Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Anglistika - amerikanistika

Anglická literatura

Ústav anglofonních literatur a kultur

Diplomová práce

Zobrazení médií v britské antiutopické literatuře
Turn Their Lights Out, Change the Channel: Depiction of Media in British Dystopian Fiction

Vypracoval
Bc. Pavel Bakič

Vedoucí práce
Colin Clark, MA

Praha, leden 2013

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 17. 1. 2013

Klíčová slova

antiutopie, dystopie, média, George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, H. G. Wells, biomoc, kánon, Marshal McLuhan

Keywords

dystopia, media, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, *Brave New World*, *When the Sleeper Awakes*, biopower, canon, Marshal McLuhan

Abstrakt

Cílem práce je poskytnout přehled o zpracování tématu médií v textech, jež utvářely moderní podobu antiutopického žánru a k nimž se další antiutopická díla nutně vztahují. Ústřední trojici interpretovaných románů tvoří *1984* George Orwella, *Brave New World* Aldouse Huxleyho (česky jako *Báječný nový svět* nebo *Konec civilizace*) a *Až spáč procitne* H. G. Wellse; teoretický úvod tvořící první kapitolu pak kromě zdůvodnění tohoto výběru rovněž vymezuje žánr dystopie a pojem médií. Druhá kapitola se věnuje pojetí historie v antiutopické společnosti a dokládá, že pro totalitní stát představují „dějiny" nežádoucí koncept, jež je prostřednictvím médií zamlžován a redukován na triádu „předrevoluční období – revoluce – věčně trvající porevoluční společnost". Bližší analýza textů pak odhaluje, že prostřední bod této posloupnosti je sám dělitelný na novou triádu, jejímž završením teprve vzniká stabilní totalitní uspořádání. Třetí kapitola se věnuje využití občanů jako médií a za využití teoretických textů Michela Foucaulta dokládá, že v Huxleyho románu je tohoto využití docíleno za využití „biomoci", kdežto v Orwellově za využití „kázně". Čtvrtá kapitola se obrací k tištěným médiím a jejich privilegované roli v primárních textech: Autoři antiutopických románů vidí literaturu jako záruku individuality a zároveň tradice vytvářené společenským dialogem. V důsledku tak kladou důraz na pojem kánonu (často zosobněného dílem Willama Shakespeara), jež je popisovanými společnostmi naopak potlačován. Pátá kapitola zpracovává tematiku elektronických médií, prezentovaných naopak v negativním světle: Zatímco literaturu musí dystopická společnost ve vlastním zájmu deformovat, elektronická média naopak od svého samotného vzniku přispívají ke společenském klimatu umožňujícímu vznik dystopie. Snad překvapivě je nejméně razantní formulace tohoto kontrastu k nalezení ve Wellsově románu, jehož méně systematický a politicky orientovaný charakter jej činí otevřenějším dílem, než jsou pečlivěji vybudované světy George Orwella a Aldouse Huxleyho.

Abstract

The thesis aims to give an overview of the treatment of media in texts that have formed modern dystopian writing and to which new additions in the genre necessarily relate. This set of texts consists of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and *When the Sleeper Awakes* by H. G. Wells; first chapter substantiates this selection and proceeds to define the concepts of "media" and "dystopia". Second chapter is concerned with the understanding of history in dystopian societies and shows that the very concept of historicity is undesirable for a totalitarian state, which seeks to blur history and reduce it to a three-point schema "before the Event – the Event (revolution) – after the Event". Closer analysis then shows that the Event itself can be divided into a further triad that has to be completed in order to pass into eternal post-Event society. Third chapter describes the use of citizens as media and shows that while Huxley's society uses what Michel Foucault calls "biopower" to achieve this goal, Orwell's society rather uses the concept of "discipline". Fourth chapter turns to printed media a the privileged role they are ascribed in the novels: The authors see literature as an embodiment of individuality and, at the same time, as a guarantee of tradition established by an ongoing social dialogue. As a result, the novels stress the idea of canon, often represented by William Shakespeare, while the societies they describe rather seek to distort or suppress canon-formation. Fifth chapter argues that, unlike literature, electronic media, are presented in a negative light: Dystopian society has to find means to subvert printed media, whereas electronic ones contribute to social climate that leads to dystopia. Perhaps surprisingly, this dichotomy is least pronounced in Wells' novel, which is less systematic and politically oriented, but more-open ended than Orwell's and Huxley's contributions to the genre.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Depiction

Undeniably, this thesis needs to begin by clarifying the terms that make up its title, by offering their definitions and justifying the way in which they delimit its subject. Paradoxically, the most general and most problematic term, "depiction", is also the one that will be given the least thorough treatment, precisely because it immediately opens up a major debate that is only tangentially related to the main topic and would take up an inordinate amount of the thesis' length if it were to be settled at least provisionally. Debates on *mimésis,* the nature of fictional worlds and the circulation of meanings between the variously defined realms of "representation" and "reality", will be glossed over. Instead, this thesis simply declares its allegiance to the tradition of text-centered close reading and, guided by definitions discussed below, follows the motif of media in chosen primary texts to determine how issues brought out by this reading contribute to the overall structure of the works and what place they take therein. Regarding dystopia as "political subgenre of science fiction"[1] means, of course, that divorcing it from its historical context would impoverish any extended interpretation, and the thesis does not shy away from discussing social and literary context or the biography of individual authors, but uses these aspects as means to stress points derived from close reading or to open up new lines of interpretation to be confirmed or refuted by textual evidence. Reading of the chosen works will inadvertently uncover value judgements pronounced on individual media or whole categories of them: It can be debated whether it is possible to imagine a structure of meaning that would eschew value judgements, or at least reduce these judgements to their least overt form of different emphasis, but such a structure would surely not be found in dystopia as a genre that, by definition, pronounces negative judgement on the society it portrays and, presumably, also organizes individual aspects of that society according to the extent to which they contribute to the maintenance of dystopian reality.

1.2 Dystopia

Saying that this aspect is inherent in dystopia "by definition" naturally begs for this definition to be provided. The aspect mentioned in the previous paragraph does not sufficiently delineate the genre, since negative stance towards described reality can be found in socially critical

---

1   Darko Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction* (Yale University Press, 1979) 61.

works of multifarious times and genres and can therefore be seen, at most, as a negative manifestation of "utopian impulse" that Ernst Bloch sees in remotest human actions lead by the "principle of hope".[2] This shows two important facts: First, that definitions of dystopia are usually bound to definitions of utopia as a longer-established genre that defines the whole field of socio-fantastic writing, and second, that the resulting definition can be so boundless and remote from the initial motivation of the enquiry that it bears little direct relevance. Attempts to formulate a narrower definition abound, but so do their critiques and summary texts that seek to combine, refine and organise previous definitions. As a result, it becomes tempting to claim that such a search is secondary to the reading of primary texts, or, more radically, that the definition is impossible to formulate. This latter case can result in a still less convincing statement than the search for proper definition: Mary Ellen Snodgrass' claim that "[n]o single description [...] fits all utopias, and no definition sufficiently covers all possible perfect worlds"[3] is easily revealed to be a tautology in which she posits an existence of a set defined by certain boundaries, but at the same time alleges that this set cannot be defined.[4]

Therefore, it is probably best to justify the selection of primary sources in this thesis on the basis of genealogy and general agreement. The genealogical argument is that a genre can be born out of a set of texts that are perceived as similar and that new texts can be included or excluded from the genre according to the degree to which they share and develop the issues of the original set. The genre and its continuity become more firmly established with the production of texts that join the tradition purposefully, even if their quality or originality is subpar, since "epigones imitate precisely what was specific in the initiator," to quote Tzvetan Todorov;[5] this ossified core is then surrounded by a less determinate set of works that relate to the key texts not in a major, but noticeable way. In other words, the problems encountered on the quest for the definition of utopia/dystopia are at least partly caused by the fact that critics deal with a tradition that is firmly established on contingent historical grounds rather than rigorously thought-out categories. Attempts to encompass this tradition result in definitions that are too broad or otherwise unsustainable, while disregarding this tradition results in

---

2   Ernst Bloch, *The Principle of Hope, Vol. 1* (The MIT Press, 1995). Literary naturalism exemplified by Émile Zola or Theodore Dreiser can be plausibly enough read as dystopian, since their critique seeks to encompass the whole society.
3   Mary Ellen Snodgrass, "Utopia", *Encyclopedia of Utopian Literature* (Santa Barbara, California/Denver, Colorado/Oxford, England: ABC-CLIO, 1995) 524.
4   Ondřej Pomahač, *Nikde a kdesi: Utopie, dystopie a jejich vzájemná poloha* (MA thesis at Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Philosophy, 2011) 13.
5   Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*, trans. Richard Howard (Cornell University Press, 1975) 7.

definitions that exclude texts that most would consider essential for the defined genre.

For these reasons, this thesis does not subscribe to a single overreaching definition of dystopia. This approach is partly made possible by the selection of texts with George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* as the inevitable focal points.[6] These novels shape the understanding of dystopia prominently and can be said to belong to the establishing set of texts as discussed above, forming a "canonical dystopian trilogy"[7] along with Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*: This does not mean that they they have no precursors, but that these precursors can be identified as such only after a body of works is singled out from the field of literature to establish a newly recognised genre.[8] Furthermore, not subscribing to any single definition makes it possible to point out aspects of more definitions that will prove useful in the thesis and to discuss some important, but perhaps not constitutive, aspects that the chosen works have in common. A starting point can be provided by Darko Suvin's definition of dystopia as

> the construction of a particular community where sociopolitical institutions, norms, and relationships are organised according to a radically less perfect principle than in the author's community; this construction is based on estrangement arising out of an alternative historical hypothesis; it is created by social classes interested in otherness and change".[9]

(Suvin's definition of what he calls "eutopia" merely substitutes "radically more perfect" for "radically less perfect"; "utopia" covers both and is defined as "radically different".) The first and last point betray an overtly activist reading and concern with authorial intention that runs counter to commonly perceived notion of "intentional fallacy", though, as discussed above, some amount of historical reading will prove necessary in the course of this thesis. More important, however, is the notion of "alternative historical hypothesis". In general terms, this point could be criticised, since the traditional "spatial" type of utopia, in which the depicted

---

6   Here, Frederic Jameson provides an example of the overly restrictive definitions mentioned above when he excludes *Brave New World* from the ranks of dystopia for being "an aristocratic critique of the media and mass culture, rather than of any Orwellian 'totalitarianism'". Fredric Jameson, *Archaeologies of the Future* (London, New York: Verso, 2007) 202.
7   Jameson 202.
8   See Jorge Luis Borges, "Kafka and His Precursors", *The Total Library: Non-fiction 1922-1986* (Penguin Classics, 2001) 363-365.
9   Darko Suvin, "Theses on Dystopia 2001", *Dark Horizons:Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination*, eds. Raffaella Baccolini and Tom Moylan (New York and London: Routledge, 2003) 188-189.

country is situated in a yet undiscovered territory, is difficult to describe as alternative history: The evolution and origins of the state most definitely differ from the history of the known world, but rather as a new chapter to be integrated than as an "alternative". The genre or trope of alternative history, however, can be uselfully recalled here, since attempts at its definiton usually stress and isolate the event from which the alternative unfolds (e.g. Axis powers winning World War II in Philip K. Dick's *The Man in the High Castle*), and this notion of decisive rift is common in utopian writing ever since Thomas More's King Utopus separated his peninsula from the mainland. It will be demonstrated that in the dystopian novels chosen for this thesis, the rift can be understood as "crime" or "catastrophe" in the sense Jean Baudrillard uses these words, a decisive event that re-shapes the way in which society defines concepts such as "reality" or "truth" and relates to them.

Another, more structurally minded feature of dystopian fiction can be identified that distinguishes it from utopia: The fact that most dystopian novels include a plot based upon conflict. Such a narrative device would be difficult to combine with the perfection of utopia, and therefore most utopian texts take a descriptive form of the so-called "visitor plot". Dystopia's basic plot, albeit it utilises conflict, is similarly focused on social description; the opposite focus, foregrounding the protagonist's character, is most likely to be found in psychological or detective fiction.[10] In a more abstract sense, the dystopian conflict is not merely present on the level of the story, but can be said to structure the whole text. This suggestion returns to the above-noted observation that literary texts always formulate value judgments, whether implicitly or explicitly, and that the same holds true for any given society or culture. In the narrative space of utopian narrative, these two value systems are in alignment: The stress the narrative lays on particular problems and their solutions corresponds to the problems and solutions the described society is concerned with. In dystopian fiction, there is a discrepancy between the two, brought out most easily by narrative conflict. Of course, this formulation is intended to provide an interpretative tool, not to separate utopia and dystopia once and for all, such ambition being prevented by purposefully ambivalent works written with literary and theoretical history of utopia in mind, like *The Dispossessed* by Ursula K. Le Guin or *Consider Phlebas* by Iain M. Banks, in which the protagonist fights

---

10   Where it might still remain a study of society's influence on a more intimate scale. It could be argued that such disparate works as Mark Twain's *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, *Dirk Gently's Holistic Detective Agency* by Douglas Adams and Michael Haneke's film *The White Ribbon* constitute a tradition of holistic detective story in which the classical structure of crime, investigation and punishment serves to demonstrate how both the act and the concept of crime result from the structuring of power in a given society.

against a civilisation that is portrayed in generally utopian terms in the whole *Culture* series to which the novel belongs.

The contrast between "conflict plot" and "visitor plot" brings out another distinctly dystopian feature: While the citizens of dystopia are as likely to be happy as discontented (the latter case is generally not found in utopia and thus forms one of dystopia's distinct characteristics), manipulated by power-holding individuals or brain-washed impersonally into obedience, they are never trusted by the apparatus of the state. While utopia might spring both from the idea that free will is compatible with (or even necessary for) a perfect society and the idea that people have to be controlled for their own happiness,[11] the dystopian state never has any confidence in its citizens.[12] This distrust is signified by attempts to mechanise every possible aspect of human life,[13] both by means of social engineering and application of "hard" technology. In the particular case this paper is concerned with, the writers use this recurring topic of distrust and mechanisation to create what might be called the hierarchy of media: Some media are depicted, to a varying extent, as being mutilated, even destroyed, by being mechanised, while others are bound inseparably to technology or flourish when they are mechanised. This distinction is closely connected to Marshall McLuhan's understanding of media as extensions of man's different faculties,[14] as this thesis will show classic dystopian fiction to be generally biased towards visual thinking (or sequential typographical tradition more particularly) and distrustful of media that have less sequential nature and/or are extensions of another sense or senses.

1.3 Selection of primary texts

Citing Russian and American examples calls for justification of this thesis' focus on British writing. For writing in major languages like English, such a justification is perhaps easier than for literatures of smaller language communities where much of the literary context is provided by translations, making it necessary for any larger diachronic study to go beyond the context of original writing in any given language. In the English-language book market, translations

---

11 "Many utopias are characterised by extremely intensive social control, though it is striking that community members frequently do not experience it as control at all. Individual happiness coincides with happiness derived from the community or imposed from above." Hans Boutellier, *The Safety Utopia: Contemporary Discontent and Desire as to Crime and Punishment* (Springer, 2004) 40.

12 To refer back to the importance of historical context: Since the 20th century, extensive policing becomes a clear mark of dystopian text, possibly laying grounds for a more ambivalent understanding of texts previously understood as utopian.

13 Snodgrass 498.

14 Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (The MIT Press, 1984).

only make up three percent of production,[15] as a result of which it seems more reasonable to treat original writing in English as more isolated. In particular cases, however, this isolation will frequently not be found to be a sound postulate: Although the Iron Curtain effectively isolated later European dystopias like Janusz A. Zajdel's *Paradyzja* or Piotr Szulkin's trilogy of dystopian films (but not Stanisław Lem's *Memoirs Found in a Bathtub*) from wider international circulation, the decisive impetus of Zamyatin's *We* for Orwell is hard to deny, Orwell having reviewed the book in 1946.[16] Even if Huxley's assurances that Zamyatin's novel had no influence whatsoever on *Brave New World*[17] are taken at face value, its influence on Orwell is enough to establish *We*'s importance in the British context, and an exclusion of its extended interpretation from this thesis has to be accounted for merely by limited space and the customary practice of delimiting literary surveys on national and/or language grounds.

Still, the delimitation seems even more arbitrary when the exclusion of other literatures written in English is considered, particularly those of the USA and Canada. Publication in the UK does not necessarily mean that a book will be widely available in North America and vice versa, but the markets are definitely more porous than when a translation is required. Again, however, a look at our particular case reveals that the dystopian tradition in North America is highly specific and independent of its British counterpart. Unlike in Britain, where a continuous tradition of modern literary utopia and dystopia is established in relation to Wells' oeuvre as the cornerstone, American tradition harks back at least to the 19th century. At that time, however, dystopian novels did not so much form an independent genealogy as a subset of larger utopian stream, albeit quite prominent in some instances, namely Ignatius Donnelly's *Caesar's Column* (1890) or Jack London's *The Iron Heel* (1908). This utopian stream quickly lost its prominence at the beginning of the 20th century, along with communitarian praxis,[18] and when it emerged again after World War II, dystopia became the more prominent variety, and perhaps also the variety more accepted as mainstream; utopias proper mostly emerge in the context of science fiction and take ambiguous, non-programmatic forms, perhaps with the notable exceptions of B. F. Skinner's *Walden Two* (1948) and Ernest Callenbach's *Ecotopia* (1975). The influence of genre-defining British texts is noticeable in the dystopias of the

---

15 Three Percent, a resource for international literature at University of Rochester <http://www.rochester.edu/College/translation/threepercent/index.php?s=about> 6 September 2012.
16 George Orwell, "*We* by E. I. Zamyatin", *London Tribune,* 4 January 1946, 15-16.
17 Raymond Fraser, George Wickes, "The Art of Fiction No. 24: Aldous Huxley," *Paris Review* 23, Spring 1960: www.theparisreview.org/media/4698_HUXLEY.pdf 17 August 2010
18 Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (Basil Blackwell, 1987) 92.

