Narrative viewpoint and the representation of power in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

BRIGID ROONEY

This essay considers how 'perspective' and 'choice of language' in George Orwell's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, position the reader and contribute to the text's representation of power, powerplay and people power.[1] The aims of this essay can be restated in the form of two key questions. What specific features of the narrative in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* construct the text's representation of power, and of powerplay? How do those features position the responder to think and feel about political power and about whether there can be people power?

Questions of medium, textual form, and genre

It is important to distinguish, at the outset, between 'narrative', as a general term for story or the telling of story, and 'the novel', as a particular medium or form of narrative. Narratives are everywhere in culture. Not only are they integral to novels but they also permeate films, news reports, and even the everyday stories we use to make sense of life. Narratives always position the listener, reader, or responder in particular ways, expressing partial truths, and creating or constructing certain views of reality while minimizing or excluding others. The novel, on the other hand, is a specific textual form that developed, in the medium of print, during the last three hundred years or so in European societies. Not all cultures and societies have given rise to 'novels', though all have told stories, in visual, oral, or written forms. The European novel's popularity peaked in the nineteenth century. Though in the twentieth century film has eclipsed the novel as predominant narrative form, the novel still remains highly popular and has spread worldwide. For its readers, the novel is such an everyday

narrative form that it is all too easy to forget its specific European cultural origins. With its wide variety of genres (such as the thriller, the romance, science fiction, fantasy, satire), the novel is very diverse—but there is also surprising consistency in how novels deploy narrative techniques to engage readers.

'This is a novel about the future—that is, it is in a sense a fantasy, but in the form of a naturalistic novel.'[2] This is George Orwell's own explanation of what narrative genres are at work in his novel. Not all readers agree, however, about the precise narrative genre of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and their disagreements reveal some markedly different ways of making sense of the book. For some, Orwell's novel works as political satire, in the tradition, for example, of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*.[3] On the other hand, some elements of Orwell's narrative depart from the strictly satirical. The depiction of power in the text is quite extreme, moving well beyond any realistic political context and into the territory of nightmare, producing a darker, more psychologically-oriented study of individual frailty in the face of absolute evil. The genre most often invoked to describe Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*—one that describes its particular plot, setting, and mood—is dystopian fiction. Though often satirical, dystopias are specifically futuristic, typically employing a plot that culminates in disaster or catastrophe, the prospect of which is terrifying to contemplate.[4] Orwell's novel uses particular narrative strategies to develop the reader's sense of terror and fear about what power is and how it is wielded in this future world.

The characteristic terror of Orwell's narrative comes, as I will show, both from its harnessing of a particular perspective or point of view and from the narrative's form and features. In the next section I will discuss how Orwell's narrative positions the reader alongside, indeed almost within, the mind of the main character, Winston Smith. This narrative positioning—which enhances the experience of terror—is of particular significance in thinking about the ways in which power is represented in the text.

Narrative point of view

Novels typically make use of an individual narrator. The narrator may be an identifiable character or may be anonymous; he or she may take part in the story or occupy a point more remote from events. Most narratives are composed using either the first or third person voice (only very rarely is the second person used). All narratives establish an organizing viewpoint. It is usually in response to narrative point of view that the reader (whether sympathetic or resistant) makes sense of the novel overall.

Nineteen Eighty-Four is obviously told in the third person. There is, however, much more to be said about the narrative than simply this. For example, is there a particular relationship between the narrative and its main character, Winston, and if so, how can this be described?

