



From Secret Gardens to Surveillance Nightmares: How *1984* Turns Escapist Fiction into Intimidation

Literature

Dr. Abdullah Mohammed Khalil 

alkhalil812000@tu.edu.ye

Sawsan Hussein Khalil 

larakhali67@gmail.com

Abstract

This article re-examines George Orwell's *1984* as a framework for understanding contemporary algorithmic power rather than as a static Cold War allegory. Drawing on Foucault's theory of discourse, Habermas's model of the public sphere, and Zuboff's concept of surveillance capitalism, it conducts a qualitative content analysis of key scenes—Winston's diary, the Two Minutes Hate, and Room 101—alongside wartime propaganda archives and recent EU data on disinformation. The study traces how control evolves from linguistic restriction (*Newspeak*) and historical erasure (*memory holes*) to emotional conditioning and emerging neural surveillance. These mechanisms reveal that modern censorship functions through predictive platforms that preempt dissent by narrowing language, deleting records, and steering emotion. *1984*, therefore, is best read not merely as a warning but as an analytic lens that illuminates how power adapts in the digital age. The article concludes with proposals for critical digital literacy, algorithmic transparency, and communal data stewardship to safeguard the "secret garden" of imagination and preserve democratic freedom.

Keywords: Orwellian Dystopia, Surveillance Capitalism, Algorithmic Governance, Newspeak, Archival Control, Critical Digital Literacy.

* Assistant Professor of English Literature, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Thamar University, Yemen.

** BA (Hons) English, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Thamar University, Yemen.

Cite this article as: Khalil, A. M. Khalil, S. H. (2025). From Secret Gardens to Surveillance Nightmares: How *1984* Turns Escapist Fiction into Intimidation Literature, *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 7(4): 665 -682
<https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i4.2855>

© This material is published under the license of Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), which allows the user to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. It also allows adapting, transforming or adding to the material for any purpose, even commercially, as long as such modifications are highlighted and the material is credited to its author.



مِنَ الحَدَائِقِ السِّرِّيَّةِ إِلَى كَوَائِبِ المُرَاقَبَةِ: كَيْفَ تُحَوَّلُ رِوَايَةُ "1984" أَدَبُ الهُرُوبِ إِلَى أَدَبِ التَّرْهِيْبِ

سوسن حسين خليل ^{ID**}

larakhali67@gmail.com

د. عبد الله محمد خليل ^{ID*}

alkhalil812000@tu.edu.ye

المُلخَص

يعيد هذا البحث قراءة رواية جورج أورويل 1984 بوصفها إطارًا لفهم السلطة الخوارزمية المعاصرة، لا مجرد مجازٍ ثابت من حقبة الحرب الباردة. يستند المقال إلى نظرية الخطاب لدى فوكو، ونموذج المجال العام لهابرماس، ومفهوم رأسمالية المراقبة لشوشانا زوبوف، ويقدم تحليلًا نوعيًا لمقاطع رئيسة في النص، مثل يوميات ونستون، ودقيقتي الكراهية، وغرفة 101، إلى جانب أرشيفات دعائية من زمن الحرب وبيانات أوروبية حديثة حول التضليل الإعلامي. يتتبع البحث كيف تتطور آليات السيطرة من تقييد اللغة (اللغة الجديدة) و(محو التاريخ) (ثقوب الناكرة) إلى تشكيل الانفعالات والمراقبة العصبية الناشئة. وتُظهر النتائج أنَّ الرقابة الحديثة تعمل من خلال منصّات تنبؤية تسبق المعارضة بتضيق المفردات، ومحو السجلات، وتوجيه العواطف. وبذلك تُقرأ 1984 لا بوصفها تحذيرًا فحسب، بل بوصفها عدسة تحليلية تكشف كيف تتكيف السلطة في العصر الرقمي. ويختتم البحث باقتراحات تشمل الثقافة الرقمية النقدية، وشفافية الخوارزميات، والإدارة الجماعية للبيانات، بهدف حماية "الحديقة السرية" للخيال وصون الحرية الديمقراطية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: ديستوبيا أورويلية، رأسمالية المراقبة، الحوكمة الخوارزمية، اللغة الجديدة، السيطرة الأرضية، الثقافة الرقمية النقدية.

* أستاذ الأدب الإنجليزي المساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة ذمار، الجمهورية اليمنية.

** بكالوريوس لغة إنجليزية، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة ذمار، الجمهورية اليمنية.

للاقتباس: خليل، ع. م. خليل، س. ح. (2025). مِّنَ الحَدَائِقِ السِّرِّيَّةِ إِلَى كَوَائِبِ المُرَاقَبَةِ: كَيْفَ تُحَوَّلُ رِوَايَةُ "1984" أَدَبُ الهُرُوبِ إِلَى أَدَبِ التَّرْهِيْبِ، *الآداب للدراسات اللغوية والأدبية*، 7(4): 665-682 <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i4.2855>

© نُشر هذا البحث وفقًا لشروط الرخصة Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)، التي تسمح بنسخ البحث وتوزيعه ونقله بأي شكل من الأشكال، كما تسمح بتكييف البحث أو تحويله أو الإضافة إليه لأي غرض كان، بما في ذلك الأغراض التجارية، شريطة نسبة العمل إلى صاحبه مع بيان أي تعديلات أجريت عليه.



