of ideal societies gave way to the despairing images of dystopia (Vieira 17). The belief in progress of reason and science was shattered by the newly demonstrated destructive powers of mankind. A "turn" (Claeys 108) in the utopian genre occurred - "in the twentieth century dystopia becomes the predominant expression of the utopian ideal, mirroring the colossal failures of totalitarian collectivism" (Claeys 108). Two major features that appeared with the turn were: the socialist engineering of human behaviour via the reconstruction of society and the eugenic

engineering of human behaviour via biological manipulation. The key texts defining the genre are *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*:

Their common theme is the quasi-omnipotence of a monolithic, totalitarian state demanding and normally exacting complete obedience from its citizens, challenged occasionally but usually ineffectually by vestigial individualism or systemic flaws, and relying upon scientific and technological advances to ensure social control. (Claeys 109)

In the light of these characteristics, dystopia can be described as the idea of 'utopia gone wrong'. However, utopia and dystopia have coexisted from their very beginning. The term was, similarly to *utopia*, a neologism firstly used in 1868 by John Stuart Mill in a parliamentary speech when he tried to find an expression for the opposite of utopia. The prefix *dys* comes from the Greek *dus* which means bad, abnormal or diseased (Vieira 16). Oppositely to utopia, it is 'too bad to be practicable' (qtd. in Vieira 16). As a literary genre, dystopia uses the narrative devices of utopia, but in contrast to utopia, it depicts a pessimistic image of society (Vieira 17). It is "a fictional portrayal of a society in which evil, or negative social and political developments, have the upper hand, or [...] a satire of utopian aspirations [...]" (Claeys 107). Some of the early famous dystopias are Joseph Hall's *Mundus Alter et Idem* (written in 1607, retells the archetype represented in More's work by systematically dismantling its thematic and formal structure) (Fortunati 4) and Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (book four) published in 1726 (Claeys 107).

As utopia merges into the dystopia of the twentieth century, it becomes clear that the distance between the positive ideal and the negative one is not as great as it may seem. The most prominent ideas in dystopian literature of the twentieth century are totalitarianism

and scientific and technological progress, which, when brought together, very often lead to dictatorship. Among the first dystopias that represented such an alternative reality are *We* (1921) by the Russian author Yevgeny Zamyatin, *Brave New World* (1932) by Aldous Huxley and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) by George Orwell (Vieira 18). They all depict societies in which technological advancement has been misused and their characteristics, as Mumford analyses, are “isolation, stratification, fixation, regimentation, standardization, militarization” (qtd. in Matter 148).

Surveillance and Control in *Brave New World*

Brave New World is founded on the idea to create utopia. The novel begins in the year 632 A.F. (After Ford) and is set in the World State controlled by ten World Controllers. The population is divided into five castes which differ in appearance and mental ability. Children are produced and raised by the State, families are abolished, and promiscuity is the ethical principle. Everybody is conditioned to love his/her position and the world as it is – in this way, the perfect world, utopia, is created. However, the two protagonists, Marx and Lenina, travel to a Savage Reservation where old social rules and customs still apply. They bring to London a Savage, John, who commits suicide after being forced to stay - he cannot accept the utopia, the universal happiness, because of the restrictions imposed on all forms of human freedom.

Traditional utopias take universal happiness for granted (Fitting 145). However, in order that happiness can be established, rules must be imposed. In Yevgeny Zamyatin's novel *We* and its One State, strict rules are in place. Human beings are uniform, call each other 'Numbers' and repeat the same routine (awakening, sleeping, eating etc.) every day at the same time. In *We*, uniformity is happiness, but the “[d]egeneration into uniformity”

happened "through loss of the sense of freedom" (Claeys 117). Claeys underlines that those who undertake resistance to the established state of affairs (those who seek freedom) in One State are called 'enemies of happiness' (qtd. in Claeys 114). Because happiness does not tolerate freedom, and because freedom is what free people value most, *Brave New World* is a dystopia. The realisation of the Benthamian principle of utility: "The greatest happiness of the greatest number" (qtd. in Miller 20) is what lead the World State into totalitarianism. *Brave New World's* society is organized around the idea of utility and is armed with all the means for preserving it forever. As Jeremy Bentham elaborates:

By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness, (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered: if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community: if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual. (*An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* 12)

Accordingly, one of the most dominant themes of *Brave New World* is the abundance of pleasures/happiness and absence of pain/unhappiness. From the conversation between one of the World Controllers, Mustapha Mond, and John the Savage, it is clear that the purpose of life in the World State is the maintenance of universal well-being and happiness of both individuals and community. This, as indicated by Bentham, should be the business of governments: to promote happiness of the society, "that is their pleasures and their security" (*An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* 22). According to him, happiness is enjoyment of pleasures and security from pains. (47) And this is done by

manipulating the citizens into a certain way of behaviour: The individual should “be *made* to fashion his behaviour. But [...] there is nothing by which a man can ultimately be *made* to do it, but either pain or pleasure” (22, emphasis in the original). In other words, in the process of ensuring benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness, the government has to control the pleasures or pains experienced by its citizens. Man is governable and the way to lead him/her is by controlling emotions – it is what motivates him/her. This is exactly how the World State operates: it controls the pleasures and pains in individuals and it does so by establishing its own ethics – the ethics of pleasure. Every individual has the moral obligation to enjoy the pleasures available to him: sexual intercourse with as many different partners as possible, consumption of a drug called soma and excessive consumerism. The protagonist Bernard Marx, who is unorthodox by these principles, gets scolded by his boss: "By his heretical views on sport and *soma* [he avoids consuming them], by the scandalous unorthodoxy of his sex-life [he has only one sexual partner], [...] he has proved himself an enemy of Society, a subverter [...] of all Order and Stability, a conspirator against Civilization itself" (*Brave New World* 129). As a matter of fact, desires should be satisfied as quickly as possible, so that they do not have time to negatively influence the individual. On the other hand, all pains of the old world are eliminated. According to Bentham, in order to augment total happiness of the community, it is necessary to exclude everything that tends to subtract from it: in other words, it is necessary to exclude mischief (*Principles of Morals and Legislation* 105). Leon R. Kass puts it succinctly: in *Brave New World*, fear, disease, war, aggression, pain, anxiety, suffering, hatred, guilt, envy, and grief do not exist anymore (106), one does not even get old. In addition to pains, there is another mischief that should be carefully handled: punishment. What if not all society members want or can be moral? What if they break the ethical and social rules? The first what often comes to mind is that they

should be appropriately punished. However, when it comes to punishment, Bentham argues that it is just another kind of mischief: “all punishment in itself is evil. Upon the principle of utility, if it ought at all to be admitted, it ought only to be admitted in as far as it promises to exclude some greater evil” (105). In *Brave New World*, there are two kinds of punishment. Firstly, you will lose the affection of other society members (a nightmare), and secondly, if your unorthodoxy threatens to contaminate others, the State will react and send you away to an island. However, it turns out that this is a paradise for nonconformists. Mond even describes this punishment as a reward:

[...] he's being sent to a place where he'll meet the most interesting set of men and women to be found anywhere in the world. All the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community-life. All the people who aren't satisfied with orthodoxy, who've got independent ideas of their own. Everyone, in a word, who is anyone. (*Brave New World* 119)

“Anyone” is someone who has developed a sense of individuality, which counters the State’s principles expressed in the slogan “Community, Identity, Stability” – in one word: uniformity. Everyone works for the Community, everyone’s Identity is determined by his caste, but all of them uniformly work for Stability – for the perpetuation of the happy status quo.

Biological Surveillance and Control

In order to have a division of labour, and at the same time keep everyone happy, five castes are established in the society of *Brave New World*: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons. To avoid any member of a caste to develop the desire to belong to another, one is born into his/her caste and conditioned to love it and to detest others. Human beings are produced in a factory. There, embryos undergo a treatment which will determine their caste,

looks and mental capacity. Already at this stage, their future is known: their physique as well as their job – everyone is predestined for a specific social function and, more importantly, postnatally conditioned to love it. This is the “standardization of the human product” (*Brave New World* xxxvii) and is one of the principal means of surveillance. Other means that support it and which can better be described as means of control than surveillance are: embryo treatment; postnatal conditioning by hypnopaedia; neo-Pavlovian conditioning; abolition of family, its ties and values as well as emotional connections between people; sexuality control; surveillance by other members of society; obligatory communal activities and control of individual’s free time; soma; stigmatization of history and regulation of scientific activity.