1950's, including their approach to the topic of media, but in that regard, a new, original theme emerges and makes it possible to draw a line between British and American dystopias. As this thesis will demonstrate, Wells', Orwell's and Huxley's principal texts are mainly concerned with electronic media as agents of disinformation, "false consciousness" and psychological reprogramming; in US texts like Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* (1953), Kurt Vonnegut's *Player Piano* (1952) or Poul Anderson's "Sam Hall" (1953), attention shifts to computer technology as means by which material reality can be not be merely catalogued, but exactly copied to the extent where clear distinction between an original and its representation disappears.[19]

Lastly, the selection from British corpus of dystopian literature remains to be elucidated. *Nineteen Eighty-four* and *Brave New World* require little explanation: As genre-defining texts, they necessarily form a cornerstone of the thesis. Reaching back to H. G. Wells' *When the Sleeper Awakes* is also led by the author's crucial role in establishing modern British tradition of both dystopian and utopian writing, *When the Sleeper Awakes* being his most clear cut dystopia (*The Time Machine* is rather a political allegory, while works like *The Shape of Things to Come* mix utopian and dystopian passages, but lack detailed focus on either due to their extended scope). Furthermore, its publication in 1899 conveniently marks the end of the 19th century;[20] without attempts at precise division of historical periods, general consensus would agree that the 20th century saw an unprecedented rise of both mass-media and totalitarian regimes and that these two developments are firmly conjoined (in the words of Marshall McLuhan, "[a]ny understanding of social and cultural change is impossible without the knowledge of the way media work as environments.").[21] In my BA thesis upon which this paper elaborates, *V for Vendetta* by Alan Moore and David Lloyd (1988) was chosen to represent the development of the dystopian genre in the second half of the 20th century, but spatial reasons, as well as new theoretical framework, precluded its substantial analysis in the MA thesis.

Other prominent works that remain on the fringe of the analysis include Well's novella *A Story of the Days to Come* (1899), which shares its fictional universe with *When the Sleeper*

---

19   A point elaborated in my earlier essay "Baudrillardian 'Real' and the Depiction of Media in American Dystopian Fiction of the 1950's" (*American SF in the Cold War*, course led by Pavla Veselá, PhD, summer semester 2011/2012)

20   Wells re-wrote the novel in 1910 as *The Sleeper Wakes*. See below for the discussion of the two versions.

21   Marshall McLuhan, *The Medium Is the Massage* (Ginko Press Inc., 2001) 26.

Awakes, and E. M. Forster's "The Machine Stops", both of which, however, fit easily with the conclusions of the thesis. Since the main frame of interpretation is defined by the theoretical line stretching from Innis through McLuhan to Baudrillard (see below), the thesis also skips fringe works with idiosyncratic relation to this frame or works that prominently suggest a different line of interpretation. Such is the case of Katharine Burdekin's *Swastika Night* (1937) and two novels by Anthony Burgess, the more properly dystopian *The Wanting Seed* (1962) and the better-known *A Clockwork Orange* (also 1962).[22] Burdekin's novel, as well as *The Wanting Seed*, call for a psychoanalytical reading in which media are depicted as manifestation of sexual forces that form the society, and to bring out this aspect, both novels introduce normative homosexuality as a central feature of their respective dystopias. *Swastika Night* portrays victorious Nazi empire several hundred years into the future, in which male bond is roughly modeled upon Greek example, while women are kept for breeding purposes in animal-like conditions and denied human rights. The impact of this policy on media is best expressed with regard to psychoanalytical distinction between written word (a means of communication by proxy, associated with the father and, by extension, with God in the religions of the book) and auditory communication (associated with mother's nursing presence). By putting one-sided stress on manliness, Burdekin's totalitarian regime disrupts the basis for effective auditory communication; at the same time, written communication is also debased, since the regime's power and re-writing of history require censorship and suppression of literacy. Burgess' *The Wanting Seed* directly invites the reader to interpret art as sublimation of "paternity lust",[23] and the overpopulated state he describes takes active steps towards elimination of sexual desire, overt use of media as vehicles for propaganda being one of them. *A Clockwork Orange*, on the other hand, is mostly concerned with language as a medium, whereas with regards to media technology, it mainly satirises idealistic notions about the beneficial effect of older media (print) and classical art (especially music).

1.4 Media

Lastly, a working definition of media remains to be articulated. In recent decades, the term has become largely synonymous with mass-media, both in theoretical writing and dictionary

---

22   Both Burgess' novels are focused on a society that is in transit towards full-fledged totalitarianism, rather than on a survey of an already established totalitarian state. Burgess' *1985* (1978) is important for this thesis as a critical analysis of Orwell's novel, whereas its original second part can be classified with *The Wanting Seed*.

23   See also Burgess' autobiographical account in Anthony Burgess, *You've Had Your Time* (Heinemann, 1990) 65.

definitions. The former can be ascribed to the fact that those media technologies that have become most wide-spread usually transmit their "message" to a wide audience, from which a much smaller set of senders is clearly separated; (mobile) telephones are a somewhat neglected exception to the rule, and within the last fifteen years, much attention has been paid to the Internet and its potential to destroy the traditional patterns in which information is disseminated. Dictionary definitions also reflect this identification of media with mass-media in both theoretical and everyday discourse, speaking of media as "the means of communication, as radio and television, newspapers, and magazines, that reach or influence people widely"[24] or "a means or agency for communicating or diffusing information, news, etc, to the public".[25] The approach taken by this thesis, however, is more akin to much broader definitions like "an intervening substance or agency for transmitting or producing an effect; vehicle".[26] One of the reasons is that the synonymy of media and mass-media arises with television as the primary impulse for the development of media studies,[27] while many important dystopian texts predate this rise. Another connected reason is that older forms of communication are often contrasted to electronic mass-media in dystopian writing. Third reason is that the line of thinking about media that has proved to be the most fruitful during the development of this thesis can be charted by the names of Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan and Jean Baudrillard, thinkers with notably broad understanding of what constitutes a medium. Especially McLuhan's definition of media as "extensions of man" sometimes seems to equate media with technology as such, in line with Freud's writing that might have influenced him.[28] The ambiguous position of media between the message they carry and the technology that enables their existence, however, is precisely why they acquire great importance for the interpretation of dystopian fiction, opening up a whole cluster of related topics. For that reason, narrower and more meticulous works of media theory (e.g. Denis McQuail's *Mass Communication Theory* or Dieter Prokop's *Der Kampf um die Medien*) are largely bypassed in favor of more speculative and wide-ranging, if less rigorous works that bring the opportunity to tackle the well-known and oft-interpreted primary sources from

---

24 "Media." Def. 2. *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Random House, Inc. 07 Sep. 2012. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/media>.

25 "Medium." Def. 5. *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 07 Sep. 2012. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/medium>.

26 "Medium." Def. 5. *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 07 Sep. 2012. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/medium>.

27 Nick Stevenson, *Understanding Media Cultures* (Sage Publications, 2002) 2.

28 Sigmund Freud, "Civilisation and Its Discontents", *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud XXI,* ed. J. Strachey (The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1976) 90-92.

inspiring and less stale angles. Furthermore, the influence of these core thinkers on the so-called "critical theory" suits the thesis, since the stance of a dystopian text towards the society it portrays is both critical and analytical by definition.

2. Media, Event, Context: Instalment of Dystopia and Its Consequences for Media

It is a common observation that utopian societies have literally achieved "the end of history", a self-perpetuating and self-repairing ideal state that does not allow for events of long-standing influence on the society as a whole. On the level of literary structure, this stasis is reflected in the synchronic focus of the text which, by its very socially descriptive character, makes introduction of a historical dimension highly problematic. Fredric Jameson likens the situation in utopian text to issues faced by theory of history: "the ever greater accumulation of facts about a given period … determines a gravitational shift from diachronic thinking (so called 'linear history') to synchronic or systemic modelling".[29] In other words, the greater the accumulation of data about utopian society, the more difficult it would be to portray their complete sum as a result of a coherent historical narrative. Instead, utopia opts for a clear rift, whether spatial, temporal or both, and the structure of a new society is established rapidly or instantaneously. "Closure alone allows system to come into being",[30] Jameson quotes Barthes' *Sade, Fourier, Loyola*, and states that "diachronic time is compressed into this single apocalyptic instant."[31] Following Jameson, history of particular utopias can be summed up by the triad "before the Event – The Event – Utopia", and the resulting utopian society can have little use for a more detailed investigation of its past: pre-Event history loses its use as "magistra vitae", since all that it could teach is incorporated into the utopian system, and post-Event history firmly moves within the system's confines.[32] An extreme formulation of this rift with historicity is provided by Jean Baudrillard, whose understanding of "catastrophe" corresponds to Jameson's ideas about the Event:

> Etymologically, [catastrophe] only signifies the curvature, the winding down to the
> bottom of a cycle that leads to what one could call the "horizon of the event," to an
> impassable horizon of meaning: beyond that nothing takes place that has meaning for

---

29   Jameson 87.
30   Roland Barthes, *Sade, Fourier, Loyola (*Paris, 1971) 23, cited in Jameson 205.
31   Jameson 187.
32   This abstraction, of course, is another instance of working definition, or rather an interpretative tool. Strictly speaking, the citizens of More's Utopia diligently keep historical records that show changing trends in their society and Bacon's Bensalem relies on scientific progress, though the application of its results is tightly regulated: "we have consultations, which of the inventions and experiences which we have discovered shall be published, and which not".
     Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. Gilbert Burnet, "Utopia by Saint Sir Thomas More – Project Gutenberg" <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2130> 16 January 2013.
     Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis,* "New Atlantis by Francis Bacon – Project Gutenberg" <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2434> 16 January 2013.

us[.][33]

This chapter follows the depiction of the Event in primary texts and the way in which dystopian media portray it, and paves the way for the following chapters, in which the triadic concept is applied to history of individual media within dystopian society.

33   Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. Sheila Faria Glaser (University of Michigan Press, 1995) 83.

2.1 *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Obscuring the Event

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the division of history into three eras described above can indeed be detected, but the Party further splits the pre-Revolutionary period into two distinct parts, "the middle ages" and "centuries of capitalism":

> Anything large and impressive, if it was reasonably new in appearance, was automatically claimed as having been built since the Revolution, while anything that was obviously of earlier date was ascribed to some dim period called the Middle Ages. The centuries of capitalism were held to have produced nothing of any value.[34]

In line with Baudrillard's postulate above, the system established by the Revolution has made other (i.e. previous) systems incomprehensible: Winston Smith knows "literally nothing about the Revolution and the years before the Revolution"[35] and ponders "the impossibility of knowing what life before the Revolution had really been like."[36] There are five main strategies at play that constitute this impossibility: eradication, modification, de-contextualisation, obscuration and re-contextualisation. Eradication seems to consist of neglect for the most part: the shabbiness of Winston's London is at least partly deliberate and intended to let the remainders of pre-revolutionary world lose prestige and ultimately disappear of their own accord. There are two notable exceptions, re-usable material ("the metal stuff's mostly been melted down")[37] and ideologically objectionable media: "the hunting-down and destruction of books" has made it "very unlikely that there existed anywhere in Oceania a copy of a book printed earlier than 1960".[38] Characteristically, Orwell gives books as the single example of destroyed media, and when he enumerates media impacted by the second strategy, that of modification, the list only includes books, pictures, statues, geographical names, dates in the records and architecture,[39] making no mention of media like film or recorded sound, whose lineage, albeit shorter, nevertheless reaches decades before the Revolution. (The reasons behind this exclusion are discussed in the following chapter.)

---

34   George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Penguin Student Editions, 2000) 89.
35   Orwell 2000, 140.
36   Orwell 2000, 67.
37   Orwell 2000, 86.
38   Orwell 2000, 88.
39   Orwell 2000, 89-90.

De-contextualisation primarily ensures that even when an information from pre-revolutionary era is encountered, it will appear meaningless or cryptic to recipients who lack a system of associations into which it could be integrated. Oral tradition offers an example: "farthings" found in an old rhyme have to be explained to Winston,[40] and the same song prompts Julia to "wonder what a lemon was".[41] Architecture offers a more direct example: As noted above, it is a subject to modification, but mostly on a nominal level of re-naming streets or re-writing dedications on memorials. The physical buildings themselves, however, pose a peculiar problem, as their different architectonic styles point to historical development of taste and technology and can therefore help citizens develop a historical understanding. The citizens do not need to acquire rigorous knowledge of architectonic history and its broader context; the Party would find it dangerous enough if they grasped the mere concept of gradual historical development, since it seeks to establish "an endless present", in which any hope for change is undesirable.[42] Its representation of history is tailored accordingly: As quoted above, any building that is "obviously of earlier date [is] ascribed to some dim period called the Middle Ages," while "the centuries of capitalism" have "produced nothing of any value." Thus, history is conveniently portrayed as a series of discrete monolithic eras where gradual change is presumably replaced by disruptive, punctuating "Events", the only directly mentioned one being Party's own revolution.

Since the idea of revolutionary change can still prove dangerous for the Party, it can be assumed that there will be attempts to diminish its suggestive potential and obscure its details, and this is in fact the Party's strategy: Regarding the revolution, "everything melt[s] into mist",[43] Winston notes. One part of the strategy consists in obfuscating the Revolution as historical event: Its precise date is constantly being pushed further into the past,[44] its principal actors are "wiped out"[45] and precise differences between the pre-revolutionary and post-

---

40   Orwell 2000, 90.
41   Orwell 2000, 133.
42   Orwell 2000, 141.
      One of the consequences of doublethink might be that habitual switching between different opinions and versions of reality (Oceania at war with Eaurasia, Oceania at war with Eastasia) instills the notion that political change is always inconsequential.
43   Orwell 2000, 35.
44   Orwell 2000, 35.
45   Orwell 2000, 69.
      Even though the Party calls its rule "English Socialism", an acknowledgment of any kind of pre-Revolutionary roots never appears in the novel, as if "the centuries of capitalism" also did not create anything of value where opposition politics are concerned. Even before the leading revolutionaries are conflated into the figure of Big Brother as the Maker, the image of Revolution as unprecedented creation is established by denial of any historical roots it might have had.

revolutionary world cannot be pinned down. It is true that Winston knows, for example, that aeroplanes were not invented by the Party, as it claims,[46] but even this uncovered lie may serve the Party's purposes, since it raises further uncertainty about the precise nature of the rift that took place between the old world and the new. At the same time, the Revolution is also being removed from history by its mythologisation, its removal from the mundane. The revolution begins to resemble religious narratives of the creation of the world: After the suppression of other leaders, Big Brother fulfils the role of the originator of the new world that could aspire to paradisical conditions, were it not for the efforts of Emmanuel Goldstein, who, like Satan, has fallen from his initial position that was "on a level with Big Brother himself"[47] according to the Party's mythology.[48] Of course, the portrayal of revolution as creation *ab nihilo* is difficult to reconcile with the attempts to blur the precise nature of revolutionary rift, but this is partly because they are intended for different audiences, the myth for those that accept official propaganda and the blurring for those like Winston who might investigate the official history critically. The non-existence of a single coherent version also further weakens the strength of any incentive that the idea of revolution could give to future coups.