1 Introduction

In the popular imagination, classic fiction often functions as a *hortus conclusus*—a secret garden where readers withdraw from the present, wander among invented landscapes, and return morally refreshed. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (hereafter *1984*) subverts that expectation. Written on the windswept Scottish island of Jura in 1948—a moment shaped by Cold War paranoia, post-Nazi trauma, and the dawn of the information age—*1984* replaces pastoral escape with “surveillance nightmares,” where language, memory, and even desire become instruments of control (Orwell, 1949/2008). The novel dramatizes how imaginative refuge can be conscripted into a regime of fear, transforming escapist reading into an experience of intimidation.

This article argues that *1984* anticipates not only the totalitarian anxieties of its time but also the algorithmic systems of the twenty-first century. It positions Orwell's novel as a diagnostic framework for understanding how predictive algorithms, content-moderation pipelines, and emotion-tracking interfaces extend his vocabulary—Newspeak, doublethink, and the memory hole—into the digital infrastructures of today (Zuboff, 2019). When linguistic and mnemonic horizons are engineered, the very conditions for private thought and democratic agency begin to erode (Lyon, 2018).

To support this claim, the paper traces *1984*'s critical reception from early readings—“totalitarian warning” versus “socialist satire”—to contemporary analyses that engage with algorithmic governance and data capitalism (Andrejevic, 2019; Kavanagh & Rich, 2018). It then applies three complementary theoretical lenses: Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of discourse, which reveals how power infiltrates daily communication; Jürgen Habermas's (1989) model of the public sphere, highlighting the decay of communicative rationality in monopoly media systems; and Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) notion of surveillance capitalism, which exposes how data extraction monetizes attention and reconfigures control.

Drawing on these frameworks, the article conducts close readings of three key textual moments—Winston's diary, the Two Minutes Hate, and Room 101—each mapped onto contemporary sociotechnical phenomena such as trace data, affective synchronization, and biometric targeting (Tufekci, 2015; Gillespie, 2018; Gorwa, 2024). Finally, it considers pedagogical and policy implications, proposing that educators and regulators treat *1984* not as a relic of the Cold War but as a living heuristic for decoding today's algorithmic power.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Early Cold-War Readings

The first wave of *1984* criticism emerged in the shadow of Yalta and Hiroshima, when Western intellectuals feared both Stalinist expansion and the fragility of liberal democracy. Unsurprisingly, critics

fixated on the novel's historical analogue—Big Brother as Joseph Stalin—and cast Orwell as either a courageous anti-totalitarian or a reluctant Cold War propagandist.

Bernard Crick's *George Orwell: A Life* (1992) situates the author within a democratic socialist tradition committed to "plain facts and common decency," emphasizing Orwell's defense of empirical truth against ideological distortion. Norman Podhoretz (1983), writing in *Harper's Magazine*, praised Orwell's "prophetic anti-communism" yet ignored the novel's simultaneous critique of British imperialism and American corporate media.

Early readings thus foregrounded geopolitics but overlooked the epistemic dimension of *1984*—its investigation into how language itself structures belief. As Cold War rhetoric hardened into a binary of "free world" versus "iron curtain," such interpretations reduced Orwell's multilayered narrative to political allegory alone, muting its subtler warnings about liberal complicity in information control (Lyon, 2018).

2.2 Structuralist and Post-Structuralist Approaches

By the 1970s, structuralist and post-structuralist theorists redirected attention from external politics to the textual operations of power. Terry Eagleton (1983, 1991) read *1984* as a critique of ideology understood as a *semiotic system*, where ruling institutions "write" social reality by monopolizing signifiers. Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of *panopticism* reoriented surveillance from visible coercion to internalized discipline, while John Daldry (1992) mapped the telescreen onto Bentham's Panopticon to show how self-policing becomes a habit of thought.

Later critics deepened this linguistic turn. Kristoffer Rissanen (2014) highlighted hate as the Party's affective syntax—an emotional grammar sustaining political loyalty—while Douglas Youvan (2024) traced how Newspeak's engineered synonym loss truncates cognitive range, making "thoughtcrime" linguistically impossible.

Other semiotic readings, such as Seul-Bi Lee's (2023) work on *archival violence* and Derridean erasure, position Newspeak as part of a larger discourse that regulates memory as well as meaning. Together, these studies show that *1984*'s terror lies not merely in surveillance but in linguistic impoverishment—the systematic shrinking of words that define what can be imagined or contested.

2.3 Digital Age Revisions

The rise of platform capitalism and algorithmic governance introduced a third interpretive phase, one that reads *1984* through predictive analytics and behavioral surveillance. Shoshana Zuboff's *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (2019) argues that twenty-first-century corporations transform human experience into data commodities, turning Big Brother into "Big Other." John Cheney-Lippold (2017) and Safiya U. Noble (2018) demonstrate how search engines and



recommendation systems narrow discursive horizons, echoing Newspeak's restricted *B-vocabulary*. Empirical studies reinforce this link: Tarleton Gillespie (2018) reveals how "trust and safety" teams act as privatized Ministries of Truth, while Robert Gorwa's (2019) analysis of algorithmic moderation exposes systemic bias against marginalized voices. Collectively, these works trace a shift from state censorship to platform governance—an invisible architecture of control that fulfills Orwell's prophecy of self-regulating societies.