The first stage, the standardization of the human product, takes place at the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre where the lives of the World State’s inhabitants begin. In the systematic use of eugenics and dysgenics, ova bought from the fertile women (only thirty per cent of the female population) are fertilized and treated. This is already the stage where the five castes are determined: as Huxley explains it more clearly in his non-fictional work *Brave New World Revisited*, in one set of bottles biologically superior ova are fertilized by biologically superior sperm, given the best possible prenatal treatment and finally decanted as Betas, Alphas and even Alpha Pluses (*Brave New World Revisited* 15). On the other hand, in “much more numerous set of bottles, biologically inferior ova, fertilized by biologically inferior sperm, were subjected to the Bokanovsky Process” (*Brave New World Revisited* 15). In the Bokanovsky’s Process, the fertilized eggs are treated with alcohol and other protein poisons and ninety six identical twins are produced out of a single egg. In this way, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons are decanted. In consequence of the prenatal treatment, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons have different physical characteristics than Alphas and Betas,

but they also differ in intelligence. According to Henry Foster, one of the Alpha males, they are shorter and have limited cognitive abilities: “‘The lower the caste, [...] the shorter the oxygen.’ The first organ affected was the brain. After that the skeleton” (*Brave New World* 11) While every Alpha and Beta is unique and is predestined to conduct work that demands a certain level of intelligence, the members of the other three castes are identical twins in the number of hundreds capable only of performing unskilled work. Huxley even describes them as “almost subhuman” (*Brave New World Revisited* 15). In other words, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons are genetically standardized as a human machine. After the surveillance of his/her birth and future abilities, in order that this new human is really operating as predictably as a machine, the bottles with the embryos are, in the manner of mass production methods, transferred on a band to the Social Predestination Room where they are decanted (i.e., born) and where postnatal conditioning is conducted.

The postnatal treatment consists of hypnopaedia and neo-Pavlovian conditioning. Hypnopaedia, sleep-teaching or the “[t]he greatest moralizing and socializing force of all time” (*Brave New World* 23) prepares the infants mentally for their role in the world. Among others, it teaches them ‘elementary class consciousness’ and to love their predetermined role. It whispers to their sleeping ears slogans like “and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I don’t want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They are too stupid to be able to read or write. Besides, they wear black, which is such a beastly colour. I’m so glad I’m Beta” (*Brave New World* 22), or consumerist slogans adapting future industrial supply for future demand as “I do love flying, [...] I do love having new clothes...” (*Brave New World* 41) or “old clothes are beastly, we always throw away old clothes, ending is better than mending” (*Brave New World* 42). The Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning describes the influence of hypnopaedia to students using these words: “Till at last the child’s mind is these

suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions *is* the child's mind. And not the child's mind only. The adult's too – all his life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides – made up of these suggestions. But *all* these suggestions are our suggestions!" (*Brave New World* 23, emphasis in the original). Besides hypnopaedia, neo-Pavlovian conditioning is used in order to make infants behave in a certain way, believe in certain things, like or dislike hobbies, games, nature, even different climates (some have a horror of cold, so they are conditioned to move to the tropics) – in other words, at this stage, the development of their beliefs and attitudes is surveilled. These procedures in which sirens, alarm bells and mild electric shocks are used are modelled on one of best-known neo-Pavlovian experiments (Firchow 311). Neo-Pavlovian conditioning is the "secret of happiness and virtue – liking what you've *got* to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny" (*Brave New World* 12, emphasis in the original). This is a method to having people do all kinds of jobs necessary for the society, loving their jobs and not wanting to cross into another caste and having some other job. This is not only the secret to the happiness of the community, but of the individual as well. However, conditioning is not a new discovery. Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World Controllers, says to John, the Savage who was brought by Marx to the World State: "As if one believed anything by instinct! One believes things because one has been conditioned to believe them. [...] People believe in God because they've been conditioned to believe in God" (*Brave New World* 207). In fact, there can exist no world without some kind of conditioning, but in *Brave New World*, it is the first and most important stage of surveillance. In surveilling the development of the embryo – making it develop in a genetically desirable way – and making infants develop in a socially desirable way, for the most part, the surveillance over the individual is completed. An adult's behaviour is predictable, s/he is a human machine, de-individualized, stable. However,

something still might go wrong, and he/she still needs monitoring. The Alphas, for example, are most dangerous: Their duties (they are psychologists - like Bernard Marx, Chief Bottlers, Directors of Predestination, Deputy Assistant Fertilizer-Generals, Professors of Feelies in the College of Emotional Engineering, Deans of Community Singery, Supervisors of Bokanovskification) demand intelligence. As Woodcock claims "they cannot be conditioned in the same way as the lower, worker casts - they have to be able to think freely to some extent (100). They are the ones who get exiled: Helmholtz, Marx and scientists who are able to develop thoughts outside the conditioned spectrum (like revolutionary scientific theories) which would endanger stability.

Surveillance and Control of Emotions

Another danger to stability comes in the form of emotional bonds rooted in interpersonal relationships manifested at clearest in the family; in fact, the danger lies in any strongly felt emotion. According to the World State, a family unit is viewed as:

"...home – a few small rooms, stiflingly over-inhabited by a man, a periodically teeming woman, by a rabble of boys and girls of all ages. No air, no space; an understerilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells." [...] And home was as squalid psychically and physically. Psychically, it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with frictions of tightly packed life, reeking with emotion. What suffocating intimacies, what dangerous, insane obscene relationships between the members of the family group! (*Brave New World* 30)

Admitting to the Freudian theory that all frustration comes from suppressed desires of the individual under the pressure of social relationships, Huxley abolishes these types of relationships in *Brave New World* (he among others also eliminates the fear of death).

Babies are produced by the State on the assembly line, they have no mothers or fathers, brothers or sisters, relatives or spouses who would require from them to suppress their instincts without conditioning them to endure this and for whom they would feel strongly about. Not only do they not exist, but they are taboo:

Our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life. Mother, monogamy, romance [...] The urge has but a single outlet. My love, my baby. No wonder those pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable. Their world didn't allow them to take things easily, didn't allow them to be sane, virtuous, happy. What with mothers and lovers, what with the prohibitions they were not conditioned to obey, what with the temptations and the lonely remorse, what with the diseases and the endless isolating pain, what with the uncertainties and the poverty – they were forced to feel strongly. And feeling strongly (and strongly, what was more, in solitude, in hopelessly individual isolation), how could they be stable? (*Brave New World* 33-34)

Therefore, feeling strongly is the main cause of unhappiness and, consequentially, instability. It is prevented by changing the structure of society, by abolishing family, monogamy, romance, and equally important, solitude. As Firchow remarks, “a re-ordering of human relationships [...] would remove the sources of dissatisfaction with civilization by renouncing coercion and the suppression of the instincts, so that, undisturbed by internal discord, men might devote themselves to the acquisition of wealth and its enjoyment” (313). In *Brave New World*, not only do relationships of the old world exist anymore, but a new ethics is introduced: an instant gratification of all desires. In regard to sexuality, it is based on the single principle of non-exclusiveness except when it comes to inter-caste relationships. In

the old world, there was “everywhere a focussing of interest, a narrow channelling of impulse and energy” (*Brave New World* 34) because people were exclusive and had a narrow circle of friends. Sexual promiscuity is one of the backbones of the new society. Huxley writes in *Brave New World Revisited* that legalizing a degree of sexual freedom practically guarantees the *Brave New Worlders* against any form of destructive (or creative) emotional tension (*Brave New World Revisited* 24). In the old world, produced by social relations and expectations, these tensions had to be let out somehow and they found their “outlet in religion, socialism, or more violent forms of demand for social change” (Needham 67). This is why in the State the “erotic play of children is encouraged, universal sexual relations are the rule, and [...] any sign of the beginning of a more deep and lasting affection is rebuked and stamped out, as being anti-social” (Needham 67).

Similarly, Firchow remarks that “[i]t is the sublimation of instinct rather than its satisfaction that makes for cultural development; it is restraint that “makes it possible for higher psychical activities, scientific, artistic or ideological, to play such an important part in civilized life” (314). Mustapha Mond explains to John in Chapter XVII why art does not exist anymore in the World State, why scientific development is controlled and restricted and why truth and beauty are of secondary or no importance. Science brings new inventions which foster change and as the World State is a stable and perfect society, there is no room for it: “Every change is a menace to stability. Every discovery in pure science is potentially subversive” (198). True, science has helped to establish stability, but it also menaces to ‘undo’ it. In Mond’s words, “people in the time of Our Ford [...] imagined that it [scientific progress] could be allowed to go on indefinitely, regardless of everything else. Knowledge was the highest good, truth the supreme value”. Fortunately, “Our Ford did a great deal to shift the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness. Mass production

demanded the shift. Universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily turning; truth and beauty can't" (200). Through mass production, human beings and the world around them are highly standardized and automatized. This and the resulted stability has put away another highly valued component of the old world: art. Artists are banished in the manner of Plato's *Republic*. In this utopian work, Socrates discusses the role of poetry and other arts in society. Works of art are but imitations of the physical world and objects which on their part are only copies of ideas/the truth. Thus, the artist and "the tragic poet is an imitator, and therefore [...] he is thrice removed [...] from the truth [...] Poets "copy images of virtue and the like, but the truth they never reach?" (Plato 460-463). However, someone might get deceived by them and think that they speak "very well—such is the sweet influence which melody and rhythm by nature have" (463). However, there is another reason poetry should not be a part of society: the poet is mostly "concerned with an inferior part of the soul" (469), with emotions as "lust and anger and all the other affections, of desire and pain and pleasure" (470), "[w]hereas the wise and calm temperament, being always nearly equable, is not easy to imitate or to appreciate when imitated" (469). And according to Plato, the enumerated affections ought to be controlled, "if mankind are ever to increase in happiness and virtue" (470). Poetry "feeds and waters the passions" (470) while the world needs reason for happiness. And "therefore we shall be right in refusing to admit him into a well-ordered State, because he awakens and nourishes and strengthens the feelings and impairs the reason" (469). Art is similarly treated in *Brave New World*. As works of art emerge from instability, as they are an outlet of tensions which do not exist anymore, art has died away. It is not needed anymore. It is forbidden to read books of the old age or to see *Othello*. When asked 'why', the World Controller answer, that it is so, because no one would never understand them:

