

***After Nineteen Eighty-Four, After Theory and After
Snowden: A World-System Theory Reading***

Stephen McQueen B.A., B.AsianSt., B.Teach., Grad.Dip.Ed., M.Ed.

This thesis is presented for the Honours degree of English and Creative Writing at Murdoch University 2015.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains, as its main content, work that has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary educational institution, including Murdoch.

Signed:

Stephen John McQueen (9204123)

28 October 2015

COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge that a copy of this thesis will be held at the Murdoch University Library.

I understand that, under the provisions of s51.2 of the Copyright Act 1968, all or part of this thesis may be copied without infringement of copyright where such a reproduction is for the purposes of study and research.

This statement does not signal any transfer of copyright away from the author.

Signed:

Full Name of Degree: Bachelor of Arts with Honours in English and Creative Writing

Thesis Title: *After Nineteen Eighty-Four, After Theory and After Snowden: A World-System Theory Reading*

Author: Stephen John McQueen (9204123)

Year: 2015

ABSTRACT

This thesis draws on the insights of George Orwell's (1949[1984]) *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to explore contemporary surveillance issues. It is argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be read from a variety of theoretical approaches that have developed since its publication in 1949. This is demonstrated by drawing on Eagleton's (2003) *After Theory* and the parallels the text has with Eagleton's call for a return to a less reductive and more self-reflexive class based analysis. Research that utilises different theoretical approaches to read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is also discussed. The thesis then considers various ways in which the different main characters have been analysed. An alternative reading is then provided, that argues that Winston, Julia and O'Brien can be read as representing aspects of modernism, cultural theory and postmodernism respectively. It is then argued that through their interactions, the text encourages a rapprochement of cultural theory and modernist class based analysis, as a means of resistance to the state. Finally, by drawing on World-system theory, an alternative reading of the global political economy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is employed to explore issues of stability and surveillance in this fictive world. This analysis is then used to explore contemporary surveillance issues after the Snowden revelations, including the role of global capital and the state in employing surveillance to control labour. Issues of resistance are then discussed in terms of the importance for a return to a class based analysis of surveillance that draws on the insights of World-system theory, but which emphasises the insights provided by cultural theory. This includes, for example, how state and capital utilise language to limit the subject positions of citizens to suspect and consumer, as well as enabling a more self-reflexive range of subject positions than those imposed by the state and global capital in the contemporary global political economy.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
CHAPTER 1.....	6
CHAPTER 2.....	17
CHAPTER 3.....	27
CONCLUSION.....	43
REFERENCES.....	45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr David Moody at Murdoch University - thank you for your supervision in the production of this thesis. I appreciate the way in which you gave of your time and academic knowledge as well as your good humoured guidance. I am very grateful.

To my family - thank you for your support, encouragement and understanding.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the introduction of surveillance practices by both the state and capital in the contemporary global political economy. However, rather than seeing such practices as properly belonging to the disciplines of politics or security studies, this thesis takes the position that literature has much to contribute to the debate. Subsequently, I have chosen to revisit George Orwell's (1949 [1984]) seminal text on surveillance, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in order to explore such practices with a particular focus on the explication of literary theories represented within the text. Whilst this is a satisfactory endeavour in its own right, this paper also seeks to provide an alternative reading of this well-known text by using World-system theory as a theoretical framework to analyse the global political economy of the text. In so doing, it argues that surveillance is intricately linked to maintaining the stability of the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. However, when that stability is contextualised within the global political economy, a linkage can be drawn between the ongoing exploitation of labour as a determining influence on the form and extent of surveillance regimes that maintain that stability.

This work is important for a number of reasons. For example, Bauman et al (2014, 122) argue in their work *After Snowden: Rethinking the Impact of Surveillance* that 'There is thus an urgent need for a systematic assessment of the scale, reach, and character of contemporary surveillance practices, as well as the justifications they attract and the controversies they provoke'. Of course, this further raises the question of whether if such justifications are insufficient, what potential is there for resistance? *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is argued, provides some useful insights into this important question through its implicit engagement with different literary theories concerning the relationship between politics, culture and society. In order to explore these insights, this thesis draws on Eagleton's (2003) *After Theory* as a theoretical framework to actively read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in a way which contemporises the text. This is achieved through an analysis of the main characters as representing different aspects of literary theory, and how the interaction of these theories through these characters provide insights into effecting political resistance and change. Subsequently, by combining World-system theory and *After Theory* as a means to

read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* from a contemporary perspective, this provides the basis for understanding surveillance issues in our own global political economy.

Thus the aims of this thesis are threefold. First, it seeks to demonstrate that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* remains an informative and explanatory text to understanding contemporary surveillance issues. Second, that by reading this text from a variety of theoretical positions, not only does literature have much to contribute to political analysis, but that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* invites the reader to return to a modernist class based approach, within a World-system framework, in order to resist the power of the state and global capital. Third, it seeks to explore how what I have called “culturalism” and modernism can inform each other and offer alternative means of understanding contemporary surveillance issues, as well as offer opportunities for resistance.

Before proceeding however, it is important to preface this approach with two points. The first is the need to clarify my usage of the terms “culturalism”, “modernism” and “postmodernism” within this thesis. Clearly, each of these theoretical approaches are themselves comprised of many different positions, and I want to emphasise that they are only used in this way as a form of academic shorthand in order to explore the interactions of these various theoretical approaches to offer an alternative reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Broadly speaking then, I use “modernism” to refer to class based analysis and the primacy of economic relations whereas by “culturalism” I am referring to a language and identity based analysis. Finally, “postmodernism” is used to describe those approaches that question modernist assumptions regarding the nature of truth, theories and grand narratives in general. Secondly, it is the presupposition of this thesis that novels should be read as texts. By moving beyond trying to discern authorial intent, texts remain relevant and continue to inform the reader long after their publication. Indeed, I believe this is one of the reasons why *Nineteen Eighty-Four* continues to appeal to new generations of readers.

The thesis therefore is structured around three central arguments with each chapter dedicated to their development. The first chapter argues that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is particularly amenable to being analysed from multiple theoretical approaches since it seeks to explore issues of power and change. This argument is substantiated by considering the parallels between *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Eagleton’s (2003) *After*

Theory, and subsequently such an analysis establishes the theoretical positioning of my research within such a context. After a summary of the arguments made by Eagleton, I consider various readings of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that demonstrate the multiple ways in which the text has been interpreted, as well as drawing from the text to demonstrate how these theoretical positions are consistent with an *After Theory* position. In many respects, such a comparison privileges a return to class identity as a primary source of instigating political change and resistance.

The second chapter considers the broader strokes of literary theory that can be read through a discussion of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and seeks to blend this analysis by reconsidering the role of the individual as portrayed in the text as a means of resistance to surveillance. This analysis begins with reviewing different interpretations of what the central characters represent in relation to the state. For example, I draw on Ingle's (2007) argument that Winston is problematically constituted by Orwell as an individual applying reason grounded in objective truth. However, I argue that an alternative reading is possible and that Winston, Julia and O'Brien can be understood in terms of representing aspects of modernism, culturalism and postmodernism respectively. Moreover, it is through these characters interactions, and the way in which they influence each other, that the text parallels Eagleton's call for a return to class based analysis.

For example, the joining of Winston and Julia can be interpreted as a rapprochement between modernism and culturalism. This is akin to taking the best of cultural theory, such as the power of language and sexual politics, and reappraising an approach to class based analysis that is more self-reflexive as advocated by Eagleton. It is argued for example, that Julia offers insights into Winston's world view and emergent consciousness. Similarly, O'Brien invokes postmodernist arguments in his destruction of the modernist Winston. In terms of resistance, it is worth considering that the state only feels threatened, and takes action against Julia and Winston, as they begin to coalesce in their insights toward the state.

The third chapter subsequently constitutes an alternative reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with a return to modernist class based analysis but which draws on culturalist insights in order to explore the stability and surveillance regimes of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. However, it is also argued that issues of class and surveillance are best

understood in terms of the global political economy. In making this argument, a brief overview of World-system theory is first provided, before then using this theory to analyse the fictive global political economy represented within *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, including the fourth region of the world. It is argued, for example, that O'Brien's conception of the ongoing stability of the Party, and the lack of potential for the proles to threaten the Party's dominance, is premised on a war economy that is sustained by the exploitation of cheap labour in this fourth region. It also argues that the proles of Oceania, largely left alone and ignored by the state, would incur greater surveillance and coercion should this source of exploited labour be lost.

The chapter then seeks to link this analysis with contemporary surveillance issues, not only in terms of a modernist World-system theory approach to the real global political economy, but which also draws from cultural theory. It is therefore argued that surveillance can be divided into two parallel issues. The first issue, which draws on the work of Lyon (2010, 325), is that state surveillance treats all citizens as suspect in a globalised context. However, whilst this is legitimated by notions of terrorism and security, it is also necessitated by unequal economic prosperity, location within the international economy as well as economic relations. The second issue concerns itself with conceptions of consumer sovereignty and how surveillance and commercial databases undermine such perceptions of freedom (325). Moreover, through the expansion of globalisation, the roles and distinctions between capital and state have become more diffuse, but that surveillance has become fundamental to the stability of the global political economy in terms of assuring mobility of capital and the control of labour. At the same time, interlaced with these two issues, are discussions on how culturalist insights help explore the justifications of surveillance. This can be seen, for example, in how language is used in terms of the appellations of suspect and consumer, and the effects this has on the subject positions available to individuals if all positions are suspect.

Therefore, reading the novel through the frames of both *After Theory* and World-system theory can offer a new and fruitful way to interpret *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as well as urgent current surveillance issues. It is also an argument that forms the basis for an informed resistance to intrusive and oppressive surveillance regimes.

CHAPTER ONE: After *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *After Theory*

Every few minutes the old man kept repeating:

‘We didn’t ought to ‘ave trusted ‘em. I said so, Ma, didn’t I? That’s what come of trusting ‘em. I said so all along’. We didn’t ought to ‘ave trusted the buggers’.

But which buggers they didn’t ought to have trusted Winston could not now remember.

George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949 [2011], 39).

So goes one of Winston’s earliest recollections, a memory that marked the end of a period of his childhood peace, shattered by an atomic bomb falling on Colchester and taking all by surprise (Orwell 2011, 38). Thereafter, an apparent revolution occurs including several months of ‘confused street fighting in London itself’ (39), leading to a continuous war between Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia; although all records of the history of the period had been altered or destroyed by the state (39). In their place is the propaganda of the Party who rule a dystopian world of constant technological surveillance by Big Brother, the crushing of individuality and demanded obedience to the Party under a violent totalitarian regime, where even language is mobilised to control peoples’ thoughts. George Orwell has created a world of suspicion and control, and according to O’Brien who represents the state whose desire for power is an end in itself, ‘If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face – forever’ (307).

