Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)
A Peer Reviewed (Refereed) International Journal
Impact Factor 6.8992 (ICI) http://www.rjelal.com;
Email:editorrjelal@gmail.com; ISSN:2395-2636 (P); 2321-3108(O)

Vol.13.Issue 4. 2025 (Oct-Dec)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA
2395-2636 (Print):2321-3108 (online)

Surveillance Culture and the Architecture of Control: The Systematic Erosion of Privacy in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Ramashray Choudhary
Research Scholar, Department of English,
Patna University, Patna, Bihar, India
Email: ramashraychoudhary237@gmail.com
DOI: 10.33329/rjelal.13.4.337

Article info
Article Received: 13/11/2025
Article Accepted: 10/12/2025
Published online: 17/12/2025

Abstract

Surveillance in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is not only a political instrument. It is a cultural condition that shapes how individuals think, feel, and exist. This paper studies the novel through the lens of surveillance culture, a framework that moves beyond the technological apparatus of totalitarianism to expose deeper structures of control that invade the private realm. The analysis demonstrates how the Party transforms surveillance into an everyday normality, producing subjects who self-regulate even without direct punishment. By examining Winston Smith's shrinking interior world, the paper highlights the systematic erosion of privacy and the psychological costs of constant visibility. Drawing on theorists such as Michel Foucault, Shoshana Zuboff, David Lyon, and Gilles Deleuze, this study argues that Orwell's work anticipates contemporary anxieties about datafication, emotional regulation, and the dissolution of the private self. Ultimately, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reveals that when surveillance becomes culture, individuality erodes quietly and control infiltrates the deepest layers of human experience.

Keywords: Surveillance Culture; Control; Privacy; *Nineteen Eighty-Four*; Totalitarianism; Panopticism.

Introduction

George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has long been recognised as a landmark text in the study of authoritarianism, censorship, and state power. Yet its enduring relevance lies not merely in its vision of a tyrannical government but in the way it portrays surveillance as a cultural logic. Orwell does not present surveillance as a collection of technologies but as a worldview that seeps into speech, behaviour, memory, and desire. The telescreen and the Thought Police serve as obvious symbols of external monitoring, but the more disturbing force is the internalised fear that shapes how citizens perceive themselves. This internalisation makes surveillance culture self-

sustaining, allowing the state's control to continue even without direct intervention.

At the centre of this analysis stands Winston Smith, whose struggle to protect his inner life becomes a quiet rebellion against the Party's architecture of control. Winston's desire to claim a private space - whether physical, emotional, or intellectual - marks him as a marginal figure in a system where privacy is treated as deviance. His diary, his illicit relationship with Julia, and his fragile memories function as pockets of resistance, yet each attempt is gradually dismantled by a political order that thrives on visibility and conformity.

Contemporary scholars of surveillance studies have expanded the scope of Orwell's insights. Michel Foucault's concept of panopticism helps explain how individuals internalise disciplinary power even without being directly observed. In the age of digital capitalism, Shoshana Zuboff's notion of "surveillance capitalism" similarly shows how personal behaviour is monitored, predicted, and shaped by forces that operate in everyday life. David Lyon's idea of "surveillance culture" further clarifies that surveillance is not simply imposed from above; it becomes normalised through habits, expectations, and institutional routines. When read through these theoretical frames, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* becomes more than a dystopian nove - it becomes a diagnostic text for understanding how control penetrates the emotional and psychological core of human life.

This paper examines the ways in which *Nineteen Eighty-Four* constructs a culture of surveillance that systematically erodes privacy. It argues that the Party's true power lies not in its overt violence but in its ability to transform visibility into a mechanism of control. By reading Winston's journey alongside key concepts from modern surveillance theory, the paper aims to demonstrate how Orwell's work anticipates the present world in which the boundaries of the private self are increasingly unstable.