Because our world is not the same as Othello's world. You can't make flivvers without steel - and you can't make tragedies without social instability. The world's stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get. They're well of; they're safe: They're never ill; they're not afraid of death; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they're plagued with no mothers and fathers; they've got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about [...]. (*Brave New World* 193)

Still, emotions could not all be rooted out. This is why Mond's "And if anything should go wrong" is so important. 'Go wrong' refers to emotions as emptiness, worry, jealousy, etc. that can appear in everyday life and which are fought by a drug called *soma*. Its importance is visible in the fact that *soma* is consumed by everyone on a daily basis. This means that all the conditioning attempts have not exterminated emotions but reduced them as much as human nature allows. This is why the individuals have to experience a kind of catharsis from time to time – not by watching *Othello* and experiencing catharsis in Aristotelian sense, but by experiencing "feelies" (a cinema of sensual stimulation) and undergoing a treatment called Violent Passion Surrogate. Once a month, in the Violent Passion Surrogate, the whole individual's system is flooded with adrenaline producing a complete psychological equivalent of fear and rage: it has all "the tonic effects of murdering Desdemona and being murdered by Othello, without any of the inconveniences." (*Brave New World* 211). At these treatments, people live through all the emotions they should not have in reality. When Lenina, a Beta female who works at the Central Hatchery and Conditioning Centre, is falling in love with John the Savage, she compares the sensations she is encountering with what she experiences "at the beginning of a Violent Passion Surrogate treatment – a sense of dreadful emptiness, a breathless apprehension, a nausea (*Brave New World* 152).

On the other hand, soma is used at any trace of emotional discomfort or “weird” ideas. When Marx, Lenina's lover, suggests to Lenina that he would like to spend more time with her alone, she uneasily answers: “why don't you take soma when you have these dreadful ideas of yours. You'd forget all about them. And instead of feeling miserable, you'd be jolly” (*Brave New World* 79). The effect of soma is that it makes an impenetrable wall between the actual universe and the mind (*Brave New World* 67). “In small doses it brought a sense of bliss, in larger doses it made you see visions and, if you took three tablets, you would sink in a few minutes into refreshing sleep” (*Brave New World Revisited* 54). It is the perfect drug, it is euphoric, narcotic, pleasantly hallucinant and it has all the advantages of Christianity and alcohol, but none of their defects (*Brave New World* 46). It can be taken at no physiological or mental cost. As everything else in the World State, soma is not a “private vice”, but a political institution. It is “one of the most powerful instruments of rule in the dictator's armory” (*Brave New World Revisited* 55). As Huxley puts it,

[t]he systematic drugging of individuals for the benefit of the State (and incidentally, of course, for their own delight) was a main plank in the policy of the World Controllers. The daily soma ration was an insurance against personal maladjustment, social unrest and the spread of subversive ideas. Religion, Karl Marx declared, is the opium of the people. In the *Brave New World* this situation was reversed. Opium, or rather soma, was the people's religion. Like religion, the drug had power to console and compensate, it called up visions of another, better world, it offered hope, strengthened faith and promoted charity. (*Brave New World Revisited* 55)

Religion

This quote opens another interesting theme – religion. It is abolished in the World State; however, substitutes have been introduced: soma and Fordism which are deeply intertwined with each other. Sion traces the etymology of "soma" in his book *Aldous Huxley and the Search for Meaning* to "Greek for "body"" (128). Yet, soma is not only a bodily experience. It has its roots in religious ritual. In *Brave New World Revisited*, Huxley explains that the original soma, from which he took the name for his drug, was an unknown plant

used by the ancient Aryan invaders of India in one of the most solemn of their religious rites. The intoxicating juice expressed from the stems of this plant was drunk by the priests and nobles in the course of an elaborate ceremony. In the Vedic hymns we are told that the drinkers of soma were blessed in many ways. Their bodies were strengthened, their hearts were filled with courage, joy and enthusiasm, their minds were enlightened and in an immediate experience of eternal life they received the assurance of their immortality. (*Brave New World Revisited* 54)

However, this ancient drug was, contrary to Huxley's, dangerous and mortals could even die of an overdose. In *Brave New World*, it is harmless. Similarly to the ancient drug, it is used in religious ritual and is connected to morality and religion. Mustapha Mond explains to John: "And there's always soma to calm your anger, to reconcile you to your enemies, to make you patient and long-suffering" (210). These are all Christian virtues. And "[i]n the past you could only accomplish these things by making a great effort and after years of hard moral training" (210). But now, morality is accomplished easily and by everybody, by "half-gramme tablets".

Everyone is a good Christian and as Mond puts it: "Christianity without tears—that's what soma is."

Besides with soma, "religion has been replaced with a worship of technology" (Reiff 88). "The new god is Henry Ford, who made the first efficient assembly line and cheap cars" (Reiff 88). Even the beginning of the new world's history is based on Ford's technological breakthrough, the introduction of the first Ford Model T by the Ford Motor Company in 1908. Huxley replaces the expression "Anno Domini" with "Year of Our Ford" (the book is set in 632 After Ford). Reiff enumerates some of the cases where Ford's name was substituted for "Lord" and where similar interventions were made:

"Oh, Ford," "For Ford's sake," "My Ford," "Ford help him," and "Ford helps those who help themselves." The Christian benediction becomes "Ford keep you!" (195). The citizens attend the "Ford's Day Solidarity Groups" instead of Christian religious services, and they go to the "Fordson Community Singery." The popular Christian Science Monitor has become the Fordian Science Monitor. And the Christian crosses have been turned into "Ts" to signify Ford's Model T car. Therefore, Lenina wears a golden T necklace, and the names of several places in England have changed—"Charing Cross" is now "Charing-T" and "Banbury Cross" is known as "Banbury-T." Even the famous English clock, "Big Ben," is changed to "Big Henry." (88)

People even make the sign of the T instead of the cross: "Here the Director made a sign of the T on his stomach and all the students reverently followed suit" (*Brave New World* 20). Bloom notes that "the reader may notice the religious symbolism of the "sign of the T" and recall the date offered in chapter 1: A.F. 632. Huxley's society has substituted Henry Ford for

Jesus Christ, and the symbol of the T-Model automobile for that of the crucifix [...]" (Bloom 27). Bloom compares the Solidarity Service Bernard is attending at the Fordson Community Singery to a mass. He summarizes the ritual as follows:

The Solidarity Service, then, seems to be Huxley's answer to going to church. The Service progresses as follows: The twelve members of the group (reminiscent of the Twelve Apostles) sit in a circle, alternating males and females. The President of the Group stands, makes the sign of the "T," and switches on the synthetic music. A cup of [...] soma is passed between the twelve, each drinking after reciting, "I drink to my annihilation." Three Solidarity Hymns are sung, interspersed with other liturgical recitations: "I drink to the Greater Being," and "I drink to the imminence of His Coming" (Bloom 40).

Bloom also emphasizes that the hymns focus "on the coming of the "Greater Being" and the simultaneous merging of individual existence into this Greater Being" (40). Contrary to the Christian theology, which begs salvation of the individual through God, the religion of Brave New World "seems to call for the annihilation of the individual and the subsequent creation of a God, the Greater Being or Twelve-in-One. The supreme deity in Bernard's society is not a larger-than-life individual, but the aggregate of all human individuals in one mass being (Bloom 40-41)". Thus, the Fordian religion is used to strengthen community. Furthermore, Bowering comments that

Huxley's utopians were provided with a series of non-stop distractions guaranteed to ward off boredom and discourage idle speculation about the nature of things. Any frustrated religious instincts were provided for by the Ford's Day Solidarity Services, where, in a crude parody of the Holy Communion,

dedicated Soma Tablets and the loving cup of ice-cream Soma were passed round. By these means the Controllers insured that the Brave New Worlders loved their servitude and never dreamt of revolution. (71-72)

Reiff refers to Huxley's essay "The Puritan", where Huxley explains how he used the motif of Fordism in *Brave New World*. She reminds that Huxley wrote that the animal man; and with him the thinking and the spiritual man; should be sacrificed not to God, but to the Machine. In the factory or in the modern industrialized world, there is no place for animals or for artists or individuals. Fordism is a religion which demands the cruellest mutilations of the human psyche and offers the smallest spiritual returns (88).