The last tactic that the Party uses to neutralise media images is decontextualisation, which comes out with regards to the work of Rutherford, a caricaturist "whose brutal cartoons had helped to inflame popular opinion before and during the Revolution". His works still appear in the newspapers sporadically, still repeating the same themes and imagery, but they have become "curiously lifeless and unconvincing".[49] The reason that can be inferred is that in the post-revolutionary context, the caricatures can no longer be interpreted as such. Caricature, according to dictionary definitions, "ludicrously exaggerat[e] the peculiarities or defects of persons or things",[50] but this quality is no longer to be found in Rutherford's work, since their manner of depiction is identical to the Party's "realistic" accounts of capitalist past (Rutherford's drawings, for example, include ubiquitous top hats, and Party textbooks portray

---

46   Orwell 2000, 35.
47   Orwell 2000, 14.
48   Heather and Garry Botting, *The Orwellian World of Jehovah's Witnesses* (University of Toronto Press, 1984) xxx.
      On a side note, Winston and Julia can be said to stand for Adam and Eve, transgressing the Party's orders by extramarital sex for pleasure and by eating from the tree of knowledge represented by the Goldstein book. (That this book is a bait laid by the Party reflects ironically on the original apple in Genesis and its purpose in the garden of Eden.)
49   Orwell 2000, 70.
50   "caricature". Dictionary.com Unabridged. Random House, Inc. 19 Oct. 2012. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/caricature>.

these as a capitalist uniform that no-one else was allowed to wear).[51] It is worth noting that Winston could hardly judge Rutherford's newer works against the older, since he was a child at the time of the Revolution and his memories of the time are "mostly unintelligible" snapshots:[52] He does not recall, for example, whether top hats were really a capitalist uniform.[53]

---

51   Orwell 2000, 67.
52   Orwell 2000, 7.
53   Orwell 2000, 35.

2.2 *Brave New World*: Stages of the Event

In Huxley's *Brave New World*, dystopian society is actually portrayed as the result of a succession of prominent Events. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the Revolution, the civil war[54] and the atomic war[55] that all hit Britain remain essentially indistinguishable and their sequence (or concurrence) is impossible to establish. Huxley's World State, on the other hand, emerges from a sequence stretching from the introduction of Ford's Model T in 1908 (which becomes year zero in the new calendar with years marked A.F.),[56] through Nine Year's War of 2049-2058 (A.F. 141-150) to the first "official" use of hypnopaedia, 2122 (A.F. 214). The first stage introduces a discourse that "shift[s] the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness",[57] the second provides the catastrophic impulse after which this discourse is accepted as supreme, but still allows for opposition, and the third ensures its perpetuity. This triad can variously be applied to other dystopian novels as well. Orwell, for example, also imagines his own present as a stage during which possible future totality gestates (as Anthony Burgess demonstrates in his analysis of the novel in *1985*), but does not mark a single clear symbol or essential element of this gestation that would correspond to Huxley's use of Fordian manufacturing. Unlike Huxley, Orwell also places his narrative into the second stage of the Event, albeit its very end: Real impossibility of dissent is only expected to be brought about by the publication of "the Eleventh Edition of the Newspeak Dictionary".[58]

The paradoxical result of achieved closure in *Brave New World* is that the society of A.F. 632 can return to a limited teaching of history. Initially, the third stage of the Event included "a campaign against the Past",[59] in the course of which the establishment employed the strategy of eradication. It destroyed elements of public space that refered to the past: museums were closed, monuments blown up. Books published before the end of the war were suppressed even as hypnopaedia was being introduced widely as a measure that would firmly install consumerist society in place. The motivation of the whole operation was to abolish history, and this intent is reflected in the re-interpretation of how media relate to historical time. In

---

54   Orwell 2000. 35, 148.
55   Orwell 2000. 32, 117, 171.
56   In a world where Polish, German and French are "dead languages" (28) and which has undergone "a campaign against the past" (57), the latinate form of A.F. sounds like a deliberate joke, since Latin no longer adds respectability and weight. On Huxley's part, it is of course only one of the ironic distortions of Christianity into Fordism, but one that does not necessarily fit the wider context of the novel.
57   Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* (Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2010) 250.
58   Orwell 2000, 48.
59   Huxley 2010, 57.

Harold Innis' terms,[60] museums, monuments and libraries function as time-biased topoi devoted to the preservation of information in time, and even though their choice and representation of data is subject to ideology, they reveal the non-identity of history to the present, portraying historical continuity as a sequence of non-identical stages. In the World State, continuity is constituted in another manner with regards to media. In those that carry "cultural" content, any continuity of that content beyond basic coherence of an individual work is removed: "the plot of the film was extremely simple",[61] the reader learns about the single movie the novel describes in any detail. No cultural archive is being built to provide access to earlier works, since the economy requires constant consumption of new products from the citizens and constant use of resources from media producers; significantly, there is no mention of a serialised work or a recurring popular hero in any medium (film, cartoons...). In the resulting situation, media *content* is deliberately discontinuous, but the process of *production* (and consumption) runs continuously. Thus, Huxley portrays a double inversion: In the World State, the act of obtaining a (cultural) product is superordinate to the product itself, instead of vice versa, and the quantitative aspect of perpetual consumption is superordinate to the qualitative aspect of using a product to the utmost. Media, however, serve another function in the World State, in which the situation is opposite: Hypnopaedic education requires continuous repetition of a given message without the slightest deviation. Therefore, in the latter case, historical dimension is removed by verbatim repetition of content and, in the former, by hyper-production of content that, by design, lacks organic development in time and only serves immediate gratification. (Similarly to physical products that are designed to require frequent replacement: "This beastly wool isn't like acetate. It lasts and lasts.")[62]

Seemingly, however, the World State has rendered history so innocuous that it can be revealed in limited form, at least to students that fall into the highest Alpha caste. As seen in the first chapter of the novel, these students are one of the few groups in the World State that learn a significant amount of skills by actual studying rather than imprinting, meaning that they experience an accretion of data and knowledge in their own personal history (most citizens do not even experience the passing of time physically, by bodily marks of ageing, since modern medicine is used to provide "youth almost unimpaired till sixty, and then, crack! the end.").[63] Because this means some sense of evolution in time, students are already familiar with this

---

60   Paul Heyer, *Harold Innis* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.) 2003, 46.
61   Huxley 2010, 183
62   Huxley 2010, 131.
63   Huxley 2010, 121.

concept, and introducing them to a limited knowledge of world history does not carry significant risk of improving their idea of historicity. Most importantly, the World State has perfected the strategy of re-contextualisation to such an extent that eradication essentially becomes obsolete: Even when the Alpha-students are told about social institutions of "pre-moderns",[64] their hypnopaedic conditioning assures that they will feel revolted and that their value-system will be reinforced rather than weakened.

This does not mean that the Alphas can come into regular contact with relics of pre-revolutionary world, but rather that an occasional encounter poses no danger: Desired universal contentment would be difficult to sustain in students if they were frequently confronted with phenomena which they are conditioned to perceive as stress-factors, and Mustapha Mond's history lecture is therefore brief and delivered in a properly appalled tone. It is also important to note that the only aspects of the past that he describes in any detail are those against which his students have been directly conditioned, like family or impossibility of immediate gratification. If other aspects are only mentioned in passing, and not defined (romance,[65] pyramids, Shakespeare),[66] it is because they are not integrated into social conditioning as antitheses of appropriate pursuits. That is to say that "family" provides direct opposition to prevailing promiscuity and mass upbringing and the concept is rendered harmless, because it is clearly defined as the negative element of this dichotomy. "Shakespeare", on the other hand, has no such direct antithesis. Before Mustapha Mond could talk about Shakespeare in more depth, he would have to provide his students with more context and therefore undesirably expand upon the system of basic dichotomies that structure the World State. In that sense, older literature is eradicated and de-contextualised at the same time: It is kept hidden to preclude stressful stimuli, but at the same time, it is placed outside accepted structures of meaning. "Because, if it were really like Othello, nobody could understand it, however new it might be."[67] Even if such exceptions as Helmholtz Watson occur, it is ensured that their artistic sensitivities will not significantly influence their peers.

64   Huxley 2010, 47.
65   Huxley 2010, 45.
66   Huxley 2010, 57.
67   Huxley 2010, 242.

2.3 *When the Sleeper Awakes*: Event as Mythology

In H. G. Wells' *When the Sleeper Awakes*, the approach to the Event has two important specifics: the protagonist himself (or his body) functions as a medium and there are several version of the Event at play, since the novel portrays a dystopian ideology in flux and examines how different cliques seek to structure history. Although the novel stands at the beginning of a dystopian tradition that culminates with Orwell and Huxley, this interest in social change also means that it looks forward to Anthony Burgess' works like *1985* and *The Wanting Seed*, which rather focus on the course of revolutionary Events themselves than descriptions of static totalitarian regimes.

In *When the Sleeper Awakes*, the manner in which "power" uses Graham (the titular Sleeper) to articulate itself passes through several stages. Before his awakening, he is used as an emblem or a symbol of social order maintained by the Council, a governing body which originated from a board of trustees designed to manage Graham's accumulating property. The result is a classic "mythology" in the sense Roland Barthes uses the term:[68] The primary sign, consisting of signifier and signified ("the Sleeper" and Graham's actual identity, respectively) is, on a different level, used as a signifier for the politics of the Council and the consequences of Graham's wealth. The Sleeper signifies financial means that he neither accumulated nor put to use himself, but that had nevertheless shaped the emergent oligarchy in his name: His fortune comes partly from manufacture of moving walkways and partly from "something about pictures by machinery",[69] changed modes of transport and ubiquity of mass-media being two of the most conspicuous features of the novel's future.

Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" provides an important tool for understanding how the Council manipulates Graham's image. To describe controlled context of perception, Benjamin uses the term "aura", defined as "contextual integration of art in tradition [that finds] its expression in the cult",[70] and Graham's hall with his glass case functions as a locus of such a cult, providing the visitors with the impression that they find themselves in the very centre of power. The Council also connects itself to

---

68   Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (The Noonday Press, 1991) 113-114
69   H.G. Wells, *When the Sleeper Awakes* (Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1899) 115-116.
70   Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction", *Illuminations,* trans. Harry Zohn (Schocken, 2007) 227.

Graham by associating itself with white flags[71] that purposely recall the association of Graham and white.[72] With regards to the division of Events as outlined in the sub-chapter on *Brave New World*, however, this situation puts the Council in a difficult position. The first two stages are not problematic, although the earlier version of the novel portrays them less ambiguously than the later: In a passage deleted from the 1910 version, the first stage is clearly the Council's secret accumulation of power, after which the "culminating stroke was the introduction of flying"[73] that enabled the Council to come to power openly during the revolutionary second stage.[74] The Council, however, finds itself in a deadlock as regards the third stage: They derive their respectability from the symbol of Sleeper they have set up, but at the same time, the existence of sleeping Graham is dangerous, since it opens a possibility of his waking up and not fitting the role of an unresisting signifier any longer. To secure their power in a successful third stage, the Council would need to dispose of Graham and eliminate this risk, by which act, however, the Council would also lose the foundation of its power. The understanding of this dilemma is probably the source of a rumour that the real Sleeper has long ago been killed and replaced by his double,[75] as well as "clamour[ing] that [the Sleeper] should be awakened".[76] The Council also aims for the minimalisation of risk by restricting approach to Graham's mausoleum, which was originally open to anyone.[77]

When Ostrog organises his revolution against the Council, he uses his knowledge of this dilemma to his advantage. Although the novel never confirms it explicitly, it is suggested that Graham's awakening might be caused by Ostrog and that "It was ten to one—wake or kill".[78] Both outcomes would destabilise the Council and thus be favourable to Ostrog, but Graham's waking is more advantageous, since it allows Ostrog to turn the Sleeper from a mythologised signifier into a medium that will directly reproduce Ostrog's own agenda. The idea of turning Graham into a medium does not occur to the Council, who follow to think of him as mere signifier even after his awakening. When Graham literally bursts his bubble,[79] their overall

---

71   Wells 134.
72   e.g. Wells 43, 54.
73   Wells 159-160.
74   In the latter version, there are two ways to view these stages. The consolidation of power in the hands of the people responsible for means of communication and transportation can be understood as stage 1 and a vague "war" (and "those Martians" [*TSA* 20-21]) as traditionally violent stage two, or, alternatively, stage 2 is represented by the definitive consolidation of power and stage 1 is represented by economic and social conditions of Graham's own time.
75   Wells 111.
76   Wells 136.
77   Wells 76, 120.
78   Wells 112.
79   Wells 27.

reaction is to isolate him and ultimately attempt to poison him (though again, this is an allegation made by Ostrog's people[80] and never fully confirmed by the text itself). Ostrog uses Graham's dislocation from his previous context to change his iconic status: It is quite probable that the black robe that Graham finds upon his awakening[81] has been planted by Ostrog, as it is likely identical to the robe Graham is given for his later public appearances,[82] black being an antithesis of the Council's white and a symbol of resistance.[83] But Ostrog goes beyond this re-fashioning of Graham's "aura" and changes him from an icon into a medium, Ostrog's own public voice that, by the power of mass-media, will be able to reach further than Graham's previous space-bound exhibition in mausoleum ("all over the world myriads of myriads of people [...] will see you also").[84] As Keith Williams writes in his analysis of the novel, Ostrog only "wants the Sleeper as [...] a benign public *screen* for his repressive new regime" (my emphasis) and a "'telegenic' persona [...] a ubiquitous simulacrum".[85]

When the division of Event is considered, however, it becomes apparent that Ostrog is subject to the same inability of closure as the Council. The first stage is defined by growing public discontent which he harvests, second by Graham's awakening, but a third one that would seal his revolution is again impossible. Ostrog needs Graham to lend credibility to his regime, but at the same time, the risk of Graham's self-assertion is much stronger than before. One of the reasons is that awakening and later media appearance has freed Graham from Benjamin's "aura": Graham exactly follows Benjamin's trajectory from controlled temple-like topos to technological dissemination that destroys the original context. At least three competing images of the Sleeper emerge as a result of aura's destruction: Ostrog's, Graham's own and that of anti-Ostrog popular revolutionaries, whereas aura-bound Graham only stood for warring factions within the oligarchy. Ostrog, however, does not seem to notice the danger of Graham's self-assertion or appropriation by another ideology, and continues to see him as a mere one-way medium; seeing Graham as an actual individual whose changing opinions can have consequences would hardly allow him to let the Sleeper walk London's streets incognito and experience the reality of lower-class life for himself.[86]

---

80   Wells 77-78.
81   Wells 27.
82   Wells 93
83   "It will never do for you to wear that black. I cannot understand how it got here," one o the Council members reacts to Graham's found garment (Wells 39), while Ostrog assures him that "black is your colour" (Wells 137).
84   Wells 137.
85   Keith Williams, *H. G. Wells: Modernity and the Movies* (Liverpool University Press, 2007) 78.
86   Wells 221-245.

The fact that different sides of the power struggle seek to appropriate Graham prompts him to repeatedly ask "Who am I?".[87] When he ultimately stops seeking for another's answer and asserts himself, Williams notes that he remains "ironically [...] dependent upon mediated image",[88] as he needs to make his announcement by means of media previously exploited by Ostrog. Williams is correct in describing the text's and Graham's insight that "this unprecedented situation demands radical rethinking of the political persona and how it is projected",[89] but strangely traces the convergence of Graham's public and private self no further and does not provide details of this re-thinking. There are two main points that should supplement his analysis. First, a question arises whether Graham's ability to emancipate himself from overt external influences means an assertion of any actual coherent "self". To an extent, he merely seems to become a medium (time capsule, as it were) for commonplace morality of his era: "Much that he said was but the humanitarian commonplace of a vanished age,"[90] which is strange for a former "fanatical Radical – a Socialist".[91] Second, his certainty and his rhetorical faculties only manifest when Graham faces the cameras: "Things that he had long wished to believe, he found that he believed."[92]Up to that point, Graham's inner life is described as disorganised and uncertain, from his delirious exhaustion at the beginning to his search for his identity in the world of the future, but during the final broadcast, he suddenly turns into a determined leader. The gaze of cameras causes his complex personality to collapse into a single state, and one that is at odds with his earlier political affiliations. This gaze is therefore shown to limit the complexity of human life, and this limitation creates a feedback loop, as shown when Graham's glad remark on meeting "that type" of "manly fellow" is met with following ironic explanation: "Photographs and kinematographs[.] [...] He has studied from life."[93] In other words, simplified media images are copied by actual people who thus discard the complexity of their own personality. This is not necessarily a development brought about by dystopian future, since Graham's knowledge of "that type" might also be only second-hand and spring from mediated realities of his own age.

In terms of the Event, Graham's story resembles that of resuscitated kings: When the situation

---

87   Wells 89.
88   Williams 79.
89   Williams 79.
90   Wells 275.
91   Wells 23.
92   Wells 275.
93   Wells 167.

of the people becomes unbearable (stage 1), he awakes to assume his crown (stage 2), and Graham's role is compared to that of a king throughout, not just explicitly by Ostrog, who sees Sleeper's position as that of a constitutional monarch in oligopoly.[94] This similarity is noted by W. M. S. Russell, who draws a slightly different analogy, mainly from the final scene, comparing Graham's lonely aerial battle and ultimate demise to Béowulf's mythical fight with a dragon,[95] a parallel that also accounts for Graham's ultimate demise. To illustrate the Sleeper's acceptance of king's role, Russell quotes his following sentence: "he who takes the greatest danger, he who bears the heaviest burden, that man is King", forgets to note, however, that the speech is qualified by "so the Master was reported to have spoken".[96] The relativisation is crucial: In fact, Graham is shown to have given up on "his dream of empire"[97] as ultimately incompatible with his public announcement "All that is mine in the world I give to the people of the world."[98] To really empower the people, the ruler has to disappear, because otherwise a figure remains upon whom the ultimate power might be projected, reducing people's feelings of self-responsibility and enabling misuse of the leader's image for crowd control.[99] Graham's death, whether he seeks it or not (and if yes, whether consciously or unconsciously), thus becomes a political apex of the story, since it removes the possibility of crowning his revolutionary Event by finishing stage 3 and instating his own regime. A call to individual responsibility and empowerment stands as the ultimate message of the novel, but whether this empowerment actually takes place at the end of the story is left ambiguous, as people continue to project ideas of kingship upon Graham even after his death.