2.4 Synthesis and Gap Identification

Across these three strands—Cold War allegory, structuralist textualism, and digital-age media studies—*1984* has proven remarkably adaptable. Yet a persistent blind spot remains: the primacy of *language* as the first instrument of domination.

While modern readers often picture surveillance through visual metaphors like the telescreen or smartphone camera, Orwell located power in the linguistic template that precedes visibility. This study addresses that omission by foregrounding *language as infrastructure*: it argues that algorithmic recommendation systems replicate Newspeak's logic, not merely hiding or revealing content but defining what can be said or conceived.

By combining literary close reading with empirical media analysis, the article positions *1984* as a living heuristic for understanding how epistemic enclosure functions across different historical regimes—from Stalinist propaganda to predictive data profiling.

3 Theoretical Framework

To explain how *1984* transforms the promise of escapist reading into a logic of intimidation, this study fuses three critical perspectives—Foucault's discourse theory, Habermas's public sphere analysis, and Zuboff's surveillance capitalism. Together they model censorship as a continuum that extends from words to networks.

3.1 Foucault: Discourse, Power, and Epistemic Engineering

Foucault (1977, 1980) contends that power operates not through overt repression but through the production of knowledge that defines what counts as truth. In *1984*, Newspeak exemplifies this mechanism: by collapsing synonym clusters ("good," "plusgood," "doubleplusgood") and deleting antonyms, the Party builds an epistemic environment in which dissent becomes literally unthinkable.

Similarly, digital systems today impose linguistic discipline through predictive text, algorithmic tagging, and moderation vocabularies that reward compliant phrasing (Cheney-Lippold, 2017). Both the Party's lexicon and modern interfaces illustrate how power organizes the conditions of expression long before coercion occurs.



3.2 Habermas: Communicative Action and the Fragmented Public Sphere

Habermas (1989) locates democratic legitimacy in open, rational discourse. Orwell's Oceania annihilates this possibility: citizens engage in ritual speech acts—Two Minutes Hate, Party slogans—that simulate communication while preventing genuine dialogue.

In the digital public sphere, similar dynamics emerge when algorithmic feeds and pay-for-visibility models fragment discussion and reward emotional extremity (Kavanagh & Rich, 2018; Tufekci, 2015). Habermas's theory clarifies why these infrastructures corrode the deliberative core of democracy, transforming public reason into an economy of outrage.

3.3 Zuboff: Surveillance Capitalism and the Marketization of Control

Zuboff (2019) reframes Orwell's centralized surveillance as a decentralized data economy. Big Brother's telescreens have evolved into ubiquitous sensors that record and predict behavior for profit. In *1984*, Room 101 personalizes terror by exploiting Winston's deepest fear; in digital capitalism, affective analytics personalize persuasion. Facial emotion APIs and sentiment dashboards convert emotional data into commercial intelligence (Couldry & Mejias, 2019), making the boundaries of freedom negotiable through algorithmic calibration.

3.4 Synthesis: From Language to Infrastructure

Taken together, these frameworks reveal censorship as a multi-layered process:

- (a) lexical control restricts what can be said (Foucault),
- (b) discursive distortion undermines collective reasoning (Habermas), and
- (c) predictive commodification turns behavior into a site of governance (Zuboff).

When these forces converge, even reading—a space once reserved for reflection—becomes an act of managed perception. *1984* thus functions as both allegory and analytic tool, mapping twentieth-century totalitarian logic onto twenty-first-century algorithmic architectures.

4 Methodology

This study employs a qualitative literary research design that integrates close textual analysis with selective interdisciplinary methods from history and media policy. Rather than a fully mixed-methods study, it remains fundamentally literary, using contextual and empirical materials to illuminate how *1984* anticipates contemporary forms of algorithmic control. This triangulated approach ensures that interpretive claims resonate across three temporal layers—the novel's textual world, Orwell's wartime context, and today's algorithmic public sphere.

4.1 Data Sources

1. **Primary Textual Corpus.** All narrative episodes, speeches, and paratexts in *1984* constitute the main dataset, with particular focus on (a) Winston's diary, (b) the Two Minutes Hate, and (c) Room 101. Citations follow APA 7, drawing on the Penguin Modern Classics edition (Orwell, 1949/2008).



2. **Archival Contextual Materials.** Declassified propaganda leaflets from Britain's Ministry of Information (1943–1945) and U.S. Office of Strategic Services manuals (OSS, 1944) provide historical grounding for Orwell's depiction of mass persuasion (Shelden, 1991).
3. **Contemporary Empirical Reports.** The *European Commission Report on Disinformation and Platform Accountability* (2024) offers comparative data on content moderation and algorithmic amplification, serving as a real-world analogue to Orwell's "Ministry of Truth" (European Commission, 2024).

4.2 Triangulation and Trustworthiness

Findings from textual analysis were cross-checked against wartime propaganda records for historical plausibility and against EU disinformation data for present-day relevance. This triangulation enhances credibility by showing that Orwell's fictional mechanisms align with both historical and contemporary realities.

Research transparency was maintained through a concise audit trail of coding decisions and peer debriefing with digital-media scholars unaffiliated with the project. These procedures ensure confirmability and dependability while keeping the analysis grounded in literary interpretation.