> It might be two or three hours ago that they had brought him here. The dull pain in his belly never went away, but sometimes it grew better and sometimes worse, and his thoughts expanded or contracted accordingly. When it grew worse he thought only of the pain itself, and of his desire for food. When it grew better, panic took hold of him. There were moments when he foresaw the things that would happen to him with such actuality that his heart galloped and his breath stopped. He felt the smash of truncheons on his elbows and iron-shod boots on his shins; he saw himself grovelling on the floor, screaming for mercy through broken teeth. He hardly thought of Julia. He could not fix his mind on her. He loved her and would not betray her; but that was only a fact, known as he knew the rules of arithmetic. He felt no love for her, and he hardly even wondered what was happening to her. He thought oftener of O'Brien, with a flickering hope. O'Brien must know that he had been arrested. The Brotherhood, he had said, never tried to save its members. But there was the razor-blade; they would send the razor-blade if they could. There would perhaps be five seconds before the guard could rush into the cell. The blade would bite into him with a sort of

> burning coldness, and even the fingers that held it would be cut to the bone. Everything came back to his sick body, which shrank trembling from the smallest pain. He was not certain that he would use the razor-blade even if he got the chance. [5]

Though composed in the third person, the perspective in the passage, which is typical throughout the novel, strongly conveys the viewpoint, sensations, thoughts, and feelings of one character: that of Winston. The following definition makes a useful distinction between two main forms of 'point of view' in third person narratives:

> **point of view**: The vantage point from which a narrative is told. A narrative is typically told from a *first-person* or *third-person point of view*; the *second-person point of view* is extremely rare. Novels sometimes, but infrequently, mix points of view. …
>
> Third-person narratives come in two types: *omniscient* and *limited*. An author taking an omniscient point of view assumes the vantage point of an all-knowing narrator able not only to recount the action thoroughly and reliably but also to enter the mind of any character in the work at any time in order to reveal his or her thoughts, feelings, and beliefs directly to the reader. (Such a narrator, it should be pointed out, can conceal as well as reveal at will). An author using the limited point of view recounts the story through the eyes of a single character (or occasionally more than one, but not all or the narrator would be an omniscient narrator). The reader is thus usually privy to the inner thoughts and feelings of only one character and receives the story as that character understands and experiences it, although not in that character's own voice. Such a narrator is generally an observer of or a participant in the action.[6]

On this basis, then, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* uses *third person limited* rather than *omniscient* narration. Limited third person narration allows the reader almost (though not quite) direct access to Winston's feelings and thoughts. It is not only that the reader seems to stand in very close proximity to Winston, but also that the reader shares or bears witness to his thoughts as they happen. Consequently, the reader is positioned to regard

the world of the novel very much from Winston's own angle of view. Another way of putting this is that the narrative is focalized through Winston.

The narrative's focalization through Winston—its adoption of Winston's perspective—produces significant effects. For instance, while descriptions of the physical appearance of both Julia and O'Brien are certainly given, it is significant that these are filtered by Winston's reactions. O'Brien and Julia, among others, do converse with Winston, and so their words can relay something of their personalities, thoughts, and feelings. Yet their spoken words cannot be trusted. What O'Brien says to Winston in Part Two proves later to be untrue. O'Brien's words come to mean the very opposite of what Winston first assumes. This reversal of initial meanings in the narrative dramatically destabilises Winston's reality. Simultaneously, the reader's sense of the powers aligned against Winston is intensified. The major reversal of meanings begins in the instant that the Thought Police break in upon Winston and Julia in their secret room above Charrington's shop:

> 'We are the dead', he said.
> 'We are the dead', echoed Julia dutifully.
> 'You are the dead', said an iron voice behind them. (p. 176)

The iron-voiced repetition of Winston's and Julia's words suggests that there is something inhumanly robotic about the Party's invisible agents. Elsewhere in the novel, too, whenever O'Brien and Winston converse, a verbal echo recurs, at first suggesting sympathy but later acquiring a mechanical, sinister character. The increasingly mocking repetition of Winston's privately uttered words (and of his inner thoughts) conveys the idea that, rather than being a safe haven for the autonomous self, an individual's mind can be breached and controlled by the Party. An even darker possibility emerges—that Winston's dream of rebellion is neither original nor voluntary but has been planted there all along by the Party.[7] If so, then all assumptions about freedom and individuality to which Winston (and the

typical 'Western' and 'middle-class' reader of novels) adheres are suddenly made to appear no more than vain delusions.