Little wonder then that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has become synonymous with unchecked state power through the use of language and technological surveillance. Indeed, the text is so iconic, it has entered our lexicon where increased state intervention in the public sphere is often termed ‘Orwellian’, reflecting a distrust on the part of individuals toward the state. Recent legislated changes by western liberal governments to collect metadata, the Snowden revelations of bulk surveillance activities by the USA’s National Security Agency and by other countries, as well as the development and analysis of vast consumer databases by social media companies and by capital in general, add to this distrust and invoke our fears of Big Brother.

Bauman et al (2014) however, caution against considering such latter day trends and revelations within an ‘Orwellian’ framework in their paper *After Snowden: Rethinking the Impact of Surveillance*. Thus they argue ‘there is a danger that both popular and scholarly debate will be reduced to familiar narratives about technological developments reshaping the relations between watchers and watched, or the fulfilment of predictions by George Orwell or Philip K. Dick’ and that ‘much more profound questions must be asked’ (Bauman et al 2014, 123). Consequently, their focus is oriented toward very important questions regarding apparent contradictory state surveillance regimes that work in cooperation with, and against, other state allies, and geographic concerns regarding access to internet infrastructures. Furthermore, they raise issues related to resistance through ‘diplomatic and legal strategies’ and greater reflexivity regarding individual internet usage, as well as the legitimacy claims of ‘authorities’ acting ‘in the name of political necessity and security’ (124).

Whilst I do not wish to argue with the profundity of such questions, in fact, I am indebted to such considerations throughout this thesis, I do wish to engage with the idea that George Orwell has little to contribute to this debate. Indeed, I believe *Nineteen Eighty-Four* raises many of these same concerns and goes well beyond a need to ‘rethink the canons of “surveillance studies” and “critical security studies”’ (Bauman et al 2014, 124); as important such deliberations are to these disciplines. One of the presuppositions of this project is that literature offers an insight into how our world works in ways that theory alone does not reveal. This is because literature can be read from multiple perspectives and in a sense constitutes an opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary analysis. To abridge the reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to an analysis of technological surveillance, or popular reductive usage of what it is to be ‘Orwellian’, is to miss the opportunity of exploring resistance and political change within an increasingly globalised political economy.

Consequently, I have chosen to revisit *Nineteen Eighty-Four* for three reasons. First, this text has indeed contributed to society’s understanding of the danger of totalitarian regimes, including technological surveillance, and explores the relationship between individuals, class and the state. However, by drawing on Eagleton’s (2003) *After Theory*, it is argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a useful text to explore the interactions of literary theory that have developed well after its

publication in 1949. Such developments include, for example, the emergence of cultural theory including Foucauldian analysis and the primacy of language, postmodernism and sexual politics. Second, the text has become symbolic with surveillance as a means of the state exercising power over the individual and at its heart is concerned with issues of resistance and political change, and again in an *After Theory* context, emergent class consciousness and the role of class. Third, I believe the text offers the opportunity to reconsider power relations within a globalised context and offers a means of understanding contemporary enhanced surveillance in western liberal democracies. This is undertaken by applying World-system theory as a means of reading the text and situating issues of class and emergent class consciousness within the global political economy represented in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By so doing, issues of power relations, including those of contemporary surveillance by the state and globalised capital, can then be placed within our own globalised world and understanding.

In short, I believe *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has much to contribute to ‘popular and scholarly debate’, not only in its foresight, but in terms of the theoretical frameworks that exist within the novel’s boundaries. Moreover, by applying World-system theory to read the text as part of an interdisciplinary engagement with literature, new understandings of contemporary surveillance are raised as well as potential forms of resistance. This is indeed a debate we urgently need to engage in if for no other reason than the current scale of surveillance vastly surpasses even that imagined by Orwell. What is more, on current trends, surveillance will continue to expand and become normalised if left unchecked. Trust, as the old man warned, has very much become the issue, and if trust is lost what of resistance?

The use of literature to inform our understanding of the world however, should not be restricted to a singular usage of one particular theory. Indeed, it is one of the virtues of literature that multiple readings are possible of any text and therefore is particularly advantageous in allowing for multidisciplinary analysis. Of course there is a danger in forcing a theory onto a text that is not sustainable, but in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the text invites multiple readings since it deals with issues of power, economic relations, political resistance and change. Moreover, the indeterminate lack of resolution to such questions, combined with the many theoretical positions that are revealed, tempered and coexist within the text itself,

attest to its foresight. Accordingly, I have chosen to locate my reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* within a theoretical context best described by Eagleton (2003) in his work *After Theory*.

In commencing this first chapter proper then, I begin with a summary of Eagleton's arguments as well as introducing supportive positions held by other theorists. I then consider several different readings of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that reflect different literary approaches. Finally, I refer to additional evidence from the text to demonstrate a parallel between Eagleton's approach and how *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be read.

Eagleton takes a broad brush to changes in literary theory over time but argues persuasively for a return to a more engaged theoretical approach to addressing the world's problems. Key to his argument, is that theoretical developments have increasingly become theory for theoreticians rather than addressing the very real problems that confront our world. This is not to say he is dismissive of theoretical developments such as postmodernism, postcolonialism and the work of cultural theorists and philosophers such as Foucault and Derrida. Instead it is a call to reality, and to acknowledge that the privileging of language and bodies over class ultimately 'suited those in power that we should be able to imagine no alternative to the present' whilst at the same time we have forgotten the 'memories of collective and effective political action' (Eagleton 2003, 7).

However, Eagleton is careful to emphasise the insights provided by cultural theory in his critique and the extent that it 'had reminded the left what it had ignored' (30). For example, he freely acknowledges that in the decline of Marxist theory due to the collapse of communist states, cultural theorists looked for alternative frameworks for political action. However, 'In a tragic irony, socialism proved least possible where it was most necessary' (9), particularly in post-colonial states. Thus he concludes, post-colonial theory 'like the discourse of gender and sexuality...has been one of the most precious achievements of cultural theory' (9). Nevertheless, Eagleton argues, the failure to focus on class is dismissive of the very forces that shaped independence in the first place (10).

Moreover, the primacy of language is highly problematic in terms of the normative for Eagleton. Thus he states for 'Libertarians like Derrida and Foucault norms are

inescapable as soon as we open our mouths' (14) yet Eagleton argues norms are not all restrictive. Indeed, most are positive (15). Instead, he argues all 'human language is a metalanguage' and that we can self-reflect on culture and the language which disciplines bodies (60). Further, cultural studies' privileging focus of analysis on language, media representations, the body and so on, as a means of resistance through identity rather than capital relations, assumes 'sheer pointlessness is a deeply subversive affair' (39).

Perhaps Eagleton's largest critique is saved for postmodernism, including for example, Lyotard's dismissal of 'grand narratives' (38) which like cultural theory maintained a dialogic relationship with Marxism, but one which did not bear the fruit of political strategy. He argues, for example, that capitalism is not threatened by minority positions of individuals or multiple identities; instead this simply provides additional markets (19). At the same time, minorities do not have a monopoly in marginal spaces, since capitalism has pushed the majority of the population to the margin (21). Eagleton is also highly critical of postmodernism as a paradigm for political change which he concludes is 'politically catastrophic' and 'remarkably dim-witted' (16).

Eagleton's critique is supported by similar research. For example, there is a parallel consideration by Jameson (1991) who discusses the individual from a postmodern perspective. Through an exploration of art, Jameson argues that High Modernism focussed very much on individual style, but that has been replaced necessarily by pastiche as the available range of styles have already been 'done'. This calls into question the 'autonomous bourgeois monad' and raises the possibility of a postmodernist decentring of the self, whereby the notion of the self as a whole was either a historical self or that the self never existed in the first place (Jameson 1991, 17). This has led to a situation where an individual may be seen as having multiple identities, but like Eagleton, Jameson argues fractious individuals become new markets for capital and meanwhile 'Faceless masters continue to inflect the economic strategies which constrain our existences, (but) they no longer need to impose their speech as a result of any 'great collective project' (17).

Moreover, Jameson (1983, 125) argues that through 'perpetual presents' of speeded up capitalism, such as the news cycle, society's capacity to retain its history is

diminished. The question he poses is a significant one: if ‘postmodernism replicates or reproduces - reinforces - the logic of consumer capitalism’ can postmodernism also, like High Modernism before it, resist that logic? (125). Like Eagleton, Jameson seeks to explore issues of resistance by the individual and society and fears postmodernism is an insufficient framework for effective political change.

In many ways *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be read in an *After Theory* context since the novel portrays so many of the concerns raised in the previous discussion and can be interpreted from various theoretical positions. Newsinger (2013) for example, reviews Orwell’s political beliefs including those of class and describes him as having been a largely unacknowledged founder of cultural studies, particularly for his use of fiction in popular culture. Roberts (2014, 221) also considers Orwell’s writings as a ‘precursor’ of cultural studies and in particular Orwell’s view on language’s capacity to simplify daily practice and to ‘streamline the complex nature of our motives and thoughts’. Roberts further links this approach to language with Bakhtin’s heteroglossia and the capacity of a hegemon to ‘accent’ language to further its dominance (221). This ‘monoglossia’ disguises understanding regarding lived experiences and social resistance. This can be seen, for example, in Orwell’s discussion of the term ‘pacification’ that people use without considering its meaning (221).

This can also be seen further in Orwell’s employment of ‘Newspeak’ in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a means of limiting the ability to form thoughts beyond the party ideology, thus preventing heteroglossic meaning and thought, and consequently acting as a means of political control. Murray (1997) for example, discusses the use of Newspeak as dialogically constructing the ideology of Ingsoc – that the rhetoric of Newspeak constructs the ideology of the diminishment of the individual and the collectivism of the party, but in order to understand and use Newspeak one must understand the party ideology.

Ingle’s (2007) analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* similarly addresses the functioning of language and objective truth and in particular the individual’s relationship with the state. Ingle argues that Julia represents the isolated individual whereas Winston represents the social individual, a point I shall return to in the next chapter, where truth is premised on civil society and public discourse. Thus Orwell demarcates the

use of public language as the field of contestation between state and society. Ingle subsequently draws a parallel between militaristic usage of language, such as terms like ‘pacification’ and ‘collateral damage’ and the use of ‘Duckspeak’ in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Ingle 2007, 739).

Similarly, writing from a Foucauldian reading of the text, Tyner (2004, 140) gives an insightful explanation of Foucauldian notions of power and knowledge and argues that ‘A dominant theme of 1984, certainly is the critical control of discourse, of truth, and of knowledge: techniques of power are employed to maintain a totalitarian system’. Yet Tyner is also very aware that Orwell is ‘clearly discordant with Foucault’s conception of power...power is not something to be possessed but instead to be exercised’ (140), since as O’Brien claims that ‘the object of power is power’ (141). Thus Tyner summarises, ‘In short, Orwell warns his readers that power, rather than simply techniques of power, can be possessed and transformed by a minority faction and in such a society there is no self devoid of the State’ (141).

