



Pedagogická
fakulta
Faculty
of Education

Jihočeská univerzita
v Českých Budějovicích
University of South Bohemia
in České Budějovice

Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích
Pedagogická fakulta
Katedra anglistiky

Bakalářská práce

The Motif of Fear in Aldous Huxley's *Brave
New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen
Eighty-Four*

Motiv strachu v dystopických románech *Brave New
World* Aldouse Huxleyho a *Nineteen Eighty-Four* George
Orwella

Vypracoval: Jiří Meisl, Aju-Hu
Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Kamila Vránková, Ph.D.

České Budějovice 2019

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že svoji bakalářskou jsem vypracoval samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. v platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své bakalářské, a to v nezkrácené podobě Pedagogickou fakultou elektronickou cestou ve veřejně přístupné části databáze STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích na jejích internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním mého autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. zveřejněny posudky školitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledku obhajoby kvalifikační práce. Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací Theses.cz provozovanou Národním registrem vysokoškolských kvalifikačních prací a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

V Českých Budějovicích dne 19.4.2019

.....
Jiří Meisl

Poděkování

Děkuji vedoucí bakalářské práce PhDr. Kamile Vránkové Ph.D. za odborné vedení této práce, konzultace a celou řadu věcných rad a podnětných připomínek, které mi poskytla v průběhu tvorby práce.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank to PhDr. Kamila Vránková Ph.D. for her inspiring advice, comments, patience and support provided during the formation of this bachelor thesis.

Abstract

The purpose of this bachelor thesis is to analyse the motif of fear in two now-classic dystopian novels; *Nineteen-Eighty-Four* by George Orwell and *The Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley. The first part includes a brief analysis of dystopian fiction and a necessary explanation of the genesis of utopian thought. The second chapter reflects on the experiences and personal struggles of both authors, as well as their incentive, leading towards other influential works. The third and fourth chapter form the final part of the thesis, the analysis of fear in *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* respectively. The thesis considers the notion of fear in both the social context and on a purely individual basis, using relevant quotations as evidence. The conclusion then highlights the previously mentioned peculiarities of both novels to summarise findings.

Anotace

Účelem této bakalářské práce je analýza motivu strachu ve dvou nyní již klasických dystopických románech; *Devatenáct set osmdesát čtyři* od George Orwella a *Konec civilizace* od Aldouse Huxleyho. První část zahrnuje krátkou analýzu dystopické fikce a nezbytné vysvětlení geneze myšlenky utopismu. Druhá kapitola přemítá o zkušenostech a osobních zápasech obou autorů, stejně jako jejich inspiraci, vedoucí k dalším významným dílům. Třetí a čtvrtá kapitola tvoří závěrečnou část práce, analýzu strachu v románech *Konec civilizace* a *Devatenáct set osmdesát čtyři*, v tomto pořadí. Práce zvažuje námět strachu v kontextu společnosti a také na ryze osobní úrovni, užívajíc náležité citace jako důkaz. Závěr poté poukazuje na dříve zmíněná specifika obou románů ve snaze shrnout poznatky.

Contents

Introduction.....	7
1. Utopian genesis.....	8
1.1 Plato and his age.....	8
1.1.1. <i>Res Publica</i>	9
1.2 Thomas More and Erasmus Desiderius.....	10
1.2.1 More's <i>Utopia</i>	10
1.3 Hobbes and liberal awakening	11
1.4 John Locke and Samuel Pufendorf	12
1.5 John Stuart Mill.....	13
1.5.1 Mill's utopian thought	13
1.6 Modern dystopia.....	16
2. Biographical background of the authors	18
2.1 Aldous Huxley	18
2.1.1 Scepticism and dystopia	20
2.1.2 <i>Brave New Dystopia</i>	21
2.1.3 Influence of Yevgeny Zamyatin and G.H. Wells.....	22
2.2 George Orwell.....	24
2.2.1 Life and work of Eric Arthur Blair.....	26
2.2.2 Orwell's <i>Burmese Days</i>	30
2.2.3 The Spanish episode	31
3. Fear in dystopia.....	32
3.1 <i>Brave New World</i> as a cloaked dystopia	33
3.1.1 <i>The Tempest</i> and John 'The Savage'	35
3.2 <i>Brave New World's</i> fear of matriarchy and family	36
3.2.1 Bernard Marx, the fearful Alpha-Plus	40
3.2.2 John and Lenina.....	41

3.3 Unholy duality of <i>Soma</i> and conditioning	42
3.3.1 <i>Hypnopaedia</i>	46
3.3.2 <i>Feelies</i> in contrast with history and art in <i>Brave New World</i>	48
4. <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i> or <i>The Last Man in Europe</i> ?	49
4.1 Fear as a cultivation of power	52
4.1.1 Nature of Ingsoc and its mandate on history	54
4.2 Oceania, war and fear.....	55
4.2.1 Winston, the unorthodox fool.....	57
4.2.2 Women and children in throes of the Party	60
4.2.3 Julia and revolution	62
4.3 Unorthodoxy and loss of identity	63
4.3.1 Thought Police and O'Brien.....	67
4.3.2 Room 101 and Winston's transformation	69
4.3.3 <i>Newspeak</i>	71
5. Conclusion	75
6. Summary	78
7. Bibliography	80

Introduction

The dystopian prose is admittedly a very popular and promising branch of literature, with plenty of existing titles covering just the 20th Century alone. Some critics place the origin of this genre as far back as the 18th Century, with Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* often branded as the pioneering work of dystopian prose¹. This thesis attempts to present a thorough analysis of the concept of dystopia, supported by several classic works of foremost ancient Greek philosophers and the English scholars of the Age of Reason. The question of fear is the principal feature of the dystopian genre, presented on the example of two classic English novels.

An interesting thing to notice is the fact that dystopia dominates mostly in science fiction genre, with the majority of now-classic novels and novellas being set in either near or distant post-apocalyptic-future, sharing a common theme of a disastrous conflict or environmental crisis in past events of these settings. Then again, this generalisation might be too blatant and disregarding, as many works utilise somewhat different models, as will be shown.

In any case, the dystopian genre is a reaction to the overly optimistic views of the future, sort of criticism of naïve ideas of unattainable. Technoscientific cases present an alternative history, with a sort of delicacy in their depictions, as they aim to criticise either the government or influential corporations, aptly mirroring historical events. This motif is justly familiar and popular among the general populace, as the room for doubt and mistrust towards authorities is still prevalent, and one might safely presume that change is not viable. While without any doubt various and rich with themes, the dystopian setting has one major unifying feature. These scenarios are written by their authors to reflect the present state of being. The dystopian novel is to warn the reader about an alternative, absolutely horrid account of the future. The society should avert such a prospect through the implementation of reason, compassion and humanity.

The dystopias this thesis deals with are perhaps the most known and mainstream works in existence, as they propose a terrifying vision of the future, each differing considerably but with the same notion in mind. However, even these legendary works have their origin and background, or rather an initial impulse, sparked by the intellectuals of old.

¹ HOUSTON, Ch., *Utopia, Dystopia or Anti-utopia? Gulliver's Travels and the Utopian Mode of Discourse*, Utopian Studies, vol. 18, Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2007, p. 437.

1. Utopian genesis

To better understand the entire evolution of dystopian literature, it is essential to find the genesis of the anti-utopian thought, the concept of the ideal and fair world. The term utopia translated from ancient Greek means literally 'no-place' or more precisely 'nowhere'.² Then there is the term 'topos', describing conventional or stereotypical themes employed by the orator during the argument; well-tended garden serves as an analogy of civilization, one example of using topos. This orator claimed that if one is to be able to remember things, one must be familiar with the exact place where they are located or kept. *Topos* thus fulfils the role of a conventional association of ideas or a system for improving memory.³

The famous ancient philosopher Plato was the first to reveal this concept, in his work *Republic*. The Middle Ages and early Renaissance were keen on ancient Greek philosophy, so it comes as no surprise that his idea spread and soon resulted in various conceptions throughout history, and especially in the early 16th Century.

In turbulent times of the Reformation, led by Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli, there existed many scholars who criticised the current order of things and maintained rather peculiar ideas about the ideal state of the world. One such individual was an English humanist and philosopher, Thomas More, a close friend of King Henry VIII. (among other merits). And yet, despite his importance, More merely continued and expanded on Plato's ideas. More, however, was the first western scholar to publish a version of utopian society, inspired by the author's era.

1.1 Plato and his age

Plato is widely regarded by academics and critics as the very pinnacle of the ancient philosophy and knowledge, founder of the Academy in Athens and the main inspiration and foundation of the so-called Western tradition, with perhaps only Aristotle rivalling his importance and impact.⁴ For the purposes of the thesis, Plato's signature work *Res Publica* will suffice. More than suffice in fact, as *Res Publica* is the very first utopic work in recorded history.

² *Oxford Dictionaries: The Definition of Utopia* [online]. [cit. 2017-20-9]. Available from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/utopia>

³ MACEY, D., *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory*, London: Penguin Books, 2002, p. 384.

⁴ *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Plato* [online]. [cit. 2017-22-9]. Available from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato/>

1.1.1. *Res Publica*

Plato's *Res Publica* is merely one arch in Plato's complex history of Athens, but for the purposes of this thesis, *Republic* is the cornerstone work.

While the work itself comprises of ten books, it basically covers two concepts of government, antithetical in their principles. First four books present a template of state recognised by Hellenistic Greeks. Following books (Book V to Book IX) serve to shatter this previous idea; Plato views both concepts as fundamentally flawed.

In the first book, Socrates is having a lengthy dialogue with Thrasymachus on the matter of justice. Thrasymachus proclaims that those in command do not take advantage of their power, with Socrates opposing this idea. Socrates reasoning leans on human virtues as according to his judgement, good men are just; only the ignorant and the despicable are unjust. Being just also indicates maintaining traditions, and mainly being one with nature as justice is natural.

In the second book, Glaucon defends the idea of injustice, and in the third book, Socrates calls for a censure of poetry, albeit well-intentioned. He also maintains that a leader should create a myth surrounding his self, forming something akin to a cult of a persona. Doing so is supposed to sustain the said person's authority among the populace. Already the dogmatic image of the Big Brother comes to mind, and justly so.

Likely the most intriguing passage is delivered in book VI. Socrates illustrates why philosophers should govern the State. Philosophers are, to put it frankly, a step ahead or above the general commonality. An analogy with doctors gives the emphasis on immunity, yet Socrates also admits that the philosopher should not interfere in politics, lest he will be corrupted or ridiculed.

So, what precisely denotes justice? Justice is intertwined with the State, forming a necessary particle of it, completing the duality and thus the whole concept. Justice is both the embodiment of the State and its order; an analogy of a soul and a body of might be fitting.

1.2 Thomas More and Erasmus Desiderius

Thomas More was an influential man in his time, being highly valued servant of King Henry VIII and prominent opponent of the Reformation. While eventually, he lost his standing with the king, he remained an iconic figure, even honoured by canonisation by *Motu proprio*, a document written and proposed by Pope John Paul II.

More profited significantly from his father John More, who became a barrister and secured his son a proper education and with it the promise of future position and success⁵. Thomas became an accomplished lawyer and earned the favour of Prince Henry of Wales, future King Henry VIII. This favour granted More an esteemed position as the undersecretary to the treasurer of London, merely a start of his turbulent career.⁶

Famously, More was a close friend and an avid defender of Erasmus of Rotterdam, another influential scholar and humanist. More has written four humanist letters to support Erasmus's reform program, which also included religious reform. Such was Erasmus's influence that *Utopia* might be considered Erasmian work.⁷ Regardless of its provenance, *Utopia* provides an excellent case of a utopian society and further develops Plato's concept.

1.2.1 More's *Utopia*

The Commonwealth of Utopia should picture a perfect and charming place as one might expect upon hearing about an ideal society. The case is different, however. While a shortage of supplies, homes and resources is virtually non-existent, it comes at a rather significant price. Personal freedom of every individual suffers from restrictions by the authorities – they control the population like puppeteers via a system of transferring of the populace.

To further this inconvenience, everyone must subdue to a lot. While assuredly less rigid than More's own time, this Utopia does not seem utopian at all, considering significant restrictions.

⁵ CROMPTON, S. W., *Thomas More and His Struggles of Conscience*, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 2006, p. 14-15.

⁶ Ibid, p. 37.

⁷ YORAN, H., *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*, Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010, p. 99.

Furthermore, as Hythloday, the explorer and yet another instance of play-on-words says;

*So you see that nowhere is there any chance to loaf or any pretext for evading work; there are no wine-bars, or ale-houses, or-brothels; no chances for corruption; no hiding places; no spots for secret meetings.*⁸

The fact that the place itself means "nowhere" and name Hythloday means 'nonsense peddler' already present a measure of expectation. Finally, More himself dismisses the notion of Utopia, calling local customs and laws ludicrous, to say the least. Then again, he admits that some of these would make an excellent addition to the law system, going as far as to 'wish, rather than expect' them to come to being.⁹

A careful reader might notice a similar pattern in *Republic* and *Utopia* – both societies are presented as the true ideal, and yet both are dismissed by their authors as unaccomplishable, while both authors would appreciate the change in law system. The reality, however, seems more like a totalitarian regime, in case of *Republic* a sort of oligarchy that was the prevalent government in ancient Sparta.

1.3 Hobbes and liberal awakening

The utopian problematic would rise again during the life of Thomas Hobbes, and Hugo Grotius, both acknowledged pioneers of liberal thoughts in the 17th Century. While Hobbes concerned himself with the principle of *social contract*, Grotius proposed *the natural law*. Both concepts are crucial for all following Western thinkers and philosophers' due to the introduction of the wholly new idea – all men have inherent rights. These rights could not be taken away under any circumstances, because they form their very natural rights.

In his most famous work, *Leviathan*, Hobbes offers an example of an unspecified state without any form of government. Such a state would slip into the state of nature, marking the end of the civilized society as people would descend to a state of 'war of all against all' as Hobbes himself notes. Preventing this outcome means the necessary adaptation of a social contract, essentially forming and maintaining a civil society.

⁸ LOGAN, G. M. – ADAMS, R. T., *Thomas More: Utopia, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 59.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 107.

Perhaps more of a deterrent example than dystopian scenario, yet one cannot help but notice striking familiarity with Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. Huxley presents the reader with a civilized society, bound by an unspoken and highly perverted variant of a social contract. Those not bound by this contract live in a reservation, separated from the rest of humankind. Unsurprisingly, these people are not even considered a proper community: hence the moniker *savages*.

Suffice it to say, these savages do not live in a state of constant war and certainly live to the fullest, while the civilized society is, in fact, wholly engineered and dependent on a particular chemical substance. Hardly assented as a civilization due to its very nature, but before going to such lengths, there is still much to cover.

1.4 John Locke and Samuel Pufendorf

John Locke is undoubtedly one of the cornerstones of the Western tradition. From his very pen came some of the most ground-breaking ideas and theses on the matter of freedom, equality and possession. It would be a crucial mistake not to mention Samuel Pufendorf when speaking about Locke.

It was Pufendorf who revised the concept of natural rights, proposed by Hobbes, who was himself influenced by Hugo Grotius, the architect of international law. Pufendorf recognised welcomed behaviour in conjunction with lawful life and pitiable behaviour, deriving from lawless conduct¹⁰. Pufendorf earned harsh criticism, and his theory was not well received; yet some found his ideas worthwhile and expanded on them, such as John Locke.

Lockean proviso limits the individual possession for the benefit of the majority, inspired by Cicero and his notion of possession – all things come directly from nature. One might acquire property solely by an investment of time and effort as it is by no means given automatically. Apprehending of property certainly constitutes a major theme in a dystopian setting, as forfeit of all personal property contributes to the loss of identity. The loss of identity then facilitates the age of oppression. The imaginary line of succession was protracted, but the next significant utopian thinker would surely be John Stuart Mill.

¹⁰ CERMAN, I., *Kdo byl první? K metodě a předmětu dějin lidských práv*, Opera historica 16, no. 1 (2015), České Budějovice: Historický ústav Filozofické fakulty Jihočeské univerzity, 2016, p. 20.