Establishing such close identification with Winston's point of view is an important way in which the narrative engages the reader's sympathy, making Winston the main conduit for representation of what it means to be human, to be an individual. Through him, the narrative represents and dramatizes what resistance to the Party's impersonal, inhuman powers means, conveying physical sensations—as well as passing thoughts, feelings and fears—as these occur. Importantly, what Winston does *not* know also conditions the narrative—his questions, puzzlement, doubts, hopes, and speculations. This deliberate limitation of view has a significant impact on the narrative's representation of power. Because the narrative strictly confines itself to Winston's view, the reader's view is also confined. Indeed the reader is as much in the dark as Winston is, about a whole range of issues. Part Three, for example, opens:

> He did not know where he was. Presumably he was in the Ministry of Love; but there was no way of making certain. (p. 181)

Like Winston, the reader continually guesses at reality. From simple details about precise location or time of day, to larger facts about the exact reach of the Party's power, much remains unknowable. Who are the faceless, anonymous rulers of the Inner Party? Where are they? When are they watching and when not? Yet these invisible powers are capable of constant surveillance of citizens, as conveyed by the omnipresent poster of Big Brother with its watching eyes and by the two-way telescreens in the homes of Outer Party members. The Party's lack of definition, its remoteness from Winston's (and the reader's) vantage point, inflates impressions of its power. Had an omniscient narrative view been adopted, the power of looking and seeing vested in the narrator, and therefore, also, in the reader, would have rendered the Party knowable: what is knowable, of course, has less power. As it stands, third person limited narration is a most significant means in Orwell's novel

by which the Party's power is represented as (seemingly) infinite and all-encompassing.[8]

The narrative's replication of Winston's viewpoint produces other effects, too, opening up questions of his reliability. Consider the following definition:

> In THIRD-PERSON LIMITED OMNISCIENT NARRATION, the narrator frequently limits the revelation of thoughts to those of one character, presenting the other characters only externally. As a result, the reader's experience is conditioned by the mental state, the qualities of perception, ignorance, or bias of the filtering or reflecting mind.[9]

Now although, as I have argued, the narrative's focalization through Winston works to restrict the reader's knowledge, this needs some qualification. Second or subsequent readings do provide different contexts within which the reader may construct new or additional meanings. A first-time reader is likely to rely upon Winston's view, but only until things begin seriously to unravel in Part Three. For the first-time reader, several unexpected twists in the plot (at the beginning of Parts Two and Three) upset initial assumptions. In Part One, Winston draws conclusions based on Julia's clean-cut, youthful appearance and is fearful and suspicious of her. Early in Part Two, Julia surprises Winston by declaring her love for him. Similarly in Part Two, Winston places his trust in O'Brien, believing O'Brien's account of the secret Brotherhood. In Part Three, however, O'Brien reappears as chief torturer, revealing that his talk of the Brotherhood was merely an elaborate trap.

On subsequent reading, however, the reader's foreknowledge of such plot developments affects the process of responding to Winston's narrative. The reader's awareness that Winston is failing correctly to interpret, understand, or anticipate events produces a gap between what the reader knows and what Winston knows. Equipped with the knowledge of the Party's trap, the reader occupies a double position, both identifying with Winston (by re-experiencing his point of view) and simultaneously observing from an ironic point the limits of

Winston's view. Thus the second-time reader's foreknowledge of the text produces an experience of narrative irony.