However notions of power, including the state ‘holding’ power, are indeed disturbed and problematised by Foucauldian theory. McHoul and Grace (1993) for example, argue that Foucault inverts Marxist conceptions of power; that rather than being ‘held’ and coercively exercised by the state, power may be seen as a web of social relations and discourses that produce historically contingent truths. Moreover, this is a productive power since discourses seek to extract time and labour and not wealth and commodities, through surveillance and self-policing. Thus the relationship of power and knowledge as expressed through language is given primacy over economic modes of production, economic relations and state power. Consequently, rather than the state ‘holding’ power, individuals may conform to discursive fields and their subject positions to get by, or they can resist.

Furthermore, Tyner (2004, 144) stresses acts of sexual resistance by Winston and Julia against the sexual laws of the state. Tirohl (2000, 57) does however critique Orwell’s discourse of sexual resistance, pointing to a patriarchal bias in his construction of the state, for example by seeking to only remove sexual pleasure from women. Furthermore, Julia ‘is portrayed as amoral, self-indulgent, hostile to other women and a person incapable of abstract thought’ (57). However, Tyner (2004, 143) also successfully identifies spaces of resistance within the world of

Nineteen Eighty-Four such as the layout of Winston's room which enables him to write a diary. Thus Winston's construction of a text within a text acts as a successful means of resistance to totalitarianism within the disciplined space of the novel characterised by the constant surveillance of the telescreens and the Thought Police.

Like Eagleton, we must therefore be mindful of how language can be a source of power, and as a critical tool kit, discourse analysis offers up the potential for resistance, particularly in understanding sexual politics. However, it does not adequately explain as a theory the simultaneous power that the state does 'hold', particularly through enhanced surveillance rules and potentially coercive powers of recent security legislation. At the same time, states utilise discourses all the time to frame economic debates, such as welfare recipients being referred to as customers or clients, as if there is somehow an economic choice involved in poverty, age or disability. Such fallacious usage of language debases notions of citizenship.

Subsequently, it is quite clear that *Nineteen Eighty-Four's* engagement with notions of power, language, universal truth and postmodernism were successfully foreseen, at the least in a formative sense, well before their development in post-structural literary theory. However, what is more remarkable is that the text can be read in terms of the limitations of such theories in instigating successful resistance.

Consider for example, the limitations placed on the primacy of language in the discussion between Winston and Syme, the writer of the Eleventh Edition of the Newspeak dictionary, as they sat eating lunch in the canteen. Syme states, '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' (Orwell 2011, 61). However, this controlled and ideologically driven usage of language is quickly dispelled by Winston who hears a voice at the next table and whilst he could not make out the whole conversation he knew it was 'pure orthodoxy, pure Ingsoc' (63). Winston further reflects, 'The stuff that was coming out of him consisted of words, but it was not speech in the true sense: it was a noise uttered in unconsciousness, like the quacking of a duck' (63). Syme subsequently confirms such speech as a Newspeak term 'Duckspeak', thereby placing particular emphasis on the importance of language's fallible role in truly controlling people, since the term is introduced twice by two characters

independently. It is through Winston's capacity to recognise and resist Ingsoc discourse, that the primacy of language is itself challenged; a position consistent with Eagleton's (2003, 60) view that all 'human language is a metalanguage'.

Furthermore, the text also qualifies the primacy of language as constituting thoughts; a position very much consistent with Eagleton's analysis. For example, when Winston and Julia are in the room above the antique shop, the voice of a prole woman singing could be heard outside. As Winston reflects, 'The words of these songs were composed without any human intervention whatever on an instrument known as a versificator' by the Music Department (Orwell 2011, 159). However, the state produced song is taken up as the woman's own and 'the woman sang so tunefully as to turn the dreadful rubbish into an almost pleasant sound' (160). Thus the imposition of state language does not succeed in completely controlling the woman's own agency, reflecting a view that individuals have the capacity to inflect their own selves and meaning onto language rather than being constituted by it.

But of course a central theme of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the role of the proles and whether class identity will ever emerge to threaten the state. This constitutes a return in its own way to an *After Theory* approach to class based analysis. Place (2003, 108), for example, attributes the emergence of consciousness in Winston to when he holds a picture proving the historical lies promoted by the Party and which becomes a latent desire to recapture the power he felt. Place argues that the paperweight that Winston purchases represents a concrete past and 'symbolises escape from a self-defeating and unnatural routine' and the suspension of time, and when he dreams of being inside the paperweight this allows him to perceive his own history clearly (109). This emergent consciousness is ultimately defeated by the Party as the paperweight is shattered, causing Winston to reflect on his hopes of resistance and concluding 'How small it always was' (Place 2003, 110). This is further undermined since the state was aware of him holding the picture seven years before, indicating he had always been under suspicion. Thus the state reasserts its power through its seemingly omniscient surveillance regimes.

As can be seen then, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* contains a blending of different theoretical approaches to effective political change yet anticipates their limitations as paths of resistance. Furthermore, what is remarkable about the text is that it seems to

anticipate the centrality of power, language and knowledge, class and state, and sexual politics all within its boundaries. Indeed, the unresolved political solution of the novel reflects an *After Theory* position in and of itself. That is to say, the text acknowledges different theoretical approaches and the understandings they elicit, yet strongly suggests that class interests and collective action are needed to effect change.

To summarise, Eagleton seeks a redress in literary theory that has at its heart a collective and politically effective approach to social change and greater equality based on a return to issues of class identity and action. He is mindful of the insights provided by cultural theorists, particularly in relation to sexual and ethnic politics, and of the need to take the best of such theories. However, class based analysis is required to address the pressing problems of this world; a theoretical approach that this thesis adopts as its starting position. It has also been argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a text, can be read from multiple theoretical positions but which also questions the limits of such theories in addressing how a society could undertake successful political resistance. Like Eagleton, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* redirects the reader to the question of class and collective action.

In returning to a class based analysis however, we must be mindful of the sometimes supportive, sometimes conflicting views of what constitutes successful resistance, and what roles the individual and the state play. Moreover, in an increasingly globalised world these issues become more complex and raise questions as to what level should the analysis be undertaken.

It is the argument of the third chapter of this thesis that World-system theory, which maintains such a level of analysis should focus on the development of the globalised political economy, is an approach which retains explanatory power. Furthermore, notions of class should be located and best understood within a globalised context. Indeed, since *Nineteen Eighty-Four* takes particular care to describe the world political economy, I argue in this thesis a World-system theory reading of this text would be a fruitful enterprise to help further our understanding of the contemporary world, and in particular regarding issues of surveillance and political change.

However, before developing such an argument, I wish to explore further the interplay of the main characters of Julia, Winston and O'Brien and adopt an alternative

reading of what these characters represent. This is an important step since it bridges the gap of reading *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as an *After Theory* text and the need to re-engage with the text from a modernist theoretical approach such as World-system theory.

In the next chapter then, I develop the argument that Winston can be read as a modernist struggling against the postmodern arguments of O'Brien, whereas Julia can be read as representing culturalism. The interactions of modernism and culturalism are therefore juxtaposed in the way these characters negotiate state power, and importantly, how they begin to inform each other. Moreover, by reading the text in such a way, this becomes a rationale for the two theoretical positions to draw on the insights of each other in order to resist state power. I argue, for example, that such a rapprochement is akin to Eagleton's call to draw on the best of culturalism but while returning to a more sophisticated, contemporary and more self-reflexive class based analysis.

CHAPTER TWO: A Theoretical Romance?

In the previous chapter, I argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be read from a diverse range of theoretical positions but which parallels many of the concerns raised by Eagleton in *After Theory*. This includes an acknowledgement of the need to draw from the insights of cultural theory, but also an argument that in order to effect political change, a return to modernist based theory with a focus on a class based analysis, rather than postmodernism, is required. However, I would like to develop this a little further by arguing that the text can also be read as an interaction of these theories, as represented through the characters of Winston, Julia and O'Brien. Thus what appears to be a bleak and tragic narrative, contains within it elements of hope, even if the characters are unaware of this hope themselves.

In making this argument, this chapter is divided into three parts. It begins by exploring Ingle's (2007) analysis of Winston as an individual subject who uses reason as well as moral autonomy to judge the state which, in such a binary construction, becomes in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* a state of unreason. Secondly, this chapter builds on this analysis by undertaking an alternative reading of the text by considering the state not as unreason, but representative of a postmodern critique of the modernist subject of Winston. Attention is then turned to the character of Julia, and makes the case for her being representative of culturalism. This is evidenced, for example, through her awareness of symbolic repression of her identity and sexuality as well as the insight she possesses into the dominant discourses of Big Brother.

Finally, by again contextualising *Nineteen Eighty-Four* within an *After Theory* approach, it is argued that the interaction of Winston, O'Brien and Julia can be read as representing a broader process by which modernism necessarily has been critiqued by postmodernism, but like O'Brien has gone too far into a hyper-textualisation of reality. Similarly, the interaction of Winston and Julia sets up a dialogic relationship between cultural theory and class analysis which enables the reader to develop useful insights into the potential for resistance through a rapprochement between these positions.

To begin then, it should be pointed out that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* really reads as a miserable narrative. The two characters of Winston and Julia, engaged in a rebellious sexual liaison that develops into an affection torn apart by a totalitarian state that tortures each character into submission so that it can retain power, counts it out as a hopeful romance set in the future. Even the characters themselves, whilst by no means perfect, agree to commit the most atrocious crimes in the name of the Brotherhood. The warnings of the text seem axiomatic. Beware government intrusion and power, beware of technological surveillance, and keep away from rats.

But amongst this miserable saga, beside these obvious Orwellianisms, there is hope. For example, I would argue the text constitutes its own history, inviting the reader to do what Winston and Julia cannot. The reader is prompted to review what the characters represent, to make sense of that insight, to look for alternative sites of resistance and, like Winston in O'Brien's office, to raise a toast to the past (Orwell 2011, 204). It is in effect a chance for history to exist and be explored in an ahistorical world; to be studied, analysed, and new paths chosen.

In one such compelling analysis, Ingle (2007) argues that Orwell's view of the individual and the character of Winston closely parallel one another. Thus Winston / Orwell privileged the individual's 'capacity to apply reason to sensory experience, and man's capacity for reason led him to grasp the nature of objective truth' (Ingle 2007, 735). As Ingle further asserts (735):

For Orwell, reality, the external world, could be discerned by the undeceived intelligence of the ordinary individual - of whom Winston Smith is the personification - by means of Lockean sense experience interpreted and codified by reason. That this 'ordinary individual', ready to do battle with the state over the issue of truth, might itself be a socially constructed concept and not a child of nature was not a possibility that Orwell entertained.