1.5 John Stuart Mill

Mill was, similarly to Thomas More, educated and raised solely by his father and to his credit, Mill Sr. gave his son proper tuition. As a mere child, Mill read classics such as Euclid's, Herodotus, Xenophon and of course, Plato in classic Greek. The later years of his childhood were devoted to Aristotle and Adam Smith, among other favoured authors.¹¹

Mill holds the distinction for being the principal character of Utilitarianism and prominent member of the Liberal Party, among many other contributions and works of political and economic nature. And yet Mill is often dismissed as a utopian thinker. It stands to reason that a social scientist and economist would have indeed thought about the betterment of the society.

This betterment would logically lean towards more productive and more secure society; Adam Smith was very well aware of this equation and proposed his views in his signature work *Wealth of Nations* (1776) almost an entire Century earlier than Mill. Suffice it to say, Smith influenced Mill to a certain degree, as did other previous thinkers, mainly Plato and his *Republic*¹².

1.5.1 Mill's utopian thought

Love for reading and knowledge, complemented with quite an open mind and sort of a drive towards perfection resulted in Mill publishing his own conception of utopian thought. Mill recognised eight significant points:

- 1) Humankind is able to form a civilized society; it is in the realm of possibility of the human mind¹³. This ability leans on the power of human spirit, purity of action and deed. Almost stoic determination and willingness to sacrifice for greater good are crucial. A highly romantic and naïve idea, that counts on virtues of heroes of old, a clear indicator of influence Plato held over Mill.

¹¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica: John Stuart Mill, British Philosopher and Economist* [online]. [cit. 2017 2-10]. Available from: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Stuart-Mill>

¹² MONTGOMERY, M.R., *John Stuart Mill and the Utopian Tradition*. In: BACKHOUSE, J. (ed) *The State as Utopia. The European Heritage in Economics and the Social Sciences*, vol 9., New York: Springer, 2011, p. 20.

¹³ *Ibid*, p. 20.

- 2) Evil has its genesis in ignorance and is not an inherent quality of humankind.¹⁴. Mill proposes that an individual is innocent. The corrupting factor presents either the government or the ruling class, but not an individual.
- 3) Proper education is a means of solving various social problems.¹⁵ Montgomery describes '*the unlimited malleability of humankind*' as the main subject of utopian thinkers. This notion of adaptability effectively goes deep into the past as one might reminisce about the idea called *Tabula rasa* connected to John Locke. Education was also the prime concern of Adam Smith, who connected education with the economic growth; educated workers did their job better, faster and the state benefited from them. They, in turn, spend money and thus a state was successful from the economic standpoint. Aside from having a more effective workforce, education was supposed to quell potential rebellions and uprisings, as people were to be beyond baseline manipulation. It stands to reason that Smith would convince the likes of Mill, who himself highly valued education.
- 4) Properly-educated masses will employ reasonable and incorruptible people into positions of power.¹⁶ These were to be democratically voted, of course. Democracy in ancient Athens effectively led to the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC), National Convention in France (1792-1795) led to public executions and terror; to name two famous examples of a failed democracy. In both cases, however, the masses were lacking the proper and complex education, even though their spokesmen were supposed to be above the common folk. They were no elites either their ranks filled with regular people endowed with great responsibility. In the case of Athens, philosophers warned of the danger the boule (council of five hundred) represented. In the case of France, chaos and mindless savagery. Mill certainly placed a high level of trust into masses, like many of his liberal contemporaries. In his concept, there is only reason and virtue as Mill disregards the notion that masses might be manipulated or swayed.
- 5) The singular issue of the government is to get the '*right people*' into the position of power; taking away power or constraining those in power is a secondary

¹⁴ MONTGOMERY, M.R., *John Stuart Mill and the Utopian Tradition*, p. 20.

¹⁵ Ibid, p. 23.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 24.

objective.¹⁷ There is some striking semblance to the concept of Philosopher-kings, elite caste of wise men, directing poor and ignorant masses at the best of their ability.

- 6) '*Character*' is a substitute for constraints on government power.¹⁸ Leaders are supposed to be charismatic, and highly able politicians and individuals, their authority could not be questioned, they were chosen by the people after all. So were some dictators in not so distant past, as well as in Mill's era, so his conviction in optimism must have been absolute.
- 7) In the private sphere, the problem facing the society is that of eradicating the natural human instinct of self-interest.¹⁹
- 8) The eradication of self-interest will usher in a perfect society.²⁰ Self-interest extinguishes to the point where "self-interest" covers only fundamental biological needs. Self-interest persists only for the privy echelons of the society.

This extensive journey was a necessary act because the idea of dystopia has a primogenitor, the original suggestion of the power of human spirit. The utopian ideas evolved throughout history, and their focus shifted with the prevailing schools of thought; consider Plato's *Republic*, led by oligarchs and then Mill's perspective (albeit naïve) vision of ideal democracy. Utopian genesis and evolution also had to be mentioned and expanded to have a general idea, what exactly dystopia takes from an individual and the masses, where lies the oppression and how deep it really reaches.

With this final proclamation of utopian thought, further attention should be placed on the concept of dystopia, debunking optimistic views or the belief in the unfettered power of human spirit and instead offering corruption of the human soul, futile hunt for pleasures and vices.

¹⁷ MONTGOMERY, M.R., *John Stuart Mill and the Utopian Tradition.*, p. 25.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 27.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 28.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p. 29.

1.6 Modern dystopia

What is now called modern dystopia derives mainly from the pessimistic outlook of the idea of automatization, primarily a fear of the machine: utter helplessness, enslavement by technology and subsequent deterioration of humanity. This theorem was first proposed by E. M. Forster in his short story *The Machine Stops* (1909), intentionally countering H. G. Wells and his optimistic visions of the future.²¹

Technophobic tendencies prevailed in later works, with David H. Keller and J. Leslie Mitchell as prominent science fiction authors. Stories such as *The Revolt of the Pedestrians* (1928) by Keller or *Gay Hunter* by Mitchell aim to reverse the society back to a more natural way of life.²² In the same token, *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley deserves mention, yet again this novel is more of a satire than dystopian reflection in line with previously mentioned novels.

As mentioned before, the dystopian setting tends to reflect the present, send a warning message of sorts. While technophobia had diminished for a while, the rising tensions in the European political theatre paved way for yet another important theme, such as totalitarianism or communism. There George Orwell reigns supreme, with his novels *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) as perhaps the most prominent works regarding totalitarian dystopia.

The odd one is, once again, Aldous Huxley. He implemented into *Brave New World* quite an unconcealed critique of the pharmaceutical industry and excessive modernisation. This criticism alone does not seem that extraordinary, had Huxley not been a descendant of a famous Darwin-propagator, famous and wealthy biologist Thomas Huxley.²³ Then again, this novel was meant to be a direct response to H. G. Wells and his belief in scientific progress.²⁴

It only stands to reason that the Cold War brought another immense stress for the populace and collective psyche. The all too feasible fear of nuclear war, omnipresent threat of nuclear conflict resulted in the creation of post-apocalyptic settings, the very nature of these left-over societies designed to live under the brutal yoke of oppressors.

²¹ CLUTE, J. – NICHOLLS, P., *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, New York: St. Martin's Press 1995, p. 141.

²² Ibid, p. 684.

²³ STRÍBRNÝ, Z., *Dějiny anglické literatury II*, Praha: Academia, 1987, p. 689.

²⁴ Ibid, p. 691.

And yet it should be highlighted that the inclination to place the setting into post-apocalyptic environment appeared far earlier, mostly prevalent in religious circles. Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson (1871-1914), an English writer from a family of writers and Catholic priest is one such example.

Benson used Catholic representatives in his stories. Most prominent of his works is surely the novel *Lord of the World* (1907), centred around the Antichrist dominating the world; post-apocalyptic scenario based on biblical prophecy. This work is being widely regarded as the very first modern dystopian novel, meaning the religious motif precedes even the fear of overt automatization.²⁵

While the turn of the Century happened to be marked by some influential dystopian works, such as *When the Sleeper Wakes* by H.G. Wells or *The Iron Heel* (1908) by Jack London, the three major works came into existence a bit later. *We* (1921) by Yevgeny Zamyatin, *Brave New World* (1932) by Aldous Huxley and finally *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) by George Orwell. Each of these is futuristic, with their setting in different timescales, so 35 years in future for *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, 500 years for *Brave New World* and entire millennium for Zamyatin's *We*.

These three novels largely influenced later dystopian works. Even post-apocalyptic fiction such as *Day of the Triffids* (1951) by John Wyndham implemented criticism of utopian potential very much as Huxley did. Ray Bradbury and *Fahrenheit 451* (1953), Philip K. Dick and his *Minority Report* (1956) and even Anthony Burgess and his *Clockwork Orange* (1971) all resonate with the notions from scenarios presented by Huxley and Orwell.

²⁵ CLUTE, J., – NICHOLLS, P., *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, New York: St. Martin's Press 1995, p. 211.

2. Biographical background of the authors

To further understand the impact these influential works had, it is necessary to delve into the lives of both Huxley and Orwell, for personal experiences and life events largely shaped their worldview and thus, their work. Both *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* present dystopian fiction, yet that is where uniformity ends. Huxley incorporated into his work fear of future, based on unpleasant development around him and of course on his considerable intellectual merit. Orwell, on the other hand, experienced the cruel reality first-hand and that of course reflected in his works and short life.

2.1 Aldous Huxley

Known by his full name Aldous Leonard Huxley (born July 26, 1894, in Godalming in Surrey-died November 22, 1963, in Los Angeles in California), was an English writer, novelist and literary critic. His name was one of importance, and the man himself comes from a well-established British family.

Huxley's grandfather, Thomas Henry Huxley, the patriarch of the lineage, was famous for his achievements on the field of biology, recognised as Darwin's associate. Leonard's father did not follow his predecessor and chose the career of a writer instead. The family tradition continued with Andrew Fielding Huxley, a brother of Aldous, who managed to obtain the honorific title of Sir and more importantly, earned the Nobel Prize in Physiology in 1963.

The older brother, Julian Huxley, was a eugenics proponent and held the prestigious position of the very first Director of UNESCO. Julian was also one of the co-founders of The World-Wide Fund for Nature in 1961. It is likely that Julian inspired the Controllers to some extent.

Aldous Huxley chose a somewhat different route, akin to his father. Leonard Huxley capitalised on the family legacy, publishing *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley* and other rather serious works, yet Thomas Huxley diverted from the conventional and delivered his experiments. Despite not pursuing the family tradition, Huxley still implemented a great deal of science and philosophy into his works, especially considering his most famous novel dealt with gene manipulation in the 1930s, as well as

behavioural conditioning (Thorndike) and preceded B. F. Skinner and his *Behaviour of Organisms* (1938).

That is but one aspect, as Huxley also foresaw the use of helicopters, among other things, then largely unexplored and still in development. Indeed, some prototypes existed as far back as 1928, yet they were nowhere near the operational level Huxley portrays in *Brave New World*. The same principle applies to most of the other technological wonders, of course, spiced with the elements of Hollywood culture that Huxley became familiar with during his later years.

In 1919, Huxley married a Belgian refugee, Maria Nys. During this time, he wrote early works, mostly consisting of poems and short stories. While these were not overly successful, Huxley's novels in the following years brought great success; notably *Crome Yellow* (1921), *Antic Hay* (1923) and *Those Barren Leaves* (1928). Huxley captivated and followed with more telling novels, such as *Point Counter Point* (1928), *Brave New World* (1932) and *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936).²⁶

These novels skyrocketed Huxley's career and provided a good demonstration of his intellectual satire. *Antic Hay* is, for example, heavily inspired by the play *Edward II.*, written by Christopher Marlow. The subject of focus is post World War I society, specifically British intelligence circles; *Crome Yellow*, an earlier work, has a very similar undercurrent, but inspired by Huxley's own experiences and portraits of prominent English authors of the age, Huxley himself included.

Crome Yellow is important due to the characteristic traits of the protagonists or antagonists, in line with the comedy of humours.²⁷ Huxley also used this concept with an emphasis on satirical portrayals of intellectual elites. A very similar approach is used in *Brave New World* as well, even though the overall atmosphere is much darker.

After 1938, Huxley relocated from Italy to California and became involved with Hollywood, writing screenplays but not renouncing his literary works and peculiar criticism. Receiving credits for film adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice* (1940) and *Jane Eyre* (1944) among others indeed increased his financial gains.

²⁶ BALDICK, Ch., *The Oxford English Literary History: Volume 10: The Modern Movement (1910-1940)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 420.

²⁷ STŘÍBRNÝ, Z., *Dějiny anglické literatury II*, Praha: Academia, 1987, p. 690.

However, Huxley also experienced difficulties with eyesight and later laryngeal cancer, which cost him the ability to speak and ultimately proved fatal.

Still, he managed to write two other major dystopian novels. *Ape and Essence* (1948) depicts aftereffects of nuclear war where humankind has regressed to an ape-like state of being. *The Island* (1962), Huxley's last work, tries to conjoin Western and Eastern culture into one happy civilization, with rather tragic results²⁸.

2.1.1 Scepticism and dystopia

Why exactly did Huxley criticise the technological advancement, glorified by the likes of H.G. Wells? The answer lies in his works, all of which have been written and published after the World War I.

Huxley was among those intellectuals who condemned the war and especially the technological marvels of the era, abused to create as much damage as possible. In fact, the technology was claimed by warmongers and leaders, not for the betterment of the social standards or the well-being of the masses, but rather for an ever more effective and brutal combat solutions.

It is hardly astounding that during and after this conflict, there were some who openly questioned the direction of humanity. The war had delivered many great and awe-inspiring advancements, and intellectuals began to fear what is to come next. The collapse of the Western civilization seemed like a prospect that very well might happen, which was a marked change of perception from the early 20th Century optimistic views.

Furthermore, the Great Depression, the creeping threat of communism and the nascent fascist danger only worsened these qualms. Huxley wrote during all these years, and his works show it very well. While his first novels centred on the WWI, with the satirical subtext and on a slightly less serious note, novels from 1930 onward show a significant difference.

While the comedy of humours is still in place, the focus shifts toward more serious matters. Instead of simple caricatures representing peculiar British upper class, Huxley aims to present the bigger picture and warn the reader about the danger of consumerism

²⁸ SION, R. T., *Aldous Huxley and the Search for Meaning: Study of the Eleven Novels*, London: McFarland, 2010, p. 126.

and technological advancement. Not in a blunt way, however, as his signature work shows the society that may appeal to many yet is completely rotten and shallow in its core.

So, no longer a satire on diminutiveness, but rather an elaborate psychological analysis. Not for the sake of psychology, however, merely the expression of profound concern that built up in Huxley over the course of his life. Technological breakthroughs, the world's politics, the Great Depression or increasingly daring psychological experiments, all of these left their mark in his later works.

2.1.2 *Brave New Dystopia*

Brave New World exemplifies the sceptical sentiment. While the novel seemingly portrays a merry society that is quite hard to be taken seriously at times, it is, in fact, utterly dreadful and horrifying vision. A vision in which people are created in so-called *hatcheries*, artificially from test tubes in their hundreds and thousands using advanced technology. Human beings are being bred for specific purposes and conditioned to be content in their roles. All of this happens under the yoke of state, of course, and the system stands on firm pillars, unlikely to be thwarted.

But what exactly made this dystopia stand out among the rest? As Huxley himself wrote in *Brave New World Revisited*:

'In 1984, the lust for power is satisfied by inflicting pain; in Brave New World, by inflicting a hardly less humiliating pleasure'

This statement is the key, as pleasure is a crucial element in controlling the masses. Holding absolute control over sexuality implies having control over the masses because sex represents not only a way of communion but also the way of achieving power. In this light, the act of unregulated sex, in fact, serves as an act of revolution on a personal level. Therefore, it presents a potential threat to despotic systems, as this kind of revolution could potentially lead to an uprising. In the case of *Brave New World*, a sexual revolution could not thwart the regime, as sexual intercourse is one of its fundamental principles; this is where the deviousness of *Brave New World* lies.