---

94   Wells 118.

95   W.M.S. Russell, "Folktales and Science Fiction", Folklore, Vol. 93, No. 1 (1982) 6.

96   Wells 291.

97   Wells 285-286.

98   Wells 276.

99   This message can also be read in the Biblical light of D. H. Lawrence's and Nietzsche's analysis of opposition between Gospel and Apocalypse: Whereas the Christ of Gospel preaches individuality, John's Apocalypse installs strict, unequivocal regime of morality that culminates in the Last Judgement. Crucially, the fact that Christ of the Apocalypse requires "all" from his followers (and everybody else) is seen as an inversion of his giving all of himself to mankind in Gospel. This dialectic is mirrored in Wells' novel when Graham says "All that is mine in the world I give to the people of the world" and his followers later threaten this emancipatory message.
Gilles Deleuze, "Nietzsche and Saint Paul, Lawrence and John of Patmos", *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (University of Minnesota Press, 1997) 36-52.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that dystopian societies in the selected works choose to portray history as divided into two major eras separated by the Event which establishes dystopian regime. The era that precedes the Event can sometimes be divided further, as in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but this division never contradicts the perception of history as a sequence of monolithic time periods in which change is provided solely by transition from one period to another. This transition (the Event), however, still represents a potentially subversive idea under regimes that seek to stretch their power into eternity. For that reason, various techniques are used to obscure any idea of historicity, including the Event. These techniques include eradication, modification, de-contextualisation, obscuration and re-contextualisation, used to varying extent in different texts: *Nineteen Eighty-Four* sees all of them used in conjunction, while *Brave New World* describes a stage at which re-contextualisation and de-contextualisation emerge as the most important techniques that, for the most part, the others merely supplement.

The Event itself can be further divided into three distinct stages, although dystopian regimes suppress this division or only reveal it to citizens who can be trusted with limited idea of historicity. First of these stages creates a situation that enables or provokes revolutionary change, second stage enacts this change and re-structures social order, and third stages seals this order for perpetuity. Different works of dystopian fiction can be situated into different stages: Although the Party portrays its victory as ultimate in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is in fact merely preparing for the third stage represented by final adoption of Newspeak. *Brave New World*, on the other hand, has already passed into third stage.

That the Event and the triadic version of history have direct consequences for media can be demonstrated on Wells' *When the Sleeper Awakes*, a novel set at a time when different parties contend for power that will enable them to establish their own triadic version of history. The consequences for media play are exemplified by the changing role of the main protagonist: First, he is an artefact shrouded in Benjamin's "aura" and his value is defined precisely by his distance from modern media technology (his extant photographs date from "a gross and a half years ago").[100] The aura is scattered by his awakening and Graham's metamorphosis into Ostrog's medium, but this shattering of aura ultimately proves instrumental in Ostrog's

---

100   Wells 120.

downfall. When Graham faces cameras on his own, however, the context-determination of aura returns in a different guise: The complexity of human personality is reduced to a coherent but impoverished fragment by technological gaze. Graham's story arc replicates the theme of political freedom and indetermination that the ending stresses, but at the same time, a possibility of such indetermined state is questioned: Graham goes through a sequence of "inauthentic" states, and death, instead of providing release, fashions him into a myth.

3. Biopower and Timelessness: Citizens as Extensions of the Governing Body

As stated in the introduction, this thesis bases its understanding of media development on Marshall McLuhan's concept of media as "extensions of man", prosthetic devices that engage, amplify or otherwise modify different physical and mental faculties. McLuhan, however, was not the first to come up with this idea, and a concise formulation can be quoted from Sigmund Freud's *Civilisation and Its Discontents*:

> With every tool man is perfecting his own organs, whether motor or sensory, or is removing the limits to their functioning.... Man has, as it were, become a kind of prosthetic God.[101]

In dystopia, this "perfection" is naturally defined by hegemonic power, meaning that it does not necessarily carry the intuitive meaning "full realisation of every individual's potential". Freud's God cannot be understood to refer to every individual man, but to the whole social milieu that determines how exactly prosthetic organs will be distributed and used. These new organs do not merely serve to manipulate the external world; to quote McLuhan, "any extension … affects the whole psychic and social complex".[102] Dystopian novels portray this complex influence in a variety of ways, but always understand it as detrimental: Implicitly or explicitly, they contain a theory of the natural structure of the human mind, against which the distorted self of dystopian citizens can be pitted. If McLuhan claims that "any invention or technology is an extension or self-amputation of our physical bodies, and such extension also demands new ratios or new equilibriums among the other organs and extensions of the body",[103] dystopian texts portray societies where these ratios have become unnatural and imbalanced. Importantly, the idea of a ratio can acquit most dystopias of the suspicion that they are deeply reactionary and distrustful of technological progress: In fact, they rather imply that progress should impact different human faculties to an extent that will establish or maintain their proper ratio.

To show that the idea of extended self does not merely apply to individuals, but also to the

---

101   Freud 90-92.
     For a meticulous discussion of McLuhan's possible influences, see "Extension", *Light Through McLuhan* <http://lightthroughmcluhan.org/extension.html> 30th October 2012.
102   McLuhan 1984, 4.
103   McLuhan 1984, 45.

"social body" of the state, Michel Foucault's concepts of "discipline" and "biopower", introduced in *Discipline and Punish*[104] and *The History of Sexuality*, respectively, and contrasted in the latter text, can prove useful. According to Foucault, power in society exerts itself upon citizen's bodies, which then become signs of this power: Uniforms, fashion or simply ascribed positions speak of the power that created them and help it articulate itself, and in that sense, citizen's body becomes a medium carrying a message, sometimes overtly so. The last chapter has discussed the way in which the protagonist of *When the Sleeper Awakes* provides a medium for Ostrog, and a recurrent element of this thesis will be to show how Wells' novel often introduces concepts that are more systematically utilised by later dystopias. The example of colour-coded uniforms is trivial: In *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* Party members wear blue overalls, there are police uniforms[105] and a special dress for the youth organisation called Spies.[106] Party version of history makes uniforms virtually synonymous with any dress – top hats and frock coats are referred to as "uniform of the capitalist",[107] while in *Brave New World*, individual castes are also identified by the colour of their garment. The use of citizens as media, however, can be far more literal than this instance in which they rather carry a token of the state's power than a fully articulated message; to return to Freud's and McLuhan's ideas quoted above, citizens are used as extensions of the "social" or "governing" body.

In *Brave New World*, for example, the idea of human being as a medium is combined with another idea present in rudimentary form in Wells, that of hypnotic teaching or mass hypnotic suggestion: In *When the Sleeper Awakes*, "[l]ittle children of the labouring classes, so soon as they were of sufficient age to be hypnotised, were thus converted into beautifully punctual and trustworthy machine minders".[108] In Huxley, citizens also become human loudspeakers when they automatically repeat hypnopaedically learnt slogans to reinforce the norms that they express. Population itself becomes a dispersed medium, in effect an extension of "the governing body", without requiring wide coverage of the World State by any technology. The reason behind discouraging loneliness ("they've had at least a quarter of a million [hypnopaedic] warnings against solitude")[109] is then to keep everybody in the proximity of an ideology-affirming medium at all times.

---

104   Michel Foucault, "Docile Bodies", *Discipline and Punish,* trans. Alan Sheridan (Vintage Books, 1995) 135-169.
105   Orwell 2000, 8.
106   Orwell 2000, 23.
107   Orwell 2000, 67.
108   Wells 197.
109   Huxley 2010, 197.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is also the case that "[i]n principle a Party member [...] was never alone except in bed,"[110] but unlike in Huxley, Oceania's citizens do not parrot Party slogans out of reflexive conviction, but rather because they are afraid not to under the conditions of permanent surveillance. Still, this conviction occurs in children (more influenced by the Party than their pre-Event born parents), in carefully orchestrated situations like Two Minutes Hate ("In a lucid moment Winston found that he was shouting with the others"),[111] and, most importantly it is the ultimate goal of Newspeak, which seeks to fashion the population into a completely transparent and reliable medium. As McLuhan points out, "the "content" of any medium is always another medium", or, more exactly, the chain ends with speech being the medium of thought.[112] In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, human body provides a vehicle for speech that in turns provides a vehicle for thought, but even thought itself serves as a vehicle for Party ideology. In the year 1984, however, there is still a possibility that dissenting minds like Winston's will introduce noise into the information, a possibility to be removed by the latest edition of Newspeak dictionary, which is to make the structure of human mind identical to the structure of official ideology, rendering transmission frictionless (save for largely mechanical issues like possible stuttering).

If the establishment seeks to use citizens as media and prevent them from spending their time alone, they also need to restrict free movement extensively (there is also another reason for this recurrent feature of dystopian texts, one related to Walter Benjamin's concept of "aura" and discussed in the chapter on electronic media). According to Foucault, "discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space",[113] the first condition of this distribution being "enclosure". In the actual world, this closure results in the creation of strictly organised topoi like asylums or barracks that provide models for the organisation of the rest of the society. To apply this understanding to utopia: In the traditional "spatial" form, utopia is understood as a comprehensively organised topos spatially segregated from the rest of the world, whereas in modern dystopias, temporary and discoursive enclosure is provided by the Event and dystopian regime represents the stage in which originally specialised application of "discipline" has become hegemonic and all-pervading.

---

110   Orwell 2000, 75.
111   Orwell 2000, 16
112   McLuhan 1984, 7.
113   Foucault 1995,141.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the inhibition of free movement is more pronounced than in *Brave New World* precisely because it is lead by the considerations of discipline, whereas Huxley introduces an extreme extrapolation of what Foucault calls "biopower". Oceania is characterised by "discipline", which Foucault describes as "the optimisation of capabilities [of the body], [...] its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls,"[114] whereas the World State is much more governed by "biopower", in which the body is seen as "imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary."[115] The biopower portrayed by Huxley can virtually disperse with disciplining altogether: Unlike eugenics, which still requires that suitable pairs (and only suitable pairs) be manipulated into producing offspring, the power of the World State is applied to embryos and infants. Even the undertaking of rejuvenating cures[116] or hand-over of one's ova to the state[117] becomes a direct result of conditioning rather than discipline. Orwell's Party, on the other hand, at most pays lip service to the idea of "biopower": The morning exercise Winston is forced to undertake obviously does not keep him in shape, seeing as he touches his own toes "for the first time in several years,"[118] experiences periodical fits of chronic cough[119] and suffers from varicose ulcers.[120] Simply put, the Party is not interested in the body of a citizen except for its role in the mechanical social structure (where it can be replaced at any time) and its capacity to experience pain. Nor is it interested in the body as a tool whose utility can be maximised for economic profit: Foucault's "optimisation of capabilities" is understood only as the heightening of people's ability to suffer. To further elucidate the difference between biopower and discipline in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it can also be mapped onto the difference between "State apparatus" and "war machine" that Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari demonstrate by contrasting chess and go.[121] State apparatus makes use of individuals whose qualities enable them to fulfill a particular task, similarly to different uses of individual chess pieces, and Huxley's World State directly "manufactures" a required number of citizens for all positions within its social structure: "We

---

114　Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (Pantheon Books, 1978) 139.
115　Foucault 1978, 139.
116　Huxley 2010, 121.
117　Huxley 2010, 7.
118　Orwell 2000, 36.
119　Orwell 2000, e.g. 22, 31, 136.
120　Orwell 2000, 36.
121　Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004) 389.

decant our babies as socialised human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons, as future sewage workers or future [...] Directors of Hatcheries."[122] Oceania, on the other hand, uses military-inspired discipline to treat its citizens as essentially interchangeable pieces whose role is defined externally by their position within social structure, like stones in go.

Just like citizens of the World State, "[i]n principle a Party member [...] was never alone except in bed,"[123] but private air-travel available to the conditioned citizens of Huxley's dystopia is unthinkable in Oceania, where absence of cars leaves citizens reliant on state-run bus lines[124] and railways and on "community hikes"[125] under incessant surveillance of others; the society is topographically rigid, maintaining separated quarters for Party Members and Proles and becoming suspicious of anyone who roams out of their usual way.[126] Such suspicious activities constitute "ownlife", a Newspeak term for "individualism and eccentricity",[127] and as Foucauldian reading would suggest, the spatial elimination of "ownlife" is accompanied by a temporal one: "Discipline [...] poses the principle of a theoretically ever-growing use of time; exhaustion rather than use".[128] In Oceania, this differentiation between exhaustion and use acquires special prominence, since the Party does not, in organising all of citizens' time, so much seek for maximal utility, but rather for maximal pronouncement of its power. "In principle a Party member ha[s] no spare time"[129] both for the reason of keeping everyone in the company of others and for the reason that the Party seeks maximal enforcement, the pleasure of exerting power being the driving force behind its existence. This might also be the reason behind the apparent sloppiness (also noted by Burgess)[130] with which Winston is not only allowed to live alone, but peruse his closet that hides him from the telescreen. Since Winston's private rebellion does not, at any time, disrupt his role as the medium of the Party's power, it might, from the beginning, be conceived by the Party as an opportunity to exercise its power in a particularly brutal way.

The use of citizens as media emerges as a prominent motif of dystopian fiction, which can seem far-fetched if narrow and strict definitions of media are taken into account, but even

---

122   Huxley 2010, 16.
123   Orwell 2000, 75.
124   Orwell 2000, 75.
125   Orwell 2000, 122.
126   Orwell 2000, 75.
127   Orwell 2000, 75.
128   Foucault 154.
129   Orwell 2000, 75.
130   Burgess 23.

theoreticians who operate with these definitions can introduce a provision that people can be seen as media under specific circumstances. Dieter Prokop, for example, first asserts that "People are not mass-media, because they put up a production rather than being produced", but concedes that even with regard to people, "we can speak about mass-media in case of deliberately produced images designed for representation or profit"[131] (his example specifically concerns churches and priests and fits well with Orwell's dictum that "A totalitarian state is in effect a theocracy").[132] After describing how citizens can be used as media and how McLuhan's theory of "extensions of man" can be extended to whole societies, this chapter now turns to McLuhan's famous idea that "medium is the message" and traces it in the primary texts, concluding that it is closely connected to the "endless present" of dystopian societies.

As shown above, this oft-noted utopian timelessness (end of history) is more fully realised in *Brave New World* than in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which might be the reason why Orwell's novel represents it by more powerful figurative images: Unlike Huxley, he cannot rely on straightforward description to make this element fully emerge. If hypnosis is Huxley's most prominent borrowing from Wells, Orwell's metaphors of the end of history utilise Wellsian images of light that are only marginally present in *Brave New World*. These images can serve to demonstrate Marshall McLuhan's concept of media impact divorced from content, since the example he reaches for to illustrate his thesis is electric light. This he describes as "a medium without a message" that is not noticed as medium "till [it] is used to spell out some brand name",[133] and this formulation shows how inextricably media are bound to technology in McLuhan's view, since, strictly speaking, pre-electric forms of light work in a similar, albeit less pronounced and ubiquitous fashion.

Huxley primarily uses electric light to suggest the concealment of natural order by technology when the "electric sky lights" of "Westminster Abbey Cabaret" outshine the stars,[134] but Wells' and Orwell's works also introduce the use of electric light as a powerful emblem of dystopian power. In *When the Sleeper Awakes*, this emblematic function mostly springs from archetypal images associated with light: Future London is roofed over and its labyrinthine architecture

---

131   Dieter Prokop, *Der Kampf um die Medien* <http://www.sgipt.org/medien/prokopgm.htm> 15 January 2013. My translation.
132   Orwell 1956, 371.
133   McLuhan 1984, 7.
134   Huxley 2010, 83.

requires perpetual artificial lighting. Natural daily cycle of light and dark is therefore disrupted by the use of technology, signalling the suppression of natural phenomena and establishment's power over them. Another archetypal function is the common symbolism of light standing for good and dark standing for evil: The fact that the establishment is in control of all city lights and uses them to its advantage symbolises how the establishment decides these binary values and can change them if necessary. It is significant that while the Council uses both darkness[135] and blinding or stroboscopic[136] light in its fight against the uprising, one of the rebels symbolically lights a giant electric lamp so that shines upon his comrades from above.[137] Glimpses of starry open sky reappear in the novel,[138] however, as reminders that the dichotomy is not really between legitimate and illegitimate use of electric light, but between natural and unnatural order.

In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the motif of light is most overtly present in the scenes that take place in the cells of the Ministry of Love, where permanent lightning again eliminates natural difference between day and night. Here, the ability of the Party to manipulate light and dark at will is also the symbol of its power to determine right and wrong, mirroring the lessons in doublethink that Winston receives during his imprisonment: Just as the Party decides whether Eurasia is an enemy or an ally or how many fingers Winston sees, it can change night into day and vice versa. Moreover, after the Party's abolishing of history described in the previous chapter, its use of electricity to eliminate daylight provides another instance of its power to manipulate time, or indeed freeze it into "an endless present" by permanently shining light-bulbs. These are emblematic of Party's approach in yet another manner: As a medium without any message, they are able to manifest power without spelling out any ideology. This absence of ideology is another crucial aspect of Oceania: In an oft-quoted passage, O'Brien informs Winston that "Power is not a means, it is an end,"[139] a pronouncement that can be read in light of John B. Thompson's *Media and Modernity*. In his book, Thompson distinguishes four types of power that function within any given society in different ratios and that are dominantly wielded by different groups that compete for their controls, these categories being political, symbolic, economic and coercive.[140] In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, however, the Party is not

---

135   Wells 98.
136   Wells 97.
137   Wells 98.
138   Wells 64, 144, 242, 295.
139   Orwell 2000, 238.
140   Thompson 12-18.

concerned with seizing a monopoly of one kind of power or their combination and giving it precedence over the other ones, as, for example, when leftist thinkers like Guy Debord see a foregrounding of economic power under capitalism. Rather, the Party seeks power without further attributes.