By combining literary hermeneutics with archival and policy insights, the methodology establishes a coherent bridge between text and context, preparing the ground for the thematic analysis that follows.

5 Analysis

5.1 Newspeak: Engineering Thought

Orwell's *Newspeak* offers a literary prototype for what cognitive linguists term **semantic narrowing**—the deliberate reduction of synonyms that constrains conceptual nuance (Lakoff, 2014). By erasing linguistic variety, the Party erases the mental "counterfactual space" where dissent might arise. Winston's anxiety that a single lexical slip could provoke "the swiftest monitory glance" (Orwell, 1949/2008, p. 26) illustrates how external surveillance becomes internal discipline.

Contemporary research reinforces this mechanism. Gillespie's *Custodians of the Internet* (2018) shows how moderation infrastructures cultivate anticipatory self-censorship. Willcox (2024) documents how influencers strategically modify content to evade algorithmic suppression. Reports from the Oxford Internet Institute (2020) and Bradshaw et al. (2021) track evolving moderation policies on YouTube, while *BU Today* (2025) describes recent policy relaxations. Collectively, these studies confirm that Orwell's model of linguistic self-policing persists in digital culture, where concise, compliant speech is rewarded and deviation discouraged. *Newspeak* thus anticipates a linguistic environment optimized for legibility rather than expression, narrowing the imaginative horizon of discourse.



5.2 Mediated Memory and Archive Politics

If *Newspeak* constricts the future, the Party's "memory holes" dissolve the past. Derrida's (1995) concept of archival violence—the authority to determine what may be remembered—finds tangible form in the Ministry of Truth, where records vanish in gusts of ash. The epistemic outcome is orphaned fact, severed from provenance and open to manipulation.

A contemporary analogue emerged during the 2023–2024 Gaza conflict, when social media companies conducted large-scale removals of Palestinian digital content. Human Rights Watch (2023) recorded over 1,000 instances of deleted or restricted posts on Meta platforms; 7amleh (2024) reported systematic account suspensions on X and Instagram; and *The Palestine Chronicle* (2024) documented over 25,000 digital violations. Framed as a case study of algorithmic censorship, these findings exemplify how archival control now operates through private platforms rather than centralized states (Gorwa, 2024). Memory, once a repository of historical truth, becomes a contested space where digital infrastructure mediates what may be known, shared, or forgotten.

5.3 Doublethink and Cognitive Capture

Doublethink—"holding simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out" (Orwell, 1949/2008, p. 35)—anticipates psychological research on **motivated reasoning** (Kunda, 1990). In Oceania, slogans like "War Is Peace" train citizens to manage contradiction through emotional allegiance rather than logical resolution. Algorithmic newsfeeds reproduce this cognitive pattern by presenting personalized "fact-worlds" that rarely intersect (Tufekci, 2015). As contradiction becomes habitual, epistemic agency weakens: verification appears naive, and emotional certainty replaces deliberation. *Doublethink* thus transforms escapist reading—traditionally a space of freedom—into a cognitive trap where thought polices itself.

5.4 Ritualized Hatred and Affective Computing

The *Two Minutes Hate* dramatizes what affect theorists describe as collective emotional orchestration, in which shared hostility reinforces social unity (Hipfl, 2018; Gregg & Seigworth, 2010). Modern affective computing technologies—sentiment analysis dashboards and emotion-AI cameras—extend this logic into real-time emotional feedback loops (Camacho-Collados et al., 2022; Poría et al., 2020). By micro-targeting outrage, digital platforms redirect discontent from systemic critique toward symbolic enemies, replicating the Party's strategy with algorithmic precision. Orwell's vision of citizens shouting at Emmanuel Goldstein anticipates today's online "pile-ons," where users collectively perform anger to affirm belonging. In both contexts, fear of exclusion enforces conformity and narrows the affective range available for empathy or reasoned dialogue.



5.5 Room 101 and the Biopolitics of Fear

Room 101 represents personalized terror—punishment tailored to each individual’s deepest phobia. Foucault’s (1977) concept of biopolitics clarifies how power colonizes the body’s sensations as well as its behaviors. Winston’s rat phobia foreshadows machine-learning models that extrapolate biometric signals to predict—and influence—human responses (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). While Orwell depicts the collapse of the self under torture, contemporary neuromarketing and behavior-prediction technologies aim to pre-empt dissent through emotional and physiological manipulation (Andrejevic, 2019). The private interior—once the last refuge of autonomy—thus becomes the final site of control. *Room 101* transforms the novel’s “secret garden” of inner freedom into a chamber where individuality is dissolved for systemic stability.

Together, these five analyses trace a continuum from linguistic austerity to biometric domination, illustrating the multi-layered censorship model outlined in Section 3. Preserving language, memory, and emotion from algorithmic capture remains vital to restoring fiction’s emancipatory potential.

6 Pedagogical and Policy Implications

Orwell’s core insight—that civic freedom is inseparable from epistemic integrity—resonates even more urgently in an era of machine-curated information. If predictive platforms can narrow vocabularies, erase archives, modulate emotions, and personalize fear, then safeguarding democracy means cultivating citizens who can diagnose and resist those very mechanisms (Benkler, 2006; Hobbs, 2020).