Once such irony is in play, other questions arise that challenge Winston's view of the world. Winston's character—his foibles, assumptions, and limitations—cannot be simply accepted or ignored. Taken to a logical extreme, Winston's whole narrative might even be seen not as objective reality but as the product of an individual's delusional nightmare or mental illness.[10] There is no need to take the argument to this extreme, however, to agree that Winston's view reflects a particular 'mental state' with certain 'qualities of perception', and at times suggests the 'ignorance' or 'bias' of a 'filtering or reflecting mind'. Thus the reader may not only be aware of the limitations of Winston's knowledge, but also become critical of Winston's implied views, values, and attitudes. I will elaborate on this last point in the final section of the discussion.

Power through unity: the significance of 'three' in the narrative

There are, however, other elements of the narrative that produce the meaning and experience of power that have less to do with Winston Smith and more to do with recurring features of language and structure. One particularly striking example I discuss in this section concerns the use of the number three. Groups of three recur repeatedly in the novel: there are the three paradoxical slogans (War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength), three superpowers (Oceania, Eurasia, Eastasia), three representatives of treason against the Party (Jones, Aaronson, Rutherford) and three ministries (Miniplenty, Miniluv and Minitrue). There are also three central characters, three parts to the narrative, and three phases in Winston's re-education. What is the significance of this emphasis on 'three-ness' in the narrative and what does this contribute to its representation of power?

The Mathematics Department at Dartmouth College, USA, list on their website some cultural associations of the number three. Here are some of their points, in summary:

- Three represents the *triad* of family—male, female, child; there is also the familiar tripartite structure of groupings like 'beginning, middle, end'; 'birth, life, death'; and 'past, present, future'.
- Of two things we say *both*; of three things we say *all*. Three-ness therefore signifies completeness, perfection and totality. Likewise, there is a theory that a single event is of no statistical significance, a second occurrence of that event may be coincidence, but a third occurrence gives it the impress of law.
- Three is often associated with divinity or deity—eg., in Christianity, the Holy Trinity; or in Ancient Babylonian culture, Anu, Bel, and Ea, who represented heaven, earth and the abyss.[11]

In Orwell's novel, the Party uses 'three-ness' to make its propaganda more powerful, memorable, and to project its perfection (the slogans, the structure of ministries, and so on). The symbolism of 'three' is about imposing and entrenching power. In the Party's propaganda, political power usurps the family ('Big Brother'). The Party's power is also represented as God-like, being eternal ('The rule of the Party is for ever', says O'Brien, p. 210) and omnipotent (God is Power, p. 223, suggesting that the Party equals God). Three-ness characterizes even O'Brien's description of Winston's re-education: '"There are three stages in your reintegration," said O'Brien. "There is learning, there is understanding, and there is acceptance"' (p. 209).

Orwell's own narrative, furthermore, echoes the Party's symbolism of 'three'. It has a three-part structure. There is, for example, a parallel in three final sequences that unifies and intensifies the narrative, mimicking the Party's own operations. Towards the end of each Part, Winston experiences a brief moment of safety or hope which is then abruptly shattered. In Part One, not long after finding Charrington's shop and

dreaming of renting its upstairs room, his 'heart turned to ice and his bowels to water' on encountering Julia (p. 84). He is mistakenly convinced she will betray him. In Part Two, in the secret room, Winston is overtaken by a 'strong, sleepy confident feeling' (p. 173), just before the Thought Police break in. In Part Three, there is a lull in the torture and Winston experiences an interlude of rest and recovery (pp. 220-6); but this illusory respite is quickly shattered by subsequent events in Room 101. The three parts of the narrative thus echo, parallel, and build upon each other, creating a sense of predestination that heightens the reading experience. The tight spiralling of the narrative therefore mirrors the Party's circling and entrapment of Winston, dramatizing its power over him, and reinforcing the idea of its victory as inevitable.