There is yet another media-related manifestation of the timelessness that the Party is striving for, one that can cursorily be connected to Hegel's understanding of history and its culmination. In the view of Harold Innis, also picked up and modified by Marshall McLuhan and already mentioned above, there are two basic types of media that denote a particular "bias" of a given culture: time-biased and space-biased. The former are "durable",[141] "heavy and unwieldy"[142] media, "such as stone, clay and parchment", which favour "decentralised, hierarchical societies governed by a ruling theocracy". The latter type, "such as papyrus and paper", favour "expansionist empires [...] maintained through the administrative efficacy of these portable and inexpensive media".[143] A society is stable as long as the two concerns are in balance, Innis alleges, and when this balance is inevitably disrupted, social collapse ensues. As it would seem, however, the Party has achieved the final synthesis and equilibrium: On one level, its use of space-biased media like telescreens and newspapers has led to an absolute abolishment of time and to perfect bureaucratic centralisation, but the expansionist ambition associated with it is purely illusory. The Party only seeks to hold its existing territory and propagate its power in time instead, a fact not witnessed in its use of mass-media, but of the "unwieldy" materials like "glittering white concrete"[144] of the Ministry of Truth. The time-bias of this building, however, also does not lie in its capacity to preserve information over extended periods of time, but simply in its imposing, everlasting brutality. The building is another empty signifier, mirroring the "power" that lies at the core of the Party's existence and that is not essentially attached to any particular ideology. As this chapter has demonstrated, citizens are both subjects and media of this power, while the "empty" medium of light provides its emblem.

---

141   Heyer 46.
142   McLuhan 1984, 17.
143   Heyer 46.
144   Orwell 2000, 7.

4. Typographic Spell: Written Word and Canon

The previous chapter has described how dystopian regimes fashion their citizens into media, and it follows that the possibility of self-expression is impaired or removed for such citizens. A question might also be raised whether any actual "self" remains to be "expressed", since the establishment ultimately seeks to re-fashion human mind and remove any true individuality. The mechanism of this re-fashioning is mostly dependent on electronic media, an issue which will be treated in the next chapter; this one turns to printed media (books, most emblematically) as the preferred embodiment of self-expression in dystopian fiction. This preference predictably results in the depiction of printed media as the most maimed or suppressed under dystopian regime. If triadic utopian/dystopian triadic version of history is applied to the history of printed media, it can be said that the Event that makes them complicit with totalitarian regime only comes as a result of the regime's activity, instead of printing media paving the way for the instalment of dystopia.

Orwell's essay "The Prevention of Literature" demonstrates how appalling or even unthinkable the demise of literary culture can seem to a writer of dystopian fiction. When imagining a possible end of "liberal culture", Orwell acknowledges that "a new kind of literature", untruthful and non-individual, may arise, but that its character is not imaginable at the moment.[145] Therefore, dystopian writers can only extrapolate the decline of known forms of media as it takes place during first generations under totalitarian rule, and from Orwell's perspective, this extrapolation is also writer's proper function, considering his strong accent on social impact of literature.[146] In "The Prevention of Literature", he seems reluctant at first to divide literature into categories, making it synonymous with printed media at large, but later in the essay, he gradually treats prose, poetry and journalism more distinctly, providing a list of different kinds of authorship ordered according to the succession in which they are "crippled" by "the destruction of intellectual liberty": "the journalist, the sociological writer, the historian, the novelist, the critic, and the poet",[147] a sequence which the following paragraphs trace in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

The "crippling" of particular kind of authors does not necessarily translate into diminishing

---

145   Orwell 1956, 376.
146   "[L]iterature is an attempt to influence the viewpoint of one's contemporaries by recording experience." Orwell 1956, 373.
147   Orwell 1956, 376.

impact of their medium. Journalists are the first victims, but according to "The Prevention of Literature", newspapers themselves, unlike belles-lettres, will only be replaced when "television technique" reaches "a higher level".[148] Therefore, their existence in the world of perfected telescreens is probably anachronistic, since daily newspapers, as opposed to telescreens, have the distinct disadvantage of being constantly re-written to comply with the momentary stance of the Party. It becomes difficult to account for the fact that old newspapers are archived in Oceania,[149] or indeed the fact that they still exist as a medium. Rather than following his society to utmost conclusions, Orwell's purpose here seems to be poetic, all the more so when we note how little he hesitated to leave out significant or emerging technological and social phenomena of his time, like automobile or telephone (not even present as McLuhan's "status symbol" of Soviet Russia).[150] Although the ultimate demise of newspapers still lies ahead in the novel's 1984, the medium has long since been deprived of its very nature, which lies in the way it constantly adds new information to those previously brought and in the way it constantly shifts its focus to reflect changes in the external world. Newspapers serve as a reminder of the changes in society and its contemporary focus and to provide a possible way of tracing these back in the archives. The Party can have no use for such a reminder in an unchanging, and indeed timeless world it seeks to create (see previous chapter), and neither for journalists who could reveal the real nature and purpose of this changelessness: The press has lost its function of "the watchdog of democracy", an institution that seeks for the truth regardless of what the current government claims it to be.

This flow and accumulation of information in the newspaper is not exclusively diachronic, but also synchronic. According to Marshall McLuhan, the distinguishing quality of newspapers is their variety and inconsistency, the mosaic of life made visible on the page that makes it "inseparable from the democratic process",[151] an idea that can also be traced back to Walter Benjamin, for whom "the principles of journalistic information" include, "above all, lack of connection between the individual news items".[152] To Orwell, this synchronic impact of the very form of newspaper is negligible or non-existent, as witnessed by his denunciation of undoubtedly mosaic "rubbishy newspapers containing almost nothing except sport, crime and

---

148   Orwell 1956, 376.
149   e.g. Anthony Burgess, *1985* (Hutchinson & Co., 1978) 46.
150   McLuhan 1984, 24.
151   McLuhan 1984, 209.
152   Walter Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire", *Illuminations,* trans. Harry Zohn (Schocken, 2007) 158.

astrology"[153] and aimed at the Proles. The adjective "rubbishy" is telling, because it creates a rift between the tabloids and *The Times*, the only Party daily mentioned (and possibly existent), the contents of which thus acquire a more elevated status, despite all unsympathetic portrayal. *The Times* are not despicable for their subject matter, which largely copies conventional composition of traditional newspapers (political caricatures,[154] news,[155] analysis[156] and forecasts or "prophecies",[157] as far as can be gathered), nor for the fact that they invariably express a fixed, non-diversified point of view, but for the fact that this point of view does not reflect writers' true individuality and the reality of the world. This observation is in line with the book's sympathetic depiction of individualist, literary culture, as it is precisely the literary men who, according to McLuhan, demand that newspapers "present a fixed point of view on a single plane of perspective".[158] In *Understanding Media*, the origin of this demand is traced back to pre-telegraph journalism of *Tatler* and *Spectator*,[159] consistently with Orwell's admitted Restoration frame of reference and his admiration of Swift, *Tatler*'s contributor.

Orwell, then, perceives honesty, individuality and social responsibility as defining qualities of literature. To show how Oceania has destroyed this function in belles-lettres, he borrows an image from *Gulliver's Travels*, the "book that has meant more to [him] than any other book ever written".[160] Namely, he recontextualizes Swift's Laputian "thinking machine" that allows anyone to write "books in philosophy, poetry, politicks, laws, mathematics, and theology, without the least assistance from genius or study" by means of mechanically rotating pieces of wood with individual word written on the sides.[161] Orwell's "big kaleidoscopes",[162] however, do not share the grand, if ridiculous aim of Swift's machine and the baroque contraptions it satirises, that is, creating new ideas or at least inspiring them: They only serve the task of producing mind-numbing literature, not allowing in the slightest for creativity and fantasy

---

153   Orwell 2000, 41.
154   Orwell 2000, 70. As discussed in the previous chapter, it is doubtful whether one can speak of caricatures in a world where the hegemonic ideology uses grotesque imagery as supposedly realistic portrayal of its enemies.
155   Orwell 2000, 134.
156   Orwell 2000, 71.
157   e.g. Orwell 2000, 39.
158   McLuhan 1984, 206.
159   McLuhan 1984, 204.
160   George Orwell, "An Imaginary Interview", *Orwell: The Lost Writings* (Arbor House, 1985) 112.
161   Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (Book Sales, Inc., 2009) 174.
162   Orwell 2000, 97.

(only sentimental songs[163] and pornographic literature[164] distributed to the proles are explicitly said to be created this way, but there is no reason to doubt other forms of trivial literature for different audiences are manufactured by similar means). The fact that there only are six distinct plots ironically echoes the saying that "there are only [n] plots in the world", commenting on it as mechanistic and reductionist. In Orwell's vision, this reduction is part of the Party's tactics against individual creative pursuit, as even "the literary"[165] are only allowed to polish the "roughed-in"[166] plots of the novels, just as all Winston's creative input in his job lies in acceptable rendering of new official illusions delivered to him; he is not even allowed his own personal style, but rather is granted his position for being able to write in the "familiar style"[167] of official communication. The lost connection between an individual author and the text is also highlighted by the use of a "speak-write", a machine that further de-problematises the state's task by lowering the citizen's functional literacy and the likelihood of keeping subversive records, as well as by bringing the spoken language close to its written form as codified in the dictionary of Newspeak. When Julia hands her note to Winston, it is not only its content that renders it subversive, but also the fact that it has been scribbled by hand (an "unformed" hand).[168]

What disappears from Oceania's literature along with the concept of authorship[169] is the idea of literature as a personal communication device: The author's side of this communication has been undone and replaced by its ever-repeating mechanical parody. A text does no longer bridge its author and the reader, but becomes a mere tool of social control, which is also true of texts that appear subversive in their content. Winston is allowed to project his ideas of what a book should be into the "Goldstein's Book": It has an identifiable, individual author (Big Brother and Goldstein are indeed the only two remaining figures, or rather personas, to whom the official version of reality still ascribes considerable individual vision); it provides its own vision of reality clearly and without resorting to doublethink; among its readers, it constitutes a community of people based on critical reflection of the world; its contents remain unchanged. The disillusion that ensues springs as much from the fact that not all of these

---

163   Orwell 2000, 97.
164   Orwell 2000, 119.
165   Orwell 2000, 119.
166   Orwell 2000, 97.
167   Orwell 2000, 44.
168   Orwell 2000, 99.
169   Unfortunately, Orwell does not inform the reader whether fictional authors are invented for the novels, as they are in 1954 TV adaptation; either case would provide interesting grounds for further interpretation. (*Nineteen Eighty-Four*, prod. Rudolph Cartier, dir. Rudolph Cartier, 1954, 47 min. 30 sec.)

points are true as from the realisation that some are, but have been appropriated by the official machine to its own ends. The book is in fact a careful mix of self-evident facts, accurate description of post-Event world and false hints at the possibilities for revolution, designed to identify potentially problematic citizens, a circulating image functioning as a bait.

The perversion of the nature of books goes further: The very history of the world is compared to an eternally vandalised palimpsest,[170] in which metaphor the crucial connection between the destruction of written word and civilisation in general is highlighted. This image, however, also highlights the fact that Orwell's approach to typographical culture is based on a more fundamental reverence for handwriting. Despite the elevated position that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* ascribes to typographical culture and communication, even "the invention of print" is ultimately a corruption of writing and "made it easier to manipulate public opinion", as per Goldstein book.[171] The way in which Winston asserts his self confirms this point of view, since his expression of his hate for the Big Brother comes via the lonely medium of hadnwritten journal. Winston reflects on the impossibility of reaching anyone through his notes, later to find almost any human communication impossible (he can not obtain any information from an old drunk;[172] he cannot properly share his anti-Party views with Julia); the act of writing a diary is therefore not communicative, but existential. Winston establishes his self and his medium in struggle against propaganda: His first note in the diary is a mere reduplication of a trivial film in writing and of associated events and feelings he is supposed and pressed by the Party to feel,[173] i.e. he remains a mere medium for Party ideology. Only later does he manage, by contrasting his own slogans and concepts against the official ones, to find his rebellious identity and create an original, non-derivative work. This is a crucial step in a world where the very notion of original is lost, removed not only by prevalence of endlessly copied works that only exist in multiplicity,[174] but also by the removal of historical dimension that is necessary to establish the relationship between an original and a copy or a derivative (newspapers). Winston demonstrates individual thought in a world where state propaganda seeks to replace it by mere mirroring of the social structure, which replacement is to be finished when Newspeak becomes the only language of Oceania and the social structure will

---

170 Orwell 2000, 38.
171 Orwell 2000, 185.
172 Orwell 2000, 81-84.
173 Orwell 2000, 11.
174 In that sense, telescreen broadcasts precisely fit Baudrillard's definition of simulacra of the second order (Baudrillard 1995, 126-127).

be defined in terms of the language its inhabitants will use as a tool of thinking of it, which, rather than thinking, will be an eternal reduplication. This void in turn mirrors its counterpart at the centre of the social structure: While the figure of a leader and an ideological cause are supposed to represent this centre, there is in fact nothing but the eternally working mechanism of power without higher purpose.

To connect *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with other primary texts, this thesis now turns to the problem of canon. Writing and literature are exceptionally suited for the creation of canons, doubly so since the invention of print: Until the advent of electricity, print has been virtually unique in it position of a medium capable of creating a series of copies that were not perceived as mere corruptions or derivatives of the original work. Printed word had a unique position when contrasted to other media: Paintings or other works of fine art circulated in toilsome copies or, later, color-insufficient photographs; print has certainly helped the circulation of music in the form of notation, but consensual notation was slow to develop and the interpretation of music remained labor- and skill-intensive. Printed word, on the other hand, could reach comparatively large audiences that would engage in debates regarding the merits of individual works and decide their popularity or lasting influence. In specifically British context, E. Dean Kolbas sees the 18th century as a time when "a national pantheon of writers began to form",[175] which provides a clear connection with Orwell's frame of reference. In Orwell's own words:

> Philosophers, writers, artists, even scientists, not only need encouragement and an audience, they need constant stimulation from other people. It is almost impossible to think without talking. If Defoe had really lived on a desert island, he could not have written Robinson Crusoe, nor would he have wanted to.[176]

That Orwell's understanding of literature is bound to the debates of literary public can also be shown on the example of the Goldstein Book. Its role in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* suggests that although books commonly denote continuity and human memory, it is not so much because written word outlives its originator, since it still can be suppressed, falsified or de-contextualised. Rather, it is the continual debate stimulated by literature that ensures the continuity of context and embodies it in a lasting, though not necessarily unchanging canon.

---

175   E. Dean Kolbas, *Critical Theory and Canon* (Westview Press, 2001) 19.
176   George Orwell, untitled column from Tribune, *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters: As I Please, 1943-45* (Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1968) 89.

In *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon*, E. Dean Kolbas provides an illuminating classification of critical approaches to literary canon, one that can be used to situate the way in which authors and dystopian establishments they describe approach the idea of canon (as suggested in the preface of this thesis, the value which the texts themselves and the dystopian regimes attribute to the idea of canon is markedly different). Kolbas discusses three main justifications for literary canon in contemporary debate, only the latter two of which he considers "fully formed theories":

> **1)** According to William Bennett, canon should uphold the "highest shared ideals and aspirations, and [...] heritage"[177] of Western civilisation against the forces of increasingly relativist academia (Lynne Cheney, Roger Kimball and Hilton Kramer are listed as his important followers). Kolbas is quick to reveal their attitude as a defense of the status quo and traditionally interpreted Enlightenment ideals that supposedly transcend ideology, unlike the ideals of their agenda-driven detractors.
>
> **2)** For Harold Bloom, the continuity of literary context is important, but it is created by mutual influence or dialogue among writers themselves and conducted via their works, rather than by discussions within the literary public. Bloom sees the importance of canon in that it allows the reader to "confront greatness", which Kolbas calls "isolated individualism":[178] the importance of canon is mainly to facilitate this confrontation for individual readers and writers.
>
> **3)** Frank Kermode, who, in Kolbas' account, sees canon as one tool for "describing, understanding and reconstructing history", its "import hing[ing] on practical necessity".[179] The process itself is assured by constant critical re-assessment and detailed interpretation of works that warrant such attention because of the copious amount of interpretations they offer.

None of these accounts seem suitable for dystopian societies, and it might therefore be expected that these societies do not endorse literary canons or that they introduce new reasons for upholding them. **3)** is undesirable for dystopian establishments because the stress it lays on historical dimension runs counter to desired dystopian timelessness and fixed values. It is

---

177   Kolbas 27.
178   Kolbas 32.
179   Kolbas 32.

possible that a dystopian state keeps a carefully chosen selection of works that illustrate the rudimentary version of history that it retains, but even then, Kermode's emphasis on constant re-assessment would not fit into the framework of interpretation upheld by establishment. **2)** also overtly stresses the historical dimension of canon, undesirable after the abrupt rift of the Event. Even more importantly, its emphasis on individual experience would challenge the highly collectivist or de-individualising principle of dystopia (i.e. compromise readers' function as media). **1)** could seem the most suited for dystopian societies if the values promoted by the establishment replaced the ideals of Enlightenment, but in *Brave New World*, prominent stress on a narrow selection of works would in fact run counter to the needs of constant distraction and production, and in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it could overly and undesirably emphasise the ability of media to fix information.