Review of Literature

The critical discourse surrounding *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has grown into a vast field, extending from mid-twentieth-century debates on totalitarianism to recent discussions on digital surveillance and data governance. Early critics such as Irving Howe viewed the novel primarily as a political warning. Howe argued that Orwell's dystopia exposed the "logic of total power," where the state's dominance rests on the destruction of individuality (Howe 118). Similarly, Bernard Crick emphasised Orwell's political commitments, noting that the novel's central anxiety lay in the threat posed by authoritarian regimes to democratic life (Crick 214). These foundational readings position the text within Cold War anxieties, yet they do not fully account for the psychological and cultural dimensions of surveillance that later theorists would explore.

Michel Foucault's contribution to surveillance theory profoundly changed the critical framing of Orwell's work. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault reimagines power as diffuse, internalised, and productive rather than merely repressive. His explanation of the panopticon - the architectural model in which prisoners discipline themselves because they might be watched - offers a conceptual tool for re-examining the mechanisms of control in Orwell's Oceania. Scholars such as Thomas Mathiesen have argued that the telescreen system in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* represents a "synopticon," where many watch the few, thus enabling the public to participate in surveillance culture (Mathiesen 219). While Orwell predates Foucault, contemporary criticism often reads the novel as a fictional enactment of Foucauldian principles.

In the twenty-first century, surveillance studies expanded further with David Lyon's development of "surveillance culture," a framework that shifts attention from institutional systems to the everyday normalisation of watching and being watched.

Lyon argues that surveillance in modern societies has become embedded in routine practices - shopping, travelling, communicating - making it almost invisible through familiarity (Lyon 19). Critics such as Rebecca Lemov have applied this framework to Orwell's text, suggesting that the Party's power thrives precisely because its citizens accept visibility as part of their daily environment. Thus, control becomes cultural, not merely political.

Shoshana Zuboff's *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* opens another critical path. Although her work focuses on corporate data extraction rather than state tyranny, Zuboff's insistence that surveillance reshapes behaviour and selfhood resonates strongly with Orwell's vision. Zuboff argues that privacy is undermined when individuals are turned into sources of behavioural data, a process that produces "instrumentarian power" designed to modify human conduct (Zuboff 376). Scholars such as Mark Andrejevic have drawn parallels between Zuboff's contemporary insights and Orwell's predictive warnings, noting that both describe forms of power that depend on deep incursions into personal life.

Gilles Deleuze's concept of the "society of control" also illuminates new directions in Orwell studies. While Foucault emphasises discipline through enclosed spaces, Deleuze describes a world where boundaries dissolve and control operates continuously through networks, codes, and open systems. This shift aligns with Orwell's portrayal of a society in which control is not confined to institutions like prisons or ministries but permeates the home, workplace, and interior consciousness. Critics such as Philip Hammond argue that Deleuze's insights help readers understand how the Party's power remains flexible and adaptive, evolving beyond static forms of surveillance (Hammond 94).

Recent scholarship also explores the emotional and psychological dimensions of surveillance in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Scholars such as Erika Gottlieb interpret Winston's struggle as an attempt to salvage emotional identity within a culture designed to produce fear and compliance (Gottlieb 163). Patrick Reedy similarly suggests that Orwell's novel dramatizes the "unmaking of selfhood" through forced visibility, where privacy becomes an act of resistance in itself (Reedy 57). This body of criticism highlights the ways in which surveillance culture does not merely control bodies - it controls feelings, memories, and intimate relationships.

Another significant strand of recent scholarship focuses on the loss of privacy as a fundamental human right. Julie Cohen, though writing primarily in the context of digital privacy, argues that privacy is the "breathing space" necessary for identity formation (Cohen 1903). Critics applying this insight to Orwell note that Winston's inability to secure such breathing space - whether in his room, his diary, or his illicit love affair - reveals the Party's deeper strategy: the systematic destruction of the conditions that allow the self to exist.