Huxley was not the first author to implement this idea, yet it makes his account of dystopia uncommon – the notion that *'everyone belongs to everyone else'* appears like

a charming prospect, certainly better than either extermination or expulsion. However, the emphasis rests on the deed itself, merely the pleasure and no emotional attachment or connection. Moreover, one cannot really fancy another way as the society is firmly conditioned. Concepts such as personal relations or chastity harken back to denounced past.

Exceptions do exist, but only outside the official society, and these are widely regarded as savages by their civilized contemporaries. If one among the civilized acts like a savage would, he receives the due acknowledgement resulting in ostracization.

2.1.3 Influence of Yevgeny Zamyatin and G.H. Wells

While Huxley certainly benefited from his family heritage and brilliant education, as well as using recent scientific breakthroughs, Huxley also had a steady source of inspiration in the form of two men. One of them was his friend, Herbert George Wells (1866-1946), another prominent British author. Wells is famous for being a progressive thinker and artist, and his positive views on technology made him sort of an intellectual opponent for Huxley.

Their difference is quite peculiar, as Huxley came from an established and accomplished family with heaps of accolades, while H.G. Wells came, very much like Charles Dickens, from a poor family desperate for renown and elevation of their social standing.

Thus, Wells developed autodidact tendencies and ultimately gained a scholarship in London. He actually benefited from lack of his social standing, as he concentrated on natural sciences, attending to courses led by Thomas Huxley and later on being credited as one of the founders of science fiction genre²⁹.

Yevgeny Zamyatin (1884-1937), on the other hand, was along with George Orwell and Aldous Huxley, one of the principal representatives of the dystopian genre, albeit less known than the former two. Zamyatin's novel *We* (1921) is an example of dystopian uniformity and heavily inspired George Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but not only Orwell, a great many other authors.

²⁹ STŘÍBRNÝ, Z., *Dějiny anglické literatury II*, Praha: Academia, 1987, p. 601-602.

Zamyatin published his work during the time of tremendous political instability and revolution, so the reality that the Soviet Censorship Bureau forbade the novel could hardly surprise, the Soviet Union published the book only in 1988³⁰.

The society of *We*, the One State, is seemingly flawless, bereft of conflicts or unfulfilled needs. However, this perceived perfection is achieved only by severe limits of one's self and intimacy. This restriction is in part accomplished by an arrangement of complete uniformity in all activities and very strongly supported by a system of pink coupons and leisure time. These coupons ensure legal sexual activities and thus at least some human connection, but only during the leisure time, as any other instance would be looked upon as a crime, due to the uniform way of life. *We*, therefore, present a twisted version of a real utopia.

Considering *We* and Zamyatin's background, the inspiration of Huxley and Orwell comes as a no surprise. After all, who else could portray the dystopian vision better than an author living in totalitarian Bolshevik Russia (himself an avid Bolshevik), during some of presumably the hardest times, given to the Russian Civil War (1917-1922) and the struggle for power.

Then again, Zamyatin presents what appears to be a model, virtually unobtainable society. But the One State is as flawed and fundamentally wrong as Huxley's World State; while Orwell eagerly took the inspiration from Zamyatin, Huxley effectively denied any connection to *We*, despite striking similarities, mainly concerning futuristic elements.

Furthermore, one must take in consideration the very nature of both societies; both are twisted utopias dependent on technology, both try to instil happiness and seek to end all suffering, or at least what their representatives perceive as suffering.

The solution to achieving the perfect symmetry, unison, is the dissolution of individuality. In this ideal vision, people are nothing more than soulless automatons, devoid of actual emotions, living strictly rational lives in the irrational environment, appeased by stimulation and stupeficient.

³⁰ BEDORE, P., *Great Utopian and Dystopian Works of Literature*, Course Guidebook, University of Connecticut: The Great Courses, 2017, p. 75.

2.2 George Orwell

Not only was Eric Blair a somewhat eccentric author, writer and novelist, Orwell's career had also been chequered. Aside from writing numerous essays on a wide range of topics, he also witnessed the Spanish Civil War, a first-hand experience that almost cost him dearly. And he would most certainly take part in the Second World War, had it not been for his tuberculosis.

Rejected multiple times by the military, he still contributed to the war effort, trying to thwart Nazi propaganda as a BBC reporter. Orwell did not enjoy the victory for long, however, as his ever-worsening tuberculosis eventually led to his demise in 1950.

The contemporary look on Orwell is quite problematic, as he is either idolised by the likes of John Rodden (*The Politics of Literary Reputation*, 1989) or not so well received by those such as Scott Lucas (*Orwell*, 2003).³¹

Due to his political stances and viewpoints, Orwell acquired a significant number of critics. A significant contribution in this division was *Animal Farm*, a novel released in late 1945. Tensions slowly began to rise among major world powers and the import of the message in his novel is clear – totalitarianism is a pressing danger.

Eric Blair had also been a sort of unique breed. A blend of rebel and truth seeker opposed to authority since early youth. He never really leaned towards any political party or movement, despite identifying as an opponent of the right and firm enemy of totalitarianism. He famously had nothing but contempt for nationalism yet represented the very embodiment of it. In the same token, he belonged among the intellectual elite and yet distrusted them³².

Orwell certainly had been a man who keeps looking for truth, however grim it may be, uncaring for a multitude of adversaries he might make along the way. Discovering the truth and presenting it to the public seems to be his main driving motive. His support for democratic socialism further screams from most of his works.

Considering Orwell not minding any adversaries, it seems peculiar that women characters appear to be somewhat overlooked by Orwell. This factuality raised serious accusations by Daphne Patai, who in her critic reception; *The Orwell Mystique: A Study*

³¹ DAVIDSON, P., *George Orwell: A Life in Letters*, New York: Liveright, 2013, p. 5.

³² COLLS, R., *George Orwell, English Rebel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013 p. 9.

in *Male Ideology* (1984) blames Orwell of generalised misogyny and male superiority that supposedly intertwines in his works.³³

Patai's criticism seems somewhat misplaced, however, as she claims that Orwell feared that masculinity was in danger. All of Patai's arguments stem from a simple formula; war is an expression of masculinity and ergo the reason why Orwell became a socialist.

In that way, he could share all the stereotypical expressions of masculinity, sharing the notion of a brotherhood in a manly environment in harsh conditions. According to Patai, these beliefs and standings found their mark in his works, whereas women are significantly lower on the social ladder.

Patai's criticism seems to overlook the very notion Orwell wrote about in his letters. That is the struggle against oppression. Furthermore, would Orwell not dispel that very notion, were he to dismantle women? Should he really feel that masculinity is in decline, he would surely have chosen conservatism or perhaps a more radical direction.

³³ NEWSINGER, J., *Orwell's Politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, p. 47.

2.2.1 Life and work of Eric Arthur Blair

While born in Motihari in North-East India, Blair studied at the prestigious Eton College in Berkshire. These early years proved troublesome as young Blair vocally opposed authorities. His rebellious nature led to a preference for Burma instead of proper education at Cambridge University.

Blair would later regret this decision, the feeling of guilt weighing him down significantly. Discovering the policies of imperialistic hold over Burma proved to be a crucial point in Blair's life, hardship and oppression he witnessed forming an utter disdain for capitalism.

The man who would later become George Orwell spent a substantial part of the 1920s in Burma, serving as a police officer. During this tenure, he witnessed first-hand the colonial rule and its negative consequences upon the local community, including the exploitation of the masses by the exalted society.

Curiously enough, Orwell himself came under an accusation of misconduct during his time in Burma in one of the autobiographies (D. J. Taylor, *Orwell The Life*). Whether it was some mishap or deliberate action, Orwell certainly left Burma with bitter spirits. He reflected this sentiment in an essay *Shooting an Elephant* (1936);

'I perceived in this moment that when the white man turns tyrant it is his own freedom that he destroys. He becomes a sort of hollow, posing dummy, the conventionalized figure of a sahib. For it is the condition of his rule that he shall spend his life in trying to impress the "natives" and so in every crisis he has got to do what the 'natives' expect of him . . . my whole life, every white man's life in the East, was one long struggle not to be laughed at'

Upon his return from Burma, Orwell declared himself to be an anarchist, later a socialist, although he steered away from communism. During these years, Blair briefly worked as a tutor in private schools, while still trying to write. In 1933, Orwell began to experience first fits of pneumonia, which would later prove fatal; at the time forcing him to convalescence.³⁴

Newfound socialism marked his works, with the most prominent example of this era being *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1937), written during the civil war in Spain (1936-

³⁴ COLLS, R., *George Orwell, English Rebel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013 p. 35.

1939). Aside from detailing the harsh life of the working class, Orwell also sheds some light on his thoughts and reasoning behind his political overturn.

*'I felt that I had got to escape not merely from imperialism but from every form of man's dominion over man. I wanted to submerge myself, to get right down among the oppressed to be one of them and on their side . . . At that time failure seemed to me to be the only virtue.'*³⁵

And he did just that. Submerging among the oppressed was his forte. To understand their struggle, one had to get as close as possible, experience gritty realities; only then can one write about them.

Suffice it to say, Orwell's desire to burrow head-first into harsh reality almost cost the lives of him and his wife. In order 'to fight Fascism', Orwell sought the Spanish Communist Party (POUM). POUM was grappling with anarcho-syndicalist labour unions (CNT) and the splinter of Spanish Communist party; the Unified Socialist Party of Catalonia (PSUC).

Orwell would have certainly perished, were he to stay in Spain in June 1937, especially given his poor physical condition. Upon his return, he cemented his disdain for Communists with a sharp essay *Spilling the Spanish Beans*. He farther incensed the left with an account of the Spanish Civil War, *Homage to Catalonia* (1938).

In the late 1930s, Orwell formed an especial aversion towards the Popular Front; he believed that Popular Front would enforce the same repressive regime he witnessed in Spain. Especially so with the rise of Hitler and his Third Reich.

As far as the ploy is concerned, according to Orwell; the Popular Front would use the working class in supposed friction with Fascism, which, going by Orwell, was a ruse. The true goal was the renewal of Imperialism. Ultimately, the cycle would repeat itself, Fascism clad in different cloak would be supported by Communists and Britain wind up just like Spain.³⁶

On the onset of World War II, Orwell was honestly torn, witnessing the politics heralding the conflict. On one hand, he reprobated the Labour Party from warmongering and yet was painstakingly conscious of aggression from Nazi Germany. If the war was truly inescapable, he would have to fight, aiding one kind of Imperialism to strike down

³⁵ COLLS, R., *George Orwell, English Rebel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 29.

³⁶ NEWSINGER, J., *Orwell's Politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, p. 59.

the other. The ghost of Spain surely veiled his rationale, as he feared the British more than the real menace, the Axis.

And yet when the war began, Orwell switched, left ILP and tried his best to enlist; so did the majority of left in fact. Deemed unfit for active service, Orwell joined the Home Guard, while his wife Eileen ironically worked for a Whitehall Censorship Office for some time, although later transferred to the Ministry of Food.³⁷

Mirroring Eileen's advancement, Orwell became a reporter for BBC, a position he fully embraced yet doubted about his contributions to the war effort, viewing his performance as a waste of time. It is thus no surprise that he eventually left BBC in 1943, albeit still harboured a passion for journalism, as evidenced by his affiliation with the *Observer* in closing days of World War II.

As a literary editor to *Tribune*, Orwell was 'smothered under journalism' but also faced severe catastrophes in his life. His mother died in 1943 and his wife Eileen, unfortunately, followed in 1945, succumbing to tumours of the uterus.³⁸

During these painful years, Orwell wrote *Animal Farm*. While he had Frederick Warburg, who willingly published his works earlier, despite potential risks, *Animal Farm* was a particularly difficult case, for several reasons. One should consider post-war England, hit hard by Luftwaffe and supply crisis, ensuring lack of general goods; a simple paper became a commodity.

Moreover, the bold combination of *Gulliver's Travels* and the Russian Revolution arrived with rather a bad timing; the Soviets were considered liberators. Orwell faced opposition in England and misapprehension in the United States, however publishing company Harcourt Brace took the risk.

By 1946, *Animal Farm* was already almost an American bestseller. The onset of the Cold War probably helped dramatically. In any case, Orwell received significant revenues. Even so, *Animal Farm* underwent various changes to avoid political faux pas.

From 1946, Orwell enjoyed Isle de Jura and set to write his magnum opus, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Health complications slowed his progress, as Orwell himself admitted in a letter to Frederick Warburg. Despite Orwell's ever-worsening tuberculosis, the

³⁷ DAVIDSON, P., *George Orwell, A Life in Letters*, New York: Liveright, 2013, Chapter: *From Morocco to the BBC: 1938-1941*, par. 1, p. 128.

³⁸ *Ibid*, Chapter: *Journalism and the death of Eileen: 1943-1945*, par. 3, p. 234.

Observer's executive, Frederick Tomlinson requested Orwell to monitor South Africa just barely before the formation of Apartheid. Orwell considered, but ultimately declined due to failing health and instead went to Hairmyres Hospital.

Streptomycin, the very first cure for tuberculosis, seemingly helped Orwell, unfortunately, he was allergic to the substance. He managed to write a couple more essays and to finish *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the latter with many difficulties both with the work itself, as well as with the publishers.

After a shocking treatment in Cotswold Sanatorium in January of 1949 Orwell's health rapidly deteriorated and he died within a year on January 21, 1950, in University College Hospital in London, aged 46.

2.2.2 Orwell's *Burmese Days*

Orwell's very first story, *Burmese Days*, was curiously published in the United States of America by Harper and Brothers in 1934. The novel faced scrutiny in the United Kingdom, only published a year later.

Despite the release of the novel, British Burma would last until 1948, seemingly unaffected by Orwell's expression. Furthermore, the characters in *Burmese Days* underwent scrutiny. Their names had to be checked to avoid representing any existing military personnel. Doing otherwise would risk persecution and elevation of charges.

Burmese Days present the very foundation for later works. Ruling class oppress and abuses the local population at whim, without any significant retribution. However, the premise is a little more complicated, reflecting politics and cultural perception.

While the exalted class rules over the indigenous people in rather brutal fashion, even these elite echelons of society are not omnipotent. Quite the opposite, as they have to submit their individualities if they desire to secure their position among the elite. For example, the main protagonist is at odds with himself.

On the one hand, he keeps Burmese in high regard and yet is still firmly rooted in his English heritage and culture. His love interest is an English woman, not due to romantic feelings, solely because Elizabeth is far more suitable wife than any Burmese lover will ever be. An engagement with Burmese would be next to unthinkable and would only lead to his exclusion from English society, with dire consequences. So, he lies to himself and pursues a woman to appease the unspoken class norms.

This reasoning bears a striking semblance to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. While the execution there is far more extreme, the premise is the same – those ruled are oppressed, but the rulers themselves are shackled, bereft of individuality. This sort of dehumanisation is required to maintain one's position, the diversion would once again lead to exclusion, with even more brutal, quite possibly terminal consequences.

Then again, this subjugation heads to a complete loss of identity and distance one from the rest of humanity. Such a person is just an empty husk, thus more susceptible to manipulation and more ruthless at the same time. An ideal instrument ready to uproot the fellow man in a relentless approach. *Burmese Days* offer a much more modest, yet still disturbing vision. A vision further expanded in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

2.2.3 The Spanish episode

Orwell's book *The Spanish Cockpit* remains to this day a prized account of the Spanish Civil War. While serving on the frontline, even commanding own unit, Orwell considered his greatest enemy boredom and cold. He also came to view his militia as an example of society; there was little to no difference between a line soldier and an officer considering equal pay, equal portions, same clothes, comrades all.³⁹ Assuredly, heaven for one as driven as Orwell; a completely different experience than prudent England.

Aside from Orwell, more than 2000 British volunteers served on the frontline as a division of International Brigades, consisting mostly of left-wing intellectuals. One in four died in a staggering and ultimately futile display; Soviet Comintern brutally purged the Brigades ranks, much to Orwell's chagrin. Even so, he joined so he could engage on the Madrid front.⁴⁰

At this point, Orwell realized that the Communists are purposefully thwarting the notion of revolution. Revolution was their ace card for the public, yet in reality, Comintern intended to keep the old ways; conquests of the working class were to be irrelevant, handed over to the middle class.