Fordism is also an ideology that follows the principles of utilitarianism, consumerism and machine. Henry Ford, the developer of the assembly line for the Ford Model T in 1913 and a symbol of the machine age and consumption, has a strong presence in *Brave New World*. The daily life of the World State consists of production and consumerism. As the inhabitants should not have any time on themselves, their leisure or better, their pleasures are organized. They include, for example, mass sport activities, feelies and game equipment of elaborate machinery which is becoming more and more complicated but is easily consumed. It is highly desirable that new things are always acquired, that (several months) old things are replaced by new ones. Maximum consumption is encouraged and is somewhat a political responsibility because it keeps the wheels turning. Under-consumption in the age of machine is even described as a crime against society (*Brave New World* 43). Calder remarks in her essay on *Brave New World* that even the problem of money is solved:

Money is one of the problems that the new world has solved, for class is determined in the test tube and possessions are determined by class. There is no

competition, no keeping up with the Joneses, no novelties to be grabbed for. The problem has been solved by rationalizing the status quo, confirming inequality in a cleanly scientific way (Calder 73)

Prospects for Change

Science and surveillance made this world so stable that it is hard to imagine something that could bring change. As Firchow says, resistance on the part of a few individuals of the first Fordian commandment (the individual is no longer free to endanger himself or his group by refusing to indulge his impulses) is, in fact, what makes up the plot of *Brave New World* insofar as it has a plot (315). In the end, all resistance fails. However, there could be one thing. According to Krishan Kumar, the only door to overturning the regime might be Lenina's falling in love (qtd. in Deery 90), the return of emotion. However, she falls in love because her desires for John remain unsatisfied for a longer period, so that she cannot go on. And unless another disturbing force as John the Savage appears and is allowed to dwell in the World State, or unless a large scale mistake happens in conditioning, the scenario is unlikely to be repeated.

A similar scenario takes place in the world of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The protagonists Winston and Julia live in a world where their every step is monitored and where they are trying to preserve their individuality. In the end, they fail to do so. The second part of this paper will analyse the surveillance system in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Surveillance and Control in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

In contrast to the World State's, the systemic organization of *Nineteen Eighty-Four's* Oceania is not by itself a surveillance system. In other words, it cannot sustain itself. While the World State plans and moulds its inhabitants in a way that makes them a part of the

system already when they are born and has to make only slight interactions from time to time when they are grown up, the people of Oceania have space to develop a subversive nature. This is why Oceania is much less stable than the World State and why it always has to struggle for survival. Although the system does much to prevent this through indoctrination, it cannot condition its inhabitants biologically. Instead, it uses fear and punishment, going against the Benthamian thought of utility, to keep them obedient and loyal. Its society is stratified in three classes, the proles, the Outer Party and the Inner Party, without consideration of securing the “greatest happiness of the greatest number” and “their pleasures and their security”. Instead, only two per cent of the society, the Inner Party, can be considered happy. In fact, it keeps itself happy by having absolute control over Oceania and its other inhabitants: Power for the sake of power brings, in this case, the greatest happiness to the least number of people. In order to preserve this state, similar means of surveillance to those of the World State are in operation: propaganda and manipulation of reality, Thought Police, constant audio-visual supervision, fear and punishment, newspeak, doublethink and the mutability of the past, sexuality control, constant warfare, control of family relationships, gin. Surveillance; however, is to the greatest part directed on the Outer Party. The proles are only important for exercising power – they are living in a world devastated by war, are uneducated, completely powerless, they seem totally disconnected from the Party and the system, and represent no threat to those in power – they are the “dumb masses” (Orwell 238). On the other hand, the members of the Outer Party are workers of the public sector, involved in state organization and “if the Inner Party is described as the brain of the State, [they] may be justly likened to the hands” (Orwell 238). It is them who are the greatest danger for stability (of the Party) – thus they have to be controlled. The control over these population’s thirteen per cent puts them practically in a

position worse than the proles'. They live in the same poor material circumstances, they are held in poverty, they do not have access to healthy food or doctors. Even things as buttons, darning wool, shoelaces, razor blades are sometimes not available to them, so they have to procure them from the proles: "Party members were supposed not to go into ordinary shops ('dealing on the free market', it was called), but the rule was not strictly kept, because there were various things such as shoelaces and razor blades which it was impossible to get hold of in any other way" (Orwell 8). "[T]he Outer Party received only 3,000 clothing coupons annually, and a suit of pyjamas was 600" (36). In like manner, they are psychologically under immense pressure being constantly monitored. It might even be stated that, although they themselves see the proles as the lowest class, it is in fact them:

[...] the Party taught that the proles were natural inferiors who must be kept in subjection, like animals, by the application of a few simple rules. In reality very little was known about the proles. It was not necessary to know much. So long as they continued to work and breed, their other activities were without importance. (Orwell 82)

The proles seem to be allowed to do whatever they want and to move wherever they want. The restrictions on the Outer Party do not apply to them. While Party members, for example, can travel outside the city only with a good reason, the proles are not restricted in that matter. Winston, an Outer Party member, trying to secretly get to the country notices in the train: "The train was full of proles, in holiday mood because of the summery weather" (133). In contrast to the proles', the life of the Outer Party members is under constant surveillance - for them, privacy does not exist. They have restricted freedom of movement, speech, thoughts and beliefs; they have to have a proper attitude and set of values. These

are the love of Big Brother and loyalty to the Party. The reverse is a crime and unspoken questioning or doubt in the Party is called thoughtcrime, "the essential crime that contained all others in itself" (22) and which Winston commits by writing "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" (21) in his diary and which is punished with death. Thoughtcrime and the methods the Party uses to prevent it are going to be dealt with in the following headings.

Surveillance and Control of Language

The life of an Outer Party member should concentrate around the Party. What is most important, however, is that one should not only follow but really believe in its principles, the principles of Ingsoc (English Socialism) which are newspeak, doublethink and the mutability of the past. Newspeak is a new version of English which should eventually replace the old. It is still in progress of developing, but newspapers, books and other press is already being written in it. In this process, language is simplified, verbs, adjectives but also some nouns are being taken out of usage. The vagueness and different shades of meaning of Oldspeak are abolished, while the vocabulary is getting smaller every year. The aim of these changes is "to limit the expressiveness of English – and therefore human freedoms – by reducing its vocabulary" (Hayes 15). One of the authors of the Newspeak Dictionary, Syme, explains to the protagonist, Winston, the purpose of Newspeak:

Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten [...] Every year fewer and fewer words, and the range of consciousness always a little smaller [...] Even

now, of course, there's no reason or excuse for committing thoughtcrime. It's merely a question of self-discipline, reality-control. But in the end there won't be any need even for that. The Revolution will be complete when the language is perfect. (Orwell 60)

In other words, when Newspeak is completely adapted there will be no need for surveillance. All odds for committing a thoughtcrime will be eradicated and people will not know of an alternative to the present state of affairs because their range of thought is narrowed to it.¹

At the same time, Newspeak has another, similar purpose: to break the link between thinking and speaking. This is to be achieved by the stylistic characteristics of the new language: short polysyllabic words and "long strips of words which have already been set in order by someone else" (Orwell qtd. in Fowler 94) Fowler gives examples for this and analyses speeches from the novel. One of them is the speech of the Party's fiercest enemy, Emmanuel Goldstein: "[t]he stylistic effect of this prefabricated language is conveyed in the account of Goldstein's speech (94) which was "rapid polysyllabic" and "was a sort of parody of the habitual style of the orators of the Party" (Orwell qtd. in Fowler 94). Another example Fowler gives is the "speaker in the canteen" (Orwell qtd. in Fowler 94): "someone was talking rapidly and continuously, a harsh gabble almost like the quacking of a duck" and his phrases "jerked out very rapidly and, as it seemed, all in one piece, like a line of type cast solid" (Orwell qtd. in Fowler 94). Fowler remarks that:

¹However, the appendix to the novel *The Principles of Newspeak*, is written in an unidentified future in which the totalitarian regime does not exist anymore. It "takes the form of a scholarly monograph looking back on Oceania as an extinct and almost incomprehensible civilization" (Resch qtd. in Stewart 166). It is written in Oldspeak which shows that the language could not be reformed as planned by the Party.