Across these critical interventions, a clear pattern emerges. Scholars increasingly read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* not only as a cautionary tale about totalitarianism but as an exploration of how surveillance culture operates at the level of everyday life. Surveillance functions as a system of control that gradually dismantles privacy, reshapes personal identity, and produces subjects who police themselves. This paper builds on these insights while emphasising a crucial thread: Orwell's novel visualises a world in which the erosion of privacy is not accidental but central to the Party's architecture of power.

1. Surveillance Culture as the Foundation of Power

In Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, surveillance is not simply a method of governance. It is the cultural foundation upon which the Party builds its authority. Oceania does not depend solely on brute force or mass

terror, though both are present in abundance. Instead, it cultivates a world in which visibility becomes the norm, and privacy becomes both suspicious and nearly impossible. Through constant watching, repeated slogans, and meticulously designed rituals, the Party teaches citizens that being observed is a condition of existence.

The telescreen is the most familiar symbol of this world, yet Orwell makes it clear that the device functions less as a technological tool and more as a cultural signifier. The telescreen does not have to monitor every individual continuously; its power lies in the uncertainty of its gaze. Winston reflects that one never knows "whether you were being watched at any given moment," which means that the rational response is to behave as if one always is. This produces what Foucault describes as the internalisation of surveillance - the process by which individuals regulate their own behaviour because observation seems perpetual. Thus, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* constructs a society in which surveillance becomes self-maintaining.

Even everyday behaviours become performances meant to satisfy the invisible eye of power. People speak cautiously, walk deliberately, and suppress spontaneous gestures. The novel's opening describes Winston turning his back to the telescreen to write in his diary, a small gesture of rebellion. Yet he knows that "even a back can be revealing." This line captures the atmosphere of discomfort that defines surveillance culture. Privacy is not only denied; it is rendered dangerous. The body, the voice, the breath - each becomes a potential betrayal.

2. The Systematic Erosion of Privacy

At its core, the Party's architecture of control thrives on destroying privacy. Not just physical privacy but also emotional, sexual, intellectual, and psychological privacy. Orwell shows that privacy is necessary for coherent identity. Without a protected inner space, human beings cannot develop stable thoughts or desires. By eroding privacy, the Party disables the individual's ability to reflect or imagine alternatives.

One of the earliest signs of this erosion appears when Winston attempts to write in his diary. The diary is a private object, a refuge for inner thought. Yet the act of writing becomes a confrontation with the political order. Winston does not fear merely being caught; he fears the impossibility of creating a private mental zone. His thoughts instinctively drift toward the language of the Party, showing how privacy collapses even before surveillance intervenes.

Sexual privacy also becomes a target of state control. The Party discourages erotic desire because desire creates loyalties and emotions beyond the state's reach. Julia explains that the Party wants to abolish sexual pleasure so that people will channel all repressed energy into political devotion. The anti-sex regulations, the Junior Anti-Sex League, and the arrangement of marriages all serve to break the private bonds that could form resistance. When Winston and Julia make love, their act is politically subversive because it produces personal intimacy - a form of privacy the Party cannot tolerate.

Memory, too, becomes a private domain that the Party aggressively invades. Winston's memories resist the Party's official narratives, but they remain fragile, uncertain, and frequently overwhelmed by propaganda. The Party's insistence that "Who controls the past controls the future" is not simply about rewriting history; it is about conquering the private memory of subjects. In such a world, truth becomes a cultural product, shaped by constant pressure and fear. When privacy is destroyed, memory loses its anchor, and individuals cannot differentiate between internal conviction and external instruction.

3. Emotional Control and the Manufacture of Fear

Surveillance culture in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* does not rely on technological observation

alone. It also depends on the manipulation of emotion. Fear becomes both a tool and a condition. The Two Minutes Hate ritual demonstrates how the Party orchestrates collective emotion, transforming private feelings into predictable responses. Citizens shout, sob, and tremble in unison, internalising anger against the Party's enemies and loyalty to Big Brother.