Despite this, Orwell's Party ostensibly still upholds a canon markedly resembling that which preceded its existence: Syme speaks about "Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron"[180] and the appendix names "Shakespeare, Milton, Swift, Byron, Dickens, and some others". The reason given is that "[c]onsiderations of prestige made it desirable to preserve the memory of certain historical figures, while at the same time bringing their achievements into line with the philosophy of Ingsoc."[181] To "bring them in line", the works are re-written in Newspeak, so that they are made to conform to the fixed world-view inherent in the new language, a process that is actually a grotesque exaggeration of **1)**. Kolbas criticises Bennett on the grounds that his understanding "works at the expense of any critical engagement with canonical works, whose specific content might not simply affirm the idea of a singular tradition and may even have critical functions itself".[182] In other words, Bennett's opinion effaces variability within the canon, a task to which the Party takes quite literally. Considering the ease, however, with which the Party can create false idols and erase actual persons, the tedious task of ideologically re-writing classical literature into Newspeak and thus pushing the "final adoption" of new language into 2050[183] appears unnecessary if carried out for mere prestige. The upholding of canon also fits uneasily with the Party version of history: Are all canonical writers relegated to the Middle Ages, or are they allowed to have existed in "the centuries of capitalism" that have "produced nothing of any value"? Most probably, the "prestige" that the text itself ascribes to written word simply contaminates the description of Oceania's regime,

---

180   Orwell 2000, 50.
181   Orwell 2000, 281.
182   Kolbas 27.
183   Orwell 2000, 281.

but other possibilities offer themselves: The motif might hint at divergent streams within the Party regarding the approach to history and cultural archive; it might be introduced as a poetic image illustrating the degradation of books and belonging rather to the "poetic" than the "political" level of the text; and lastly, it might obscurely allude to a kinship between the values of the text and the Party, opening up a possibility of deconstructive reading.

Despite the undesirability of canon for dystopian regime, the establishment paradoxically offers itself as the most natural element through which the problem of canon can be introduced into the text. Unlike citizens, who are discouraged from forming any idea of historicity, the government retains the knowledge of historical development and facts, or even otherwise banned historical artifacts: Huxley's Controller, for example, keeps his library of pre-Event works in a safe, with religion as his "great", but obviously not single interest (significantly, his "avowed library" of orthodoxies contains "books [...], reading-machine bobbins and sound-track rolls", while the secret one only includes physical volumes,[184] despite the Event being situated in 2058). Individual protagonists, on the other hand, encounter at most a very limited set of pre-Event texts, but their reaction to these can actually be understood to affirm modern Western literary canon: e.g. when the protagonists are confronted with Shakespeare, they recognise his merit without having any pre-conception of his greatness, meaning that the formation of canon is presented as a result of the work's inherent quality rather than externally imposed ideological selection. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, "Shakespeare [...], mysteriously but effectively, stands in a shorthand for all that Winston and Orwell treasure",[185] to quote Margaret Drabble. The mystery here is how can Winston know of Shakespeare and associate him with his beautiful, sensual dream of the past, from which he wakes uttering the Bard's name.[186] It is precisely the implausibility of this knowledge, however, that exalts Shakespeare the most: In the quoted scene, he emerges from Winston's subconscious dreamscape as a sort of Jungian archetype.[187] In other words, Orwell inverts the praise that Shakespeare commonly receives: If Shakespeare is often said to be "for all time" and to include all humanity, Orwell also suggests that all humanity includes Shakespeare, even when the Party relegates him into collective un-conscious.

---

184 Huxley 2010, 254.
185 Margaret Drabble, "Of Beasts and Men", *On "Nineteen Eighty-Four": Orwell and Our Future,* Abbott Gleason, Jack Goldsmith, Martha C. Nussbaum eds. (Princeton University Press, 2005) 48.
186 Orwell 2000, 31.
187 At one point, Winston muses about "some kind of ancestral memory" he might posses (Orwell 2000, 56).

In Huxley's *Brave New World*, a volume of Shakespeare's collected plays is explicitly upheld against the culture of synthetic media discussed in the next chapter. This symbol embodies several phenomena antithetical to the order of World State: tradition, emotional variety, intellectual effort (which is both signified by the use of constraining blank verse and required from the reader to make sense of uncommon and archaic language), and, not least, a chance to bring a particular sense (sight) into intensive focus. As the following chapter will demonstrate, the use of electronic media in the World State seeks to engage human sensorium as a whole and disrupts precise division of human senses and mind; because of that, book-form, although a medium secondary to Shakespeare's work, stands in sharper contrast to brave new world's entertainment than theater would with its engagement of sight and hearing. It cannot be said, however, that a coherent Shakespearean world-view is contrasted to the foundations of the World State. As mentioned above, it is often noted that Shakespeare's work does not represent any such coherent opinion, but is rather admirable for the width and variability of its representation.[188] As a narrative element, the Savage is successful in voicing this multiplicity and making it an element of the novel, but as a character, he is finally unable to accommodate the demand that he, a single person, should in his self preserve all emotional variety of mankind; in other words, such emotional synthesis is impossible, unlike World State's all-embracing sensory synthetism. The situation of the actual world is reversed here: Instead of persons experiencing particular feelings from the variety their discourse offers, a single person embodies this multiplicity against unified society.

Furthermore, the Savage is not only a stranger in cultural and spatial sense, both among natives and "civilised people", but also a traveler from typographical past who ironically ends his life precisely in loneliness and non-involvement that, according to McLuhan, written media allow. Huxley, however, has chosen Shakespeare precisely to avoid one-sided representation of printed word as a medium that allows detachment. Such detachment would be signified by choosing a novel: In the words of Walter Benjamin, "the reader of a novel [...] is isolated, more so than any other reader". Shakespeare, however, introduces an element of poetry and therefore a link to inclusive oral culture, since "even the reader of a poem is ready to utter the words, for the benefit of the listener".[189] In the context of dystopian society, Shakespeare then represents a synthesis that can, on the one hand, provide private enjoyment

---

188   e.g. Jerome Meckier, "Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley", Shakespeare Quarterly, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Spring, 1971), 134.

189   Walter Benjamin, "Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov", *Illuminations,* trans. Harry Zohn (Schocken, 2007) 100.

and spiritual nourishment, but, on the other hand, does not fully isolate its readers like a purely prosaic narrative would, inviting them, by musicality and quotability of Shakespeare's verse, to share their reading experience with others.[190] Accordingly, the civilisation that the Savage seeks to be a part of is that of varied individuals in Shakespearian interaction, and unified World State offers no sense of belonging. Huxley's use of Shakespeare therefore fulfills a function that is similar to Orwell's references to the origin of newspapers: In both cases, these motifs suggest variety of human experience and self-expression that is lacking under dystopian establishment.

In H. G. Wells's proto-dystopian novel *When the Sleeper Awakes*, no reference to Shakespeare is found, but society's changing attitude to literature is also demonstrated on texts already available in the author's time and again suggests the primacy of literary canon as established before the Event. Literature, it is true, has all but vanished from future society and has been reduced to empty tradition (Poet Lauerate who "of course" writes no poetry)[191] or famous names that are arbitrarily used to give legitimacy to empty and emotionally manipulative, but "attractive" education of women;[192] another scene, however, provides greater insight into the way literature of earlier era reverberates in future Britain. In the room where he is imprisoned by the Council, Graham examines a machine and thinks that what is described as "peculiar double cylinders" might be "books, or a modern substitute for books".[193] On closer inspection, the machine is revealed to be a kind of personal video-player with cylinders as the medium; they are labeled in "phonetic spelling", or "mutilated English" that remains intelligible to Grahams because the medium of film is said to have "fix[ed] the language",[194] just as the invention of printing did once (distinct class-accents survive, suggesting different media exposure). This description is reminiscent of Orwell's fear of language simplification and rigidity and suggests early on that the reader is presented with an inferior medium. Although the protagonist is clearly captivated by the machine, it is still referred to as "the latter-day substitution for the novel",[195] and its derivative nature is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that all films introduced in the text are adaptations of literary works. In *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*, Raymond Williams introduces an idea that can explain this

---

190   Huxley 2010, 199.
191   Wells 166.
192   Wells 168.
193   Wells 60.
194   Wells 65.
195   Wells 64.

derivative nature and will later prove useful for the interpretation of Orwell's attitude towards electronic media: "Unlike all previous communications technologies, radio and television were *systems primarily devised for transmission and reception as abstract processes, with little or no definition of preceding content*. When the question of content was raised, it was resolved, in the main, parasitically." (original emphasis)[196]

Perhaps because "the cylinders" are not real-time broadcast media, but devices intended for re-playable content, they do not parasitically feed on public events and theatre, as Williams would suggest 75 years after Wells, but primarily on literature. Interestingly enough, the protagonist knows Kipling's "The Man Who Would Be King", one of the adapted works, but observes that two other stories mentioned are "no doubt [...] by post-Victorian authors",[197] and, as such, were only created after his falling into a coma. Those stories, however, are *The Heart of Darkness* and "The Madonna of the Future", the former first serialised some three years after the protagonist's falling asleep, still during Victoria's reign,[198] and the latter not a post-Victorian story, but most probably a work by Henry James, published in 1873 and perhaps baffling the protagonist with its title to comic effect. Graham regards "The Man Who Would Be King" as "one of the greatest stories in the world",[199] while the film he plays is emotionally striking, but regarded with reservations, as witnessed in phrases such as "flashes of dubious enlightenment", "the end has been a tragedy that oppressed him" and evasive "its intense realism was undeniable",[200] a statement that should be read in light of Graham's later "I want reality [...] not realism".[201]The absence of books, newspapers or writing materials in

---

196 Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (Routledge, 2003), 18.
197 Wells 62.
198 In fact, *When the Sleeper Awakes* and *Heart of Darkness* were first serialised practically at the same time, and the serialised version of Wells' novel does not include references to either Conrad or James. These were only added when the book was published as single volume.
See detailed historical account in Linda Dryden, "A Note on *When the Sleeper Awakes* and *Heart of Darkness*" <http://researchrepository.napier.ac.uk/2632/1/HD_and_Sleeper_Notes_and_Queries.doc> 9 December 2012.
199 An instance of the novel's self-reflexiveness, as both the story and the novel are concerned with "study [of] what occurs to a man who finds himself moved from private to public life, that is, when such a man, hitherto a private person, is endowed with "powers and functions and rules,"" as Frederick R. Karl describes Wells' literary "plan". (Frederick R. Karl, "Conrad, Wells, and the Two Voices", PMLA, Vol. 88, No. 5 [Oct., 1973], 1054)
The connection between Kipling's and Huxley's story is also supported by Graham's king-like role discussed above. Surprisingly, self-reflexive intertextuality is more prominent in Wells than in later, more modern texts hitherto analyzed, as further evidenced by the fact that Graham is "a Socialist" and an author of pamphlet including "one or two prophecies[,] some of them already exploded, some of them [...] established facts" (Wells 23), a description by which the novel itself limits its prophetic aspirations.
200 Wells 63-64.
201 Wells 219. The full quote is only present in the older version, the newer reduces it to the first clause, only

the room indicates a shift in dominant media and places Graham in the role of a passive recipient.

Since Wells only names three of the films from "one entire side of the [...] room [...] set with rows of [cylinders]",[202] it cannot be determined by what system they are ordered and whether they all spring from Victorian models, let alone whether such situation results from Victorian literature's eminence or from attempts to accommodate the Sleeper. The film Graham watches also might or might not be an adaptation of previously existing work of literature, but in any case, James' and Conrad's work are put into somewhat negative light by being associated with it. Here, the text reflects Wells' assessment of the two writers as "powerfully receptive types" of "luminous impressions" who nevertheless "[start] off at a dozen points [...] uncoordinated";[203] the word "luminous" suggests that the effect of their writing is similar to that achieved by film. Even tough their presence in the future is a mark of at least some enduring influence of Victorian literature, it also betrays a slightly pessimistic view of the new society's taste.[204] Still, it is likely that their works have been mistreated in the process of adaptations, since two hundred pages later, the stronger to suggest the power of media and expose Ostrog's licence, even Kipling's public image is distorted to represent him as a bard of "Negroes".[205] The willful nature of this distortion demonstrates that Wells does not see the deformation of literary works by changing society as a one-way influence, but rather a feedback loop in which purposely warped works can in their turn exert influence upon society: Kipling's songs raise the Negroes to blood-thirsty frenzy.

To sum up, all three works endorse the idea of canon and, by extension, literary tradition. The dystopian regimes they depict, on the other hand, either distort the canon (Wells) or suppress it (Huxley); Orwell picks up on both his predecessors and lets Oceania use both approaches, even though no clear connection between these seemingly antithetical methods is suggested. Books are virtually the only canon-forming medium represented, something that later dystopian works challenge: In *V for Vendetta*, for example, the main protagonist does not only collect works from all varieties of media, but also uses them to build comprehensive archive

---

resulting in a minor de-emphasis in the overall context of the dialogue.
202   Wells 62.
203   Karl 1049.
204   Wells 60.
205   Wells 229.

rather than selective canon.[206] Whereas for Huxley or Orwell, the canon as embodied by Shakespeare came into being in unrestrained debates of the literary public and is capable of including all human experience, for V, the formation of canon is always ideological and narrows the range of this experience.

---

206   e.g. Alan Moore, David Lloyd, *V for Vendetta* (Vertigo, 2008) 9, 166.

5. Substitutes for Books: Electronic Media and the Return of Aura

The last part of previous sub-chapter suggests that later dystopias might follow Wells in depicting technologically advanced media as derivative (relying on adaptations of canonical works of literature) or downright deleterious both to art (in their technologically enabled "realism") and society (largely because of the rift with tradition that they create and that enables the establishment to dictate their interpretation). A less clear-cut reading will be suggested in the last part of this sub-chapter, but for now, this distinction will prove useful for opening up the interpretation of later texts. Both Huxley and Orwell view electronic media as dangerous innovation that threatens to destroy the natural order of the human mind; in both novels, the treatment of electronic media is also markedly topical for the time they were written, providing the most direct link to the realities of the authors' time.

The medium of "telescreens" is the most apparent instance of the pervasiveness of electronic media in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s Oceania, and they are commonly understood as Orwell's extrapolation of what the newly emerging TV broadcasting might evolve into. The establishment has made the telescreens ubiquitous to such an extent that when electrical current is cut off artificially "in preparation for Hate Week", the telescreens remain on,[207] an unquestioned, permanent part of the world of the novel. It is, however, worth noting that the real horror of the telescreen is not the images it transfers, but the sound. The image can be "dimmed",[208] perhaps to give people an illusion of freedom and control over the machine; this can be allowed, as they are all the same required to keep their eyes off screen to do work and as simple looking away would serve the same purpose. The sound, however, can only be "[sunk] somewhat", leaving the words "still distinguishable"[209] and keeping "every citizen [...] for twenty four hours a day [...] in the sound of official propaganda."[210] With the exception of the "Two Minutes Hate",[211] very little description of the telescreen images is provided throughout the novel: In terms of visual propaganda, much more space is given to various posters, and it is not the images, but the sounds the telescreens produce that serve to

---

207   Orwell 2000, 5.
       Burgess finds it hard to imagine there are two separate power-grids (Burgess 22), but even if their installation was beyond the Party's power, they are not strictly required, since a remotely controlled switch will suffice.
208   Orwell 2000, 5.
209   Orwell 2000, 5.
210   Orwell 2000, 186.
211   Orwell 2000, 13-19.

characterise them. This characterisation is for the most part found in the first third of the novel, where dismal nature of future Britain is portrayed and corresponding qualities are ascribed to the telescreens: The sounds they produce are annoying ("hideous, grinding speech",[212] "ear-splitting whistle",[213] "shrewish voice",[214] "piercing whistle",[215] "the telescreens bruised your ears",[216] "brassy female voice" seems to "stick into [Winston's] brain like jagged splinters of glass"),[217] inconsistent and vague ("babbling away",[218] referring to the telescreens' sounds as "stuff",[219] the same word used elsewhere to describe distasteful food),[220] distracting ("with the voice from the telescreen nagging at his ears he could not follow the train of thought further"),[221] impersonal almost to the degree of natural elements (words and music "stream out",[222] "pour out",[223] "trickle"[224] from the telescreens). The resulting distraction does not only concern hearing, but all man's capacities: Intense stimuli of particular senses trigger defensive mechanism of overall numbing, as McLuhan observes.[225] [226]

The last set of items in the list provides another illustration of how integral a part of the world telescreens have become, and as a whole, the list illustrates the overall spiteful way in which they are portrayed: They have no redeeming quality, no subversive use, and provide an ideal vehicle of propaganda that does not need to be re-written, unlike newspapers, and that exploits recipient's emotional response instead of cognitive faculties. In his *Orwell's Revenge: 1984 Palimpsest*, Peter Huber provides exhaustive evidence that in Orwell's thinking, this negative view extends to all electronic media, telescreen being an obvious embodiment of "the logical end of the machine age", in fact "the phonograph, film camera, and radio