Agents of the Comintern were simply eager to appease Moscow, with no real concern for either the Revolution or the working class of Spain. Suffice it to say, Spain was but one of many countries on the European soil where the Soviets tried to impose their will. A confrontation with revolutionary forces and Comintern was imminent, and Communists indeed wrought a bloody toll on POUM, banning the party and initiating a wave of arrests, forcing Orwell to flee to France.

While Orwell himself survived, many of his friends and associates remained imprisoned by the regime, condemned as Trotsky sympathisers. Furthermore, his recount (*Homage to Catalonia*, 1938) remained mostly dismissed, as he was not convenient to the left; Orwell's publisher Victor Gollancz, an avid Soviet sympathiser and British Communist Party adherent, refused to release his account.⁴¹ Orwell eventually succeeded with Frederick Warburg, but by that time Europe was in turmoil of Hitler's aggression, and he barely sold any copies.

³⁹ NEWSINGER, J., *Orwell's Politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999, p. 46.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 49.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 55.

3. Fear in dystopia

Given the previous assessment, dystopia is the antithesis of utopia, to put it simply. More's utopia presents a perfect society, one absent of crime and deviation from *Bonum commune*.

Hobbes desired to maintain social contract as a way of avoiding the collapse of civil society, liberals such as Locke, Smith and Mill all proposed similar values, all in favour of a secure state and more productive, all around better society. These thinkers all took inspiration from Ancient Greek philosophy and added Christian values and principles.

Most dystopian works also use this predicament, albeit in twisted ways. Yes, security and productivity are reached but at a terrible price. *Bonum commune* is maintained, through violence, manipulation and repression. Still, these are perhaps closer to Plato's original idea; Justice is the embodiment of the state, as Socrates proclaimed.

States are indeed controlled by an elite caste or a leader, who creates a myth sustaining himself, making his claim to rule all the stronger. And yet justice is natural and good men are just because they are one with nature; both Orwell and Huxley have unnatural rulers, who are seemingly inhuman yet able to rule the masses effectively and make the society more productive and secure, as liberals wanted.

It is a perversion, of course, something false and despicable, not unlike the dominion of Satan in the *First Epistle of John* from the New Testament. In any case, dystopian works are commonly built on fear, as fear is possibly the singular driving force of humanity. Fear could be so easily used against the masses, as history had shown so many times.

Distinguished dystopian works are indeed inspired by almost unbelievable regimes, (the Soviet Union for Orwell, Zamyatin and Solzhenitsyn) perhaps unwittingly mirroring the New Testament?

The oppressors in dystopian works use fear as their leverage. It is their forte and the primary reason for the prevalence of the system. The populace is usually either cowering in fear at the very idea of rebelling against the system or completely unaware of the bleak reality of the system. Powerful elite employs various means to secure the compliance of the masses. Some of these means include straightforward threats of a physical nature, while others consisting of more subtle means.

To speak out against the ruling elite is to risk one's very existence. No quarter is given or expected. The victims of the regime are beaten into submission, forced to admit to having tried to topple the standing order, while innocent.

The watchful eye of the state goes far beyond any limitations, gazing into personal lives and none, barring the elites, are safe. Children denounce their parents, devoted exclusively to the government.

3.1 *Brave New World* as a cloaked dystopia

Aldous Huxley implemented a somewhat provoking idea, exploring new possibilities in the dystopian genre. Instead of creating an aggressive and blunt regime, brutally constraining lives of the oppressed, Huxley presented a seemingly ideal society, wanting in hardship or strife.

The notion of fear is an obsolete concept as there is no longer a necessity for fright, nor are there any causes. Fear is accessible only to those living outside the civilization in the Reservation, people dubbed *savages* by their civilized contemporaries.

One can also experience fear if abstaining from using an officially prescribed drug, called *Soma*. Any such instance is outstanding as every proper and civilized subject utilises Soma pedantically.

In such a perfect society, fear is a violation of what is considered natural. Therefore, any action to remove this fundamental human emotion is taken to ensure the continuity of prosperity and well-being.

Children commonly attend to the dying, to get them used to the idea that death is inescapable and not a matter of concern. Furthermore, those in the process of dying are stupefied with narcotics as to not perceive any discomfort, so that passing is as pleasant experience as it can get. It would not seem so terrific, if not for the fact that people are decanted and conditioned for their future roles and to disregard other, less fortunate castes.

What seemingly makes for a utopian society is, in fact, a deception. The World State and its Controllers rule through pleasure, which substitutes the need for human relationships and interactions.

Gratification and medications are omnipresent in exchange for the extermination of natural, human emotions. Striving to create a perfect society and deeming the preference for indulging in unbound pleasure as natural, this culture has become unnatural, prosecuting signs of humanity. The World State has come to regard humanity as something unnatural, a thing to fear, while debased by itself.

Zamyatin's impact is undeniable. The compliance of the general populace is secured through free love as the society does not know emotional attachment. And yet this is another way to constrain the masses and furthermore, dehumanise them.

Orwell's Oceania does virtually the same, albeit using different means. The intention is not wholly evil as it serves a purpose of creating a perfect society, ridden of hardship. Ironically, these attempts of creating a perfect society only serve to condemn The World State.

Instead of creating a utopian society, the Controllers brought about a synthetic civilization, one filled with substitutes and falsehood. It is important to realize that *Brave New World* is heavily inspired by works of William Shakespeare, with one play in particular; *the Tempest*.

3.1.1 *The Tempest* and John 'The Savage'

The Tempest is one of Shakespeare's later works and as such enjoys stable popularity. Various dramatists replicated the play, mainly during the Restoration era (1660-1688) and well beyond. Many an author also expanded on various symbols and aspects of *The Tempest* (*Caliban upon Setebos* by Robert Browning), and some plays bear striking semblance to the Shakespeare's work, such as *Die Schöne Sidea* by Jacob Ayer.⁴²

The Tempest is more than a mere recreational play for the higher echelons of society, as it outlines the prosperity of the Elizabethan era, the rising prominence of England among the European superpowers. Throughout the play, there are various remarks about famous explorers and discoveries including places of wonders and awe. Some of these, such as Prospero's kingdom, portray an almost supernatural island '*full of noises, sounds and sweet airs, that give delight and hurt not*'⁴³.

Prospero's island is not unlike the World State. Prospero uses mystic arts for the betterment of the society while his principles are almost scientific. In his axiom, logic and intelligence are crucial as freedom is defined by one's submit to social laws.

The Controllers are not so dissimilar as the social convention defines the freedom, which is merely an illusion. The disruptors of these social conventions, uncivilized barbarians are known as savages. Prospero too has his own savage; Caliban, a deformed and degraded being, a former failed student of Prospero. Caliban is a base creature seemingly lower in status than men, yet able to create something stronger than Prospero's civilization. Caliban's idea is unshackled freedom, which Prospero vehemently disputes.

The savages in *Brave New World* are akin to Caliban because unlike the inhabitants of the World State, they live in reservations like Neolithic peoples. John is unconventional, however. Certainly a product of both worlds, and never really belonging in either of them, John is civilized and had access to classic literature, especially Shakespeare, just as one of the very few select. He is utterly dismayed by the World State, seeing the citizens as debased individuals without restraints and moral values, condemning it just like Caliban denounced Prospero while being in the moral position of Prospero.

⁴² BOAS, F.S., *The Warwick Shakespeare, The Tempest*, London: Blackie & Son Limited, 1897, p. 15, 18.

⁴³ *Ibid*, Act III, scene III, p. 77.

3.2 *Brave New World's* fear of matriarchy and family

Zamyatin and his major novel *We* already received mention, yet Zamyatin's influence needs further consideration. His usage of sexuality set the precedent for dystopian fiction and touched the unexplored and sensitive topic. In *We*, Zamyatin explored the correlation between sexuality and political power; sex is, in fact, a form of revolution. Zamyatin's predicament was furthered in 1976, when Michel Foucault published *The History of Sexuality*, dealing with the concept of power. As Foucault writes about sexuality;

*'It appears rather as an especially dense transfer point for relations of power.'*⁴⁴

Dystopias revolve around controlling people's passions and cravings, with sexuality being the cornerstone. To control sexuality means to control access to power or even the very idea of holding power. Sexuality is the instrument of the government or the ruling elite, used as commerce or commodity. It is therefore under regulation using various ways, but the principle is still the same. Any breach of this control is an act of rebellion. But the case of the World State is slightly different.

Brave New World introduces the idea that '*everyone belongs to everyone else*' and sleep conditioning and social engineering further magnifies this mantra. Sexuality is directly linked to pleasure, but not related to procreation or intimate connection. All the supposedly cultured people are open about their sexual relations. Simply having sexual intercourse is no revolutionary act. The World State does not offer the choice of chastity or monogamy, and neither does it accept such deviations. The drug Soma come in beneficial whenever someone feels too emotionally invested.

Fear does not stem from the government as the populace is designed to live content lives, aided by the usage of soma and access to free love. Fear derives from anything baseline human not necessarily connected to immediate pleasure. Motherhood is considered particularly abominable and undesired. For any proper and "pneumatic" woman, the idea of having children is the worst possible nightmare.

Students in the Hatchery and Conditioning Centre remain completely repulsed upon being told of ancient times before Ford when sex ushered to pregnancy, and that such a

⁴⁴ FOUCAULT, M., *The History of Sexuality*, Paris: Pantheon Books, 1978, p. 103.

thing was the desired outcome. When the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning centre confronts curious students with the truth, they remain completely puzzled;

'In brief,' the Director summed up, 'the parents were the father and the mother.' The smut that was really science fell with a crash into the boys' eye-avoiding silence.

*'Mother,' he repeated loudly rubbing in the science; and, leaning back in his chair, 'These' he said gravely, 'are unpleasant facts; I know it. But then most historical facts are unpleasant.'*⁴⁵

While the students rather swiftly forget these uncomfortable ideas, their fear and utter stolidity are palpable. This feeling is reinforced by the Controller's approach, putting even the Director at unease;

Mustapha Mond leaned forward, shook a finger at them. 'Just try to realize it' he said, and his voice sent a strange thrill quivering along their diaphragms. 'Try to realize what it was like to have viviparous mother.' (...)

*'Try to imagine what "living with one's family" meant.' They tried; but obviously without the smallest success. 'And do you know what a "home" was?' They shook their heads.'*⁴⁶

The Controller then explains the concept of home and equates it to *'an under sterilized prison'*, abound with supposedly obscene relationships. The one example above all is a mother and her child, likened to a *'cat that could talk'*. The Director references to Sigmund Freud to support his claims, as it was Freud who allegedly set the precedent of *'the world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery'*.

He then offers an explanation; in the past, ancestors lived restricted lives, suffered from pain and poverty, became isolated an emotional – how could they have lived fulfilling lives without stability? Emotions, beliefs and chastity, supported by democracy and liberalism offered *'liberty to be inefficient and miserable.'*⁴⁷

While this tirade is more of a condemnation than an expression of fear, the mere idea of motherhood frightens every proper citizen of the World State. And the reader is presented with one example of this unimaginable horror; a civilized woman named Linda, mother of John *'the Savage'*. Not only was she lost in a reservation among savages, but she was also anticipating and even successfully delivered a child.

⁴⁵ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 15.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p. 23.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p. 31.

By doing so, she shattered her worldview and challenged the ideas of the World State; the occasion forced her to become what she and her like perceived as unnatural and alien. She eventually bonds to her son, although there still are slips, as evidenced in one particularly harsh exchange;

*'Linda,' he cried out. 'Oh mother don't!'
'I'm not your mother. I won't be your mother.'
'But, Linda...Oh!' She slapped him on the cheek.
'Turned into a savage,' she shouted. 'Having young ones like an animal...If it hadn't been for you, I might have got away. But not with a baby. That would have been too shameful.'*⁴⁸

Linda nearly immediately relents yet still has to use a replacement for Soma to help her come to terms with the severity of the circumstances. Her position is very difficult as the locals consider her a weak and inept woman that has only herself to offer. Linda is facing adversity and abuse, so her only comfort is her son John. And yet the urge to utilise drugs coupled with the effect of conditioning is far too dominant, and so she strives to recreate her personal World State.

Upon Linda's eventual return to the World State, she serves as a living reminder of what exactly does motherhood inflict upon a woman. She appears hoary and desolate, bereft of soma and other miracles of civilization; this merely reinforces the negative stereotypes deeply rooted and subtly enforced by the Controllers. Linda herself launches into the Director's arms, revealing him to be the father of John. This confrontation provides an interesting exchange as after the initial enthusiasm, desperation sets in;

*'Don't you remember, Tomakin?' she repeated in a voice that trembled.
Her eyes were anxious, agonized. The blotched and sagging face twisted grotesquely into the grimace of extreme grief.*

The Director is visibly appalled and confused, believing that the scene is some part of a farce, but Linda continues, much to his horror;

*'You made me have a baby,' she screamed above the uproar. There was a sudden and appalling hush; eyes floated uncomfortably, not knowing where to look. The Director went suddenly pale, stopped struggling and stood, his hands over her wrists, staring down at her, horrified.
'Yes, a baby – and I was its mother'*⁴⁹

⁴⁸ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 85.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 101.

John finally puts the nail into the coffin by calling the Director his father. By this point, Tomakin is finished and left speechless. He is, of course, well aware of his parentage yet refuses to admit the fact as he recognises the consequences.

The Director, like most Alphas, or any other caste really, clings very tightly to their role and social status by their design. Revealed as a father, the Director of Hatcheries breaks from his predestined role and instantly loses all prestige and is humiliated, abruptly leaving the position of his own accord. No threat of physical violence is needed, as his supposed transgression ostracizes him from the rest of enlightened society. Tomakin would be ridiculed and never again recognised as the elite of society, not even a wayward element.

Realizing this, Tomakin loses his sense of purpose and identity. For a woman to have a child is unacceptable, it is social suicide. No one, barring the Controller, dares to show individuality, and the society has unspoken rules of uniformity. There could not be a worse fate than being excluded from the system, and the very idea induces fear.

Linda is understandably overwhelmed by experiencing rejection. Huxley mentions that while all want to see John no one want to see Linda and likewise she does not crave to be seen. Linda involuntarily assumes the mantle of an outsider; she was rejected in the reservation and is dismissed once again, this time by her cherished people. Her only remaining comfort is soma, so long denied to her.

Of course, John is her biological son, so he ought to be the primary reason for her to carry on. Nonetheless, Linda never truly accepted the role of a mother as it is in direct opposition to her conditioning and culture. Furthermore, she experienced first-hand how much pain, and distress one must endure with a child. And anything uncomfortable, fear-inducing serves as anathema to a mind of a resident of the World State.

So not only is the very idea of begetting a child feared taboo from the social standpoint, but the challenges concerning parenting a child are indeed something women from the World State are ill prepared for. Linda endured so much fear and pain during her relatively short life that she resorted to soma-induced suicide, choosing narcotics induced pleasure as her escape from fear. The same happened with Tomakin.

3.2.1 Bernard Marx, the fearful Alpha-Plus

Bernard Marx is one of the few actual humane characters of Huxley's *Brave New World*. Considering Bernard was created as an Alpha-plus, his humanity stands as somewhat odd. The Alphas are designed to be the pinnacle of the World State, exemplifying its values, and intended to act as its leaders. Bernard, however, is neither of these.

He lacks their physical perfection, success with women and above all nurtures a distaste for *soma*. According to the Controller, an unusual accident happened during his decantation, resulting in Bernard becoming "queer". And yet in spite of his alleged deficiencies, Bernard retains the mental capacity of an Alpha and well beyond, as he sees through the veneer.

Due to his otherness, Bernard is not being taken seriously, which puts him in a similar position as the Director, after his revealed parentage. Unlike the Director, Bernard is fully able to think for himself and defies the norms, refusing to accept the illusion. He pays a steep price for his divergence; regularly mocked and ridiculed he reaches a point of avoiding any possible contact due to a creeping fear of being scorned.