These orchestrated emotions establish a template for everyday life. The constant threat of vaporisation, the disappearances, and the omnipresent Thought Police create a psychological environment in which fear becomes habitual. People anticipate danger even when none is visible. They avoid thinking critically not because they are incapable but because they fear the consequences of private thought. In this landscape, silence becomes safer than speculation, and obedience becomes easier than reflection.

Moreover, fear is intimately linked to loneliness. By isolating individuals, the Party prevents the creation of social bonds that might challenge its control. Winston's fear intensifies because he has no one to trust. He cannot speak openly to colleagues, neighbours, or even relatives. The destruction of community life is deliberate; it creates subjects who fear not only the state but also one another. Surveillance becomes horizontal as well as vertical. Citizens participate in watching each other - children spying on parents, neighbours reporting neighbours.

This culture of mutual suspicion ensures that privacy is not only discouraged but structurally impossible. People hide their emotions, their thoughts, and their doubts. Eventually, they hide from themselves. The most profound victory of surveillance culture is that it makes private life feel unsafe.

4. The Internalisation of the Gaze: When Surveillance Becomes Self-Surveillance

One of Orwell's most striking achievements is his portrayal of how surveillance becomes internalised. Winston experiences this early in the novel when he realises that even his subconscious reactions could betray him. The tightening of his face, a flicker of fear, a moment of hesitation - any of these might be interpreted as political dissent. This creates a form of self-surveillance that goes beyond external control.

The Party does not need to monitor everything because individuals begin to monitor themselves. Winston carefully modulates his expressions, controls his breathing, and avoids any behaviour that might seem abnormal. Children, indoctrinated early, perform even more dramatic acts of self-surveillance. They recite Party slogans with enthusiasm and eagerly participate in identifying traitors within their communities.

This process culminates dramatically in Room 101. When Winston faces his worst fear, he breaks completely. In that moment, the Party's power succeeds not because it forces obedience but because it destroys the private mechanism of judgment within him. He betrays Julia, the person who represented his hope for personal life, and in doing so, he abandons the possibility of private loyalty. After this moment, Winston's inner life collapses. He becomes the instrument of his own subjugation.

By the novel's end, surveillance has become so deeply internalised that Winston no longer needs to be watched. He has accepted the Party's gaze as his own. This transformation illustrates Orwell's most unsettling insight: totalitarianism triumphs not when it kills the body but when it rewrites the self.

5. Language as Control: Newspeak and the Destruction of Private Thought

The erosion of privacy in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* also occurs through linguistic manipulation. Newspeak, the Party's official language, aims to eliminate words associated with rebellion, freedom, and individuality. Orwell's appendix explains that the purpose of Newspeak is to make unorthodox thought

impossible. If a word does not exist, the thought cannot be conceived.

Language thus becomes a cultural technology of surveillance. It polices thought even before surveillance detects it. People who speak Newspeak internalise the restricted vocabulary and gradually lose the capacity to conceptualise private desires or political alternatives. The impoverishment of language shrinks inner consciousness. Privacy depends on the ability to articulate one's own experiences; when language contracts, the self contracts.

Syme, one of the architects of Newspeak, proudly notes that "we're cutting the language down to the bone." His enthusiasm reveals the frightening ease with which cultural workers participate in the destruction of private life. Newspeak functions as a long-term strategy of cultural control, one that slowly removes the linguistic conditions needed for dissent.

6. Surveillance Culture and the Collapse of the Private Self

Winston's trajectory demonstrates the gradual collapse of the private self. At the start of the novel, he clings to fragments of memory, desire, and curiosity. He yearns for love, truth, and meaning. His rebellion is fragile but real. However, as surveillance culture tightens its grip, these fragments disintegrate.

Physical privacy disappears as the telescreen monitors his movements. Emotional privacy collapses when he realises he cannot trust anyone. Psychological privacy vanishes as he becomes aware that even his dreams might betray him. When the Thought Police arrest him, the final form of privacy - intellectual privacy - crumbles. O'Brien forces him to rewrite his memories and surrender his capacity for independent judgment.