Power, powerplay and people power

In the novel, then, the Party's power is represented as invincible. An impersonal bureaucratic machine personified by the probably fictional Big Brother, the Party exercises a total and absolute power from which there is no escape. The Party has demonstrated not only that it has the capacity to monitor and control the lives of individuals—that it can 'get inside' and destroy one's inner being—but also that its thirst to exercise and even to play with power is relentless. Thus, in this novel, the theme of 'powerplay' acquires the sinister sense of the ways in which Party 'plays with' or 'enjoys' power. The Party's desire to play with its victims is dramatized in O'Brien's play with Winston. The Party seeks a mad group gratification—a collective pleasure—to be achieved through the possession and exercise of power. The horrifying words of O'Brien as Winston undergoes his re-education in Part Three graphically sum up the evil extremity of the Party's vision of the future: 'If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—for ever.'

One critic provocatively describes Orwell's novel as more like a vision of hell than a vision of any ordinary or realistic human world.[12] From this angle, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is controlled less by human politicians than by tormenting demons. To draw this out a little further, we could argue that the Party's power verges on the magical. In any real world, how could surveillance and control be so comprehensive? How could the microscopic actions of every individual be ceaselessly monitored for years at a stretch, and how could intricate traps be set to encourage and catch out these individuals in some act of thoughtcrime? O'Brien himself hints at the idea that the Party sets people up to act out a drama of thoughtcrime, a drama on which the Party feeds, when he says to Winston:

> 'This drama I have played out with you during seven years will be played out over and over again, generation after generation, always in subtler forms. Always we shall have the heretic here at our mercy, screaming with pain, broken up, contemptible—and in the end utterly penitent, saved from himself, crawling to our feet of his own accord. That is the world we are preparing, Winston.' (p. 215)

In other words, the Party needs to make the heretic suffer in order to experience and affirm its power. A torturer without a victim is incapable of feeling powerful; O'Brien therefore needs Winston. This makes more sense of what appears from time to time as the magnetism—the love affair—between Winston and his torturer. Even under torture, Winston feels comforted by the love and care of O'Brien: '[O'Brien] was the tormentor, he was the protector, he was the inquisitor, he was the friend' (p. 196). The paradox of loving the tormentor is played out in the narrative's bitterly triumphant closing words: 'He loved Big Brother' (p. 239).

The story of Winston's defeat by the Party is a nightmare representation, then, of totalitarian political power fuelled not by any desire to improve society but by the pleasure of cruelty and domination.[13] The outcome of the story—the victory of the Party—not only involves but also requires the crushing of Winston as representative individual human being. Does this

story of the defeat of the individual, however, suggest that no hope remains? What weight does the text give to O'Brien's assertion that the Party will remain in power forever? In relation to the question of the narrative's optimism or pessimism about the future, I offer two concluding arguments.

First, there is the inclusion in the novel of two fragmentary texts that promise alternatives to Winston's view. These are the excerpts from Goldstein's book and the Newspeak Appendix. Goldstein's book, however, is embedded within the narrative, and so—once O'Brien reveals himself as its author—is easily discredited. Only the Newspeak Appendix remains unframed. Because this fragment is positioned outside (beyond the end of) the narrative proper, as an appendix, it points to the possible existence of a future beyond Winston's own doomed narrative. Written in the dry and technical language of anthropological analysis, the Newspeak Appendix offers to explain the methods of thought control employed by the Party regime. Such a text could only have been composed in a more distant future, beyond the narrative's own time, when it is possible to read Winston's narrative as a kind of surviving historical record. Yet the presence of the Appendix is enigmatic and unexplained. Who is its narrator? How is the reader to evaluate its credibility? The question remains: to what extent does the Newspeak Appendix convincingly refute O'Brien's assertion that 'The rule of the Party is forever' (p. 210)?