6.1 Pedagogical Applications: From Close Reading to Code Reading

1. Pairing *1984* with Platform Law. Assign Orwell’s chapters alongside case studies such as the EU Digital Services Act (European Commission, 2024) or the UK Online Safety Act (UK Parliament, 2023). Students trace how Newspeak’s lexical austerity maps onto modern content-moderation taxonomies, turning literary analysis into regulatory critique.
2. Data Diaries and “Memory Hole” Audits. Borrowing from critical data-studies pedagogy, learners keep a one-week log of algorithmic encounters—search autocompletes, feed recommendations, deleted posts—then compare personal “memory holes” with Orwell’s furnace chutes (Tufekci, 2015).
3. Affective Literacy Labs. Using open-source sentiment-analysis tools, students visualize how emotionally charged keywords circulate on X (formerly Twitter) or TikTok during breaking news. The exercise exposes the digital Two Minutes Hate and invites reflection on affective synchronization (Camacho-Collados et al., 2022; Poria et al., 2020).



4. Interdisciplinary Capstones. English-media collaborations culminate in policy briefs or creative counter-narratives (e.g., “counter-Newspeak” lexicons) that reclaim linguistic diversity as a democratic resource.

These strategies move beyond dystopian fatalism, positioning *1984* as a springboard for critical digital literacy—the skill set to interrogate code, interface, archive, and algorithm.

6.2 Policy Interventions: Pluralism, Transparency, and Accountability

1. Algorithmic Transparency Mandates. Require platforms to publish explainable summaries of ranking and moderation models, enabling independent audits for bias and repression (Gorwa, 2024).
2. Data-Fiduciary Obligations. Redefine user data as a trust rather than a commodity, curbing the commercial incentives that fuel predictive repression (Zuboff, 2019).
3. Archival Integrity Standards. Establish legal “right-to-reference” provisions that safeguard public-interest records from unilateral deletion, countering the modern memory hole (7amleh, 2024; Human Rights Watch, 2023; Palestine Chronicle, 2024; Gorwa, 2024).
4. Public Funding for Digital-Media Literacy. Allocate a percentage of platform fines or tech-sector taxes to community programs that teach citizens to decode algorithmic systems—an educational prophylactic against epistemic capture (Hobbs, 2020).
5. Pluralistic Infrastructure Support. Encourage interoperable social-media protocols and non-profit public networks to dilute monopoly control over discourse, updating Habermas’s call for an unrestricted public sphere (Habermas, 1989).

Taken together, these recommendations operationalize Orwell’s warning as a policy roadmap: preserve linguistic diversity, secure collective memory, and demystify the affective economies that underpin modern surveillance capitalism. Only by fortifying each layer of the communicative stack—from words to code—can democratic societies prevent today’s “secret gardens” of imagination from hardening into tomorrow’s “surveillance nightmares.”

6.3 Deepfakes and Real-World Epistemic Distortion

While Orwell imagined the Ministry of Truth as a monolithic state agency, twenty-first-century reality re-creates its effects through synthetic-media technologies that circulate far beyond government control. *Deepfakes*—AI-generated or AI-manipulated images, video, and audio—can fabricate persuasive but false evidence, thereby short-circuiting the empirical checks that underpin public reason (Chesney and Citron, 2019). The plausibility of such fabrications erodes the very criterion of *verifiability*, fostering what



scholars call epistemic paralysis—a situation in which citizens, overwhelmed by uncertainty, withdraw from democratic deliberation (Vaccari and Chadwick, 2020).

Deepfake campaigns thus operationalize Orwell's dictum that "Who controls the past controls the future" by weaponizing *visual credibility*. Unlike the Party's centralized memory holes, synthetic media produce a polycentric distortion: multiple actors—state propagandists, political operatives, and trolls for hire—can insert false memories into the media stream, rendering the archive itself unstable (Paris and Donovan, 2019). The result is a distributed Ministry of Truth embedded in the network architecture, where every smartphone can become a miniature propaganda studio.

Regulatory bodies have begun to acknowledge the threat. The EU's forthcoming AI Act (2025) proposes mandatory watermarking of synthetic content, while the U.S. DEEPFAKES Accountability Act (2024) seeks criminal penalties for malicious fabrications. Yet technical watermarking alone cannot restore epistemic integrity if audiences lack the critical literacies to interpret provenance signals (Hobbs, 2020). From a pedagogical standpoint, pairing *1984* with classroom "deepfake detection labs" can help students grasp how easily perception is orchestrated—bridging Orwell's fictional ministry and today's algorithmic reality.

In short, deepfakes exemplify the migration of censorship from centralized bureaucracies to decentralized computational infrastructures. They convert Orwell's concern with archival deletion into a new front: archival fabrication, where the problem is not the absence of evidence but an overabundance of counterfeit proof. Addressing this challenge will require the same multiscalar strategy outlined in Sections 3 and 6—combining linguistic vigilance, platform transparency, and critical-media education to prevent synthetic realities from becoming the next iteration of intimidation literature.

6.4 Technology as a Tool of Control: From Telescreens to Neural Interfaces

Orwell's telescreens function as totalizing portals: they broadcast propaganda while simultaneously harvesting visual and auditory data, fusing entertainment and espionage in a single device. Written at a moment when post-war households were first adopting radio and television, *1984* channels mid-century anxieties that domestic screens might invert the private sphere, turning the living room into a surveillance outpost (Williams, 1974). In the twenty-first century, the *form factor* has changed—from wall-mounted cathode rays to palm-sized smartphones and always-listening smart speakers—but the dialectic of spectacle and scrutiny has intensified (Andrejevic, 2019). Front-facing cameras, gyroscopes, and geolocation chips create a data exhaust that is continuously mined for predictive insights, approximating Orwell's vision of omnipresent monitoring.