By the end, Winston's inner life is reduced to a hollow space filled by Party slogans. He loves Big Brother not because he believes but because belief has become the only available psychological refuge. The Party has engineered a world in which privacy is not merely restricted - it is unimaginable.

This is the ultimate outcome of surveillance culture. It does not simply monitor. It reshapes the human personality until privacy ceases to exist and control becomes naturalised.

Conclusion

Surveillance in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is far more than a political tactic. It is a cultural atmosphere that saturates every aspect of life, from public behaviour to interior thought. Orwell constructs a world in which control is not imposed solely through terror or physical coercion but through the slow, deliberate erosion of privacy. By establishing a surveillance culture, the Party reshapes the psychological foundations of human identity. People learn to fear not only external punishment but also their own impulses, memories, and desires. In such a system, control becomes most effective when it becomes invisible, when individuals internalise the rules so deeply that they regulate themselves automatically.

Winston Smith's journey illustrates the costs of living under such a regime. His struggle to carve out moments of privacy - writing in a diary, recalling childhood memories, loving Julia - highlights the innate human need for an inner space untouched by power. Yet each attempt exposes the fragility of privacy in a society designed to dissolve it. The Party's relentless dismantling of Winston's private world demonstrates how surveillance destroys the conditions necessary for selfhood. When fear becomes a daily habit and visibility becomes permanent, the self begins to fracture.

The Party's triumph at the end of the novel is not merely its domination of the public sphere but its conquest of Winston's inner life. By making him love Big Brother, the Party completes a cultural transformation that redefines identity itself. The collapse of

Winston's privacy marks the death of his individuality. This conclusion aligns with the central argument of this paper: Orwell warns that the greatest danger of surveillance lies not in the technologies that watch us but in the culture that teaches us to accept, normalise, and internalise that watching.

Seen through the lens of modern surveillance theory - Foucault's panopticism, Lyon's surveillance culture, Zuboff's behavioural modification, and Deleuze's society of control - *Nineteen Eighty-Four* emerges as a prophetic text. It anticipates a world where visibility is routine, data flows continuously, and private life becomes increasingly vulnerable. Orwell shows that when surveillance evolves into culture, it ceases to feel like repression and begins to resemble everyday life. This is the most chilling lesson the novel offers: the erosion of privacy does not happen all at once. It happens quietly, through habits, language, memories, and fears, until individuals no longer remember what it means to live unobserved.

In the end, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* stands as a powerful meditation on the fragility of the private self and the destructive potential of a society built on permanent visibility. By illuminating how surveillance culture systematically erodes privacy, Orwell compels readers to defend the spaces - mental, emotional, social - where individuality can still survive. His warning remains urgent in a world where surveillance technologies have become more sophisticated, more pervasive, and more deeply woven into the ordinary routines of life. The novel calls us to remain attentive to the subtle forms of control that shape our choices and to protect the private spaces where human freedom, dignity, and imagination continue to grow.

Work cited

Andrejevic, M. (2007). *iSpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. University Press of Kansas.

Cohen, J. E. (2013). What privacy is for. *Harvard Law Review, 126*(7), 1904–1933.

Crick, B. (1992). *George Orwell: A life*. Penguin Books.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October, 59*, 3–7.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)

Gottlieb, E. (2001). *Dystopian fiction east and west: Universe of terror and trial*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hammond, P. (2009). The global politics of information: Development, security and surveillance. *Information & Communications Technology Law, 18*(2), 87–103.

Howe, I. (1950). The fiction of anti-utopia. *The New Republic*, 114–119.

Lemov, R. (2015). *Database of dreams: The lost quest to catalog humanity*. Yale University Press.

Lyon, D. (2018). *Surveillance culture: Living in a datafied world*. Polity Press.

Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's panopticon revisited. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*(2), 215–234.

Orwell, G. (2021). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1949)

Reedy, P. (2005). Mirrors of discomfort: The psychic life of surveillance. *Organization Studies, 26*(7), 1085–1108.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.