Still, Bernard is not alone, as he has an accomplice; Helmholtz Watson, the only man Bernard could consider a friend. Helmholtz is also an Alpha-plus but lacks Bernard's deficiencies and unlike Bernard remains calm and collected, able and willing to forgive. Watson is the moral ideal, refusing *soma* and pleasure, and yet also physically perfect like the rest of his caste and is treated as such by women. Bernard envies him both, and his pettiness strains their relationship.

Remarkably, Helmholtz shows restraint and refusal to indulge in narcotics, despite having access to it; even more exceptional considering his social status. Not only is he aware of the state of things, but he is also fully willing to break the system. In this respect, he is closer to John, and the two indeed become close friends much to Bernard's resentment. His complex of inferiority forces him to alienate even the trusted few, and his cowardly behaviour is self-destructive and even drives him to consume *soma*, despite hating the drug. When finally confronted by the Mustapha Mond, Bernard was all too eager to betray his friends to save himself and very nearly collapsed out of pure horror what is to come next. Despite being severely flawed, Bernard is very humane, especially in comparison to almost prudish John and permissive Watson. Nevertheless, all three part their ways as good friends.

3.2.2 John and Lenina

John serves as an instrument through which the reader can accurately see the debased pseudo-culture of the World State. Even while Bernard and Helmholtz both oppose the system, they still are a part of it whether they like it or not.

They both scoff at the term *mother* and can hardly fully sympathise with John. Neither of them has read any noteworthy literature and also did not hold grasp over morality as much as John did. John is unique as he is an offspring of the World State not decanted and conditioned.

John accepted the culture of the reservation and apposed Shakespeare, so when he heard his mother's retelling of the World State glories, he surely must have been eager to meet this *Brave New World*.

But in the end, he rejected the Controller's World State just as Caliban refused Prospero's kingdom. A society without God, chastity and abstinence is utterly alien to him. His desperate pleas and anger at the state of things merely reinforce his status as a savage. He, in turn, gives up on this supposed civilization;

The Savage nodded. 'I ate civilization.'

'What?'

*'It poisoned me; I was defiled. And then,' he added in a lower tone 'I ate my own wickedness.'*⁵⁰

Lenina, on the other hand, strives hard to be a proper, pneumatic woman. Her seeing of Bernard is done mostly to fill in her expected social role as her colleague implores her to be more promiscuous. Bernard is disappointed in her, despite her sincere efforts to appease him. Lenina fears to fail her role more than anything as she anxiously does not want to be perceived as wanting. Her deliverance is, of course, a gram of soma.

Lenina takes a liking in John, as he is different from all other men she ever knew. However similarly to Bernard, her accessibility sits ill with him, despite his apparent affection. Still, Bernard, ever the opportunist, took the opportunity, while John would never do so. He is seeking true love, romanticised from reading Shakespeare.

Lenina, on the other hand, was conditioned and predestined to eschew chastity or shyness. She can also never grasp the concept of love, and John's proposal of marriage crumbles when met with disgust and fear;

⁵⁰ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 164.

'Listen Lenina...people in Malpais get married.'
'Get what?' the irritation had begun to creep back into her voice.
(...)
'For always. They make a promise to live together for always.'
'What a horrible idea!' Lenina was genuinely shocked.⁵¹

Avow of love is met with an attempt at seduction. Given his troubled childhood and his values, it comes to no surprise he rejects her in anger. That and his mother's death lead to a breaking point.

3.3 Unholy duality of *Soma* and conditioning

The caste system of the World State is the basis of society. People are artificially created and divided across designated types according to a social role they are expected to perform, such as Alpha, Beta or Gamma. Gammas are brought about to be a working class and to be content with their dispositions. This process of mass decantation is shown to be efficacious indeed, yet it is not absent flaws as we see in case of Bernard and Helmholtz, and even Linda to some extent.

Even the Controller agrees the process is not perfect. *The Bokanovsky Process* allows creating throngs of identical twins and imprinting happiness with the given role as to minimise chances of rebellion and maintain so valued stability. Despite exceptional genetic tinkering, violations of the order are still a possible threat, and further means are required.

Soma forms a backbone of the World State. Whenever one feels scared or even momentarily worried, one consumes a gram of soma, and all his concerns vanish. Soma is available to all castes and viable in almost in all forms; even in a cone of ice cream and even the police uses soma to quell troublemakers.

Soma is compelling enough to soothe even the likes of John or Helmholtz. Bernard, despite his misgivings, slips to take a gram here and there, to alleviate his fears and anxiety. Linda does likewise, same goes for Lenina and Tomakin. The society was conditioned to loathe unpleasant feelings and ideas and thus is utterly dependent on soma, the only coping mechanism.

⁵¹ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 129.

The Controllers are among those few who, like Bernard and Helmholtz, penetrated the system, yet realized the importance of soma and farce. In their mind, decantation and soma form a lesser evil. Lesser evil that ultimately proves as beneficial, according to the Controller;

*'And if ever, by some unlucky chance, anything unpleasant should somehow happen, why, there's always soma to give you a holiday from the facts. And there's always soma to calm your anger, to reconcile you to your enemies, to make you patient and long-suffering.'*⁵²

Soma is widely regarded, by rank and file, as well as the highest echelons, as the ultimate salvation due to its ability to maintain the status quo. However, despite its pacific value, soma still needs to be complemented by yet another narcotic, quite the opposite in its principle; *The Violence Passion Surrogate* (V.P.S.) Once a month, each resident of the World State receives the injection of V.P.S. As the Controller states during his conversation with John;

*'Violent Passion Surrogate. Regularly once a month. We flood the whole system with adrenalin. It's the complete physiological equivalent of fear and rage. All the tonic effects of murdering Desdemona and being murdered by Othello, without any inconveniences.'*⁵³

The existence of V.P.S. provides an intriguing paradox. Fear and discomfort are undesired, detested even, although nonetheless essential for even the conditioned and predestined minds. Even then it is merely a synthetic sensation, a substitute for trepidation just as soma is a substitute for happiness.

Then again, the World State thrives on all sorts of substitutes and surrogates, ranging from various food substitutes to more devious concepts, such as pregnancy substitute. All the effort concentrates towards proper nutrition and hormonal balance, to maintain stability and effectivity at the highest level.

This peak performance would be impossible, however, were it not for the process of conditioning. The process is heavily inspired by the authentic method of classical conditioning by Ivan Pavlov, in *Brave New World* used for the initial stages of development, and also by the operant conditioning (B. F. Skinner, John Watson) employed for later, more complex operations and directives.

⁵² HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 161-162.

⁵³ *Ibid*, p. 163.

If the people of the World State were not conditioned to use soma, how many possible consumers would the drug have? The effect of conditioning on the usage of soma is merely one facet, as the conditioning is a fundamental part of social education.

Future castes are manipulated as early as embryos at first. Through the usage of various amount of oxygen and exposure to heat, are undertaken the first steps to control one's destiny. The next phase of conditioning concerns children barely of toddler's age; the Director of Hatcheries eagerly shows the process to astonished students.

In this exemplary case, the infants from the lower Delta caste are conditioned to hate flowers and books through the usage of an electric shock. The sheer horror they experience has to be repeated two hundred times to take full effect.

The process of conditioning then proceeds in two forms, with the first concerning social behaviour, utilising erotic games between youngsters, and the other form being a pseudo-scientific method of hypnopaedia. Hypnopaedia serves to hammer in the universal truths and preconceptions about castes and attributes, with even a seeming triviality like different colour playing a vital role;

'All wear green,' said a soft but very distant voice, beginning in the middle of a sentence, 'and Delta Children wear khaki. Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children.

(...)

*And Epsilons are still worse. They're too stupid to be able to be able to read or write. Besides they wear black, which is such a beastly colour. ... Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they're so frightfully clever. I'm really awfully glad I'm Beta, because I don't work so hard.'*⁵⁴

Despite ingrained misgivings, lower castes are still deemed useful due to their role, as they help maintain prized stability; *'as we can't do without anyone'*. Dealing with lower castes is nevertheless frowned upon and particularly stressful for likes of Bernard.

In any case, the result of conditioning is a perfect worker and consumer, content with his role, not wishing for anything better nor asking questions. If soma is available, his world is devoid of fear and worries, and conditioning will hold.

⁵⁴ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 18.

Aside from being content, he will also not cause any harm, as long as his consumerist desires are met and satisfied. Furthermore, he will not even realize that manipulation and conditioning had taken place as the social norm seems completely natural.

The Alphas are quite aware of their dispositions, yet they too received rather complex conditioning. Despite realizing their superiority over other castes, and having the knowledge about conditioning and manipulation, Alphas still have no intentions to topple the system; partly thanks to conditioning itself, usage of soma but also their limited free will.

Few of those who see beyond the veil, like the Controller, fully realize that in case of a collapse of the system, the end of civilization will follow. The others do not even waste time on such predicaments as the thought is uncomfortable and odd. In their mind, the benefits outweigh any possible disadvantages, and when one doubts, there is always soma

3.3.1 Hypnopaedia

The conditioning is carried out through hypnopaedia; one of *Brave New World's* many pseudo-scientific methods. This method touches the idea of sleep-learning, which happened to be an authentic, albeit pseudoscientific method. In 1927, an Austro-Hungarian inventor, Benjamin Saliger invented the so-called Psycho-Phone, claiming that;

*'It has been proven that natural sleep is identical with hypnotic sleep and that during natural sleep the unconscious mind is most receptive to suggestions.'*⁵⁵

Saliger's approach was refuted in 1956 (W. H. Emmons and Ch. W. Simmons), and again in 2012 by Weizmann Institute of Science (*Nature Neuroscience*, vol. 15). However, in Huxley's time, the idea sounded more plausible, and Hypnopaedia resonated well after 1956, as it clearly inspired *Clockwork Orange* (Anthony Burgess) and other science fiction works.

Brave New World was the first and Huxley took Saliger's vision to heart. When the director discusses hypnopaedia, he speaks about its moralising role and avail;

*'Till at last the child's mind is these suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions is the child's mind. And not the child's mind only. The adult's mind too - all this life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides - made up of these suggestions. But all these suggestions are our suggestions!' The Director shouted in his triumph. 'Suggestions from the State.'*⁵⁶

The Director blatantly admits that the population is brainwashed and presents this factuality as a moral approach. Suggestions mostly centre on the tenets of the World State philosophy. Whether it concerns a general statement, soma or promiscuity, there is always an opportunity to apply one of these proverbs. These axioms also significantly boost the economy, as they promote consumerism, similarly to the advertisement, yet stronger altogether.

In a way, hypnopaedia completely automatizes certain choices and ideas; Lenina, even when overdosed by soma still remembers her Malthusian drill, designed to prevent pregnancy.

⁵⁵ KING, W., K. – THURBER, J. – ROSS, H., „*Talk In The Dreams*“, *The New Yorker*, October 7, 1933, p. 7.

⁵⁶ HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969, p. 19.

Aside from expressing the desired, they also denote distaste or outright fear; such as black or khaki colour, both associated with unpleasantries simply because the lower, less desired castes traditionally wear such colours.

Then, of course, the already mentioned repulsing idea of motherhood and family. One usually draws these proverbs when either in a broad social gathering or when challenged or facing distress, as is especially true for women of the World State. Especially Lenina uses her false knowledge as a shield of denial.

3.3.2 *Feelies* in contrast with history and art in *Brave New World*

Huxley's *Brave New World* has a peculiar view upon history. The Controllers and by extension the Directors preach about the vileness of history whenever they can. They have reasons to resent the past; first of all, just the thought of decantation seemed immoral, sleep learning was prohibited, caste system frowned upon - liberalism and democracy advocated inefficiency and warlike ways. Eventually, scientist caste took over after wasteful conflicts and put an end to "the Past".

Everything before Ford is refused by civilization as crude and primal as it harkens back to days when families still existed, which is, of course, a violation of the World State principles. Not only families but also deprivation, starvation, illnesses and other horrifying misfortunes, thoroughly alien to one disposing of the World State mentality. Even the official dating system only begins after Ford's departure (abbreviation A.F.).

Conditioning specifically targets books, among other things, as they might touch one of the societal taboos and generally lead to free thoughts and individualism. Individualism then, in turn, risk compromising the stability. Religious texts are particularly dangerous, regarded by the Controllers as an exceeded concept, much to John's displeasure which is not surprising given his almost antediluvian mindset. Even then, books and knowledge, in general, are kept and guarded by the Controllers and other highest officials. John's access to Shakespeare is an accident that should not have happened under normal circumstances.

While the populace is not allowed to read or produce high art, the World State offers one of its many substitutes; the ultimate experience called *feelies*. Where *Solidarity Service* glorifies the so-called *Greater Being* via '*Orgy-porgy*', thus virtually presenting an allegory on religion, feelies and scent organ perform the role of culture. As a proper substitute, feelies represent cheap rubbish substitute lacking any depth, instead of offering actual high art.

Intentionally so as first of all, no one would even be able to understand classic works such as *Othello* and secondly, the very notion of tragedy invites despised instability. Finally, as the Controller himself admits, the high art was a necessary sacrifice and feelies provide an alternative. An alternative filled with sensation, empty words and pleasure; a simplistic story about a "negro" lunatic bereft of soma, pursuing a pneumatic Beta with affection, with the woman saved by gleaming Alphas.

4. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or *The Last Man in Europe*?

While Huxley formulated his novel in his prime, for Blair, the dystopian novel rendered the final part of his struggle and a desperate race against time. The novel was formerly supposed to be titled, *The Last Man in Europe*, however, Orwell remained unconvinced by the name, and Warburg further suggested *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as a more profitable option.

Warburg's idea transpired further as Orwell suffered setbacks during writing. The initial manuscript set the story to the year 1980, but Orwell's ever-worsening illness postponed work on the novel and thus year 1984 designated the book.

As mentioned earlier, this fact must have affected the tone of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* rather considerably, Orwell's feverish episodes providing with plenty of creative demons.

His painful experiences in India and Spain comprise another major factor, coupled with WWII, and later the death of his wife. It clearly shows as the novel is as bleak as one can get. Orwell himself mentioned the difficulties that had befallen him and rather rarely, shared his vision for *Nineteen Eighty-Four* with his publisher, Fred Warburg;

*'I don't like talking about books before they are written, but I will tell you now that this is a novel about the future—that is, it is in a sense a fantasy, but in the form of a naturalistic novel. That is what makes it a difficult job—of course as a book of anticipations it would be comparatively simple to write.'*⁵⁷

A difficult task indeed, as Orwell would later inform his friend, a member of the Bloomsbury Group, Roger Senhouse about his progress, stating that;

*'I hope before I arrive to have finished the rough draft of my novel, I which I'm on the last lap of now. But it's a most dreadful mess and about two-thirds of it will have to be rewritten entirely besides the usual touching up.'*⁵⁸

As he worked on the novel voraciously, Orwell's physical condition got to a point where he conceded in his letters that he felt deadly sick. Orwell was sincerely wasting away; all the while being pressed by Warburg with deadlines. His agreement to comply

⁵⁷ ORWELL, S. - ANGUS, I. (ed.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell, Volume 4 1945-1950*, London: Secker & Warburg, 1968, 85. *Letter to F. J. Warburg*, par. 1, p. 329-330.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 93. *Letter to Roger Senhouse*, par. 4, p. 382.

only accelerated an untimely death as Orwell laboured even when no longer able to walk. Finally, by the end of November 1948, the manuscript was prepared, made his way to London by December and eventually published in June of 1949. Orwell lived long enough to hear praise and accolades but did not and could not bask in his triumph, as he passed away in early 1950.

Nineteen Eighty-Four differs tremendously from both *We* (Zamyatin) and *Brave New World*. The One State and the World State share many similarities, with Huxley's vision being more consumeristic and satirical than Zamyatin's. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, on the other hand, is wholly different in its fundamental principles. Where the Controllers try to meet the demands of the masses for the sake of stability and prosperity, Orwell's Party rule with an iron fist, caring not for satisfaction.