Second, there is the absence from the narrative of any significant viewpoint emanating from the proles. Orwell's choice of a member of the Outer Party as his narrative's focal point directs and finally restricts its representation of power. Winston is neither from the privileged 'Inner Party' nor is he a prole: he is of 'the Middle' group (High, Middle and Low groups are mentioned in Goldstein's book). Winston's perspective necessarily circumscribes the degree to which the narrative can represent the possibility that power may reside with the mass of ordinary people. Simultaneously inspired and repelled by them,[14] Winston at one point remarks, 'If there is hope, it lies with the proles' (p. 59). Yet there is little or no

evidence in the narrative to refute the view to which O'Brien leads him in the end: 'The proletarians will never revolt, not in a thousand years or a million. They cannot' (p. 210). Confronted with this, Winston finds himself overwhelmed by weariness, knowing that

> men in the mass were frail cowardly creatures who could not endure liberty or face the truth, and must be ruled over and systematically deceived by others who were stronger than themselves. (p. 210)

Any threat to the Party from the masses, an expendable, unskilled labour force of 'proles', is thus discounted. The only remaining threat to the Party comes from a subordinated but literate middle grouping to which Winston himself belongs. Keeping the subhuman proles down through mass propaganda and random bombing, the Inner Party is free to focus its systematic surveillance on individual members of the Outer Party. The complete crushing of Winston's individuality dramatizes and completes the perfection of the Party's power. Yet, with the narrative allied to Winston's 'middle' view, the proles are deprived of an independent voice and remain at the narrative's margins.

This raises the vexed and controversial question of the extent to which extreme pessimism about people power is really just Winston's view, or whether Orwell's novel is also implicitly pessimistic, and dependent upon a class-based, hierarchical attitude to 'the masses'. In other words, if Winston and O'Brien make élitist assumptions about the masses, to what extent do these assumptions permeate the text as a whole? The question of how much capacity 'the masses' have to play a conscious or resistant role in society, or in history, is one that has long preoccupied artists, writers and political thinkers. It is a question that arises in consideration of a wide range of texts, from contemporary song lyrics to films representing working-class life and experience.[15] Either way, to resist a hierarchical view of the proles the reader must also resist being positioned by a narrative that is so comprehensively aligned with Winston. It is through such resistance that the reader can construct other

meanings and possibilities. Just as they seem to elude the full attention of the Inner Party, the proles may also escape from between the lines of Orwell's novel, defying its presumption that it can represent in full their lives and thoughts.

Endnotes

[1] This reading of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* responds to elements within the NSW Stage 6 English Syllabus. Orwell's novel is currently an option for study in the HSC Advanced Course. In Module C: Representation and Text, students 'explore various representations of events, personalities or situations'; 'evaluate how medium of production, textual form, perspective and choice of language influence meaning'; and develop their understanding of 'the relationships between representation and meaning' (see *English Stage 6 Syllabus*, p. 52). In the current prescriptions list, Orwell's novel appears as an option within Elective 2: Powerplay. In this elective, students 'consider representations of and the interplay of types of power', 'analyse portraits of the powerful', 'consider how the depiction of particular relationships provides insight into the nature of politics', and 'consider the extent to which power resides with the people' (see *English Stage 6 Prescriptions 2001 and 2002*, p. 22).

[2] *Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (London: Secker and Warburg, 1968), iv, 502; cited in Raymond Williams, *Orwell*, Modern Masters, 3rd edn (London: Fontana, 1991), p. 95.

[3] For example, Bernard Crick argues a case for seeing Orwell's book as primarily satirical: '*Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Satire or Prophecy?', in *The Future of Nineteen Eighty-Four*, ed. Ejner J. Jensen (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984), pp. 7-21. Against this view, see Malcolm Pittock, 'The Hell of Nineteen Eighty-Four', *Essays in Criticism* 47 (1997), 143-64. Available from The Chestnut Tree Café internet site: http://www.seas.upenn.edu:8080/~allport/chestnut/hell1984.htm

[4] Gorman Beauchamp asserts that, like all dystopias, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is 'an admonitory satire': 'From Bingo to Big Brother: Orwell on Power and Sadism', in *The Future of Nineteen Eighty-Four*, ed. Jensen, p. 75.