Therefore, Ingle's critique of Orwell's conception of the 'ordinary individual' as well as the position of the liberal subject within civil society more broadly, emphasises the importance of the social sphere and truth as being socially derived and 'a product of our loyalty to the groups in civil society to which we belong' (741). Furthermore, experience and reason alone are insufficient and that social interaction in order to qualify our understandings is required, and without this social dimension, the capacity for individual autonomy is subsequently diminished (740). In the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* all civil groups and interactions have largely been destroyed

by the state leading Ingle to conclude that whilst Orwell's conception of objective truth is flawed, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 'demonstrates the crucial importance of civil society, of the communal or societal setting of the moral autonomy to be marshalled in the defence of objective or social truth' (743).

Ingle's analysis therefore is a persuasive rebuttal of Orwell's conception of the liberal subject and objective truth. Interestingly however, Ingle does seem to set up a binary between the reason of Winston and the state as 'unreason' when he argues 'In Oceania the state embodied unreason, and so reason, affirmed by common sense and championed by Winston Smith, the ordinary man, was its natural enemy' (735). Whilst this position is certainly defensible, such a binary does seem to limit the reader's usage of the text to conceptions of individual autonomy and social interaction. Perhaps this is reflective of the difficulty of inferring authorial intent on to a text, a problematic proposition at best. If we consider the text as a text, another reading of Winston's interaction with the state is possible.

In beginning the second part of this chapter then, rather than seeing the binary of reason and unreason as the basis of Winston's engagement with the state, I would like to consider the possibility that Winston represents modernism itself, and rather than the state constituting unreason, may instead be read as a representation of postmodernism. Subsequently, it is argued that through O'Brien, postmodernism defeats the modernist individual. Following on, Julia, rather than being autonomous through her rejection of rationality, can then be read as representing what I have called in this thesis a culturalist approach to issues of power.

Subsequent to his arrest, Winston undergoes a process of torture and debate with O'Brien. All the power of the state as a coercive force is therefore on display, and it is of course an uneven debate; Winston is strapped to a table and given electric shocks whenever he tries to retain his rationality which I suppose is always going to influence anyone's opinions. But it ultimately is through the implicitly postmodern ideology of the Party that the modernist subject is destroyed. This can be seen in a number of ways.

Firstly, O'Brien refutes the notion of the individual self, claiming that Winston does not exist (Orwell 2011, 296). This prompts Winston to reflect, 'Did not the statement, 'You do not exist', contain a logical absurdity? But what use was it to say

so? His mind shrivelled as he thought of the unanswerable, mad arguments with which O'Brien would demolish him' (297). Thus O'Brien invokes a postmodern idea of a fractious, decentred self to undermine the modernist subject, a view which seems to Winston so counterintuitive. This acts to warn the reader the diminishment of the individual precedes the capacity of the individual to hold the state to account.

Secondly, following on from High Modernism, postmodernism rejects notions of 'grand narratives', which seen through another prism, are theories of how the world works. Again Winston reflects, 'O'Brien was a being in all ways larger than himself. There was no idea that he had ever had, or could have, that O'Brien had not long ago known, examined and rejected. His mind contained Winston's mind' (293). Thus the text warns the loss of explanatory theories of how the world functions, let alone ideas to create a better world, not only invites despondency but removes constraints on state power.

That O'Brien's ideology is premised on a postmodern view is further evidenced in the discussion of the 'why' regarding the Party's control over the masses. When O'Brien asks 'What is our motive? Why should we want power? Go on, speak,' Winston thinks in a modernist bricolage of potential justifications of state power over its citizens (301). This includes acting for the 'good of the majority', the frailty of men who must be ruled by strong rulers, happiness over freedom, and 'That the Party was the eternal guardian of the weak, a dedicated sect doing evil that good might come, sacrificing its own happiness to that of others' (301-2). Such modernist assumptions as to the purpose of the state are subsequently dismissed by O'Brien when he of course reveals that power was the true end and not just the means. Furthermore, O'Brien states his postmodern views even more succinctly when he extols: 'You must get rid of those nineteenth-century ideas about the laws of Nature. We make the laws of Nature' (303-4). Consequently, objective truths and reality are transformed into constructions whereby 'Nothing exists except through human consciousness' (304).

Even mathematical rationality is interrogated in the text through Winston's belief that $2+2=4$ versus the contingent truth of the Party. For example, Winston reflects 'In the end the Party would announce that two plus two made five, and you would have to believe it...the logic of their position demanded it. Not merely the validity of

experience, but the very existence of external reality, was tacitly denied by their philosophy. The heresy of heresies was common sense' (92). However, it should be noted in passing, that Ingle (2007, 735) disagrees with Orwell's conception of mathematical truth. Nevertheless, it is only under torture that Winston recants this belief and it is left to the reader to ponder whether Winston's demise as the last man in Europe, parallels the decentred self and the dismissal of the modernist individual.

The final destruction of the modernist subject sees Winston drawing on an elemental view of humanity, but as O'Brien states 'We control life, Winston, at all its levels. You are imagining that there is something called human nature which will be outraged by what we do and will turn against us. But we create human nature' (Orwell 2011, 308-9). Winston continues to resist so O'Brien asks, 'Then what is it, this principle that will defeat us?' (309) and Winston replies, 'I don't know. The spirit of Man' (309). However, Winston's demise comes quickly as O'Brien states, 'You are the last man... You are the guardian of the human spirit. You shall see yourself as you are. Take off your clothes' (310). It is at this point Winston sees his crushed body before a mirror and is made subject to abuse by O'Brien's contempt for his body: 'That is the last man. If you are human, that is humanity' (312). This abjection and humiliation goes beyond Winston. It is the postmodern crushing of the modernist subject.

At the same time, Ingle (2007, 736) further discusses Julia as the 'only truly free individual'. This is premised on questioning the primacy of reason itself. Evoking Dostoevsky as the 'foremost opponent of reason's enthronement', Ingle argues that Julia's pursuit of her own interests, presumably most notably her sexual proclivities against the wishes of the state, reflects her own free 'individual volition' (735) and her own 'subjective truth' (736). As Ingle explains regarding Dostoevsky, 'it was in rejecting rationality and the quest for objective truth and thus sending 'all systems and theories to the devil' that man safeguarded his autonomy' (Dostoevsky 1972, 33-34 cited by Ingle 2007, 736). Of course one could ask how Dostoevsky arrived at such a conclusion without some usage of rationality and at least some kind of theoretical approach, but that spoils the apparent liberation that he incites with such statements. It kills the fun.

Nevertheless, characterising Julia as the ‘only truly free individual’ (Ingle 2007, 736) because she acts according to her own ‘subjective truth’ is problematic if it is only explained in terms of the absence of rationality and objective truth. As mentioned in chapter one, Tyner’s (2004) reading of Julia and Winston from a Foucauldian perspective, categorises their sexual liaisons as resistance against the state, providing additional insight into what Julia represents. That Julia is a political actor is confirmed when Winston reflects ‘Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act’ (Orwell 2011, 145). Moreover, Tirohl’s (2000, 56) analysis further complicates Julia’s ‘free individual’ status by arguing that ‘Julia’s approach to living is to break the rules while staying alive. Winston’s aim, conversely, is to undermine the Party. Julia evades authority; Winston seeks to rebel against it’. Thus Julia is free in the sense of evasion from the state, a view of Julia also held by Winston when he concludes, ‘knowing nothing else, accepting the Party as something unalterable, like the sky, not rebelling against its authority but simply evading it, as a rabbit dodges a dog’ (Orwell, 2011, 151).

However, instead of seeing Julia as lacking rationality because she refuses to engage theoretically with the state, or as Tirohl (2000, 57) characterises Julia as having ‘insight but uses simpler intellectual routes than Winston’, I would like to suggest that Julia demonstrates elements of a culturalist approach to notions of power. She ignores the state, not because she lacks rationality, but in terms of her subjectivity, it is through surveillance that she is controlled and her body disciplined. Her efforts of resistance start with her own body and refusing to be controlled through the panoptic gaze of Big Brother in the aspects of life that matter to her. Julia does not just act on ‘individual volition’ (Ingle 2007, 735), but through a pursuit of her interests from a different theoretical stance derived from her carefully considered reflexivity based on her sexuality and identity.

For example, in Winston and Julia’s first sexual encounter, Julia is highly aware of the usage of external symbols as a means of sexual repression imposed upon her by the state. As Winston explains his initial mistrust of Julia since she seemed a Party member like so many girls ready to ‘denounce’ thought-criminals, she replies ‘It’s this bloody thing that does it’, she said, ripping off the scarlet sash of the Junior Anti-Sex League and flinging it onto a bough’ (Orwell, 2011, 139). Thus she discards the

symbol of external discipline of her body. At another time in the room above the attic, an inversion of what constitutes femininity in this regime occurs. She expresses the desire to abandon the overalls of the Party and actively take up a particular feminine identity including wearing a dress, scent and make-up and claims 'In this room I'm going to be a woman, not a Party comrade' (164). Whilst this could be interpreted as authorial conceptions of femininity, I would argue Julia is adopting a rebellious stance against state determined discourse regarding gender identity.

Similarly, Julia uses language as an act of resistance. When she does talk about the Party it is with rebellious language based on profanities which surprises Winston and he reflects (141):

Party members were supposed not to swear, and Winston himself very seldom did swear, aloud, at any rate. Julia, however, seemed unable to mention the Party, and especially the Inner Party, without using the kinds of words that you saw chalked up in dripping alleyways. He did not dislike it. It was merely one symptom of her revolt against the Party and all its ways, and somehow it seemed natural and healthy, like the sneeze of a horse that smells bad hay.

However, Winston is self-deceiving here since he too has it within himself to swear but denies the rebelliousness of language itself. For example, in his flat he wants to scream profanities as he writes in his diary recalling his encounter with the prostitute and 'The urge to shout filthy words at the top of his voice was as strong as ever' (79). At the same time, he misinterprets her usage of language as a 'symptom of her revolt'. Instead, it should be seen as using language as a means of power, a concept very much the focus of culturalists, and literature is replete with the usage of profanity as a means of rebellion against dominant discourses. This includes, for example, the Beat writers such as Ginsberg and Kerouac in the late 1950s (Lawlor and De Rooy 2005, 52).