Why should they try to appease with pleasure, when fear and oppression is a far more effective medium? Totalitarian state imposes its dictates to subdue the population directly, instead of deception of utopia as The World State maintains.

The Party indeed employs lies and deceptions, however, its mandate for power is unquestionable, and thus the ugly truth is visible for all to see.

In *Brave New World*, the populace is conditioned to accept given roles and to be content with them, so people live in a lie, manipulated without their knowledge and preordained for a purpose they could never choose by themselves.

The Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* would never bother to go to such lengths as, after all, it has all the tools necessary to manipulate and lacks the inclination to better the standard of living. Nor does the party employ soma or other narcotics, only cheap substitutes for alcoholic beverages.

There is no escape from bleak reality, no holidays and no respite. There is also no island, no peaceful resolution for those who resist the Party and Big Brother; only termination and torture. As one of the universal truths say;

WAR IS PEACE

FREEDOM IS SLAVERY

IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH.

These antithetic proverbs are a part of Ingsoc doctrine. Ingsoc (English Socialism) form the official ruling body of Oceania, a possible combination of the United States

of America and the British Commonwealth that sets the theatre of the novel. At first glance, such a statement seems similar to proverbs of *Brave New World*, albeit twisted. However, the philosophy of Ingsoc is based around so-called *doublethink* and proposed by *Newspeak*. Any deviation from the expected behaviour is branded as a *thoughtcrime* by the Party. The supposed violator is pursued as a heretic and then vaporised or effaced.

If by some unfortunate accident, Bernard existed in Oceania, his deviation from conventional thoughts would not be rewarded with a pension on an island of his choosing, as was the case in World State; instead, he would face most severe consequences. His fears would be met and surpassed any expectations in infamous Room 101.

4.1 Fear as a cultivation of power

Huxley's Controllers present instant gratification and entertainment as a way to keep the populace in line, to maintain the stability, so lacking in the reviled past. Fear is undesired, yet still, ever present and thus surpassed by way of narcotics and various substitutes, further thwarted by conditioning. All effort aims at a peaceful, productive and mainly consuming society as in this world economics intertwines with happiness. Yes, the residents of World State have their fears, to a great extent learned through the conditioning, as was mentioned in the previous chapter. There still are subjects of dread and *Soma* is essential in their eradicating, yet the ultimate goal is to eliminate fear, hardship and stress to generate and sustain stability.

Orwell's Party seeks the same idea of stability, recognising the importance of order. However, where Controllers try to rule through pleasure, avoiding fear and unpleasantries, Ingsoc rules specifically through fear. Fear and coercion form fundamental principles of Ingsoc and sense of dread is ever-present among the dwellers of Oceania. The Party has the ultimate authority and answers to no one, and its wrath can fall upon any dissenter at any time. Any deviation from "pure orthodoxy" behaviour is pursued by the Party as "heresy" and punished as such. The patriarch of the party, a mystical figure that is known as "The Big Brother" is a semi-religious figure, despite strong atheistic connotations Ingsoc seems to uphold. Still, the heretics are put to fire just as victims of the Spanish Inquisition, with the same zeal and fanaticism.

THE BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU.

The Big Brother is far from the only one watching. This statement induces widespread paranoia as, very much like in Stalin's era as a "Big Brother" of Soviet Union, the oppressive regime is at its peak. The Party is concerned with uprooting the supposed inner enemy, who infiltrated the ranks of Ingsoc and acts subvert against it. Purges affect everyone all the same, and even top-tier Party member might fall out of favour and find himself accused of conspiracy against Ingsoc.

This lack of immunity or amnesty and absolute and unquestionable power of the government generates dread, as well as total obedience. Fear becomes the main driving force of Ingsoc as it is fear that keeps everyone in line, and even forces everyone to adore the Big Brother and the principles of Ingsoc.

The reason why the yoke of the Party is so strong lies in very advanced technology it possesses, and of course, a competent apparatus of dedicated workers divided into specific sections. The technology of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* serves the propaganda, rather than focusing on the betterment of standard of living, as is the case in *Brave New World*. The Party cares not for the well-being of the populace as their solution rests on various ministries that fabricate blatant lies, and yet present them as the truth. Even designations of these ministries are contradictory;

*The Ministry of Truth, which concerned itself with news, entertainment, education and fine arts. The Ministry of Peace, which concerned itself with war. The Ministry of Love, which maintained law and order. And the Ministry of Plenty, which was responsible for economic affairs. Their names, in Newspeak: Minitrue, Minipax, Miniluv and Miniplenty.*⁵⁹

If the Party decides there is plenty, the responsible ministry acts accordingly, and the same principle applies to alterations of facts to better fit the propaganda. Revisions become indiscernible from the truth, and the only lasting certainty is doublethink. Knowing the real answer or the true nature of things, and yet still submit to Party's will is branded as doublethink. Exercising doublethink lean on two contradictory claims and believing them both at the same time. In this manner, a brainwashed mind does no longer think clearly and is easier to manipulate, accepting ever-changing news and plain lies as the ultimate truth.

Suffice to say there is no other option as doing otherwise would result in unorthodoxy, and very likely even thoughtcrime punishable by the Thought Police.

The Thought Police act as the ace card of Ingsoc for they enable to truly delve into the mind of an individual and prevent crime before it even began. In this horrible reality, one is watched and judged by the curious eye of the Party and even that of his most immediate, including children. The extent of the Party is inescapable.

Fear, hatred and paranoia are desired and supported by the Party because of its manipulative influence. The Ministry of Peace always has an enemy to wage war against, keeping the populace of Oceania gripped in fear, while the Ministry of Love preaches nothing but hatred and scorn, and finally, the Ministry of Plenty instigates a famine. Finally, even a mere thought at dissent prompts a violent response, resulting in vaporisation, obliteration from existence.

⁵⁹ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books 2008, par. 1, p. 6.

4.1.1 Nature of Ingsoc and its mandate on history

It is necessary to mention the nature of Ingsoc that Orwell presents. According to one particularly heretical tome, called *The Book*, that eventually becomes available to the main protagonist, the Party was not always in charge. The society, in all historical periods, was divided into "the High", "the Middle" and finally "the Low". The High represents the upper tiers of society, the Middle stands for middle class, and finally the Low represents the working class.

The case of *The Book* is that these groups are perpetually at conflict for power; the Middle strive to depose the High and install themselves in their stead. To this end, the Middle mobilises the Low, appealing on the tenets of freedom and justice. The Middle becomes the High and Low remain in the same position. Such a cycle is inescapable, and the Party is exactly the case of the Middle taking over.

The Party, however, found a way to maintain its mandate for likely perpetuity. The technology available to the government is, of course, exploited and geared towards allowing total domination, just as the state apparatus. Still, while Ingsoc seems like the ultimate evil, according to Orwell, it is merely a consequence of perversion of socialism;

*But in each variant of Socialism that appeared from about 1900 onwards the aim of establishing liberty and equality was more and more openly abandoned*⁶⁰

Equality is more than possible, considering the advanced technologies of the 20th Century, yet according to the Book, it threatens the hierarchical order and for that reason, as early as 1930 authoritarian tendencies began to appear. A decade of strife and civil wars brought to power such a dominant ideology as Ingsoc.

Still, Ingsoc is presented merely as a continuity of past regimes and de facto inevitability, with one major distinction; collectivism, that catapulted the oligarchy of the Inner Party to the position of power and simultaneously effectively perpetuated inequality. The Party remains unchallenged owing to technology, surveillance and the sovereignty over history, keeping others in the dark, knowing full well that;

*'Who controls the past,' ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.'*⁶¹

⁶⁰ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Penguin Books 2008, par. 1, p. 211.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, par. 2, p. 37.

4.2 Oceania, war and fear

Oceania is a continent-spanning empire in all but name, consisting of both North America, South America, South Africa, Australia and of course Great Britain (designated as Air Strip One) complemented by archipelagos in the Pacific Ocean. Despite its status as a global force, Oceania is still engaged in a bitter contest over Africa with the other two superpowers, Eurasia and Eastasia.

Eurasia shares a resemblance to the Soviet Union shortly after World War II, as the Union greatly expanded its reach and begun to install satellite states with the intent to further the Union into Europe.

This similarity might have been Orwell's epigraph considering the book's release at the onset of the Cold War with the Berlin crisis reaching its boiling point. Then again, the same proposition might apply to Oceania as Ingsoc, and its cult of the Big Brother virtually represent Stalin's rule and the cult of personality respectively.

Finally, Eastasia comprises of China, Mongolia and all East Asia. Eastasia is most likely inspired by the People's Republic of China, back then led by Mao Zedong, an infamous blood-soaked dictator that fits in the narrative of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* perfectly.

All the superpowers engage in a struggle of global proportions, or so the Party claim. Given the Party's tendency to remake history and evidence at whim, it could be entirely possible that the only actual domain of Oceania is Airstrip One and other superpowers might not even exist or exist under different names and with less violent tendencies.

The one significant proof of the existence of these super states is a book supposedly written by a heretic named Goldstein '*The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism*'.

If a Big Brother is an allusion to Stalin, then Goldstein is Trotsky or Kamenev, perhaps Bukharin. In reality, Goldstein's identity and ideas present a careful trap laid by the Party and by extension by O'Brien, a high-ranking party member, who wrote the book, assuming the identity of Goldstein.

In any case, "Goldstein" wrote a rather detailed specification of the superpowers through the description of warfare and general policies. The nature of war has changed,

as the super states cannot destroy one another, even with assistance. As Goldstein alludes in his book;

*'The primary aim of modern warfare (in accordance with the principles of DOUBLETHINK, this aim is simultaneously recognized and not recognized by the directing brains of the Inner Party) is to use up the products of the machine without raising the general standard of living.'*⁶²

The author then follows with the explanation of why does the Party frown upon the standard of living;

'But it was also clear that an all-round increase in wealth threatened the destruction—indeed, in some sense was the destruction—of a hierarchical society.

(...)

*In the long run, a hierarchical society was only possible on a basis of poverty and ignorance.'*⁶³

The Party seeks the stability, just like the Controllers in *Brave New World*, however, unlike the Controllers, the means are endless wars and conflicts, for they present a solution to expend labour force and goods without outright wasting.

Most importantly, the stressful reality of continuous warfare makes it easy for the masses to give in to the Party. Despite the endless arms race and flow of news from frontlines, these wars are not as devastating as one would imagine, and this applies to all the powers.

The main intention of mutual wars is to provoke fear and hate, redirect passions on some real or imaginary foe and strengthen the cult of *Ingsoc* or *Neo-Bolshevism* (Eurasia) and *Obliteration of the Self* (Eastasia). After all, Eurasia could overwhelm Airstrip One at any given time but chooses not to, likewise, Oceania does not mingle with the others directly, making these supposed pompous wars seem like a masquerade.

These totalitarian regimes thrive on war, which is laden heavily with propaganda and filtered as to fit the narrative. In truth, the authentic wars are inner affairs directed at the populace with a single purpose; to annihilate free thought and individuality.

The masses are manipulated to believe the enemy lies not only outside of Oceania but also within. Co-worker, neighbour, brother; all could be potential adversaries of the Big

⁶² ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 2, p. 196.

⁶³ *Ibid*, par. 2, p. 197-198.

Brother. While the fearless soldiers of the Oceania wage war on remote frontlines, the brave souls of Oceania are expected to wage war against their own unorthodox kindred. This desire to uproot rebels is hammered in by so-called *Two Minutes of Hate*, where people collectively express disdain for the enemies of Ingsoc. The Party gives its subjects an opportunity to vent built-up frustration all the while reinforcing the propaganda, shaping fear and hate as a tool to lay the claim for power all the stronger. Most do not realize this factuality or apply the principles of doublethink, yet not all stand blind and dull, like Winston.

4.2.1 Winston, the unorthodox fool

Winston Smith is the protagonist of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, an employee of the Ministry of Truth and a member of the Outer Party. Like Bernard, he too is an intellectual and sceptic, secretly opposing the regime. Unlike Bernard, his fear of the consequences of his actions is justified as Winston knows full well what happens to dissenters.

Only through Winston is the dystopia most palpable, as on one the hand, he is the insider and yet still rather diverse than all his peers. Considering the constant exposure to the government, resulting in police surveillance and forced obligations under threats of persecution, one invests all his thoughts and emotional energy into the Party. Omnipresent propaganda replaces one's ideas, Winston however, is an exception.

He already rebels by writing a diary, as merely opening a book invokes a punishment. His suffering is such that he feels the need to express it; both the hatred for the Big Brother and his hope for the system's breakdown.

Winston's desperate desire for deliverance mingles with fatalism and leads him further to damnation. After his written condemnation of the Big Brother, Winston relents, realizing he committed a thoughtcrime;

*Thoughtcrime was not a thing that could be concealed for ever. You might dodge successfully for a while, even for years, but sooner or later they were bound to get you.*⁶⁴

From this point onward, Winston knows he is doomed, yet seems to prefer death to this non-existence, all the while petrified of the consequences. O'Brien, an Inner Party member, and Julia, a fellow Outer Party member, both strengthen his resolve as O'Brien

⁶⁴ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 21.

is Winston's hope and Julia his love interest, yet fear of retribution is ubiquitous, fatalistic even.

It comes as no surprise, given the fact that more than thirty people Winston personally knew either vanished or were vaporised. Winston sometimes covered similar cases in his line of work, such as his fabricated *'private Ogilvy'* who replaced an "unperson" he used to know. One of his colleagues, Syme, has a conversation with Winston and asks;

'Did you go and see the prisoners hanged yesterday?' said Syme.
'I was working,' said Winston indifferently. *'I shall see it on the flicks, I suppose.'*
'A very inadequate substitute,' said Syme.⁶⁵

Syme revels in the scene and is far from being the only one. Twisted principles of Ingsoc, so endorsed by the Party made the populace hateful and petty, virtually no one, barring Julia, truly stands with Winston. People of Oceania are malnourished as there is a constant scarcity of commerce, everyone is on edge due to propaganda, and borderline misanthropic tendencies are common.

Syme takes sadistic satisfaction in expanding Newspeak, effectively destroying the structure of language. Winston notes Syme is precisely the type to get vaporised.

Normal interactions are no longer a possibility, much to Winston's dismay even his friend is a potential enemy who could turn on him at the slightest hint of unorthodoxy. The rest is but a stupefied flock, irritating Winston tremendously;

*It appeared that there had even been demonstrations to thank Big Brother for raising the chocolate ration to twenty grammes a week. And only yesterday, he reflected, it had been announced that the ration was to be REDUCED to twenty grammes a week. Was it possible that they could swallow that, after only twenty-four hours? Yes, they swallowed it.*⁶⁶

With disgust, Winston describes his comrades as *'beetle-like'*, sick and almost inhuman creatures, physically so far apart from the *'tall-muscular, deep-bosomed'* model endorsed by Ingsoc, yet perfectly orthodox devotees steeped in the principles of Newspeak. Women are no better, and invoke the feeling of dread and hatred; when Julia merely looks at him for the first time, Winston almost breaks down in panic;

The sweat started out on Winston's backbone. A horrible pang of terror went through him. It was gone almost at once, but it left a sort of nagging

⁶⁵ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 52.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, par. 1, p. 61-62.

uneasiness behind. Why was she watching him? Why did she keep following him about?

Quite likely her real object had been to listen to him and make sure whether he was shouting loudly enough.⁶⁷

Winston is completely petrified as he realizes he just committed *facecrime* and his fatalism compels him to expect punishment, underlining the sense of paranoia shared amidst the Outer Party and well beyond.

No wonder that mighty O'Brien appears like a pillar in this twisted, de-humanised world, offering a chance which Winston takes without hesitation.

Unfortunately, Winston does not realize his trust is ill-founded as O'Brien is a member of the Inner Party and the whole chain of events was a carefully laid plan. Unlike Bernard, who was rewarded for his keen sight alongside Helmholtz by the Controller, Winston and Julia both suffer for their initiative, and the government breaks them, finally fulfilling Winston's sense of fatalism.

⁶⁷ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 64-65.