---

212   Orwell 2000, 13.
213   Orwell 2000, 31.
214   Orwell 2000, 35.
215   Orwell 2000, 59.
216   Orwell 2000, 68.
217   Orwell 2000, 93.
218   Orwell 2000, 6.
219   Orwell 2000, 55.
220   e.g. Orwell 2000, 104, 111.
221   Orwell 2000, 94.
222   Orwell 2000, 55.
223   Orwell 2000, 55.
224   Orwell 2000, 259.
225   McLuhan 1984, 31.
226   A device picked up later by Kurt Vonnegut in his short story "Harrison Bergeron"; Orwell's variant is more devious in that it does not only disrupt though by bursts of random noise, but by incessant propagandist attack on subconsciousness. Kurt Vonnegut, "Harrison Bergeron", *Welcome to the Monkey House* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1998) 7-15.

transmitter rolled into one".[227] Two years before the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Mark Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno expressed similar distaste in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* when they described television as "synthesis of radio and film" that betrays "thinly veiled identity of all industrial products" and ideologically homogenised discourse this identity effects.[228]

Yet, Huber acknowledges, "[r]adio is the worst of all" for Orwell,[229] and this identification of telescreen with radio rather than television points to a wider tendency in the novel. Orwell's depiction of modern media does not so much refer to situation after World War II, but reaches for imagery from an earlier stage of development, as exemplified by Orwell's depiction of cinema and "Two Minutes Hate", which resemble anecdotal accounts of people over-reacting when first confronted with film projection.[230] The films screened in Oceanian cinemas also resemble "the cinema of sensation" in that they are virtually non-narrative, and they also hark back to silent cinema, as the little story they retain is exclusively told through imagery and the soundtrack is limited to sound effects with no dialogues.[231] This retrograde depiction of modern media could be seen as a part of deliberate "dumbing down", for which the Party reduces even modern media to their more primitive form, but given the context of Orwell's writing, it rather appears that his goal is to show that the negative role modern media play is not due to their corruption in the dystopian state, but is already present in their rudimentary forms, i.e. that the Event which determines the negative impact of these media is close to (or identical with) their very conception. It cannot be said that Orwell never admitted the possibility of electronic media being used beneficially, but when he did, as in "Poetry and the Microphone", it was usually in passing and immediately qualified by remarking how entwined with "bureaucracy" the new media are from their very beginning,[232] while journalism is being bureaucratised slowly and from "the lower reaches".[233] Orwell's stress on individual experience and its literary embodiment finds its nemesis in the "factory process"[234]

227 Peter Huber, *Orwell's Revenge: 1984 Palimpsest* (Free Press, 1994) 24.
228 T. W. Adorno, M. Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment,* trans. J. Cumming (London: Verso Books, 1997), cited in: Paul A. Taylor and Jan Ll. Harris, *Critical Theories of Mass Media: Then and Now* (Open University Press, 2008) 80.
229 Huber 24.
230 Stephen Bottomore, *The Panicking Audience?: early cinema and the `train effect'*, Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1999. 197-216
231 Orwell 2000, 11.
232 George Orwell, "Poetry and the Microphone", *Such, Such Were the Joys*, <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79e/part19.html> 10 December 2012.
233 George Orwell, "The Prevention of Literature", *The Orwell Reader: Fiction, Essays, and Reportage*, ed. Richard H. Rovere, Harcourt, Brace, 1956. 291
234 Orwell 1956, 291.

through which electronic media come to being and in which individuality is replaced by mechanisation, and as a socialist, Orwell was suspicious of the capital needed to produce and disseminate new media[235] (interestingly enough, he mostly feared the capital in the hands of governments, while corporate power is a phenomenon also only mentioned in passing).

If modern media are portrayed in somewhat regressed forms in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, some significant or emerging technological and social phenomena of Orwell's time, like automobile or telephone, are absent altogether, as noted earlier.[236] Their absence is not an oversight, but a crucial measure taken by the Party and provoked by its understanding that consumers of media are not empty vessels, an insight that can be read in the light of another of John B. Thompson's arguments presented in his book *Media and Modernity*. Perceiving citizens as empty vessels would represent a stronger form of the oft-repeated[237] idea that every dictator dreams of his subjects being "tabulae rasae" of empirical philosophy, because it would portray them as boundlessly manipulable not merely during their formative years, but at every stage of life. Against this understanding, Thompson cites studies that explored different reactions to media contents according to recipients' background and concludes that creators of content cannot control every possible context of reception and therefore the precise impact of their product. Whereas Thompson ends on a cautiously optimistic note, Orwell's totalitarian state seems to follow similar train of thought in an opposite direction: Where simple dissemination of propaganda is not sufficient to create and maintain desired social structure, a cooperation of coercive mechanisms is necessary to narrow down possible contexts of reception.[238] The first condition is the restriction of free movement, which, as described above, also ensures that citizens will at most times find themselves in company of others, so that the state can use them as media.

Telephones would not pose a direct danger, as the technology itself would of necessity rest on state-owned, interceptable lines, but they are undesirable as a participatory and dialogical medium. This element of dialogue adequately explains why Orwell would not see telephones in the same negative light as other modern media, as they allow direct communication of

---

235   "Poetry and the Microphone"
236   McLuhan 1984, 213.
237   e.g. Steven Pinker, "The Blank Slate, the Noble Savage, and the Ghost in the Machine", The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, delivered at Yale University April 20 and 21, 1999. 201 (23 in document pagination) <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/documents/pinker00.pdf>
238   The division of Earth into three blocks is possibly motivated, in part, by the desire for easier control of smaller and more homogeneous populations.

personal experience between their users; on the other hand, Orwell does not seem to feel about telephones as strongly as about literature, for example, because he simply omits the former, but chooses to portray the latter as pitifully mutilated (see previous chapter). The dialogical possibilities of telephones would represent a hazardous exception in Oceania, where any mediated communication is kept one-way, clearly separating consumers from producers. This separation which, of course, also reflects the division of power, has perfected the control over perception context to such an extent that producers and consumers have interchanged their respective positions as to the amount of relevant information they gather. Media, Thompson alleges, make structures of power visible to heterogeneous viewing public whose exact structure, on the contrary, remains unknown to those who control the media.[239] In Oceania, the exact opposite is true, because the combination of rigid, predictable social structure with two-way telescreens has made each consumer entirely known to those in control, while the consumers never know who might be watching them and, by extension, who produces the messages they receive. This is not only true of mass-media, but of any vertical transfer of information in the social hierarchy: At work, Winston receives his tasks on anonymous, semi-ciphered slips of paper, delivered via "pneumatic tube".[240]

Therefore, physical control in Oceania does not only ensure that citizens function as propaganda-broadcasting media, but also results in neutralisation of any empowering aspects of new electronic media and relapse into earlier, less democratic forms of communication. The establishment controls context of perception can again be connected to Walter Benjamin's concept of "aura", defined as "contextual integration of art in tradition [that finds] its expression in the cult";[241] the cult function of art (or, by extension, any media content) can acquire new forms, but never disappears entirely as long as some form of aura is maintained (Orwell: "A totalitarian state is in effect a theocracy").[242] Mechanical reproduction destroys aura and thus enables works to expand beyond their original context and enter new and unpredictable constellations of meaning. For centuries, printed media were unique in dispensing with aura and have firmly imprinted themselves as such in the mind of literate and literary public, adequately explaining why, in classic dystopian fiction, their re-instating into the frame of aura is most prominently emphasised as corruption when compared to more recently emergent electronic media. Benjamin himself explicitly describes the renewal of aura

239   Thompson 5.
240   Orwell 2000, 36-37.
241   Benjamin 223.
242   Orwell 1956, 371.

as a technique of totalitarian control, drawing distinction between fascism, which renders politics aesthetic, and communism, which "responds by politicizing art".[243] This difference could seemingly be used to distinguish between different dystopian texts on the basis of which system they extrapolate, a debated issue in the case of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but stable totalitarian society depicted in the novel could in fact be a final stage of either: Both aim for total identification of communication, aesthetics and politics, so that what can be communicated must of necessity be ideologically correct and *therefore* beautiful. Both Orwell[244] and Benjamin[245] conclude that such a stabilised society has to stimulate masses by fighting against an external enemy unless it seeks to endanger its own structure. For Benjamin, this is the reason behind fascist imperialism; in Orwell's world, even the risks of war have become an illusion maintained for the sake of stability.

In Huxley's *Brave New World*, physical conditioning allows for less rigid scheduling and control in later life and for citizens' easier access to vehicles and media: Absent cars and telephones of Orwell's world are replaced by private air-travel and freely available telephony. Even in the world of pre-natal conditioning, however, media still play a great role in education, Huxley shows as he proceeds from "birth" to further stages of human life. The most crucial element is hypnopaedia, sleep-teaching realised by pre-recorded voices reading to sleeping babies (another example of controlled context, since the minds of children are more pliant than those of adults and since unconsciousness of the sleeper, as opposed to a wakeful person, can be shaped more directly and without defiance). Bernard Marx is doubly ironic about this method in his repeated remarks "[n1] repetitions with frequency [n2] at the age of [n3]":[246] He does not only remind himself and others of the training mechanism behind their innermost beliefs, but also puts a sarcastic twists to how automatic the reactions of people to conditioned events are – his own reminder comes with the same inevitability and seeks to reveal a twofold distrust of society towards its citizens. Not only can they not be trusted to shape their own subconsciousness haphazardly and need to have it formed externally as soon as possible, but even those already thus processed are not trusted enough to perpetuate the process of hypnopaedic teaching themselves and a record player is used to remove any possibility of error.[247] By exploiting hearing as a channel of receiving language

---

243   Benjamin 241.
244   Orwell 2000, 167-180.
245   Benjamin 241.
246   Huxley 2010. 53, 8, 102, 109.
247   Huxley 2010, 18.

information that sleepers do not shut, it first introduces the reader to the omnipresence of sound that characterizes the World State as much as it later does Oceania.

Only young people are taught through repetition in their sleep, the whole society, however, rests on a minimisation of the difference between children and adults: Children are encouraged to engage in "rudimentary sexual game"[248] from the youngest age, while adults are pushed to spend their time in mindless games that serve to increase consumption. Even after hypnopaedic education, this lifelong state of sexually excited childhood is further upheld by auditory stimuli, as seen prominently in chapter five, where Bernard first takes Lenina dancing to a "newly opened Westminster Abbey Cabaret". Here, the pairs dance to the music of "CALVIN SLOPES AND HIS SIXTEEN SEXOPHONISTS",[249] the very name of the band announcing physical, rather than intellectual or aesthetic experience. The song being played is described in terms of sexual intercourse, saxophones starting like caterwauling cats and reaching "the little death [...] a climax". Then, corresponding to post-coital bliss, the physical rapture abates and is replaced by blissful feelings of return to prenatal condition inside an embryo bottle.[250] The situation suggests sex, infantility and musical elation in the same measure, but no character reflects upon the dissociation of sex and reproduction even when the two phenomena are thus prominently juxtaposed. It is also worth noting how markedly the music of World State recalls jazz and its reception in Huxley's time, beginning with the choice of saxophone for the iconic instrument, continuing with apparently non-traditional rhythmic structure and loose tonality of the music ("five-four rhythms", "a diminuendo sliding gradually, through quarter tones"),[251] and culminating with its connection to sensuous, spontaneous dancing. Here, the text joins contemporary voices denouncing jazz as "pathological, nerve-irritating, sex-exciting music"[252] and foreshadows Allan Bloom's denouncement of rock music's "one appeal only, barbaric appeal [...] to sexual desire".[253] This treatment is consistent with general distrust of modern media, as McLuhan finds "hot jazz" a natural occurrence in the age of "hot new media of movie and radio".[254]

In the very following scene, the stupefying effect of music and escalated sexuality is again

---

248   Huxley 2010, 36.
249   Huxley 2010, 83.
250   Huxley 2010, 83.
251   Huxley 2010, 84.
252   Geoffrey C. Ward, Ken Burns, *Jazz: A History of America's Music* (Alfred A. Knopf, 2000) 79.
253   Allan Bloom, *The Closing of American Mind* (Simon and Schuster, 1987) 73.
254   McLuhan 1984, 19.

depicted very similarly, this time framed as a parody of Christian mass in which the effects of "the opium of the people" are enhanced by an actual drug and which again ends in an orgy taking place in "the crimson twilight of an Embryo Store [...] foetal darkness".[255] This time, the participants are expected to sing along instead of remaining passive recipients (the call and response, ecstasy-inducing songs recalling gospel music this time), but rather than actual creative participation, this fact is an illustration of Huxley's own thesis on music as found in *Brave New World Revisited*. There, he asserts that what "would be shameful for a reasonable being to write, speak or hear spoken", can, if set to music, cause "pleasure [...] and even [...] a kind of intellectual conviction"[256] in the same being. Like hypnopaedic education, music also ingrains its message into recipient's mind and forms a Pavlovian "conditioned reflex" that ensures its recollection in particular contexts.[257] Both music and hypnopaedia rely on slogans, but the former has less direct political and organisational function; rather, in connecting itself inseparably to sexual excitement, it seeks to create a closed continuum of entertainment for World State citizens, a continuum of perpetual enjoyment in which all pleasurable activities, including former "arts", only refer and lead to one another, forming a narrow, closed universe of gratification, in which "[feelies] mean themselves"[258] and lack any referent outside this tautology. In this world of freely available pleasure without boundaries, it is only natural that sexual relationships are analogically based on the idea that "every one belongs to every one else".[259] A condensed image of the direct role media play in maintaining social order comes in the fifteenth chapter, in which the Savage attempts to hold a public speech on freedom. When the police breaks in, they do not only pacify the crowd by drugs, but also utilise a "portable Synthetic Music Box"[260] prominently to drown Savage's words and calm the patients down, which is an interesting twist on the mechanics of power. If the feudal system is based on violence, the armed forces are used to heighten this violence when necessary; if drugs and mind-numbing media are the pillars of society, police primarily ensures order by these means.

World State's media and art are synthetic in two different senses. Firstly, to eliminate human error, their content is reproduced artificially and mechanically, and although creating them is still a "delicate work",[261] the resulting pieces are rendered and broadcast by different

---

255   Huxley 2010, 92.
256   Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World Revisited* (RosettaBooks, LLC, 2000) 44.
257   Huxley 2000, 44.
258   Huxley 2010, 243.
259   e.g. Huxley 2010, 46.
260   Huxley 2010, 235.
261   Huxley 2010, 72.

synthesizers. It remains undisclosed whether even "a Voice [...] more musical than any merely human voice, [...] supernatural Voice"[262] is fully electronic, but it is decidedly at least artificially enhanced, and although unconcealed "sound-track rolls" are sometimes used instead of musicians,[263] The Sexophonists may or may not be using playback. In any case, at least the majority of their instruments is electronic, creating an effect of technological depersonalisation; elsewhere, Huxley refers to music machines as "Super-Wurlitzers",[264] granting the manufacturer of jukeboxes and player pianos a place in the eclectic pantheon of the World State, along with Ford, Freud, Pavlov and Bokanovsky. Secondly, the media of *Brave New World* are synthetic (or synaesthetic) in the way they seek to engage more senses at once. In the "feelies", his extrapolation of cinema, Huxley depicts a medium that not only assaults sight and hearing, but also the sense of touch, and, by means of "scent organ",[265] also of smell. Recipients are so habituated to this sensory overload that even in private, they do not only keep broadcast media on, but commonly switch both television and radio on upon their coming home.[266] This provides another instance of the World State's attempts to indiscriminately engage citizens on more levels at once: Cultural experience becomes similar to that of other physical activities, like sex and sport, and this blurring of boundaries serves to further debase all these activities by stripping them of their distinct purposes and functions. They are furthermore highly pervaded by technology, sex by "sex-hormone chewing gum"[267] and the "vibro-vacuum massages"[268] (the use of machines for sexual pleasure enhances the egoist dissociation of sex and human contact), sports like "obstacle golf"[269] or "musical bridge"[270] by inventing ever more complicated tools, cinema by having its effect broadened to other senses. Biographically of note is the fact that only two years before finishing *Brave New World*, Huxley negatively reviewed *The Jazz Singer*, the first feature-length sound film. Laura Frost persuasively connects contemporary context and Huxley's biography with the contents of the novel and arrives at very similar interpretation to the one presented here. For example, she helpfully describes the physicality with which early silent films and later sound cinema are connected in contemporary writing, as well as frequent comparisons of their effects to the

---

262   Huxley 2010, 90.
263   Huxley 2010, 182.
264   Huxley 2010, 224, 226.
265   e.g. Huxley 2010, 183.
266   Huxley 2010, 101.
267   e.g. Huxley 2010, 67.
268   e.g. Huxley 2010, 42.
269   e.g. Huxley 2010, 50.
270   e.g. Huxley 2010, 55.

effects of narcotics.[271]

Considering how sharply *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Brave New World* contrast electronic media to written word, it might come as a surprise that in *When the Sleeper Awakes,* Wells problematises this dichotomy, and even demonstrates how skepticism towards innovation can be fueled by unreflected force of habit. The most overt instance is again found in the scene in which Graham explores the cylinder-player: He feels "archaic indignation" over pornographic version of Tannhäuser's tale, being confronted with "no idealisations, but photographed realities",[272] meaning that new art is not only indecent, but that new media have also resigned from artistic transformation to mere reduplication of actual world (an attack on realism enabled by modern photographic media). In his indignation, however, Graham "[forgets] the part played by the model in nineteenth century art", a qualification that works on several levels. Firstly, it calls into question the amount of artistic idealisation in average Victorian artist's work, implying that the artists relied on their models and did not demonstrate any substantial capacity of idealising or characteristically transforming them in their work; secondly, it serves as a reminder of actual nudity that accompanied the creation of elevated paintings and that would be considered indecent, were it not for social conventions that regarded model's nudity as acceptable; thirdly, it draws attention to frequent understanding of artist-model relationships as lascivious and promiscuous. On all counts, it unmasks Graham's outrage as hypocritical, or at least exorbitant: His disgust at modern-day pornography is justifiable, but the contrast to Victorian art is excessive and probably enhanced by Graham's feelings of alienation in the world of the future.