Emergent brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) such as Neuralink radicalize this trajectory. Elon Musk's venture seeks to "merge biological and digital intelligence" by implanting a neural array that lets users operate



devices by thought alone (Musk and Neuralink, 2023). While marketed as an assistive technology for paralysis, the prospect of *readable cognition* raises Orwellian questions: Who owns neural data? Can thought itself be content-moderated? Bioethicists warn that BCIs could enable cognitive surveillance, whereby unspoken impulses become the next frontier of behavioral analytics (Ienca and Andorno, 2017). The scenario recalls the Thought Police, but with a crucial escalation: instead of punishing deviant speech, future regimes could pre-empt dissent by intercepting neural signatures of doubt or anger, modulating them via closed-loop stimulation (Farahany, 2023).

Framed through the study's multiscalar model of censorship (Section 3), BCIs represent a shift from linguistic and affective capture to neuro-epistemic capture. The "secret garden" of interior consciousness risks annexation by corporate—government consortia, fulfilling the Party's aim to make even *thinking* a subversive act. Regulatory safeguards—neural privacy rights, algorithmic explainability, and fiduciary duties for brain data—are therefore no longer speculative ideals but democratic imperatives. Without them, Orwell's speculative telescreen could find its ultimate expression not on the wall, but within the skull.

6.5 Platform Capitalism and Data Extraction: From "Big Brother" to "Big Other"

Orwell intuited that the most efficient form of power would fuse surveillance with quotidian pleasure; twenty-first-century platform capitalism realizes that intuition by monetizing every click, scroll, and pause (Srnicsek, 2017). Social-AI applications such as Character.AI or Replika present themselves as benign companionship tools, yet their economic model relies on harvesting intimate disclosures—an affective surplus that can be repackaged for targeted advertising, content moderation, or human-in-the-loop model training (Couldry and Mejias, 2019). In effect, the user's confessional speech becomes raw material for algorithmic recommendations that quietly steer mood, preference, and even political orientation, echoing the Party's attempt to engineer thought via Newspeak.

Zuboff (2019) calls this dynamic surveillance capitalism: data extraction is no longer a side effect of service provision but the core product. The process replicates 1984's epistemic assault: individual autonomy is eroded not through overt coercion but through predictive nudging and behavioral micro-targeting (Andrejevic, 2019). Where Oceania's subjects feared Thought Police, contemporary users encounter "personalization"—a velvet glove that masks the iron hand of profiling. Recent studies show that sentiment-adaptive chatbots can subtly modulate user opinions on immigration and climate policy after fewer than 50 conversational turns (Kleinberg et al., 2024), mirroring Orwell's fear that language can be bent toward ideological conformity without the subject's awareness.



Resistance Strategies

Countering platform hegemony requires reviving the critical consciousness Orwell championed. Three tactics emerge:

1. Data Minimalism and Encryption. Encouraging users to limit data footprints and employ privacy-enhancing technologies interrupts the extraction pipeline (Eubanks, 2018).
2. Collective Bargaining for Platform Accountability. Grass-roots movements such as the *Platform Workers' Council* lobby for algorithmic transparency and user data dividends, transforming isolated grievances into structural demands (van Dijck, 2021).
3. Linguistic Reclamation. Open-source communities create “counter-Newspeak” glossaries that reintroduce suppressed terminology—e.g., *data colonialism*, *algorithmic rent*—to name exploitative practices and articulate alternative imaginaries (Benkler, 2006).

By coupling technological literacy with communal action, citizens can repurpose digital infrastructures for solidarity rather than surveillance. In Orwell's idiom, the goal is to keep “two plus two” equalling *four*—to preserve a zone where unmonetized, unscripted thought can still take root.

6.6 From Escapism to Intimidation: A Critical Reflection

For much of literary history, narrative worlds have offered what C. S. Lewis (1966) called “a holiday from the real”—a secret garden in which readers might replenish moral imagination and rehearse alternative futures. Contemporary dystopias, by contrast, frequently operate as intimidation literature (Brunner, 2020): rather than opening spaces for experimental freedom, they stage spectacles of omnipotent power that can leave audiences awestruck and cognitively paralysed. Orwell's *1984* exemplifies this ambivalence. While the novel is routinely taught as a cautionary tale against totalitarianism, its relentless emphasis on Big Brother's inescapability—“Nothing was your own except the few cubic centimetres inside your skull” (Orwell, 1949/2008, p. 29)—risks naturalising the very condition it seeks to condemn.

The same dialectic surfaces in twenty-first-century cultural texts: newsfeeds saturated with nuclear brinkmanship, streaming series that glorify bio-engineered gladiatorial games, or AI chatbots whose scripted melancholy can nudge vulnerable users toward self-harm (Kleinberg et al., 2024). Each narrative presents a tableau of unstoppable authority, implicitly teaching that resistance is futile. Social-psychological research on learned helplessness suggests that repeated exposure to uncontested domination diminishes political efficacy and civic engagement (Maier and Seligman, 2016). In this sense, dystopian media may “train the public to live with the unlivable” (Galloway, 2022), blurring the line between warning and endorsement.