The rapidity and fluency are made possible by the fact that the speaker is simply uttering strings of orthodox jargon and is in no sense choosing words in relation to intended meanings or to some state of affairs in the world. Thus language neither springs from consciousness (the speaker is not thinking), nor has any relation to truth.(94)

In this sense, Newspeak is a parody of the political and managerial language that

[...] through jargon, euphemism, prefabrication, dead metaphors, stock phrases and the like—they dissociate thought and language, turning the speaker into an unconscious machine that is not expressing thought, and indeed, through the deadness and the purely symbolic character of his language, is prevented from thinking. (Fowler 99)

The speaker is not thinking about what s/he is saying. It does not even matter. S/he is repeating meaningless phrases and the purpose of his/hers speech is to "invoke and communicate orthodox feelings" (Fowler 96). Bhabha addresses the same issue. He writes about Winston's "struggle for "consciousness" to the process of speech" (Bhabha 186) and quotes from the novel that the intention of "short, clipped words of unmistakable meaning [...] was to make speech, and especially speech on any subject not ideologically neutral, *as nearly as possible independent of consciousness*" (Orwell qtd. in Bhabha 186, emphasis in the original). Such words "roused the minimum of echoes in the speaker's mind" (Orwell qtd. in Bhabha 186), that is, they triggered no abstract associations but only feelings of orthodoxy. This is another way of avoiding thoughtcrime.

Surveillance and Control of Thought

Nevertheless, until Newspeak has fully replaced Oldspeak, people must be thought self-discipline. The technique that should enable this is reality-control or doublethink. It is a self-disciplinary technique which makes it possible for one to believe that, for example, a statement is true, although one knows that it is a lie. The telescreen and the newspapers, for instance, claim how there is more food, clothes, houses, furniture, cooking-pots, fuel, ships, helicopters, books, babies than last year and less disease, crime, and insanity than last year (Orwell 68). However, it is obvious that this is not so, because, for example, the sugar ratio is constantly being reduced. Doublethink is described as

[t]o know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully-constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them; to use logic against logic,[...] to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself.

(Orwell 40-41)

One has to train his/her mind to defend itself from thoughtcrime: “The mind should develop a blind spot whenever a dangerous thought presented itself. The process should be automatic, instinctive. Crimestop, they called it in Newspeak” (319). People are thought to control their own thoughts and beliefs accordingly to the Party’s wishes. In other words, people are made to develop self-surveillance. The most obvious application of this technique concerns the mutability of the past. Winston’s job at the Ministry of Truth is destroying documents and rewriting them. Everything that happened and that is not in line with the

current Party's plans or activities is being rewritten. Winston, for example, has to rewrite a paragraph of Big Brother's speech, in such a way as to make him predict the thing that has actually happened (Orwell 45). However, nobody in Winston's surroundings seems to notice these changes except him. He is astonished by how nobody seems to care about or remember that Oceania is every few years changing its enemy at war, sometimes it is Eurasia but then it suddenly is Eastasia. At the same time, the Party claims that it has always been at war with Eastasia. Lies are presented as facts and the concept of objective reality is brought into question. It has been replaced by the reality of the Party. Lonoff writes that the "palpable reality of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the nightmare" (33). She does not mean the Kafkaesque nightmare which arises from actions performed by the characters driven by the "chaotic force of the subconscious" (33) but a nightmare that arises from an "articulated logic" (33). The Party is "a nightmare system whose horrors include the worship of power, constant surveillance, denial of the past and of objective reality" (Lonoff 36, emphasis added). It is the context of Winston's daily life (33-34). His nightmarish "reality was decaying, dingy cities where underfed people shuffled to and fro in leaky shoes, in patched-up nineteenth-century houses that smelt always of cabbage and bad lavatories" (Orwell 85). It is a reality in which, it is claimed, nevertheless, that the world has never been happier and better off. As Lonoff claims, "[o]n the other side there is Winston, fighting for sanity, for memory and truth, for self [...]" (36). Winston, who was a boy when the Revolution happened, can still feel that the world had not always been as it is now: "Why should one feel it to be intolerable unless one had some kind of ancestral memory that things had once been different?" (Orwell 69) Thus, he is obsessed with memory and truth. He is obsessively trying to remember the pre-Revolution age and is seeking for people who have memories of

it. He is not worried that much by the fact that the Party does falsify reality, as with the fact that external reality will never again exist because it was denied by the Party philosophy:

And what was terrifying was not that they would kill you for thinking otherwise, but that they might be right. For, after all, how do we know that two and two make four? Or that the force of gravity works? Or that the past is unchangeable? If both the past and the external world exist only in the mind, and if the mind itself is controllable what then? (92)

In effect, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a work about reality and how we perceive it. At the end of the book when Winston is in captivity and tortured, O'Brien, his tormentor, explains to him:

Only the disciplined mind can see reality, Winston. You believe that reality is something objective, external, existing in its own right. You also believe that the nature of reality is self-evident. When you delude yourself into thinking that you see something, you assume that everyone else sees the same thing as you. But I tell you, Winston, that reality is not external. Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else. (Orwell 285)

One can make his own reality and this is the goal of the Party: to monitor and control it. Winston abandons his and finally accepts the Party's reality after going through the three stages of re-integration which O'Brien enumerates as learning, understanding and acceptance (Orwell 297) and which Gottlieb discusses as "Orwell's parody of the spiritual journey undertaken by many a mediaeval mystic, consisting of the three stages of Purgation, Illumination, and Union" (54). During these three stages, Winston learns to understand the three paradoxes of the Party's slogan. In the first phase, he learns to understand the slogan War is Peace through reading Goldstein's book; he is made to deny that he remembers the

photograph of Aaronson, Rutherford, and Jones (purgation through recollection); and he is made to admit that two and two make five (purgation through the senses) (Gottlieb 54). According to Gottlieb "Winston reaches this stage when he no longer wants to deceive O'Brien, but genuinely wants to see the four fingers as if they were" (54). In the second phase (equivalent to the mystic's Enlightenment or Illumination) Winston finally comes to understand the motivation behind the terror – O'Brien explains to him that "[t]he Party seeks power entirely for its own sake (301), and that the purpose of terror is terror itself. He starts to understand the second slogan, Freedom is Slavery, and that the individual is a slave to the Party, "a mere cell in the collective. This is [...] what the mystics have called the accumulating of knowledge about God, which comes through reason and study" (Price qtd. in Gottlieb 55). The third stage is connected to "Winston's ability to love" (Gottlieb 55). He betrays his love for Julia in embracing the love for Big Brother. And "[t]o "love" Big Brother in the spirit of true Acceptance means to become one with the essential nature of the Godhead revealed as the brutal, treacherous God of Power" (Gottlieb 55). In the mystic spiritual journey, this stage represents "total self-abandonment" (Underhill qtd. in Gottlieb 55) and "a sense of oneness in which" (Gottlieb 55) "[m]y me is God: nor do I know my selfhood except in God" (Underhill qtd. in Gottlieb 55). According to Gottlieb, in this stage, Winston has finally learned to practice doublethink: "Acceptance [...] is the ability to ignore, to forget, to *unlearn* all the knowledge he has accumulated throughout his journey" (56, emphasis in the original). He has learnt the final paradox: Ignorance is Strength. After this third stage, Winston is finally able to doublethink. He is a proper Party member. Doublethink can be best demonstrated on the example of O'Brien. According to Lonoff, "[h]e is doublethink made palpable"(37). Pittock points to O'Brien's

ability to analyse how the regime functions, including the place in it of perpetual warfare and doublethink, in a way that is objectively true O'Brien indeed admits that 'Goldstein's' account is true "as a description" [...] —while at the same time believing that what he has shown to be true is false, even though the true account had shown not only the falsity of the false account but its social function. That this involves the potentiality of infinite regress can be shown by reducing the particulars of what is involved to abstract variables:

(a) O'Brien, the Inner Party member, knows that x is not y, but knowing that x is not y, he believes all the more certainly that x is y (O'Brien knows)

(b) 'Goldstein' (i.e. O'Brien [who is the actual writer of Goldstein's book]) knows that O'Brien, the Inner Party member, knows that x is not y, but knowing that x is not y, he believes all the more certainly that x is y (O'Brien knows that O'Brien knows). (120)

Given this, Pittock compares O'Brien to the "traditional idea of Satan as both supremely intelligent [...] and completely alienated both from the good and from truth and reality, which, since he can appear as an angel of light, he can nonetheless comprehend" (120). In fact, the novel is a sum of contradictions: it represents the classical battle between the good and the evil. For the reader, the Party is evil and Winston is good, but the morality of Winston's reality is inverted. The Party is good, Big Brother is a Saint/the god and Winston is the sinner. As Gottlieb claims, "[i]n the hands of O'Brien he undergoes the spiritual experience of conversion, until he is remade into the image of Big Brother, and made to live up to the Party's superhuman, and therefore inevitably inhuman, standard of the "good" (58). There is a "psychic battle [...] between 'sacred' and 'satanic,'" (Gottlieb 53) in the novel.