[5] George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1954), p. 18.

[6] Ross Murfin and Supryia M. Ray, eds, *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms* (Boston: Bedford, 1998).

[7] See, for instance, Winston's dream of the Golden Country, which recurs while he is in the Ministry of Love (pp. 224-5). In 'The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*' (see above, n. 3), Pittock argues that the recurrence of Winston's dream in this context shows that it may not be spontaneous, but rather planted by the Party.

[8] This narrative strategy (as with notions of power in Orwell's novel) can be usefully compared and contrasted with how power is described by the poststructuralist philosopher, Michel Foucault. Foucault considers how the relationship between surveillance and power works in the modern world. He applies the notion of the panopticon (an eighteenth-century design for a modernized prison system, developed by the English philosopher, Jeremy Bentham) to the way that modern people adjust themselves to perpetual surveillance by becoming more self-regulating. An example is the use of speed and red light cameras which, by creating the possibility of observation at any time, induce changes in driver attitude, making them more self-aware and self-regulating. There are a number of websites that give more detail about these ideas. One example can be found in background information for 'The Virtual Panopticon':
http://is.gseis.ucla.edu/impact/f96/Projects/dengberg/

[9] From a guide to critical terms for science fiction and fantasy, posted on the website of Purdue University (accessed 13 September 2001):
http://icdweb.cc.purdue.edu/~felluga/guidesf.html#narration

[10] See Robert Currie, 'The "Big Truth" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*', *Essays in Criticism* 34 (1984), 56-69.

[11] See:
http://www.dartmouth.edu/~matc/math5.geometry/unit4/unit4.htm l#Trios
For the symbolism of the number three in ancient Greek philosophy and in the European Renaissance, see Rudolf Wittkower, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*, 3rd edn (London: Alec Tiranti, 1962), pp. 101-7.

[12] Pittock, 'The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*' (see above, n. 3).

[13] Gorman Beauchamp suggests that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* sadism is what motivates political power, and that this link has been seen by some as a problem with its analysis of power: 'Orwell seems to suggest that the aggressive and destructive manifestations of power politics (dropping bombs, etc.) are the large scale displacements of individual desires to hurt others—drives that, rather than exceptional, are commonplace and found all around us' ('From Bingo to Big Brother', p. 79).

[14] Roger Fowler compiles a list of grotesque descriptions of characters in Orwell's novel, arguing that these not only add to its texture but also create the impression that 'Winston … lives in a world peopled by a variety of strange monsters': *The Language of George Orwell* (London: Macmillan, 1995), pp. 203-5.

[15] Many other texts can be considered in relation to the question of how 'the masses' are defined and represented. Are 'ordinary people' brainwashed by mass culture or can they participate in social or political change? What power do they have, and in what ways can they exercise it? Examples from the contemporary era include:

- Patti Smith, 'People Have the Power' (1988), song lyrics
- The Living End, 'Prisoner of Society' (1998), song lyrics
- Naomi Klein, *No Logo* (Toronto: Knopf, 2000), prose non fiction
- Ed Finn, 'Exposing the Business Propagandists: corporate PR experts see people as a herd waiting to be led', essay available from the Canadian Alternative Policy Centre Website: athttp://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/articles/article305.html
- *Raining Stones* (dir. Ken Loach, 1993), film
- *The Royle Family* (dir. Steve Bendelack, Mark Mylod, and Caroline Aherne, 1998-), television sitcom series
- *A Very British Coup* (dir. Alan Plater, 1988), television serial
- *People's Century: People Power* (prod. Zvi Dor-Ner and Peter Pagnamenta, 1998), television documentary series: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/peoplescentury/episodes/peoplepower/

BRIGID ROONEY holds a postdoctoral fellowship in the Department of English at the University of Sydney. Her doctoral thesis was on the Australian novelist, Christina Stead,

and she is now working on a study of contemporary Australian writers as public intellectuals.