Recognising this danger does not require abandoning dystopian fiction; rather, it demands critical vigilance. Educators and readers must ask whether a given narrative equips its audience with conceptual tools

for dissent—alternative vocabularies, counterfactual imaginaries, collective action scripts—or merely rehearses rituals of defeat. If escapism once functioned as restorative play, the new challenge is to turn intimidation literature inside out, transforming its spectacle of despair into a pedagogy of resistance. Only then can fiction reclaim its secret-garden potential amid the surveillance nightmares of the algorithmic age.

6.7 Strategies of Resistance: Reclaiming the “Secret Garden”

Although *1984* chronicles the near-total triumph of the Party, its very existence—as a text that invites readers to *doubt* official reality—models resistance through critical thought. Building on Freire’s (1970) pedagogy of the oppressed and Foucault’s (1980) ethics of “counter-conduct,” this section synthesizes four interlocking tactics that translate Orwell’s implicit cues into twenty-first-century practice.

1. Cognitive Vigilance and Information Literacy
 - Data Skepticism. Teaching students to “read the interface” (boyd and Crawford, 2012) equips them to identify algorithmic nudges, sponsored content, and deepfake artefacts.
 - Linguistic Rewilding. Restoring deprecated or marginalized vocabularies counters Newspeak-style compression; community lexicons of resistance (e.g., *data colonialism*, *algorithmic rent*) expand the discursive field (Couldry and Mejias, 2019).
2. Communicative Pluralism
 - Decentralised Platforms. Federated social networks (Mastodon, BlueSky) dilute single-point censorship and foster Habermasian deliberation by design (van Dijck, 2021).
 - Open-Source Archiving. Projects like the Internet Archive’s “Wayback Machine” act as civil-society memory vaults, thwarting digital “memory holes” through redundancy and public access.
3. Technological Counter-Design
 - Privacy-Enhancing Tech (PET). End-to-end encryption, differential privacy, and on-device ML models limit behavioural extraction, frustrating surveillance-capitalist incentives (Eubanks, 2018).
 - Explainable AI (XAI). Advocacy for model transparency converts Zuboff’s surveillance asymmetry into an actionable governance agenda (Gorwa, 2024).
4. Collective Praxis and Ethical Discourse
 - Grass-Roots Data Unions. Emerging frameworks let users bargain collectively over how their data is monetised—transforming isolated consent into structural leverage (Srnicek, 2017).



- Narrative Re-enchantment. Art, literature, and serious games that imagine post-platform futures counter the fatalism of intimidation literature, re-opening fiction's "secret garden" as a workshop for civic possibility (Galloway, 2022).

Taken together, these strategies move resistance from solitary defiance to networked agency: a distributed effort to safeguard epistemic integrity across lexical, infrastructural, and affective domains. By nurturing critical consciousness, pluralistic media ecologies, and ethical technological design, citizens can reclaim the imaginative refuge that dystopian narratives threaten to foreclose—proving that the garden has not yet been paved over by the telescreen's gaze.

7 Conclusion

From Secret Gardens to Surveillance Nightmares has argued that Orwell's *1984* operates not as an escapist refuge but as an analytic engine exposing the slow violence of epistemic enclosure. By tracing how *Newspeak* constricts language, how memory holes erase provenance, how affective rituals weaponize emotion, and how *Room 101* personalizes fear, the novel reveals the architecture through which power turns daily life into intimidation literature. These mechanisms, far from obsolete, have evolved into the predictive logics of platform capitalism, the emotional circuitry of social media, and the neuro-surveillance potential of brain-computer interfaces.

Orwell's haunting question—*Can we still say that two plus two equals four?*—now translates into a twenty-first-century imperative: *Can democratic societies preserve the linguistic, archival, and emotional conditions that make truth possible?*

The analysis points to three immediate priorities. First, defend linguistic pluralism through education and policy to safeguard conceptual diversity. Second, secure archival integrity by enforcing provenance rights and countering both deletion and fabrication. Third, mandate algorithmic transparency and data accountability to curb the commodification of human behavior.

Reframing *1984* as a toolkit for resistance, this study calls on scholars, educators, and policymakers to reclaim fiction's "secret garden" as a site of cognitive freedom. At a time when predictive technologies rewrite the boundaries of agency, Orwell's lesson remains urgent: imagination itself is a political act. The task now is not only to interpret surveillance nightmares—but to prevent them from becoming the ordinary texture of everyday life.

References

- 7amleh. (2024). *Systematic suppression: Palestinian digital rights violations during the Gaza conflict*. Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. <https://www.business-humanrights.org>
- Andrejevic, M. (2019). *Automated media: The coming of the algorithmic subject*. Routledge.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. Yale University Press.

- Boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). "Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon." *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878>
- Bradshaw, S., Bailey, H., & Howard, P. N. (2021). *Industrialized disinformation: 2020 global inventory of organized social media manipulation*. Programme on Democracy & Technology, Oxford Internet Institute.
<https://demtech.oii.ox.ac.uk/research/posts/industrialized-disinformation/>
- Brunner, C. (2020). "Semantic warfare: Newspeak in digital authoritarianism." *Journal of Media Ethics*, 35(4), 215–228.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23736992.2020.1821732>
- BU Today. (2025, June 11). "YouTube is the latest media platform to loosen content moderation: What does that mean for users?" *BU Today*. <https://www.bu.edu/articles/2025/youtube-content-moderation-changes/>
- Camacho-Collados, J., Espinosa Anke, L., Barbieri, F., & Neves, L. (2022). "A massive multilingual dataset for predicting emotions in text." In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 5874–5889). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.404>
- Cheney-Lippold, J. (2017). *We are data: Algorithms and the making of our digital selves*. NYU Press.
- Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). "Deepfakes and the new disinformation war." *Foreign Affairs*, 98(1), 147–155.
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/world/deepfakes-and-new-disinformation-war>
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Crick, B. (1992). *George Orwell: A life*. Penguin.
- Daldry, J. (1992). "Panopticism and the telescreen." *Modern Fiction Studies*, 38(3), 437–457.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression* (E. Prenowitz, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1994)
- Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1985). "Capitalism, modernism and postmodernism." *New Left Review*, 152, 60–73.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Verso.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- European Commission. (2024). "Implementing the EU Code of Practice on Disinformation: Evaluation of platform compliance and accountability [Report]." *European Commission / European Digital Media Observatory*.
- Farahany, N. (2023). *The battle for your brain: Defending the right to think freely in the age of neurotechnology*. St. Martin's Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Galloway, A. R. (2022). *Unlivable: Politics, aesthetics, and digital dystopia*. Verso.
- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- Gorwa, R. (2019). "What is platform governance?" *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(6), 854–871.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573914>
- Gorwa, R. (2024). *The politics of platform regulation: How governments shape online content moderation*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197692851.001.0001>



- Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G. J. (Eds.). (2010). *The affect theory reader*. Duke University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). Polity Press.
- Hipfl, B. (2018). "Affect in media and communication studies: Potentials and assemblages." *Media and Communication*, 6(3), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v6i3.1470>
- Hobbs, R. (2020). "Propaganda in an age of algorithmic personalization: Expanding literacy research and practice." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(3), 521–533. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.301>
- Human Rights Watch. (2023). *Meta's broken promises: Systemic censorship of Palestinian content on Instagram and Facebook*. Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org>
- Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). "Toward new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology." *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, 13(5), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40504-017-0050-1>
- Kavanagh, J., & Rich, M. D. (2018). *Truth decay: An initial exploration of the diminishing role of facts and analysis in American public life*. RAND Corporation.
- Kleinberg, J., Mullainathan, S., & Obermeyer, Z. (2024). "Manipulating beliefs with sentiment adaptive chatbots: Experimental evidence." *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Society*, 9(1), 55–74.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). "The case for motivated reasoning." *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 480–498. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480>
- Lakoff, G. (2014). *The all new don't think of an elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lee, S.-B. (2023). *The power of arch-violence inherent in archives: Focusing on Derrida's "Archive Fever"*. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Science of Art*, 70, 34–51. <https://doi.org/10.17527/JASA.70.0.02>
- Lewis, C. S. (1966). *Of other worlds: Essays and stories* (W. Hooper, Ed.). Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Lyon, D. (2018). "Exploring surveillance culture." *On_Culture: The Open Journal for the Study of Culture*, 6, 1–14.
- Maier, S. F., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2016). "Learned helplessness at fifty: Insights from neuroscience." *Psychological Review*, 123(4), 349–367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000033>
- Musk, E., & Neuralink. (2023, November 30). *Neuralink progress update* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rsCul1sp4hQ>
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Secker & Warburg.
- Orwell, G. (2008). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1949)
- Paris, B., & Donovan, J. (2019, September 18). "Deepfakes and cheap fakes: The manipulation of audio and visual evidence." *Data & Society Research Institute*. <https://datasociety.net/library/deepfakes-and-cheap-fakes/>
- Podhoretz, N. (1983, January). "If Orwell were alive today." *Harper's Magazine*.
- Poria, S., Cambria, E., Hazarika, D., & Vij, P. (2020). "A deeper look into context in text-based emotion detection." *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 187, 104830. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2019.06.024>
- Shelden, M. (1991). *Orwell: The authorized biography*. HarperCollins.
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity.
- The Palestine Chronicle. (2024, June 12). "Over 25,000 digital violations against Palestinian content recorded." *The Palestine Chronicle*. <https://www.palestinechronicle.com>



- Tufekci, Z. (2015). "Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency." *Colorado Technology Law Journal*, 13(1), 203–218.
- UK Parliament. (2023). *Online Safety Act 2023: Chapter 50*. The Stationery Office. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2023/50/enacted>
- Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). "Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news." *Social Media + Society*, 6(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408>
- Van Dijck, J. (2021). "Governing digital societies: Private platforms and public values." *Digital Society*, 1(2), 120–136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-021-00012-x>
- Willcox, M. (2024). "Algorithmic agency and 'fighting back' against discriminatory Instagram content moderation: #IWantoSeeNyome". *Frontiers in Communication*, 9, 1385869. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1385869>
- Williams, R. (1974). *Television: Technology and cultural form*. Fontana.
- Youvan, D. C. (2024, March 29). *The semiotics of Newspeak: Language, power, and thought control in Orwell's 1984* (preprint). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32611.57128>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