Moreover, Julia's capacity to recognise and reject dominant discourses often exceeds that of Winston; a capacity Winston himself does not always recognise. For example, Winston believes her understanding of what constitutes a political act is a result of her having 'grown up since the Revolution and was too young to remember the ideological battles of the 'fifties and 'sixties. Such a thing as an independent political movement was outside her imagination: and in any case the Party was invincible' (Orwell 2011, 176). However, her insight into the dominant discourse of the war without end demonstrates otherwise and 'In some ways she was far more acute than

Winston, and far less susceptible to Party propaganda' (176). In their discussion regarding the war 'she startled him by saying casually that in her opinion the war was not happening. The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself 'just to keep people frightened'. This was an idea that had literally never occurred to him' (176). Similarly, Julia rejects the possibility of an underground resistance led by Goldstein which 'she said, were simply a lot of rubbish which the Party had invented for its own purposes and which you had to pretend to believe in' (175).

But perhaps Winston's preoccupation with the state prevents him from seeing how she sees power and oppression. We are led to this since Julia's use of 'they' or 'them' when referring to the Party (151) shows her focus, rather than being on the state, is dismissively elsewhere. Julia is highly cognisant of the need to self-police and conform to the dominant state discourses through her passionate membership of community organisations including the Junior Anti-Sex League. Thus Julia demonstrates a rationality, but one which is not directed against the state. Resistance, in her view, stems from her own understanding of what constitutes truth and how language is used to discipline bodies and is reflected in the dominant discourses of society, and you either conformed or resisted according to your own subjective decisions. Julia exercises her subjectivity in a process of self-awareness that is clearly above that of Winston's wife Katherine, where the latter is seen as having fully accepted the party line.

However, Julia's 'evasion' of the state is problematic. The reader is aware that Julia is deluding herself, including the freedom she assumes she has. Consider, for example, her way of picking partners seems only premised on facial interpretation, which is certainly the case for Winston: 'It was something in your face. I thought I'd take a chance. I'm good at spotting people who don't belong. As soon as I saw you I knew you were against them' (140). It is highly unlikely, in a surveillance state, that this would be sufficient to avoid being noticed. Indeed, she fails to recognise O'Brien as a member of the Thought Police either at the antiquity shop or in O'Brien's home when he pretends to be a member of the Brotherhood.

Furthermore, Julia's recount of her history also demonstrates her lack of freedom. Julia has had multiple sexual encounters... 'Hundreds of times – well, scores of

times, anyway', and always with Outer Party members (144). On the first occasion we are told 'She had her first love-affair when she was sixteen, with a Party member of sixty who later committed suicide to avoid arrest. 'And a good job too', said Julia, 'otherwise they'd have had my name out of him when he confessed' (151). However, it is entirely possible that she had been known to the Thought Police since that time. Thus when she was 'picked out to work in Pornsec' we are told it was because 'She had been a troop-leader in the Spies and a branch secretary in the Youth League before joining the Junior Anti-Sex League. She had always borne an excellent character' and that being selected for Pornsec was 'an infallible mark of a good reputation' (150). Instead, it seems a measure of the confidence of the Party, that she is placed in such a position. Her apparent sexual purity is juxtaposed with her own desires and pornography in much the same way as Winston, since he works in the Records Department manipulating history and yet having access to his 'incriminating evidence', is allowed to continue working there seven years. Julia's evasion of the state, nor her ignoring it, does not make her free.

To draw some conclusions then, if we read Julia as representative of culturalism, then some interesting issues develop. First, she helps inform the modernist Winston. Concerned as he is with state power and the role of the proles, he begins to see the power of discourse and symbolic representations in disciplining bodies, as well as her insights into state discourses such as the ongoing war. Yet Julia's rebellion, without taking into account state power and how this is exercised and potentially challenged, demonstrates an understated element of culturalist theory. Again Eagleton (2003, 39) reminds us, that at its most extreme as a politics of personal identity expression, it assumes 'sheer pointlessness is a deeply subversive affair'.

At the same time, Julia draws a strength from Winston, in the form of her having greater freedom to express her sexual identity, including, her conception of being a woman. Interestingly, Julia also seems to take up the symbology of the proles as part of this process. For example, her wearing scent is significant because as Winston explains 'Only the proles used scent' (Orwell 2011, 74). Perhaps she too starts to see the value of adopting class identity. Finally, the struggle between modernism and postmodernism certainly highlights the limits of modernist ideals. However, the loss of such ideals opens up the potential for the state to exercise power over the

individual, since individuality, theories of resistance and how to achieve a better world, are challenged at the very level of their existence.

However, I would argue that it is crucial that it is only when Winston and Julia unite that the state actually feels threatened and moves to arrest them both. In an *After Theory* context, this parallels the need for modernism to be revisited, in the light of the insights of cultural theory. It is a call to reconciliation between these theories and like the text, to re-explore our history for answers and to take the best of the theories and to come to workable solutions. This includes the need to reintroduce a class based analysis as well as to integrate the power of language, sexuality and identity politics. We cannot ignore the state, language or class.

In the next chapter, I again return to the text as a world to be explored with modernist theory, but with a class based focus by drawing on World-system theory. I then consider the applicability of this theory to our contemporary world in terms of surveillance and the control of labour. But adding to this, I also explore how the power of language can be mobilised by the state and capital to transform citizens into suspects and consumers.

CHAPTER THREE: World-System Theory, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *After Snowden*

In the previous two chapters, I have argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can be read in an *After Theory* context. This is seen in how the power of language and the power of the state are intermingled. It is also through the characters of Winston, Julia and O'Brien that a rapprochement between culturalist and modernist theory, but tempered by postmodernism, parallels Eagleton's call to a return to class based analysis but in a way which draws from, and is informed by, the dialogic relationship between these different theoretical approaches. Indeed, as the previous chapter argued, it is through such a process of rapprochement between modernist paradigms that effective resistance to surveillance is made possible.

In this final chapter then, I seek to employ a modernist class based analysis of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by drawing on World-system theory and use this as a framework to understand contemporary surveillance issues. In adopting such an approach, it is argued that issues of class and surveillance need to be set within a context of the global political economy. However, in keeping with a focus on the power of language, emphasis is also placed on the capacity of the state and capital to mobilise language in order to constrain and even dictate the subject positions of citizen and consumer sovereignty.

The chapter is therefore structured into three parts. It begins by providing a brief oversight of World-system theory in terms of its origins and concepts. Part two then analyses the global political economy represented in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and considers issues of stability, surveillance and the potential for change. It is argued, for example, that O'Brien overestimates the stability of the surveillance state and that his disregard for the proles is a function of, and is enabled by, the global political economy that Orwell has constructed. The third section draws on this analysis, and discusses contemporary issues of state surveillance in terms of our own global political economy. This includes how increased surveillance regimes are premised on the need to maintain stability in an unequal world and unequal economic relations but which take differing forms dependent on the position of countries within the global political economy. Furthermore, it is argued that state and capital, in the

process of surveillance, alter notions of citizen and consumer sovereignty to the subject positions of suspect and controlled consumer (Lyon 2010). However, through a World-system theory approach which utilises a class based analysis, as well as by drawing on the culturalist strength of utilising the power of language, such positions can be contested. In short, as Winston hopes, there is hope.

According to Robinson (2011, 724), the popularity of World-system theory is largely attributable to Immanuel Wallerstein who in 1974 published *The Modern World System*. Primarily, this paradigm emerged out of the shortcomings of modernisation theory popular after the post-war period of the 1950s and 1960s in terms of seeking to explain the apparent failure of states to develop economically. Rather than focussing on the characteristics of states which underpinned such approaches, World-system theory attempted to explain economic development, or the lack thereof, in terms of the effects of the globalisation of the capitalist mode of production which emerged at the beginning of the 16th Century.

However, according to Hier (2001), World-system theory had previously been explored by Oliver Cox who published in 1948 a series of analyses which parallel Wallerstein's work in many ways, again focussing on the development of global capitalism from its emergence and spread throughout the globe. Cox's work was not widely received however, according to Hier (2001, 82-3), because he published in a period where 'any deviation from post war economic triumphalism', particularly a Marxist critique, was not acceptable to the intellectual climate of the time. Moreover, as an African American academic (originally born in the Caribbean) working in a racially segregated America, this also created barriers for the acceptance of Cox's work. By contrast, Wallerstein published at a time, as mentioned, when modernisation theory was in decline and Marxist analysis was again enjoying resurgence. The reception of these works, it should be added, also could be interpreted in light of changes in the global economy itself. In Cox's case, for example, 'post war economic triumphalism' preceded the development of a post-war expansion of the middle class, where consumerism and Cold War rivalries became the legitimating discourse of American hegemony.

Further adding to this complex origin narrative, Chirot and Hall (1982, 88-9) point to theoretical developments that emerged prior to World War Two which drew heavily

on Marxist theory at the time; a theory operating on the assumption that the capitalist mode of production would spread as capitalism expanded. Finally, Robinson (2011, 725) points to the emergence of dependency theory, originating from Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s, which reflected a neo-Marxist critique of global capitalism. This theory emphasised an explicit inverse relationship between the economic development of some countries and underdevelopment in others as a result of global capitalism.

World-system theory then, argues that as capitalism expanded around the globe, nation states formed into three groupings – the core, semi-periphery and periphery. The dominant core is able to extract a surplus from the periphery in the form of low cost (usually price taking) commodities and cheap labour and in return supplies high cost (usually price setting) manufactured and technologically based goods and services. Thus capital, instead of accumulating in the periphery, is actually transferred through trade to the core. Semi-peripheral countries can try to move toward the core or slip down the hierarchy to the periphery as they trade between the two groups. The explanatory power for this theory, as opposed to modernisation theories, is that global capitalism has evolved into a system characterised by an entrenched over-privileged core and a periphery beset with serious barriers to development and the encumbrance of poverty (Chirot and Hall 1982, 85).

Moreover, global capitalism is characterised by an international division of labour that has developed over time. In the core, labour benefits from the wealth transference in terms of higher pay and welfare rights and is therefore less likely to express class solidarity or resistance. On the other hand, labour in the periphery has minimal capacity to organise because of coercive state practices designed to maintain the supply of cheap labour to attract limited global investment in competition with other states. At the same time, the semi-periphery performs a political function that benefits the core as well. For example, this includes ‘diverting pressures from the periphery in the same way that a middle class may defuse tensions between workers and capitalists’ (Robinson 2011, 729) by deflecting and absorbing potential periphery antagonisms.

Finally, the core organises itself around a hegemonic state which legitimates the transfer of surplus to the core but does not act as a centre as such, as was the case of

empires of the past (Robinson 2011, 731). This division of labour on a global scale helps explain why Marxist predictions of class struggle failed to materialise in the West, since for Wallerstein the proletariat were mostly to be found in the periphery (Hier, 2001, 83). Similarly, Chirot and Hall (1982, 86) confirm the theory posits that ‘revolution will have to come chiefly out of the periphery and semi-periphery where proletariat class interests are clearer’, although it should be noted that it is class interest not proletarian location that is stressed, since that would be to deny a proletariat actually existed in the core.