4.2.2 Women and children in throes of the Party

Curiously enough, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, women and children are a source of fear just like they are in *Brave New World*. The reasons vary, however. As far as women are concerned, Winston himself notes;

*It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallows of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers-out of unorthodoxy.*⁶⁸

Not only are they the most ardent believers, but they also push organisations such as the Junior Anti-Sex League, proposing artificial insemination. Sexual intercourse is already devoid of pleasure, under severe punishment, and serves only to produce another generation of Party adherents via joyless marriages, devoid of passion or feelings. Winston too endured such matrimony, ultimately willing to choose celibacy over "our duty to the Party", and both come to fear the act itself. Party's mandate on sexuality is crucial in de-humanisation and enslavement, Winston naturally reels against such predicament. His desire for human affection leads to slums occupied by proles, the majority of the population and lowest castes of Oceania.

A pyrrhic victory at best, because while Winston achieves his aim as the sexual act, sexually performed, was rebellion, he remained utterly disgusted and done the deed solely to rise against the dogma. Women of Oceania are de facto conditioned almost in a similar manner to those of *Brave New World*, as elites in both novels turn human nature against the humankind. The Party is far more violent and brash in its approach, furthermore preferring chastity over promiscuity, yet the goal is all the same for both *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*; removal of the concept of family and mandate on sexuality, complemented with authority over records.

Children seem to have a peculiar place in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Winston fears them due to their destructive potential and is correct in this assessment. Children represent the most devious instrument of the Party because their generation virtually grew under the Big Brother, exposed to the influence of the state and never knowing anything else. Winston and his peers experienced a normal childhood, without the pervasive magnetism of the Party. Still, they are left brainwashed to adore the Party, to accept its everlasting continuation. Children make up for the most radical and fanatical elements

⁶⁸ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 12.

of Oceania, hinted to denounce their parents with regularity. Throughout the novel, the Parsons family illustrates just how much of a danger child represent;

*'You're a traitor!' yelled the boy. 'You're a thought-criminal!
You're a Eurasian spy! I'll shoot you, I'll vaporize you,
I'll send you to the salt mines!'*⁶⁹

It is a game, of course, a substitute for regular children games. Already, inhuman tendencies begin to appear under the guise of innocent childhood fantasies. Parents are usually at work or pressed hard merely by surviving, barely having the time or inclination to play with them. To bestow affection would also suggest a thoughtcrime and the child itself could denounce its progenitor. Mrs Parsons is utterly petrified and hopeless. Despite apologies, she is perfectly aware that her children might be the reason for her vaporisation, sooner or later. The state effectively assumes the role of a parent and the ultimate authority while one's child matures into a potential adversary.

And yet, although often called *'little buggers'*, many a parent, especially devoted Outer Party members seem to value their progeny. Heinous, despicable acts that children commit serve as an expression of devotion to the Party, which many parents prize above emotional connection. Parsons brags about the accomplishments of his children and mentions;

*'Did I ever tell you, old boy,' (...)' about the time when those two nippers of mine set fire to the old market-woman's skirt because they saw her wrapping up sausages in a poster of B.B.? Sneaked up behind her and set fire to it with a box of matches. Burned her quite badly, I believe. Little beggars, eh? But keen as mustard! That's a first-rate training they give them in the Spies nowadays—better than in my day, even.'*⁷⁰

'Youth Spies' forms children into an extension of the Thought Police, making them into a manifestation of the Big Brother himself. Only children know their parents perfectly, as they are dependent on them for their very survival and parents invest emotions and love into their progeny. It is likely that a parent will tend to speak openly before his child and that one's offspring will recognise subtle differences in one's behaviour, imperceivable by others. Precisely what the Party might utilise in its pursuit of domination; exploiting naivety of the children, Party creates faultless agents and future loyal following.

⁶⁹ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 2, p. 25.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, par. 1, p. 65-66.

4.2.3 Julia and revolution

Oceania's women, with the exclusion of proles, are mostly weak but fanatic adherents of the Party and Winston in particular reserves an especial resentment, hate even towards them. It seems he redirects his hate and fear of the Party and projects it onto women in general. Two notable exceptions are his mother and Julia, the woman he initially considered as a possible agent of Thought Police.

If O'Brien is Winston's firm pillar, then Julia is his deliverance from the bleak and boring world of Oceania. Julia is young and beautiful, able to disguise her true feelings brilliantly, outwardly posing as an ideal Outer Party member. As she explains, the only way to survive is to mimic and pretend to play the game while in reality, she hates the Party with passion. Winston attracted Julia for the same reason, and their relationship stems from resentment of the Party. The act of intercourse becomes a part of the political struggle against the Party and in extension a fight for humanity itself. Not love, but passion and the promise of hope, as Winston notes;

Not merely the love of one person but the animal instinct, the simple undifferentiated desire: that was the force that would tear the Party to pieces.⁷¹

Remarkably, Julia proposes a rebellion on an individual level and does not speak about the policies of the Party, unconcerned as long as it does not entail her being. Nor does she endorse an organised effort, reflecting her opportunistic tendencies leading to an occasional breach of rules. The risk they take is immense, and the pair need to take extra measures as curious eyes, hidden microphones might be everywhere. Both have a new motivation to carry on in their lives, as they have one another and an enemy to topple. However, the Party already won by infecting their thoughts, which ultimately leads them to commit to recklessness and trust a very suspicious Charrington and enigmatic O'Brien, a member of the Inner Party.

Winston regards proles as probably the only hope of toppling the regime, given their position on the periphery of Party's interest, and considering intellectuals of his like fail in this regard. Wishful thinking at best, considering proles are denied any progress and kept utterly stupefied by the Party, spending most of their time bickering among each other.

⁷¹ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 2, p. 132.

4.3 Unorthodoxy and loss of identity

The belief system cultivated by the Party is surprisingly not all too different from the tenets of *Brave New World's* World State. As mentioned, marriage is an aberration, love or passion an abandoned concept and the subjects of both worlds undergo extensive and careful manipulation or conditioning. Slogans too are not so dissimilar in their influence, and the absence of Newspeak in *Brave New World* stands handily balanced by pseudo-scientific formulations and synthetic forms mentioned in the previous chapter.

Rules and regulations are firmly set in Oceania, while the World State has many unspoken rules, universally recognised by society. 'Ownlife' in Newspeak, meaning individuality, is every bit as horrid as being "queer" in World State. It is the penance for individuality that sets the two apart, as in the case of Oceania, empty threats are non-existent.

Fear cultivates power, and power derives from the sexual impulse that Ingsoc shapes into fervent adoration of the Big Brother and the Party itself. The populace is required to exercise doublethink to remain orthodox, as the breach of orthodoxy is a heresy. This supposed breach could be achieved merely by singing or talking to oneself or similar trivialities.

The slightest deviation from the model behaviour invokes persecution, and while people disappear, everyone seems to know the cause. The choice of a complete submission wins over the threat of obliteration, stemming from individualism. Winston is unorthodox from the very beginning, and his alignment with Julia cements his fate.

Winston, perhaps more than others, stands as an example of the influence the Ingsoc holds. He opposes the Party at every turn, but in every instance, he feels the weight of guilt and equates his actions to crimes. Despite being a measured intellectual, Winston is still half-convinced he will receive due punishment.

Assuredly, fear of being arrested and tortured plays a significant role and justly so, however, unlike many of his peers, Winston is perfectly lucid. Even as he waits for Julia, Winston cannot get rid of the idea of impending doom that feels almost deserved.

Julia is a polar opposite, and her optimism is almost inappropriate as in private, she mounts spirited defiance on a very individual basis, slipping even further into unorthodoxy;

*'I'm going to get hold of a real woman's frock from somewhere and wear it instead of these bloody trousers. I'll wear silk stockings and high-heeled shoes! In this room, I'm going to be a woman, not a Party comrade.'*⁷²

One does not need to be as expressive as Julia; even some characters, devotees of the like of Syme or Parsons disappear and face punishment for supposed crime. What exactly constituted their transgressions? It is remarkably hard to follow suit in a world where the state demands absolute obedience and the present changes at any moment.

Some tenets are purely instinctual and require careful application of doublethink. The announcement during the climax of the Hate week, during which the Outer Party members prepared to display their rage reserved for Eurasia proceeds to the inevitable conclusion; Oceania was not after all at war with Eurasia as Oceania was at war with Eastasia and Eurasia was always an ally.

As the speaker delivers his sermon, no one even doubts the sudden reversal, and the audience assumes an act of subterfuge had taken place as Oceania had always been at war with Eastasia. Five years erased in an instant swept away.

Despite Julia's dangerous thoughts, Winston is the actual opponent of the Party. His recollection of childhood, hardship and hunger, is traumatic enough to blot out the propaganda of Ingsoc. He adores his mother, apprehending her boundless love and he realizes that it is only natural; a direct opposition of the Party's ideology.

Doubts about the mutability of the past and revulsion of inhumane Ingsoc leads Winston to believe there must be resistance, so-called Brotherhood led by Goldstein. Julia and Winston both admit the possibility of being discovered, given the risk of their relationship and connection to O'Brien. The one thing they swear to each other is not to betray one another to the Party;

'If they could make me stop loving you - that would be the real betrayal.'
*She thought it over. 'They can't do that,' she said finally. 'It's the one thing they can't do. They can make you say anything - ANYTHING - but they can't make you believe it. They can't get inside you.'*⁷³

Unfortunately for the pair, the Party thrives on betrayals. The great purges of the early history of the Party were nothing but a series of betrayals. Children denouncing their

⁷² ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 149.

⁷³ *Ibid*, par. 1, p. 173-174.

parents is also a betrayal, just as Charrington unveiling his true purpose as an undercover Thought Police agent, betraying Winston and Julia. Finally, revelation by O'Brien leaves Winston hopeless.

In the end, however, it is Winston who is the arch-traitor. O'Brien forces him to betray Julia, irrevocably breaking him completely, destroying his identity in the process. O'Brien revokes Winston's individuality, the one he considered a friend turns Winston into what he despised the most; a mindless, orthodox instrument of the Party.

The loss of identity is accomplished using several methods, that form a wicked system of psychological abuse. Winston first goes through a vicious cycle of beatings, that is merely a formality to prepare him for later stages of the ordeal. Furthermore, Winston is always nursed back to health to withstand even more abuse. The next phase consists not of the physical torture but rather a cerebral humiliation;

They slapped his face, wrung his ears, pulled his hair, made him stand on one leg, refused him leave to urinate, shone glaring lights in his face until his eyes ran with water; but the aim of this was simply to humiliate him and destroy his power of arguing and reasoning.⁷⁴

The purpose of these humiliating tactics is to bully Winston into a destabilised, nervous wreck that dares not resist and repeats the mantras. Confessions are extracted at this point as one's mind is unable or unwilling to reason any longer. Winston makes all sorts of confessions, uncaring whether they are ludicrous or not, solely hoping his captors will let him be.

Finally, O'Brien himself oversaw Winston's interrogation. While essentially torture, O'Brien appears to regard the procedure as a treatment, as in his mind unorthodoxy Winston demonstrates is an illness that ought to be cured by an orthodox member for the sake of the Party.

'Whatever the Party holds to be the truth, is truth. It is impossible to see reality except by looking through the eyes of the Party.'⁷⁵

Winston violated the concept of the collective mind of the Party, and O'Brien tries to relearn him to make him sane again. This process, of course, means that any singularity is erased and replaced by the collective will of the Party. Winston is forced not only to accept that two plus two makes five but also thoroughly believe it, should the Party

⁷⁴ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 2, p. 253-254.

⁷⁵ *Ibid*, par. 3, p. 261.

dictate as such. Yielding to the principles of Ingsoc must be a voluntary act, one must denounce his peculiar subconscious to be wholly revamped to fit the image of the Party. Only emotions that still linger in these husks of an individual consist of self-loathing for past misdeeds and boundless devotion, love even, reserved for the Party. Hollowness and inability to live for oneself or even to feel the slightest joy and permanent reduction to an unliving automaton is the faith of those who stray away, as O'Brien muses;

*'There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother. There will be no laughter, except the laugh of triumph over a defeated enemy.'*⁷⁶

⁷⁶ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 280

4.3.1 Thought Police and O'Brien

Across the breadth of Oceania, a device called telescreen litters the Air Strip One, performing the function of television and cameras, ensuring permanent surveillance of the inhabitants, barring proles. Proles are exempt from the monitoring due to their numbers and relative insignificance.

The Thought Police use these devices to project propaganda and more importantly to spy for possible thoughtcrimes; O'Brien uses the recording as proof of Winston's conspiracy against the Party. Winston, like all other Outer Party members, greatly fear surveillance, knowing well his unorthodoxy might betray him as a thought criminal;

Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it, moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment.⁷⁷

Even in sleep is one observed by the Thought Police, and any words he might mutter end up recorded by telescreens. Similarly, careful examination applies to human interactions with an accent to oddities or hints of unorthodoxy.

The slightest difference in behaviour pattern might indicate an inner conflict that is likely to be in opposition to the principles of Ingsoc. If such is the case, the culprit must face punishment despite his actual innocence, as he might commit to a crime in the near future.

The Thought Police go to extreme lengths to prosecute their charges. One of its agents, known to Winston as Mr Charrington, for example, underwent an extensive alteration of his physical appearance.

Winston stands convinced that "Charrington" is twice his actual age and that he remembers a time before the dominion of Ingsoc. Charrington not only looks completely different, but he also spied on Winston and Julia the whole time through hidden telescreen.

Outer Party members are expected to perform so-called *crimestop*, a mental technique that makes any notions against Ingsoc seem as illogical and inconceivable. Doublethink is yet another mechanism regularly used to guard against unorthodoxy. Winston fails

⁷⁷ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 3, p. 4-5.

to exercise crimestop and implements doublethink on a very superficial level and is therefore quite certain of imminent reproach.

Ironically, his unorthodoxy leaves him vulnerable and easy to manipulate. Winston chooses to trust a man from the Inner Party, famed for being fervent adherents of Ingsoc, a man he does not know, and believes him purely on instinct; this proves to be a fatal miscalculation on Winston's part.

If the Big Brother is the ultimate symbol of the Ingsoc, then O'Brien is its personification. Aside from being a charismatic Inner Party member, O'Brien is also an exceptionally gifted and ardent agent of the Thought Police. It becomes clear that O'Brien set all the events in motion; notebook from Charrington, apartment in Victory Mansion, the fabled Goldstein's *Book* and perhaps even Winston's affair with Julia.

Considering the boundless possibilities of the Party, it would not be a stretch to claim that Julia was manipulated or influenced by O'Brien. After all, a member of the Inner Party is one of importance, yet still dedicated much of his time to a single violator and set in motion a plan that required years to come to fruition.

Such an elaborate plan only reinforces the idea that Winston served merely as a project of the Party, dedicated to implementing ever more effective means to combat unorthodoxy and thoughtcrime. In this manner, his defeat is all the more tragic as he involuntarily helped the Party further suppress any possible future insurgencies.

4.3.2 Room 101 and Winston's transformation

Winston's tribulations take place in the fabled Ministry of Love. There he meets his former co-workers, who are all guilty of breaching the principles of Ingsoc. The general prisoners are unruly, to say the least, Outer Party members, however, are utterly petrified. Worse still, many, like Parsons sincerely accept their misbehaviour and exhibit genuine guilt;

'Between you and me, old man, I'm glad they got me before it went any further. Do you know what I'm going to say to them when I go up before the tribunal? "Thank you," I'm going to say, "thank you for saving me before it was too late."'78

The prisoners in Winston's cell end up transferred to Room 101, and the mere designation wakes dread that Winston has not seen ever before during his lifetime. One particular, 'Skull-faced' prisoner is willing to do anything, prostrating himself, begging, promising to denounce anyone within his eye-sight and worse;

*'I've got a wife and three children. The biggest of them isn't six years old. You can take the whole lot of them and cut their throats in front of my eyes, and I'll stand by and watch it. But not Room 101!'*⁷⁹

Astonishingly, the man gladly utters any unspeakable profanity to save his own feeble existence, even at the highest price. Is such nonexistence even worth living? Already, the Party pervades through every facet of living in its pursuit of utter domination. The Party is obsessed with power and victory as the victory over weak and feeble forms the centrepiece of Ingsoc ideology. The sense of self-preservation is far too compelling for either the weak or the strong to overcome. Strong or weak, ultimately it matters not as no one can withstand inhumane methods of the Party. Fanatical zeal spreads the whole procedure across the entire months, as long as there is any hint of opposition.