In Oceania, the satanic is the opponent of the system "in order that it could set up the category of the 'sacred' for the leader" (Gottlieb 52) and

that Big Brother may continually reveal his more than human power by scoring new victories over the inexhaustible supply of invariably satanic opponents. Thus who or what belongs to the satanic at any given moment may change, but the category of the satanic is unchangeable, indispensable to the psychological apparatus of totalitarianism. (Gottlieb 53)

According to Gottlieb, "Orwell's parody implies a direct parallel between the Party and the Church Militant" (52). He also comments on the Chapter 7 on Doublethink, which

indicates, there is a point where the Party goes beyond the Church: to add to the tension of polarizing the entire world in terms of 'sacred' and 'satanic,' the Party arrogates to itself the power to switch the enemy at will, and then to deny that a switch has taken place. (52)

And in Oceania, people are trained from early on to be "vigilant in detecting and persecuting evil", but at the same time, they are "prevented from relying on their own judgement or memory in identifying evil" (Gottlieb 52). This is why they

succumb to a state of mind the Party chooses to call the "love" of Big Brother, the same state of mind Goldstein's Book defines as "controlled insanity" or Doublethink. To have any sense of good and evil, the people of Oceania have to be ruled by, indeed become one with, the will of Big Brother, and Big Brother chooses to reveal his will through the Law of Contradiction [...](Gottlieb 53)

In using contradiction, oxymoron and paradox, by making people abnegate Reason and accept the unresolved paradox, the Inner Party attempts to generate fervour of faith (Gottlieb 53). Additionally, the Party seems to have "the kind of powers traditionally attributed to demons" (Pittock 111). It knows what people are thinking and dreaming; it has telepathic powers and can know the future (Pittock 111). The Party has set up a trap for Winston and Julia: it has set up the shop and the room above it, for example, knowing that they would fall for it:

[...] the secret police had already set up and stocked the fake junkshop knowing that Winston would visit it, and would see its obviously carefully chosen wares as embodying a reality and values rooted in the past which he would regard as inimical to the very regime which established it to have exactly that appeal to him. (Pittock 115)

The regime lets Winston develop the illusion of an effective alternative reality and an alternative value system and when he discovers that there are none, his nightmarish reality will be all the more terrible (Pittock 117). Pittock also argues that "[w]ith such powers at their command no one can stand against them and no one ever does [...]" (Pittock 133). Thoughtcrime does not stand a chance.

Panoptical Surveillance

In order to ensure that there is as little thoughtcrime as possible, another mechanism is in operation, a technical device with the aim to monitor the activities of the Outer and Inner Party members. Set in every flat, working place, building and square, the metal plaque simultaneously emits programs and receives information on what is going on in front of it. It emits propaganda and picks up both picture and sound. However, there is "no way of

knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment [...] You had to live – did live, from habit that became instinct – in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and, except in darkness, every movement scrutinised” (Orwell 5). This makes one fear that it might pick up signs of unorthodoxy with the result of the Thought Police coming to get one. It produces paranoia and makes people develop a defence mechanism by acquiring a posture and face expression which they think is acceptable. Winston, for example, sets “his features into the expression of quiet optimism which was advisable to wear when facing the telescreen” (Orwell 7):

The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself -- anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example) was itself a punishable offence. There was even a word for it in Newspeak: facecrime, it was called. (Orwell 71)

Although one never knows if one is being watched, the fear of being uncovered and punished is that great that one behaves as he is always being watched. In fear, one would exercise doublethink. Michael Yeo calls this type of surveillance panoptical surveillance (Yeo 53). Indeed, this system of supervision could be compared to Bentham’s concept of panopticon, developed for different buildings meant for keeping people under inspection. It would enable one inspector to monitor everyone in the building. As it is impossible to always supervise everyone, the solution would be that they all feel that they are being inspected. Bentham calls this the apparent omnipresence of the inspector (*The Panopticon Writings* 41) and explains: “[...] the greater chance there is, of a given person's being at a given time

actually under inspection, the more strong will be the persuasion - the more *intense*, if I may say so, the *feeling*, he has of his being so" (*The Panopticon Writings* 40). In this situation, the supervised will avoid behaving in a way for which they would be punished if detected. As Yeo puts it, "Winston self-censors and plays for the camera, pretending to believe and think what he is supposed to and hiding his true thoughts and beliefs" (Yeo 54). At the core of the panoptical principle is, according to Harry Strub, the idea that people will behave themselves when they know they are being watched: "Bentham believed that a continual watch over a prisoner might ultimately lead to his reformation [...] because those being observed expect negative consequences to follow the detection of inappropriate behaviour" (Strub 41). Citing the *Principles of Penal Law*, Strub emphasizes that Bentham was aware of the fact that the threat of severe punishment for misbehaviour must be omnipresent: "in every tense: in memory, in sufferance, and in prospect" (Bentham cited in Strub 41).

In addition to this type of surveillance, Yeo identifies in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* another one: surreptitious surveillance. It does not, as the panoptic, prevent speech or action, but detects what people really think and believe when they are in surroundings which they believe are not monitored. Winston, when surrounded by telescreens or other comrades even tries to avoid unorthodox thought in order not to give himself away involuntarily. However, believing that one is in a private space not under surveillance, one is disinhibited and acts and thinks (Yeo 55). This is the case with Winston when he meets Julia in a room above the old shop, not suspecting that there is a telescreen behind an old picture. The Thought Police, thus, operates in two ways: on the one hand visibly and publicly and on the other hand secretly and invisibly. Yeo remarks that the pervasiveness of surveillance is an indication that the Party expects that propaganda will fail in many cases (59) and that panoptic self-policing prevents people from straying from these norms, and surreptitious

policing weeds out those who hide their deviance in public, catching them at it in private (58).

Big Brother and the Reminders of Surveillance

Another means for reminding people to watch their thoughts is the poster of Big Brother. It is an extension of the telescreen in that it is supposed to have the same effect on people – it reminds them that they are closely monitored. It cannot pick up sounds and it does not have an installed camera, but it nevertheless makes one feel paranoid:

It depicted simply an enormous face, more than a metre wide: the face of a man of about forty-five, with a heavy black moustache and ruggedly handsome features [...] On each landing [...] the poster with the enormous face gazed from the wall. It was one of those pictures [*are there other kinds?*] which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move. BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU, the caption beneath it ran. (Orwell 3)

Big Brother is the leading figure of the Party since the Revolution – at least he is represented as such: “The story really began in the middle sixties, the period of the great purges in which the original leaders of the Revolution were wiped out [...]. By 1970 none of them was left, except Big Brother himself” (Orwell 86). He is the face of the Party which is every day appearing on the telescreens and posters, and in whose name the Party demands loyalty from the comrades. In other words, a cult of personality is organized around him. However, it is not quite clear if he is a real person, or just a means of propaganda and surveillance established by the Inner Party. As Lerner notices, “[w]e are encouraged to think that the leader is a fiction created by the Inner Party” (70). In the book *The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism* allegedly written by Emmanuel Goldstein (a means of surreptitious

surveillance) – the fiercest enemy of the Party -, Big Brother is described as a focusing point for love, fear, and reverence, emotions which are more easily felt towards an individual than towards an organization (Orwell 238). His figure is not only used to more easily direct what people feel towards the Party, but also towards the enemy, or even their comrades. He is the Benthamian inspector, always present, always watching, loved and feared, but who at the same time generates hate. Gottlieb draws a comparison between Big Brother and the mystical symbol of the pervasive eye,

a fundamental concept of mysticism being that the human Soul is always in the presence of God. Big Brother's hypnotic gaze, which penetrates all minds of Oceania, is a parody of this concept, and it points to the greatest danger inherent in the totalitarian mentality. (57)

Gottlieb compares Big Brother's eye with the eye of the God of the mystics: "The eye by which I see ... is the same as the eye by which God sees me." (57) The Party, not satisfied only with obedience "makes the individual internalize the censoring eye of the punitive authority; by the end Big Brother has penetrated Winston's Superego, and the Thought Police has taken internal—that is, total—command over the Self" (Gottlieb 57-58).