What can be argued then is that according to World-system theory ‘the appropriate unit of analysis for macrosocial inquiry in the modern world is neither class, nor state/society, or country, but the larger historical system, in which these categories are located’ (Robinson 2011, 727). In now turning to the second part of this chapter and using World-system theory to provide a reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is with this level of analysis in mind. What follows then is an analysis of the fictive world created by Orwell with particular emphasis on its political economy.

Before beginning proper however, it is worth pausing and considering the structure of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By this I mean that there are actually three levels of texts in the novel, each providing for a layer of analysis that draws from different theories. Firstly, I have argued that the whole text becomes a history in an ahistorical world which enables the reader to do what the characters cannot; to consider their history, limitations and theoretical dispositions, as well as what they represent. A second text is present however, and here I again draw on Tyner’s (2007, 145) Foucauldian reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and in particular the issue of successful resistance. Tyner takes the position that one example of Winston’s acts of resistance, the writing of his diary, creates a text within a text and through which Orwell comes to embody Winston. Further, this demonstrates the success of Winston’s resistance as Tyner (2007, 145) argues:

Orwell does not disappoint his readers, for our reading of the novel, our engagement with the dystopia of Oceania, and our understanding of the workings of the Party is itself an act of resistance towards future disciplinary procedures... And thus, Winston – through Orwell – successfully resists; his warning does remain, to be read by countless generations even after his (Winston’s / Orwell’s) death.

However, I would like to temper this enthusiastic conclusion, by considering the global political economy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and by arguing that O’Brien is

also embodied by Orwell in terms of his fears for the world at a global level. This is because O'Brien, the torturous intellectual representative of the state that succeeds in crushing Winston as the last man of Europe, also produces a text within a text 'known simply as *the book*' (Orwell, 2011, 16). It is from this text we may gain a greater understanding of the political economy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and in particular the world system that enables Oceania to function as it does. But it also represents a view of the world that O'Brien uses to legitimate his actions and beliefs as part of a totalitarian state. By not critically engaging with *the book* and O'Brien's world view, and actively resisting it with a level of analysis that accounts for the global system, we miss the full implications of Orwell's warning not revealed in Winston's diary.

The book emerges quite early in the novel as being a text associated with the rumoured opposition to Big Brother and the Party. Written supposedly by Goldstein, the hated opposition leader of a rebellious force called the Brotherhood, *the book* was 'a compendium of all the heresies, of which Goldstein was the author and which circulated clandestinely here and there' (Orwell, 2011, 16). Sensing O'Brien to be an Inner Party rebel and part of the resistance, Winston and Julia eventually visit O'Brien to swear their allegiance to the Brotherhood and arrangements are made for *the book* to be passed to Winston (205) which he subsequently reads in parts. Of course Winston is finally arrested and subjected to torture and indoctrination by O'Brien and it is only at this point that the book is revealed to have been written by O'Brien himself with the help of others (300). However, as Winston reads this manifesto, entitled 'THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF OLIGARCHICAL COLLECTIVISM by Emmanuel Goldstein' (213), the reader of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is introduced to this different text within a text which describes the dynamics of the world political economy.

The book describes the emergence of a world in the mid-twentieth century that is divided into three super-states; Europe has been overtaken by Russia creating Eurasia, and the British Empire by the United States of America to form Oceania. A third state emerged a decade later after further fighting, consisting of China and its neighbours creating Eastasia (214-5). Laden with atomic weapons, any two states are unable to defeat the third state. Whilst war has been perpetual for their twenty five year existence, fighting mainly occurs around the frontiers and on the Floating

Fortresses that protect shipping lanes. Unbeknown to the population, fighting in the main areas of each state occurs only to a limited extent.

All states share a similar ideology of totalitarianism, and stability is maintained by ensuring that surplus production created by machines is channelled into weaponry rather than consumption. By so doing, the potential threat to the hierarchy of society is permanently removed. As *the book* (219) states:

For if leisure and security were enjoyed by all alike, the great mass of human beings who are normally stupefied by poverty would become literate and would learn to think for themselves; and when once they had done this they would sooner or later realise that the privileged minority had no function, and they would sweep it away. In the long run, a hierarchical society was only possible on a basis of poverty and ignorance.

Consequently, the redirection of surplus into weaponry and ongoing fighting forms a type of war economy. At the same time, this legitimates the position of the Party since it ‘helps to preserve the special mental atmosphere that a hierarchical society needs’ (228).

However, there is a fourth region of the world described by *the book*. Largely equatorial, the area is described as ‘a rough quadrilateral with its corners at Tangier, Brazzaville, Darwin and Hong Kong’ (216). This area is hotly contested by each of the super-states. Because each of these states is geographically vast, *the book* explains, each has sufficient access to the raw materials needed for their war economies (216). However, this fourth region is greatly desired as a ‘bottomless reserve of cheap labour’ aside from some products difficult to produce in cold climates as well as valuable minerals (217). The population of this unnamed area represents one fifth of the world’s population (216), or ‘scores or hundreds of millions of ill-paid and hard-working coolies’ (217) and, as the following description (217) suggests, theirs is a hopeless life of exploitation:

The inhabitants of these areas, reduced more or less openly to the status of slaves, pass continually from conqueror to conqueror, and are expended like so much coal or oil in the race to turn out more armaments, to capture more territory, to control more labour power, to turn out more armaments, to capture more territory, and so on indefinitely.

Before considering these issues further, it is worth pausing and considering if this text within the text can actually be trusted, since O’Brien is a duplicitous character. But Orwell is careful to assure the reader of its validity since Winston asks, ‘Is it

true, what it says?’ and O’Brien responds, ‘As description, yes. The programme it sets forth is nonsense’, referring to the lack of potential for rebellion from the proletariat (300). The trustworthiness of the text is similarly confirmed by Winston as he pauses from reading *the book* prior to his arrest where he reflects (229):

The book fascinated him, or more exactly it reassured him. In a sense it told him nothing that was new, but that was part of the attraction. It said what he would have said, if it had been possible for him to set his scattered thoughts in order.

Consequently, *the book* is not only validated as a description of the political economy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but the novel actually invites readers to engage with the text from a theoretical position rather than with ‘scattered thoughts’ and to scrutinise the world view described by O’Brien and his assumptions. It is through World-system theory that this may be accomplished.

For much of the novel, there is a questioning of the ability of the proles to challenge the state. O’Brien argues through *the book* (240):

From the proletarians nothing is to be feared. Left to themselves, they will continue from generation to generation and from century to century, working, breeding and dying, not only without any impulse to rebel, but without the power of grasping that the world could be other than it is.

In contrast, Winston holds on to his hope in the proles until his incarceration stating ‘Sooner or later it would happen, strength would change into consciousness’ (252). As World-system theory suggests however, issues of class and the state have to be situated within their economic context on a global basis. I would argue that Winston in a discussion with Julia senses this important point immediately before their capture, when he further reflects (252):

The birds sang, the proles sang, the Party did not sing. All around the world, in London and New York, in Africa and Brazil and in the mysterious, forbidden lands beyond the frontiers, in the streets of Paris and Berlin, in the villages of the endless Russian plain, in the bazaars of China and Japan – everywhere stood the same unconquerable figure, made monstrous by work and childbearing, toiling from birth to death and still singing. Out of those mighty loins a race of conscious beings must one day come.

Thus Winston almost seems on the verge of optimism here, which of course is quickly denied him. However, it is worth considering how stable O’Brien’s world actually is from a World-system theory perspective. The super-states of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* draw their power from a world system premised on ongoing war both in terms of an economic system and as a legitimating mechanism. This however, is

made possible only by an international division of labour consisting of the proles and the cheap labour of the fourth area of the world.

The proles of Oceania indeed lead austere lives but are largely left alone by the state. For example, they are able to live mostly free from surveillance and are not subject to state control regarding marriage or reproduction. They can purchase goods and consume beer, mix freely amongst themselves and references are made to the black market suggesting some freedom to trade. Whilst that might not constitute freedom or the good life, compared to the conditions of workers in the fourth area, their lot could be far worse.

It is however the source of cheap labour of the periphery, exploited through the use of coercion by whomever controls the territories, which produces and sustains the ongoing war economy. One could question then if, as O'Brien claims, that the permanent loss of the fourth area would leave the system unaltered. Certainly, O'Brien is completely dismissive of one fifth of the world's population and their importance when he concludes (217):

By their labour the slave populations allow the tempo of continuous warfare to be speeded up. But if they did not exist, the structure of world society, and the process by which it maintains itself, would not be essentially different.

However, herein lays the failure of O'Brien's world view. According to World-system theory, if class struggle were to occur then it would potentially be where exploitation is greatest. Alternatively, other types of resistance or conflict might emerge as the other states wage wars in the fourth region, again leading to potential external threats to the stability of Oceania. One fifth of the world cannot be held in exploited poverty forever and they too have agency. Alternatively, even if weaponry had to be sourced only from the proles of Oceania should the fourth region cease to exist, the result would be that labour demands and costs would be significantly higher. Ensuring subsequent labour compliance would therefore require greater coercion and surveillance by the state.

Consequently, by positioning the state and class within the world system itself, an alternate reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* emerges. The stability and control of Oceania as described by O'Brien is not guaranteed, since he ignores the effects of an international division of labour and the surplus that is extracted from the poorest one

fifth of the world. Should this fourth area be disrupted in some way, contrary to O'Brien's presuppositions, the system becomes unstable. This potentially would require the state to expand their surveillance of the proles or face greater rebellion and potential collapse. Again, emergent class identity and struggle could threaten the stability of Oceania, just as Winston hopes.

As this point, I would like to re-join with Tyner's (2007) Foucauldian reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and in particular the concept of Winston / Orwell successfully resisting through Winston's diary. As readers, we are encouraged to resist the dangers of unchecked power, surveillance and 'future disciplinary procedures' (Tyner 2007, 145). However, I would argue that the reader must also consider the world system that produces the threat in the first place. A world system built on exploitation can never be stable without coercion. What is clear, however, is that rather than ignoring the proles because they are no threat is not purely a function of their class status, identity nor their 'intellect' (Orwell 2011, 240). They do not organise against the state because they enjoy a benefit from the state compared to the exploited labour of the fourth region. At the same time, the proles are not surveilled because they are considered nonthreatening. Instead, the state's capacity to extract the surplus needed to enable the state to function is derived from the proletariat of the fourth region where more coercive means are used to ensure compliance. In short, O'Brien's days are numbered unless he begins to surveil the proles of Oceania.