He is, however, not the only character to ascribe disproportionate virtues to media of earlier time: "The old man who knew everything" sets printed books he read as a boy against Babble Machines that are "easy to hear, easy to forget", correctly describing the lack of fixed information that simplifies state control, but wrongly assuming that the "histories"[273] he has read were necessarily accurate and that they have imparted him with infallible memory and power of reasoning. At the same time, unrealistic qualities can also be ascribed to historical eras by those who have no direct experience of them: Helen believes the flattering, chivalric

---

271   Laura Frost, "Huxley's Feelies: The Cinema of Sensation in *Brave New World*", Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Winter, 2006), pp. 443-473.
272   Wells 65.
273   Wells 115.

account "old books" give of their times.[274] Under given circumstances, this provides a positive impulse (and Graham stops short of undeceiving her), but also hints at the high value which systems of evaluation assign themselves. When this aspect of the novel is paired with the earlier discussion of they way in which existing stories are adapted in future England, it can be said that the novel uses art as a hermeneutic tool: Just as metamorphoses of known stories provide Graham with clues to understand new society, the reader receives clues about characters and historical eras from the way in which they relate to different media and works of art, which marks *When the Sleep Awakes* as a novel concerned with historicity of these relations. Another example is provided when the painter who encountered Graham at the beginning of the novel later becomes an advertiser and covers the Cliffs of Dover with posters,[275] by which the novel signals social shift towards capitalistic dystopia and waning reverence for nature (and natural order), which is allowed to be obscured by artificial simulacra for the sake of advertisement.

As a recapitulation of this chapter, the topics and motifs it has discussed can be traced in *When the Sleeper Awakes,* since Wells' novel again features motifs that Huxley and Orwell later picked up and integrated them more centrally into their respective dystopian visions: Wells himself probably felt that the political dimension of his novel is not its primary accomplishment, since the re-worked edition *(The Sleeper Awakes*) relies more on the development of the plot and discards whole chapters of social commentary and descriptions of the new society. Motifs that later occur in Huxley and Orwell include education conducted under hypnosis or by phonographs that eliminate both error and possibility of discussion,[276] though these approaches are not shown to be used in conjunction as in Huxley. The purposes modern art serves are either trivial and utilitarian (the art of painting has given way to the art of face-painting),[277] sedative (simple entertainment for the working class)[278] or distorted by fierce competition for people's attention (religion can only keep its prominence by abandoning its orthodoxies and competing for representation in the media).[279] All non-private property, including tablecloth, is used to promote products and boost the economy.[280] Ubiquitous advertisement and entertainment serve the purpose of sensory overload and numbing, as

---

274   Wells 205.
275   Wells 19.
276   Wells 52.
277   Wells 171-172.
278   Wells 206.
279   Wells 224.
280   Wells 228.

evidenced by competing Babble Machines that, like Orwell's telescreens, only prominent people can switch off in their own apartments.[281] Huxley's world is therefore characterised by the same ubiquitous noise as Orwell's and Huxley's, a fact also evidence by loudly cracking guns used to pacify insurgents.[282] Electronic media have assembled the population in panoptical "prisons"[283] or "machines"[284] of cities. In line with Huxley's comments in *Brave New World,* distrust of music is suggested when Graham is, by turns, swept away by a revolutionary song and charmed by music at a banquet of the rich.[285]

281   Wells 232.
282   Wells 98.
283   Wells 205.
284   Wells 215.
285   Wells 175.

6. Conclusion

This thesis has begun by elaborating on "the Event" as a central concept in study of utopian and dystopian fiction and followed its consequences for media and the way in which media are used to portray it. First, a discussion of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has demonstrated how dystopian history is segmented into three distinct epochs, pre-Event, Event and post-Event. After this, it has been shown that, if dystopian establishment seeks to ensure its power for perpetuity, it needs to suppress the concept of historicity and historical change. Five basic strategies have emerged: eradication, modification, de-contextualisation, obscuration and re-contextualisation. While Orwell's Oceania uses all five in conjunction, Huxley's World State, discussed in the second part of the chapter, has, primarily by eradication, arrived at a stage at which re-contextualisation and de-contextualisation largely suffice to keep citizens ignorant of history. Huxley's novel has also yielded a further segmentation of the Event into three parts: The emergence of conditions that allow for installment of dystopian regime, this installment itself and a point at which permanence of this regime is secured. This segmentation can also been applied to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Oceania is only just nearing the third stage) and Wells' *When the Sleeper Awakes*, which takes place at a time at which different versions of history are at strife and compete to carry out their respective Events. In the novel, the main protagonist himself is used as a symbol of the way signs and media are modified and re-appropriated in the course of revolutionary Events: Beginning as an aura-enveloped signifier, he later escapes his controlled context only to become human loudspeaker for a would-be dictator, but the absence of aura ultimately leads to his self-assertion. This return to "authentic self" is problematised, however, since it relies on the gaze of electronic media and threatens to return the protagonist to the state of mythologised icon.

Huxley's and Orwell's work are often understood as antithetical (e.g. Neil Postman's *Amusing Ourselves to Death*), and this thesis contrasts them in the third chapter, which continues with the theme of using citizens as media. In Foucault's terms, Orwell's Oceania is shown to reach this use by "disciplining" its citizens, regarding them as interchangeable pieces determined by their position within social structure, whereas Huxley's World State uses techniques of "biopower" that endow each citizen with precise set of qualities that suit his pre-assigned position (both Oceania and the World State then supplement these techniques by discouraging solitude and controlling all contexts of perception). McLuhan's understanding of media as

extensions of human body is thus applied to the "social" or "governing" body whose subjects constitute its extensions; McLuhan's concepts are also traced and illustrated in the second part of the chapter, in which the use of the "empty medium" of electric light by dystopian states is analysed. The conclusion of this analysis is that their control over light symbolises their power over natural phenomena, their ability to manipulate moral dichotomies (light/dark as good/evil) and their control over time, which can be further demonstrated on the use of time-biased media like architecture.

The fourth chapter has turned to media that are more commonly understood as such and has explored the way in which dystopian novels and the societies they describe relate to written and printed word. Dystopian societies seek to neutralise or suppress them: If the triadic version of history is applied to the history of media, it means that printed and written word are maimed by an Event that coincides with the revolutionary turn that has established the dystopian regime. The reason for this suppression as portrayed by the authors is that printed media are perceived to facilitate phenomena antithetical to "new world order", such as individual expression, historical continuity and solitude. This solitude, however, is not identical to detachment, since both literature and newspapers are understood as agents of public debate, each on a different time-scale. To represent these positive aspects of typographical culture, both Orwell and Huxley reach for Shakespeare, whose work symbolises tradition, intellectual effort and multifariousness of human experience. This prominent role that Shakespeare plays raises the question of canon and its existence or justification in dystopian society: The thesis has shown that publicly upheld canons are undesirable for dystopian establishment and that in Orwell's Oceania, where English literary canon is still upheld by the Party in a mutilated form, this motif is difficult to reconcile with the overall drift of the novel. At the same time, the thesis has shown that, on a narrative level, the establishment serves as the most natural device for the author to introduce the problem of canon, since only the rulers of dystopian society have actual access to archives and fact-based understanding of history. Lastly, the chapter turns to Wells' novel that uses canonical works as hermeneutic literary device that is used to signify changing attitudes of future societies; his book also warns against a-historical understanding of art and social change and reveals pre-conceptions that can compromise this understanding. Still, new electronic media are understood as derivatives of earlier literary tradition.

The fifth and last chapter has been concerned with electronic media. Most importantly, it has used Walter Benjamin's concept of "aura" to argue that dystopian state re-instates this controlled mode of perception by maintaining strict, topographically rigid social structure: Whereas this observation is true of Oceania as a whole, Huxley's World State mostly uses this rigidly controlled context in citizens' formative years, in which proper ways of perception are firmly inculcated in their minds. Furthermore, the thesis has shown that both Huxley's and Orwell's depiction of modern media represents an overtly satirical streak of their respective novels, since they clearly refer to media as they existed at the time of writing. These references are more direct in *Brave New World*, where Huxley extrapolates jazz music and newly emergent sound films of his era into forms that suggest a disruption of human mind by engaging the highest possible number of senses at once and blurring the borders between them; if all entertainment activities aim for this all-encompassing engagement, is also follows that they begin to lose their distinction and also blur into each other. Orwell, on the other hand, uses imagery borrowed from early days of electronic media (silent films, radios) and uses it to suggest that the occasion that made modern media exploitable by dystopian governments was identical with their emergence, rather than any later perversion. That is to say that in the triadic version of the revolutionary Event, they contribute to the first stage and fall among phenomena that provide suitable context for dystopian totality to arise. For Huxley, the corruption of a particular medium occurs when it leaves its specific and proper role, especially by removing human element (electronic reproduction) or by engaging more senses at once instead of bringing a particular sense (and cognitive faculties) into focus.

To conclude, it might be said that, with regards to media, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* do not stand in sharp opposition against each other, as, for example, Neil Postman would suggest, but that they approach the theme from similar positions. They complement each other in their understanding of the Event and the strategies that dystopian establishment uses to suppress the idea of historicity, they both portray the use of citizens as media (though the strategy they envision is different), both illustrate the necessity of canon and continual cultural tradition by introducing Shakespeare into the narrative (and both do so for similar reasons), both distrust modern media and are skeptical of their empowering potential that Walter Benjamin and others would suggest. In conjunction, they provide a set of themes and topics that exercise prominent and inescapable influence on later dystopian writing. In relation to Wells as their predecessor, they systematically develop motifs that Wells

often merely sketches; this methodical construction of fictional world aligns their respective works more closely with utopian narrative tradition, but possibly makes them less open-ended and deliberately meta-textual than Wells' novel.

WORKS CITED

Bacon, Francis. *New Atlantis.* "New Atlantis by Francis Bacon – Project Gutenberg" <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2434> 16 January 2013.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies.* Translated by Annette Lavers. The Noonday Press, 1991.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation.* Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser. University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Walter Benjamin, "Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov." *Illuminations*. Translated by Harry Zohn. Schocken, 2007. 83-110.

Walter Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire." *Illuminations*. Translated by Harry Zohn. Schocken, 2007. 155-200.

Benjamin, Walter "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*. Translated by Harry Zohn. Schocken, 2007. 217-252.

Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope, Vol. 1.* The MIT Press, 1995.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of American Mind.* Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Borges, Jorge Luis. "Kafka and His Precursors." *The Total Library: Non-fiction 1922-1986.* Penguin Classics, 2001. 363-365.

Botting, Heather and Garry. *The Orwellian World of Jehovah's Witnesses.* University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Bottomore, Stephen. "The Panicking Audience?: early cinema and the 'train effect'." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1999. 197-216

Boutellier, Hans. *The Safety Utopia: Contemporary Discontent and Desire as to Crime and Punishment.* Springer, 2004.

Burgess, Anthony. *1985*. Hutchinson & Co., 1978.

Burgess, Anthony. *You've Had Your Time.* Heinemann, 1990.

"caricature." Def. 1. *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Random House, Inc. 19 Oct. 2012. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/caricature>.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Nietzsche and Saint Paul, Lawrence and John of Patmos." *Essays Critical and Clinical.* Translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco. University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 36-52.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004.

Drabble, Margaret. "Of Beasts and Men." *On "Nineteen Eighty-Four": Orwell and Our Future.* Gleason, Abbott, Jack Goldsmith and Martha C. Nussbaum, eds. Princeton University Press, 2005.

Dryden, Linda. "A Note on *When the Sleeper Awakes* and *Heart of Darkness.*" <http://researchrepository.napier.ac.uk/2632/1/HD_and_Sleeper_Notes_and_Queries.doc> 9 December 2012

Foucault, Michel. "Docile Bodies". *Discipline and Punish.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. Vintage Books, 1995. 135-169.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction.* Translated by Robert Hurley. Pantheon Books, 1978.

Fraser, Raymond, George Wickes. "The Art of Fiction No. 24: Aldous Huxley." *Paris Review* 23, Spring 1960. <www.theparisreview.org/media/4698_HUXLEY.pdf> 16 January 2013.

Freud, Sigmund. "Civilisation and Its Discontents". *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud XXI.* Ed. J. Strachey. The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1976. 57-146.

Frost, Laura. "Huxley's Feelies: The Cinema of Sensation in *Brave New World.*" *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Winter, 2006). 443-473.

Heyer, Paul. *Harold Innis.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Huber, Peter. *Orwell's Revenge: 1984 Palimpsest.* Free Press, 1994.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World.* Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2010.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World Revisited.* RosettaBooks, LLC, 2000.

Jameson, Fredric. *Archaeologies of the Future.* Verso, 2007.

Karl, Frederick R. "Conrad, Wells, and the Two Voices." *PMLA*, Vol. 88, No. 5 (Oct., 1973). 1049-1065.

Kolbas, E. Dean. *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon.* Westview Press, 2001.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times.* Basil Blackwell, 1987.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Medium Is the Massage.* Ginko Press Inc., 2001.

McLuhan, Marshal. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man.* The MIT Press, 1984.

Meckier, Jerome. "Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Spring, 1971). 129-135.

"Media." Def. 2. *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Random House, Inc. 07 Sep. 2012.

<Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/media>.

"Medium." Def. 5. *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 07 Sep. 2012. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/medium>.

"Medium." Def. 5. *Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*. HarperCollins Publishers. 07 Sep. 2012. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/medium>.

Moore, Alan and David Lloyd. *V for Vendetta.* Vertigo, 2008.

More, Thomas. *Utopia.* Translated by Gilbert Burnet. "Utopia by Saint Sir Thomas More – Project Gutenberg." <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/2130> 16 January 2013.

Nineteen Eighty-Four. Prod., dir. Rudolph Cartier. BBC, 1954.

Orwell, George. "An Imaginary Interview." *Orwell: The Lost Writings.* Arbor House, 1985.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* Penguin Student Editions, 2000.

Orwell, George. "Poetry and the Microphone." *Such, Such Were the Joys.* <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/o79e/part19.html> 10 December 2012.

Orwell, George. "The Prevention of Literature." *The Orwell Reader: Fiction, Essays, and Reportage.* Ed. Richard H. Rovere. Harcourt, Brace, 1956.

Orwell, George. Untitled column from *Tribune. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters: As I Please, 1943-45.* Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1968.

Orwell, George. "*We* by E. I. Zamyatin." *London Tribune,* 4 January 1946. 15-16.

Pinker, Steven. "The Blank Slate, the Noble Savage, and the Ghost in the Machine." *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, delivered at Yale University April 20 and 21, 1999. <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/documents/pinker00.pdf> 17 January 2013

Pomahač, Ondřej. *Nikde a kdesi: Utopie, dystopie a jejich vzájemná poloha.* MA thesis at Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Philosophy, 2011.

Prokop, Dieter. *Der Kampf um die Medien.* <http://www.sgipt.org/medien/prokopgm.htm> 15 January 2013.

Russell, W.M.S. "Folktales and Science Fiction." *Folklore*, Vol. 93, No. 1 (1982). 3-30.

Snodgrass, Mary Ellen. *Encyclopedia of Utopian Literature.* ABC-CLIO, 1995.

Stevenson, Nick. *Understanding Media Cultures.* Sage Publications, 2002.

Suvin, Darko. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction.* Yale University Press, 1979.

Suvin, Darko. "Theses on Dystopia 2001." *Dark Horizons:Science Fiction and the Dystopian Imagination.* Baccolini, Raffaella, and Tom Moylan, eds. Routledge, 2003.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels.* Book Sales, Inc., 2009.

Taylor, Paul A., and Jan Ll. Harris. *Critical Theories of Mass Media: Then and Now.* Open University Press, 2008.

Three Percent, a resource for international literature at University of Rochester <http://www.rochester.edu/College/translation/threepercent/index.php?s=about> 6 September 2012.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre.* Translated by Richard Howard. Cornell University Press, 1975.

Vonnegut, Kurt. "Harrison Bergeron." *Welcome to the Monkey House.* Dell Publishing, 1998. 7-14.

Ward, Geoffrey C., and Ken Burns. *Jazz: A History of America's Music.* Alfred A. Knopf, 2000.

Wells, H.G. *The Sleeper Awakes.* W. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1921.

Wells, H.G. *When the Sleeper Awakes.* Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1899.

Williams, Keith. *H. G. Wells: Modernity and the Movies.* Liverpool University Press, 2007.

Williams, Raymond. *Television: Technology and Cultural Form.* Routledge, 2003.