Control of Emotions

Control of emotions is the last aspect of control that will be discussed here. It is connected to *Brave New World's* soma which is used to control undesirable emotions and is "an insurance against personal maladjustment, social unrest and the spread of subversive ideas" (*Brave New World Revisited* 55). However, perhaps the most important difference in control of emotions between *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is that, in the latter

case, catharsis is undesirable. Whereas negative emotions and suffering are to be avoided in *Brave New World*, they are purposely provoked and amplified in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

A good example of how the Party controls emotions would be the Two Minutes Hate, an everyday communal ritual. It is comparable to *Brave New World's* Solidarity Service at the Fordson Community Singery where people are gathering to praise Ford and where they chant phrases as "Ford, Ford, Ford" and "I drink to the Great Being", or "I drink to the imminence of his coming" (*Brave New World* 70). Ford becomes a messianic figure under which "Everyone works for everyone else" and people are but a cell in the organism of the Great (well)Being. The ritual ends with unification – with an orgy – and aims to strengthen the Community. This is also one of the aims of the Two Minutes Hate ritual. Gottlieb analyses that the ritual is based on the already discussed polarization: "It is by attributing satanic powers to Goldstein, the Prime Enemy, that Big Brother, who admittedly had started his career as a mere mortal, could imperceptibly arrogate to himself the power of supernatural goodness, the power of the Sacred" (Gottlieb 53). In the ritual, the Outer Party members gather in front of a telescreen for a program with the Party's enemy, Emmanuel Goldstein. "All treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching" (14). He was shown on the telescreen, abusing Big Brother, advocating freedom of speech, Press, assembly and thought (15) – principles adverse to the Party's. Party's propaganda was so effective that the "sight or even the thought of Goldstein produced fear and anger automatically" (16), strong emotions easily manipulated:

A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge-hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current, turning one even against one's will into a

grimacing, screaming lunatic. And yet the rage that one felt was an abstract, undirected emotion which could be switched from one object to another like the flame of a blowlamp (Orwell 17).

Winston's hatred is at first not directed towards Goldstein, but towards Big Brother, the Party and the Thought Police, because he knows that Goldstein is the "sole guardian of truth and sanity in a world of lies" (17). But at the next instant, everything said about Goldstein seemed to be true and "his secret loathing of Big Brother changed into adoration, and Big Brother seemed to tower up, an invincible, fearless protector, standing like a rock against the hordes of Asia, and Goldstein" (18). Gottlieb comments that "[i]t is due to the experience of the communal ecstasy of hate directed at the satanic Goldstein; that the true believer is "uttering a prayer" to Big Brother, the "Saviour!" (Gottlieb 53). A participant of the ritual tremulously murmurs: 'My Saviour!' and the group breaks into "a deep, slow, rhythmical chant of 'B-B!' . . . B-B! . . . B-B!' - over and over again" (19) which is reminiscent of the chant "Oh Ford, Ford, Ford" and the Solidarity Service Days in *Brave New World*. Both are religious rituals, where people unite in preying to their gods. Moreover, the ritual of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is an exercise in doublethink, in self-disciplined transference of hate from one object to another: "It was even possible, at moments, to switch one's hatred this way or that by a voluntary act" (18). Winston even succeeds in transferring his hatred from the face on the screen to a girl behind him.

Besides producing and manipulating negative emotions, the Party tries to kill all the positive ones. In contrast to *Brave New World*, desires must not be fulfilled because this produces useful frustration which the Party can channel into hate, fear, and mistrust. Sex between Party members is forbidden. As Julia, Winston's lover, explains, it was not merely

that the sex instinct created a world of its own which was outside the Party's control and which therefore had to be destroyed, but that the Party used sexual privation to induce hysteria, and hysteria was desirable because it could be transformed into war-fever and leader-worship. She says: 'When you make love you're using up energy; and afterwards you feel happy and don't give a damn for anything. They can't bear you to feel like that. They want you to be bursting with energy all the time" (Orwell 153). To prevent the Party members from having sex, an Anti-Sex ethics is introduced and anti-sex conditioning conducted:

The women of the Party were all alike. Chastity was as deep ingrained in them as Party loyalty. By careful early conditioning, by games and cold water, by the rubbish that was dinned into them at school and in the Spies and the Youth League, by lectures, parades, songs, slogans, and martial music, the natural feeling had been driven out of them. (78)

Eroticism is dangerous because it binds people and creates loyalty not to the Party but between Party members. Winston considers his relationship with Julia to be a political act: "No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party" (145), rebellion.

However, usually, interpersonal relationships are another cause of frustration and are constructed very much in line with marriage customs and personal relations in Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia* (See Plato 305-325; and More 93-98). The Party does not want Party members to have any close relationships of trust with each other, and their relationships are accompanied by fear and mistrust. One has to always worry that he might

give an unorthodox impression and that his comrades and family members would report him to the Thought Police. Additionally, the Party is completely in control of one's private life, even family: "All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose, and [...] permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another" (Orwell 75). The sole purpose of marriage is producing new generations of loyal comrades and the institution of family is an extension of the Thought Police. The children, for instance, who are easily conditioned and indoctrinated, are raised by children's organizations as the Spies and taught to be loyal to the Party from early childhood.

What was worst of all was that by means of such organizations as the Spies they were systematically turned into ungovernable little savages [...] they adored the Party and everything connected with it. The songs, the processions, the banners, the hiking, the drilling with dummy rifles, the yelling of slogans, the worship of Big Brother -- it was all a sort of glorious game to them. (Orwell 29)

This being a game to them, they are always on the run after traitors of the Party. The seven-year-old daughter of Winston's neighbour, for example, "slipped off from the hike, and spent the whole afternoon following a strange man. They kept on his tail for two hours, right through the woods, and then [...] handed him over to the patrols" (Orwell 66). She later even denounces her father (despised by Winston for his unquestioning acceptance of everything the Party tells him) claiming he was saying "Down with Big Brother" in his sleep. Children are loyal only to the Party and it is "almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children" (29). They are instrumentalized to a surveillance mechanism and the family "was a device by means of which everyone could be surrounded night and day by

informers who knew him intimately” (Orwell 153). The infusion of this surveillance type is also the reason why solitude does not exist anymore. As in *Brave New World*, people control what other people are doing and intervene if necessary. Solitude, thus, is undesirable and almost considered a crime - private life is eliminated. There is even danger of saying something inappropriate in sleep which could be picked up by the telescreen or the children. The only private thing one could have (even for a short time) are thoughts. Although the system is paranoid about people having private thoughts, they do develop:

“On coins, on stamps, on the covers of books, on banners, on posters, and on the wrappings of a cigarette Packet [...] Always the eyes watching you and the voice enveloping you. Asleep or awake, working or eating, indoors or out of doors, in the bath or in bed -- no escape. Nothing was your own except the few cubic centimetres inside your skull. (Orwell 31-32)

Still, Winston is aware that he cannot have the few cubic centimetres inside his skull forever - the Thought Police would get him sooner or later. Even, when he succeeds to think clearly, the surveillance devices hinder him to be productive. The telescreen, for example, always produces noise: “[...] with the voice from the telescreen nagging at his ears he could not follow the train of thought further” (Orwell 118). The telescreen, thus, is not only a reminder of surveillance but, also a means to disturbing clear thinking by constant annoying sounds. In combination with his poor health and booziness caused by gin (the only available alcoholic drink to Outer Party members), Winston is passivized in his attempt to write or think: “He was conscious of nothing except the blankness of the page in front of him, the itching of the skin above his ankle, the blaring of the music, and a slight booziness caused by the gin” (10). Gin (oily-tasting, causing tears and stomach burning), telescreens, poor health and the 20 to

30 bombs falling every day on London make one think only about pains and how to avoid them.

And people are very aware of pain, the prospect of more pain and the prospect of death. The Party has since the Revolution every couple of years performed purges in which political offenders disappeared or were publicly executed. Fear is the motivation for loyalty. Death, however, has changed its character, it has ceased to be tragic and become an everyday possibility. As the relationships based on love and trust have disappeared, other peoples' misfortunes mean no more than fear for the individual. As Winston at one occasion thinks of his mother's death, he realizes that in the old world, death was tragic and sorrowful in a way that was no longer possible:

Tragedy, he perceived, belonged to the ancient time, to a time when there was still privacy, love, and friendship, and when the members of a family stood by one another without needing to know the reason ... [S]he had sacrificed herself to a conception of loyalty that was private and unalterable. Such things, he saw, could not happen today. Today there were fear, hatred, and pain, but no dignity of emotion, no deep or complex sorrows. (Orwell 35)

The sole purpose of the surveillance system in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with all its means and supports is ensuring stability of the established hierarchy and insuring power of the top two per cent. This is true even with the brainwashing process, people as Winston have to go true in order to be purified of thoughtcrime. O'Brien explains to Winston who does not understand why the Party is bothering with torture before killing people. O'Brien asks: "How does one man assert his power over another, Winston?" (305) and answers himself "Exactly. By making him suffer".