What can be seen from this analysis then, is that World-system theory is a useful framework within which to interpret issues of class and surveillance. In beginning the third part of this chapter, I further utilise this theory in order to explore contemporary surveillance issues, particularly as they relate to the global political economy. Before beginning however, this thesis does not seek to provide a detailed account of the various legislative and state based intrusions on the privacy of citizens recently introduced throughout the world since this has already been detailed by Bauman et al (2014) in their work *After Snowden: Rethinking the Impact of Surveillance*. However, it does seek to contribute to their call, as raised in the introduction to this thesis, that 'There is thus an urgent need for a systematic assessment of the scale, reach, and character of contemporary surveillance practices, as well as the justifications they attract and the controversies they provoke' (Bauman et al 2014, 122), by drawing on this analysis of Orwell's influential text. To that end,

moves by western liberal governments to introduce metadata retention schemes, the mass collection of personal data from citizens as well as antiterrorist legislation subsequent to 9/11 and the War on Terror are indeed discussed. However, such issues are situated within a World-system framework and how such measures are in part utilised to ensure stability and ongoing capital accumulation in an unequal world.

This third section begins therefore with a discussion in relation to ensuring political stability from a World-system theory perspective by the emergence of the need to treat all as suspect. Secondly, it explores how economic surveillance also ensures and sustains stability in an unequal world, but disrupting notions of consumer sovereignty. Finally, in keeping with the aim of a rapprochement between modernism and culturalism, I argue that class based analysis through a World-system theory approach and culturalism is needed to resist such measures.

According to World-system theory, the core organises itself around a hegemonic power in order that ongoing accumulation occurs in ways that is beneficial to it and to ensure the stability of the capitalist global system. This dominance in the hegemon's power is evident in the research of Bauman et al (2014) regarding surveillance issues in a post-Snowden era. For example, in considering the transnational character of the USA's surveillance regimes, Bauman et al (2014, 127) point to the 'structural asymmetry' that exists between apparent cooperation between allies, such as through the 'Five Eyes' agreement of which Australia is a part, as well as security arrangements and exchanges between Europe and the USA, and revelations of spying against those same allies, in particular Germany and France. As Bauman et al (127) conclude, 'Far from a seamless flow of information, power relations structure the game'.

That has not prevented other core states from employing mass surveillance programs upon their own citizens however, since France, Germany, and the UK have all introduced similar legislation. Countries in the semi periphery, and I would argue this includes Canada, New Zealand and Australia, have also all followed suit in quick succession. According to Dempster (2015, 1), for example, Australia's metadata retention laws which commenced on 13 October, 2015, enable 'at least 21 agencies of executive government' to access citizen metadata without judicial oversight and

the principal justification for such laws has of course been based on perceived terrorist threats. However, whilst terrorism is undeniably a threat, the scale of surveillance that has been introduced as well as the indeterminate length of the War on Terror, is very concerning. Indeed, it is tempting to draw a parallel between this response by states with the ongoing war in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a means of creating legitimacy for the position of the Party since, as stated previously, it ‘helps to preserve the special mental atmosphere that a hierarchical society needs’ (Orwell, 2011, 228).

However, another major concern is that digitised databases create, according to Bauman et al (2014, 129), a “data subject” defined by algorithmic analysis of behaviour in order to ‘draw generic profiles and to identify threats and targets’. Thus in a ‘collect it all’ process, “data subjects” are ‘constituted and accessed with regards to their particular position (to a threat). Their rights depend upon how distant - or not - they are from given targets’ (129). Moreover, citizens must self-police in order that they do not attract the attention of such analysis. However, the categories and behaviours are not at all well-defined or made explicit, and not only change over time but also are dependent on the ways in which the data is processed (Lyon 2010, 332).

Consequently, there has been then a fundamental realignment of the relationship between the individual and the state, not simply restricted to privacy issues or even to the digital sphere, rather, that under mass surveillance all are considered suspect (325). This subject position, created by the state, is an anathema to the modernist subject. Indeed, it is this power of the state to create subject positions that is the greatest warning of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

For example, the need to self-police against unknown categories is evident when Winston decides to begin his diary. As he reflects, ‘This was not illegal (nothing was illegal, since there were no longer any laws), but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punishable by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labour camp’ (Orwell 2011, 9). Thus Winston is constituted as a criminal by the state through his act of writing, and whilst he can estimate the punishment, cannot be sure of the crime he commits. At the same time, the arrest of Winston’s neighbour Parsons, demonstrates how such positions become internalised. When Winston and

Parsons meet in the jail, Parsons hopes that his work as a good Party member and work record will result in a lenient sentence. However, he is glad he has been arrested since ‘Thoughtcrime is a dreadful thing, old man,’ he said sententiously. ‘It’s insidious. It can get hold of you without your even knowing it’ (267). Thus despite being ‘denounced’ by his daughter, Parsons remains proud of her and intends to tell his jailors ‘thank you for saving me before it was too late’ (268). The reader is therefore made aware of the way in which Parsons has not just taken up the subject position demanded of him by the state, but through a process of internalising this position is incapable of resistance.

Moreover, it is not only in the political hierarchy that stability is required but also in terms of economic relations. For example, the rise of China as an economic power could be seen as a threat to USA economic hegemony and notions of economic freedoms guaranteeing political rights. Zizek (2012, 57), for example, raises the question regarding the expansion of capitalism in China and potential democratic reform of that country by asking, ‘What if China’s authoritarian capitalism is not a stop on the road to further democratization, but the end state toward which the rest of the world is headed?’ In World-system theory terms, a new hegemon would certainly alter the balance and purposes of surveillance according to their own legitimating needs. Relatedly, Lyon (2004, 141) makes the point that different forms of surveillance have been introduced according to different social, cultural and political contexts. This has resulted, for example, in the acceptance of increased CCTV usage in the UK, electronic tagging more readily employed in the USA and identity cards in Asia.

However, these approaches either presuppose that there was freedom in global economic relations prior to China’s rise to begin with, or put aside economic relations altogether. Both positions ignore that economic relations between the core, semi-periphery and periphery exist and structural inequalities are deliberately sustained. This is problematic in terms of understanding surveillance in three ways.

Firstly, in an unequal world of different economic relations, different levels and types of surveillance techniques to ensure stability are required. For example, developed core countries largely dominate knowledge and technological industries thus requiring surveillance to protect intellectual property and copyright. Similarly,

consumption constitutes a significant proportion of these economies hence greater need for economic surveillance. Moreover, as argued above, the stability of the economic system is central to the hegemon's purpose, and instability in the economic system is detrimental to ongoing capital accumulation. As a result, the redistribution of surplus, in the form of welfare, ensures the stability and compliance of labour, as argued previously in this chapter. Thus both the core and semi-periphery have established - to varying degrees - welfare programs. However, in an economic irony, as welfare costs have risen such measures have been increasingly targeted by governments. Consequently, government databases, reporting requirements and increased surveillance of welfare recipients to ensure compliance has increased. Recent proposed cashless welfare card trials in Australia seems to be the latest iteration of such a process and as Jabour (2015, 1) reports, raise serious issues regarding privacy rights.

Similarly, semi-peripheral countries also require security mechanisms according to their place in the global political economy. This may include entering into formal security arrangements with the core. For example, Australia participates in the Five Eyes agreement, which allies Australia to the USA, but which has also enabled NSA surveillance to be extended globally (Bauman 2014, 127). At the same time, Australia has utilised this agreement to vastly extend its own surveillance regime. According to O'Neil and Anderson (2015, 1), a previously unreleased Snowden document reveals that Australia accessed the NSA's PRISM program (which collects private internet details and usage) at a higher rate than the United Kingdom in the twelve months up to May, 2012, resulting in Australia producing 310 intelligence reports compared to the UK's 197.

Similarly, the pursuit of free trade agreements with other countries ultimately legitimate and facilitate global access for the core in terms of sustaining access to global markets, often through the capacity to define the rules of what constitutes 'free trade'. For example, when commenting on the recently concluded Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement between the USA, Australia and ten other Pacific Rim nations, President Obama stated 'When more than 95% of our potential customers live outside our borders, we can't let countries like China write the rules of the global economy... We should write those rules, opening new markets to American products while setting high standards for protecting workers and preserving our environment'

(BBC 2015, 1). Indeed, in Australia, free trade agreements and notions of economic competitiveness have become so entrenched in public discourse as unquestionable economic and political orthodoxy, dissenting voices are easily marginalised.

Furthermore, peripheral countries must ensure that security and stability is maintained, including guaranteeing the labour supply and access to raw materials, in order to attract and retain global capital investment. This can result, for example, in restrictive labour laws, diminished rights to organise, and the banning of unions, with legislation and coercive force by the state frequently employed. Moreover, whilst capital must remain mobile, labour mobility is severely restricted. For example, the use of the term ‘economic’ refugee as opposed to a ‘genuine’ refugee, as a means to prevent labour moving legitimately from regions of poverty to wealthier regions, is widespread. However, it is the state that defines these terms, which in turn become part of a broader economic discourse that ignores structural inequality. Thus security concerns, and the types of surveillance it attracts from both domestic and international sources, is at least in part due to economic position.

Secondly, notions of the free market protecting against undue influence by the state are also becoming increasingly diffuse, as security regimes blur the distinction between state and capital. For example, data retention is collected, stored and provided by private telecommunication companies on behalf of the state, and as Dempster (2015) suggests, Australians may well have to pay for their own surveillance as these companies seek to recover the costs of the scheme. Similarly, Lyon (2004, 141) identifies the role that private companies have in designing and selling of security systems on an international basis to governments. Finally, private companies are increasingly fulfilling previously state based security roles, including for example, managing off-shore detention centres in the case of Australia (Bradley 2015, 1).

Finally, liberal conceptions of consumer sovereignty have also been undermined by the collection of big data. Through searchable databases, capital has developed the capacity to reduce consumer sovereignty. Lyon (2010, 329) for example, in his analysis of Bauman’s work on surveillance, takes account of the emergence of commercial databases that filter and sieve those who can contribute to profit and thus enjoy consumer privilege, and those that cannot who are subject to more coercive

means of control. Lyon (2010, 330) further raises the idea of an inverted panopticon; rather than seeking to control, the gaze of the panopticon is used to exclude. Thus people must ensure they do not appear on exclusionary lists, by self-policing their commercial activities. This can include for example, issues regarding insurance, credit and employment opportunities.

At the same time, online purchases can be influenced through search engine policies and product purchase histories and open up the potential for price differentiation based on consumer capacity such as income. For example, consumers have become used to paying different fares for an airplane seat compared to the person next to them (Benasek and Mongan 2015, 1). The potential for pricing differentiation is therefore huge, where small increases in price can have significant profit benefits (Gittens 2015, 1). In the process however, the consumer as sovereign - having the capacity to freely choose where to spend their money in a free market - not only becomes distorted but also increasingly illusory.

To summarise then, World-system theory as a modernist approach retains explanatory power for understanding current surveillance practices. These practices, however, are intricately linked to structural inequality in the world, whilst at the same time legitimate and stabilise the world political economy. This is achieved by reducing citizen sovereignty and consumer sovereignty into the subject positions of suspects and consumers where the rights of citizens and the subject positions available to them, are increasingly dominated by the state and capital. In the final part of this chapter, I now seek to reconnect this analysis with the warnings of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as well as the potential for resistance both from a class based and culturalist perspective. In so doing, and to conclude this chapter, there are three main points to consider.

Firstly, both in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and our own contemporary global political economy, the issue of stability and the subsequent surveillance that sustains it need to be seen in terms of inequality within the global political economy. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the proles are not surveilled since surplus labour is extracted from the fourth region of the world. This would change if this source of labour was lost. In contemporary times, similar patterns are present. Inequality is structural, but as globalisation has increased, greater surveillance is required to perpetuate these

arrangements, and is in part dependent on economic relations between different regions of the world.

Secondly, the subject positions available to people are increasingly limited, in part because there is no counter narrative, nor theoretical positions that enable resistance. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, what are implicitly postmodernist arguments destroy the modernist ideals of class interest and the capacity to effect change. Similarly, in contemporary times, class interests are controlled increasingly through surveillance, both political and economic, and postmodern critiques to modernist ideals are unlikely to prove effective against surveillance. Indeed, it is worth recalling the concerns of Jameson and Eagleton regarding the capacity of postmodernism to resist the logic of late capitalism and to act as a successful political strategy. In short, postmodernism takes away the very tools needed for successful resistance, although it might be useful in keeping our dreams in check. Subsequently, it is the argument of this thesis, which I believe is consistent with the return to class based analysis that Eagleton advocates, albeit from a modernist World-system theory viewpoint, that class interest can help resist these suspect / consumer trends.

Thirdly, however, in keeping with Eagleton's argument to take the best of the dialogic relationship of modernist class based analysis and culturalism, this thesis argued that similar parallels existed in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. It is when Winston and Julia engage in a rapprochement that the state is threatened. In our contemporary world, class based analysis must also address the dominant discourses that limit subject positions. For class based analysis to be effective, there is also a necessity to access the power of language to undermine and resist notions of suspect and consumer and economic refugee and replace them with equality and citizenship. It is through class and language as points of resistance that subject positions can be widened and strengthened. And it is through such a unified approach to the economic relations and discourses that entrench inequality, and the surveillance and justifications of surveillance that sustain them, that resistance is possible.

CONCLUSION

This thesis began with a quote from *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with an old man lamenting having trusted someone, and Winston not remembering whom he was not to have trusted. Luckily, we are more fortunate, in the sense that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* provides the reader a framework to explore different theoretical approaches to notions of power, surveillance, stability and resistance. Unluckily, it would seem the old man was right, given the rise and rise of surveillance.

Thus the focus of this thesis has been to read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in contemporary terms. In the first chapter it was argued that one of the strengths of the text is that it is particularly amenable to being analysed from multiple theoretical perspectives, including culturalist, modernist and postmodernist approaches in order to explore notions of power and social change. By drawing on Eagleton's *After Theory*, and his analysis of different theoretical approaches, it was argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* could be read in similar terms. This included taking the best of different theoretical understandings, such as the role of language and discourse in sexuality politics, but that it was through a class based approach that effective political change can be achieved.

In the second chapter, focus turned to what each of the main characters represented in this theoretical debate about culture, power and resistance. This included, for example, Ingle's argument that Winston represented a rationalist individual, standing in judgement of an irrational state. However, this thesis posited that the characters of Julia, Winston and O'Brien each demonstrated the approaches of culturalism, modernism and postmodernism respectively. Various references to the text were made in order to demonstrate the validity of this approach, including for example, the postmodernist arguments of O'Brien in defeating Winston's modernist hope in the proles, whereas Julia's culturalist approach to her own identity and pursuits demonstrated a disregard for the relevance of the state except when it directly confronted her. However, it was also argued that Julia and Winston, through a process of rapprochement of ideas, represents a need to return to modernist approaches to understanding political power, not only by drawing on the strengths of culturalism, but by demonstrating a means to effective political resistance.

In the third chapter, this thesis set about arguing, by drawing on World-system theory, that as a result of global capitalist expansion, issues of class are best situated within the global political economy. This, in effect, is indeed a return to modernist, class based analysis, but which is an approach best suited to issues of surveillance in a globalised world. The origins and main arguments of World-system theory were therefore discussed, before applying this theory to the fictive global political economy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. It was argued, for example, that the stability of Oceania was dependent on the capacity of the state to extract a surplus from the labour in the fourth region of the world. However, this labour source was controlled through coercion whilst the proles of Oceania did not need to be surveilled since their location in the system, and the relative freedom they enjoyed, ameliorated the emergence of class identity. Furthermore, should that source of surplus be lost, instability in the political economy would ensue, including the need for the state to surveille the proles.

Finally, in applying this reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to the contemporary global political economy, it was argued that World-system theory is again a useful means of exploring the issues of stability and surveillance. Thus it was argued that the expansion of global capitalism has resulted in a structurally unequal world comprised of a core, semi-periphery and periphery. As a result, the stability of the system is premised on global capital being mobile whilst labour is not, each conferring differing surveillance needs depending on the location within the global system. However, it was also argued, by drawing on a culturalist perspective, that both the state and global capital, through their surveillance regimes as well as accompanying discourses, have shaped the subject positions available to people. Thus citizen sovereignty has been reduced to that of the subject position of the suspect, and consumer sovereignty reduced to constrained consumer.

In sum, this thesis has taken the approach that literature has indeed a role to play in exploring issues of surveillance, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* remains as a warning to readers of the dangers of surveillance that we confront today. However, its foresight, in terms of demonstrating the interactions of our theories in order to better understand surveillance, is but part of its measure. The real strength of the text lies in its path to effective resistance. Winston might have forgotten who not to trust, but the reader must not.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Zygmunt, Didier Bigo, Paulo Esteves, Elspeth Guild, Vivienne Jabri, David Lyon, and R. B. J. Walker. 2014. "After Snowden: Rethinking the Impact of Surveillance." *International Political Sociology* 8(2): 121-144. doi: 10.1111/ips.12048.
- BBC. 2015. "Trans-Pacific free trade deal agreed creating vast partnership." *BBC*, October 6. <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-34444799>
- Benasek, Anna and D.T. Mongan. 2015. "Big data is coming for your purchase history - to charge you more money." *The Guardian*, May, 29. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/may/29/big-data-purchase-history-charge-you-more-money?CMP=share_btn_link
- Bradley, Michael. 2015. "Transfield and detention centres: It's no longer business as usual." *ABC*, September 25. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-09-24/bradley-transfield-and-detention-centres/6800448>
- Chirot, Daniel, and Thomas D. Hall. 1982. "World-System Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8(1): 81-106. doi: 10.1146/annurev.so.08.080182.000501.
- Dempster, Quentin. 2015. "Data retention and the end of Australians' digital privacy." *WA Today*, August 29. <http://www.watoday.com.au/technology/technology-news/data-retention-and-the-end-of-australians-digital-privacy-20150827-gj96kq.html>
- Eagleton, Terry. 2003. *After Theory*. London: Penguin Group.
- Gittens, Ross. 2015. "Canny online retailers know your top dollar." *WA Today*, October, 6. <http://www.watoday.com.au/comment/canny-online-retailers-know-your-top-dollar-20151005-gk21q8.html>
- Hier, Sean P. 2001. "The Forgotten Architect: Cox, Wallerstein and World-System Theory." *Race & Class* 42(3): 69-86. doi: 10.1177/0306396801423004.

- Ingle, Stephen. 2007. "Lies, Damned Lies and Literature: George Orwell and The Truth." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9(4): 730-746. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-856X.2007.00298.x.
- Jabour, Bridie. 2015. "Cashless welfare card could breach right to privacy – human rights committee." *The Guardian*, October, 1.
http://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2015/oct/01/cashless-welfare-card-could-breach-right-to-privacy-human-rights-committee?CMP=share_btn_link
- Jameson, Fredric. 1983. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society." *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, edited by Hal Foster. 111-125. Seattle: Bay Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lawlor, William and Diane De Rooy. 2005. "Censorship." *Beat Culture: Lifestyles, Icons and Impact*, edited by William T. Lawlor. 51-56. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC Clio.
- Lyon, David. 2004. "Globalizing Surveillance: Comparative and Sociological Perspectives." *International Sociology* 19(2): 135-149. London: SAGE. doi: 10.1177/0268580904042897.
- Lyon, David. 2010. "Liquid Surveillance: The Contribution of Zygmunt Bauman to Surveillance Studies." *International Political Sociology* 4: 325-338. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2010.00109.x.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. 1993. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Murray, Jeffrey. 1997. "George Orwell, sexspeak, and the dialectical critic." *New Jersey Journal of Communication* 5(1): 30. doi: 10.1080/15456879709367314.
- Newsinger, John. 2013. "Life After Death: The Relevance of George Orwell." *Journal of Contemporary History* 48(4): 890-898. doi: 10.1177/0022009413494565.

- O'Neill, Margot and Brigid Anderson. 2015. "Australia accessed NSA spy data more than UK over 12 months: Edward Snowden document." *ABC*, October 15. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-10-15/edward-snowden-docs-show-australia-accessed-nsa-spy-data/6856994>
- Orwell, George. 2011 [1949]. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Melbourne: Penguin Group.
- Place, Troy. 2003. "Orwell's 1984." *The Explicator* 61(2): 108-110. doi: 10.1080/00144940309597774.
- Roberts, John Michael. 2014. "How are George Orwell's writings a precursor to studies of popular culture?" *Journal for Cultural Research* 18(3): 216-232. doi: 10.1080/14797585.2013.851832.
- Robinson, William I. 2011. "Globalization and the sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A critical appraisal." *International Sociology* 26(6): 723-745. doi: 10.1177/0268580910393372.
- Tirohl, Blu. 2000. "'We are the dead ... you are the dead'. An examination of sexuality as a weapon of revolt in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four." *Journal of Gender Studies* 9(1): 55-61. doi: 10.1080/095892300102452.
- Tyner, James A. 2004. "Self and space, resistance and discipline: a Foucauldian reading of George Orwell's 1984." *Social & Cultural Geography* 5(1): 129-149. doi: 10.1080/1464936032000137966.
- Zizek, Slavoj. 2012. "Capitalism." *Foreign Policy* 196: 56-7. Academic OneFile.