Obedience is not enough. Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing. Do you begin to see, then, what kind of world we are creating? It is the exact opposite of the stupid hedonistic Utopias that the old reformers imagined. (305)

Prospects for Change

As rebellion cannot come from within (Winston and Julia are brainwashed into loving Big Brother), Winston considers the 85 per cent of the population outside the Party crucial. However, the proles are considered inferior and not human by the Party members. They shouldn't have any strong political feelings, and were taught "a primitive patriotism which could be appealed to whenever it was necessary to make them accept longer working-hours or shorter rations. And even when they became discontented, [...] their discontent led nowhere, because being without general ideas, they could only focus it on petty specific grievances" (Orwell 82). Thus, in order that the proles could rebel, they would need the help of the higher classes. And as long as no member of the higher class was allowed to think and act freely, there was no danger from the proles.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to analyse the system of surveillance and control in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By doing so, it has been remarked that the organization of the World State is a surveillance system in itself. Apart from eugenics (biological surveillance) and postnatal conditioning (surveillance of emotional development), more elements of control than surveillance follow the life of adult inhabitants. The most

important results of surveillance and control are the abolition of family ties, strong emotions and long-lasting desires. They bring instability to the individual and this is the greatest danger to the stability of the State. Strong emotions are also the most important means of control in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The government of Oceania keeps a part of its population under an explicit surveillance system where everyone is aware that he is being monitored (even if he is not). It tries to generate as much fear and frustration as possible which it then controls by channelling them where they are needed. Every one individual is under control, and much effort is invested in bringing him under control. However, people are not, as in *Brave New World*, biologically and emotionally conditioned to behave by themselves as the government wishes. They always have to be reminded and in the more stubborn cases, tortured and brainwashed into behaving.

Both systems use human emotion in their organization. One uses happiness and pleasure, while the other uses pain and fear. One uses reward, and the other punishment. Both systems “stem from a common hedonistic theory of human nature – that man is infinitely malleable in adapting his actions in accordance with the principles of pleasure-approach and pain-avoidance” (Strub 48). While *Brave New World* is based on the principle of utility, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* represents, according to Strub, a complete inversion of Bentham’s utilitarianism. While Bentham seeks to arrange the greatest good of the greatest number and to maximize pleasure (good) and minimize pain (evil), the government of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is committed to stamping out pleasure and multiplying pain.

The reason why Oceania is not a utopian society, is that power, as the leaders see it, is inflicting pain and humiliation over their subjects of reign – there is no happiness. Why then, the World State is not a utopia? It cannot be for lack of freedom, because the old utopias

have also restricted freedoms of their inhabitants. Instead, it is because human nature had to be changed in a formidable way in order to reach happiness. Humans are not humans anymore, but machines in human form. *Brave New World* is a good example, how, although a product of the human mind, the machine is often despised and feared. However, the World State is a utopia for its inhabitants (except for some exceptions as Marx), and a dystopia for the readers.

Works Cited

- Bentham, Jeremy. "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation." Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907. The Online Library of Liberty. Web. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/278>. PDF.
- Bentham, Jeremy. "The Panopticon Writings." Ed. Bozovic, M. London: Verso, 1995: 29-95. Web. 22/8/2013. PDF.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Doublespeak and the Minority of One." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 179-188. PDF.
- Bloom, Harald. "Introduction." *Bloom's Guides. Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Chelsea House Publishers, 2004: 7-69. PDF.
- Bowering, Peter. "Peter Bowering on Huxley's Use of Soma." *Bloom's Guides. Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Chelsea House Publishers, 2004: 70-72. PDF.
- Calder, Jenni. "Huxley Saw Power for Both Good and Evil in Science." *Social Issues in Literature. Bioethics in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Bryfonski, D. Greenhaven Press, 2010: 71-78.
- Claeys, Gregory. "The Origins of dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Claeys, G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010: 107-131.
- Deery, June. "Brave New World Reflects the Gender Bias of Its Time." *Social Issues in Literature. Bioethics in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Bryfonski, D. Greenhaven Press, 2010: 84-94.

- Firchow, Peter. "Science and Conscience in Huxley's "Brave New World"." *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Summer, 1975): 301-316. University of Wisconsin. JSTOR. Web. 17/08/2013. PDF.
- Fitting, Peter. "Utopia, dystopia and science fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Claeys, G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010: 235-154.
- Fortunati, Vita. "Utopia as a Literary Genre." *Dictionary of Literary Utopias*, Ed. Fortunati, V.; Trousson R. Paris: Champion, 2000: 634-643.
- Fowler, Roger. "Newspeak and the Language of the Party." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 93-108. PDF.
- Gottlieb, Erika. "The Demonic World of Oceania: The Mystical Adulation of the 'Sacred' Leader." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 51-70. PDF.
- Hayes, James. "Nineteen Eighty-Four Unplugged." *Engineering & Technology* (24 may - 6 June 2008): 14-18. Institution of Engineering & Technology. Web. www.theiet.org/engtechmag. 18/8/2013. PDF.
- Huxley, Aldous. "Brave New World." Vintage, 2004.
- Huxley, Aldous. "Brave New World Revisited." Rosetta Books LLC, 2000. PDF.
- Kass, Leon R. "Huxley Presents a Choice Between Imperfect Humanity and Perfect Biotechnology." *Social Issues in Literature. Bioethics in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Bryfonski, D. Greenhaven Press, 2010: 104-108.

- Lerner, Laurence. "Totalitarianism: A New Story? An Old Story?" *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 71-82. PDF.
- Lonoff, Sue. "Composing Nineteen Eighty-Four: The Art of Nightmare." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 31-50. PDF.
- Matter, William W. "The Utopian Tradition and Aldous Huxley." *Science Fiction Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (July 1975): 146-151. SF-TH IncStable. JSTOR. Web. 17/08/2013. PDF.
- Miller, Jacques-Alain; Miller, Richard. "Jeremy Bentham's Panoptic Device." *October*, Vol. 41 (Summer, 1987): 3-29. The MIT Press. JSTOR. Web. 17/08/2013. PDF.
- Monahan, Torin. "Surveillance as Cultural Practice." *The Sociological Quarterly*. Volume 52, Issue 4 (Fall 2011): 495-508. Midwest Sociological Society. PDF.
- More, Thomas. "Utopia. Revised Edition." *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*. Ed. Logan, G. M.; Adams, R. M. Cambridge University Press, 2003. PDF.
- Needham, Joseph. "Brave New World is concerned with the Misuse of Science for Power." *Social Issues in Literature. Bioethics in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Bryfonski, D. Greenhaven Press, 2010: 66-70.
- Norton, Furaha D. "Introduction." *Visions of Utopia*. Ed. Rothstein, E. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003: VII-IX. PDF.
- Orwell, George. "Nineteen Eighty-Four. The Annotated Edition." London: Penguin Books, 2013.

- Pittock, Malcolm. "The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 109-126. PDF.
- Plato. "The Republic." The Wiretap Electronic Text Archive. 2012. PDF.
- Rothstein, Edward. "Utopia and Its Discontents." *Visions of Utopia*. Ed. Rothstein, E. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003: 1-28. PDF.
- Strub, Harry. "The Theory of Panoptical Control: Bentham's Panopticon and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *The Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences*, Volume 25 (January 1989): 40-60. PDF.
- Stewart, Anthony. "The Heresy of Common Sense: The Prohibition of Decency in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations. George Orwell's 1984. Updated Edition*. Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2007: 137 - 178. PDF.
- Vieira, Fátima. "The concept of Utopia." *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Claeys, G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010: 3-27.
- Woodcock, George. "In *Brave New World* Freedom is Traded for Happiness." *Social Issues in Literature. Bioethics in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Bryfonski, D. Greenhaven Press, 2010: 95-103.
- Yeo, Michael. "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Two Sides of the Same Coin." *Global Media Journal - Canadian Edition*. Volume 3, Issue 2, Canada: Laurentian University, 2010: 49-66. PDF.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the characteristics of totalitarianism in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. This analysis shows how the surveillance system is constructed in the two works, what the differences are and what the similarities. The paper is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the construction of surveillance in *Brave New World*. Several control and surveillance methods are recognized and analysed: the standardization of the human product; embryo treatment; postnatal conditioning by hypnopaedia; neo-Pavlovian conditioning; abolition of family, its ties and values as well as emotional connections between people; sexuality control; surveillance by other members of society; obligatory communal activities and control of individual's free time; soma; stigmatization of history and regulation of scientific activity. The analysis shows that surveillance in *Brave New World* is a complex system of control comprising many different elements including systematic monitoring: the life of individuals or groups of individuals starts with biological surveillance - they are programmed to behave predictably as machines and later in life, this predictability is supported by strict means of control.

The second part of the paper deals with surveillance in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* which consists of audio-visual supervision and is aided by following supporting means of control: propaganda and manipulation of reality; Thought Police; constant audio-visual supervision; fear and punishment; newspeak; doublethink and the mutability of the past; sexuality control; constant warfare; control of family relationships; gin. However, not all of the population is subjected to all means of surveillance - only the members of the Outer Party are controlled strictly, because they are the ones who are dangerous to the system.

The paper argues that the systems of *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are totalitarian and that their ultimate goal is to preserve themselves. It also shows that they serve a completely different means: the aim of one is absolute wellbeing of the population, and the aim of the other, absolute concentration of power in few individuals.

Key Words

George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Surveillance, Control