A cycle of torture, hunger and beatings serve to weaken the resolve, strip away pride and dignity, yet it is Room 101 that finally shatters any possible resistance. One faces his most unendurable fears, whether it is a fear of being decapitated or, in Winston's case, a phobia of rats. The deviousness of this scheme lies in the fact that every convict going through the procedure stands exposed to a custom-tailored horror. Quite literary the most insufferable mental torment realized by the Thought Police, operating on one's greatest vulnerability. There is no escape, only desperation and helplessness; in

⁷⁸ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 4, p. 245.

⁷⁹ Ibid, par. 1, p. 249.

a moment of such extreme distress, one is willing to put anyone else before him. Even Winston, bravely resisting O'Brien, gives in when confronted by his phobia of rats. His eventually compromising Julia is even more impactful considering that before his torture, he swore to himself the following;

*'If I could save Julia by doubling my own pain, would I do it? Yes, I would.'*⁸⁰

Julia is Winston's last vestige of humanity. Even beaten and humiliated, broken by O'Brien and invincible reasoning of Ingsoc, he still defies and feels hatred towards the principles of Ingsoc. More importantly, he has feelings for Julia and firmly believes it is the one thing the Party cannot alter. And yet when the trial comes, Winston fails and acts not unlike the Skull-faced man earlier. Exposure to his greatest fear overpowers any notion of loyalty to the only being that stood with him;

*'Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don't care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me!'*⁸¹

Fear is an essential component of Ingsoc. Winston's affection for Julia replaces an unswerving love of the Big Brother, not merely learned obedience but genuine warmth. His mere physical appearance is more in tune with those he formerly regarded as 'beetle-like' and the Party infected every facet of his being. Julia is no different, and upon their encounter after re-education, Julia reveals she too betrayed Winston as there was no other way but to wish someone else took her place.

His gin-filled nonexistence is reminiscent of his experience of Rutherford, Jones and Aaronson, who also spent most of their time in the Chestnut Tree Cafe. To underline the transformation into an orthodox subject of the Party, Orwell presents Winston's final memory of her mother.

The one time his family was not at odds and visibly merry, satisfied even, playing a board game Winston brands as a false memory, yet when the telescreen roars the propaganda, his reaction is much more accepting. His twisted mind now perceives the tenure at the Ministry of Love as an unfortunate, yet much-needed redemption from the pathos of his ignorance;

*Two gin-scented tears trickled down the sides of his nose. But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother.*⁸²

⁸⁰ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par. 1, p. 250.

⁸¹ Ibid, par. 2, p. 300.

⁸² Ibid, par. 3, p. 311.

4.3.3 Newspeak

The success of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is partly due to Orwell's approach to language. Language forms such a vital part of society and culture that many take it for granted, and Orwell knew it. Language not only serves as a means of communication but also allows expression of thoughts, desires and passions, enables the very progress of the human race as language essentially forms the core of humanity.

It stands to reason that a totalitarian regime will go to great lengths to assume control over language and replace it with an artificial construct created in accord with its ideology. Newspeak is a prime example of such a construct. The rules of Newspeak are governed by Ingsoc, making it a platform for ideology and propaganda.

While only a few are indeed fluent in Newspeak, it still appears in the articles and official directives in the line of work. It forms a pervasive, inescapable reality, yet still competes with the "Oldspeak", the actual language that the Party seeks to abolish.

The purpose of Newspeak is to eliminate any line of thought differing from the ideological viewpoint of the Party by carefully applied restrictions and implementation of new words. Restrictions apply to both the meaning of language and the number of words that are in use, specifically those of Oldspeak.

An example provided by Orwell '*free*', is no longer ambiguous, as it could not denote political or intellectual implication for it would be against the interest of the Party. '*Knife*' already conveys the meaning of '*cut*', so there is no need for such an expression that might also have multiple interpretations with negative implications, hurting the Party.

In Newspeak, a base word can virtually represent any part of speech and inflexion always follows the same principles, barring pronouns, the relatives, the demonstrative adjectives and the auxiliary verbs. Negation derives from the affix *-un*, such as '*ungood*' or '*uncold*', meaning bad and warm respectively.

To intensify words, Newspeak implements prefix *plus-* or *doubleplus-*, effectively replacing word such as better by '*plusgood*' and '*doubleplusgood*' puts even more emphasis. Preterite ends with *-ed* and plurals end with *-s* or *-es*, adjectives by adding *-er* or *-est*.

While formally based on the English language its almost coded form makes it hard to be perceived even by users of Standard English or, according to the Newspeak translation, Oldspeak;

*times 3.12.83 reporting bb dayorder doubleplusungood refs unpersons
rewrite fullwise upsub antefiling⁸³*

Newspeak is codified across several editions of vocabulary and formally divided into three sections, each of which suits the narrative of the Party and abides the same principle.

'*The A Vocabulary*' operates with words mostly known to contemporary English and contains the most basic expressions for regular day to day existence, albeit the extent of words remains much reduced. The simplicity and narrow meaning of these words rule out any chance of intellectual defiance. Syme even admits as much in his conversation, or rather a monologue, with Winston;

*'In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it. Every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word, with its meaning rigidly defined and all its subsidiary meanings rubbed out and forgotten.'*⁸⁴

In the same breath, Syme admits that the whole process will outlast both of them yet perfected as early as the Eleventh Edition of Newspeak dictionary. The new version supposedly leans more on so-called '*The B Vocabulary*', that consists of words with solely political connotations. As a general rule, these expressions are compounds and could be inflected. Unlike the previous section, these expressions require a deeper understanding of Ingsoc principles;

*Only a person thoroughly grounded in Ingsoc could appreciate the full force of the word BELLYFEEL, which implied a blind, enthusiastic acceptance difficult to imagine today; or of the word OLDTHINK, which was inextricably mixed up with the idea of wickedness and decadence.*⁸⁵

The need for understanding Ingsoc means that *The B Vocabulary* is the most crucial component of Newspeak. Implemented abbreviations and shortcuts do not invoke the necessity for a logical breakdown as all of them have a similar structure and are bereft of any emotional air.

⁸³ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008, par., 4, p. 46.

⁸⁴ Ibid, par. 3, p. 55.

⁸⁵ Ibid, par. 1, p. 318.

'The C Vocabulary' stands somewhat on the fringe, intended for dedicated workers and forming pseudo-scientific jargon.

Newspeak is also peculiar in that the vocabulary gets progressively smaller with every edition, and every cut presents a small victory for the Party. The reservoir of possible expressions is limited as it is, and any further cuts only dissuade the user from overt thoughts. The majority will not even have a reason for a revolt, as their worldview would be severely limited. Those who do attempt to rebel lack the means to put forth intellectual defiance as Newspeak does not entail it. Only those such as Winston, an Oldspeaker, can defy the regime and then again even he stumbles in the face of O'Brien's reasoning.

The futuristic vision O'Brien presents to Winston is one of domination of Ingsoc. Already feeble resistance will be crushed into nothingness, and the Party would rule completely unchallenged, channelling Newspeak as its medium. Crime will have become an impossibility as no one would even have an idea of how to conceive defiance without any conceptual basis.

Without meanings, definitions and concepts, words lose their power, and that by extension leads to Newspeak subjects losing control over humanity. Even now, concepts such as *freedom* resonates solely with the Party and its proverbs such as *'Freedom is slavery'*. Syme claims that this particular proverb should be discarded as the glorious Party already dealt with slavery, an insight that sends him to the Ministry of Love. Winston is the only one with a clear concept of freedom;

*'Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows.'*⁸⁶

Winston's heroic journey ends with an inevitable failure and a promise of change for the worse. Oldspeak will be rooted out and with it the last remnants of independent thought and any connection with the past. The already tight shackles will clasp even tighter, and *'Duckspeak'* and *'Goodthink'* will constitute the only accepted modes of thought, governed by the principles of Ingsoc, doublethink and orthodoxy. The goal is to eliminate the actual need for logic and reasoning as the tenets of Ingsoc are meant to be as natural as breathing to a subject of the Party.

⁸⁶ ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books 2008, par., 3, p. 84.

Unfortunately, the same policy applies to the other two superpowers as well, so there is virtually no escape, not even among the proles may one find solace. It might be plausible to surmise that story like Winston's plays out across both Eastasia and Eurasia, with the same conclusion.

The world in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* stands divided between comparable totalitarian regimes founded upon fear. Albeit extremely limited, liberties of sorts are still possible as shown throughout the novel; yet it is the promise of future invokes nothing but pure dread. Individuality and free will shall disappear all across the world, replaced by the dictate of the state; something quite impossible without keeping the mandate on the language.

5. Conclusion

Both novels present a dystopian vision of the future world. Usually, dystopian fiction depicts a totalitarian regime or other elitist group oppressing the masses using fear and coercion. In this regard, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* stands as somewhat stereotypical, especially compared to *Brave New World*. And yet both novels are anything but stereotypical and share remarkable similarities.

The concept of fear is assuredly different, as Huxley created a society leaning heavily on the ideas Hobbes proposed in *Leviathan*, while simultaneously leaning on some elements of Plato's *Republic* and *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare. The concept of fear in the World State is an undesired sensation that remains associated mostly with the condemned past. The present seems like a paradise, without heavy labour or toil and endowed with highly advanced technology designed to ease living.

What we perceive as human and natural, a citizen of the World State would fearfully regard as abominable. People are not born, but artificially created, conditioned and assigned to specific social castes. The whole system depends on the control over sexuality, prescribed distribution of drugs, mental manipulation and surprisingly rigid social order. A small group of individuals run the state as omnipotent Controllers, mirroring Shakespeare's Prospero or Plato's philosopher kings. Seemingly utopic society is a fraud, interpreted by the Controller Mustapha Mond as a necessary sacrifice for maintaining the stability of society.

Brave New World regards fear as a viable threat to this stability; when confronted with the idea of motherhood, family or love, citizens of the World State baulk in terror. Any exhibition of human behaviour earns scorn or provokes discomfort.

In this regard, fear has a compelling social character, as the characters need to maintain their social status despite their place in a predestined caste. A revealed father loses his position, as well as social standing, a mother resorts to a drug-induced suicide, and the only layer of society that lacks this mentality is disconnected from the World State and considered bestial.

Nineteen Eighty-Four, as established, portrays a society founded upon fear that also seeks stability, albeit the ruling Party cares only for the stability of its subjects. Terror, war and fear cultivate the power that is further ascertained by a language serving ideological needs, ensuring that the Party reigns unchallenged. The penalty for

nonconformity is severe, and the state deliberately nurtures fear and hate, the only two officially allowed sentiments.

At first glance, both systems present antipathic philosophy, but not so upon closer inspection. Zamyatin in his novel *We* (1921) essentially expressed what Foucault wrote many years later in the *History of Sexuality*; sexuality transfers power. Huxley's Controllers rule through pleasure, utilising sexuality as a part of their methods of sustenance. Orwell's Party, on the other hand, represses sexuality to the point of extreme purity.

In both cases, all effort centres around thwarting marriage or the concept of family as these conceptions could challenge the veracity of the regime.

A mother is an abomination in *Brave New World* and so is in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, albeit the reasons are different, the purpose is the same. Similarly, the children invoke fear in *Brave New World*, as pregnancy or even delivery is considered a social stigma, taboo even. Artificially created children undergo inhumane conditioning as to strip them of any idea beyond the craving for instant gratification.

The Party conditions children with propaganda and remakes them into an extension of state surveillance, prompting the little agents to spy on their parents and denounce them to police as traitors, effectively fulfilling death sentence. Not merely children, all are led towards animosity.

The regimes of both novels attempt to reduce meaningful human interactions to the bare minimum and offer a substitute in the form of collective, but ultimately hollow activities, ending any sense of intimacy. Absence rouses suspicion and possible reproach as any sense of individualism is undesired and repressed, even in relatively mild *Brave New World*.

Oceania and the World State also either dismantled any traces of the past or try to demonise history to maintain their supremacy. Bernard Marx and Winston Smith are both truth seekers and actively attempt to resist the system, but only one faces punishment for the initiative.

Nineteen Eighty-Four presents a horrifying future and residents of the World State cannot match distress of the inhabitants of Oceania. Despite many similarities in principles, both systems are entirely different, and yet equally horrid for a contemporary individual. One maintains falsehood to retain synthetic civilization and

the other rules supreme with an iron fist in absurd cruelty. Both, in turn, abolish humanity and precede over a realm of emptiness.

Remarkably, both dystopian scenarios still resonate even today and with the constant advancement of technologies, perhaps one day soon a more modest and humane variant of *Brave New World* will not appear like science fiction, whether for good or ill. One might only hope that the terrifying vision of the authoritarian superpowers of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will stay fictional for all times.

6. Summary

The aim of the thesis was to analyse the motif of fear in novels *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell. Fear as a concept is a fundamental component of dystopian fiction, yet both authors approach the motif of fear very differently.

The first chapter provides an introduction to the phenomenon of dystopia through the description of utopia. Due to the complexity of the concept, an exposition to Ancient Greek philosophy is necessary. Following parts mention the works of prominent intellectuals of the Western civilization to convey the complete image of utopian thought. The last section of the chapter contrasts with the previous as it depicts the modern dystopian prose emerging from the early 20th Century. Deliberately so, to show a remarkable shift in perception from liberal opinions towards scepticism reflecting social tension on the eve of global conflicts.

The second chapter is devoted to Orwell and Huxley as both authors and unique individuals. Environs and personal experience gradually influenced their work, and such a fact needs to be reflected. Similarly, some sources of inspiration, such as Yevgeny Zamyatin, William Shakespeare or H.G. Wells, need a brief remark. The other famous or influential works Orwell and Huxley wrote reserve a mention, especially those connected with the two analysed novels.

The third chapter forms the analysis of the notion of fear in *Brave New World*. Firstly, the technologically advanced and seemingly ideal nature of the World States requires examination, provided in the opening subchapter and complemented throughout the entire chapter. The notion of fear of human nature, in the form of motherhood and other aspects then follows, examined in the context of society, as well as purely on the individual level. Fundamental characters provide particular examples for that purpose. John, on the other hand, serves to highlight the unnatural tone of the World State, as well as renders an allusion to *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare. The influence of various substances and manipulation of the ruling caste forms the last significant element of the chapter. While not fear-inducing by themselves, these methods are crucial as they enforce distribution of fear and resentment towards undesired actions. Not merely actions, but also prejudice or partiality, significantly influencing the way society operates. Therefore, these methods form an indispensable part of the analysis.

The fourth chapter describes Orwell's vision. Given the characteristics of his dystopia, this chapter is rather extensive. Fear plays such an essential role in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, that covering all aspects simply meant devoting more space to all the features.

Further knowledge about the author forms the initial chapter, complemented with the essential characteristics of his novel. Then the notion of fear is analysed across the following subchapter as a driving force of the regime, that describes yet another part of the thesis. Further elaboration considers the theme of fear from a similar perspective as done in case of *Brave New World*, as a social issue. In an effort to show similarities between the two novels, the idea of motherhood and the concept of family constitutes subchapters along with an elaboration of main characters.

The concluding subchapter, on the other hand, serves to highlight the difference between the two novels through the concept of punishment. The relevant parts show the impact of fear on the destruction of individuality and just how far the Party is willing to go to suppress difference, using both the main character and others as proof. The whole process of painful compliance of the main character serves to show the foulness of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in its full extent.

Finally, the very last segment explores the role of language in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and implications for a foreseeable future, completing the whole picture of Orwell's dystopia. As alluded in conclusion, both novels share striking similarities, despite their difference in tone. Fear, in general, is an obsolete concept in *Brave New World*. The regime rules unopposed and its Controllers are perfectly aware of the falsehood they promote yet regard it as a necessary evil. Those who somehow overcome manipulative conditioning are sent away to prevent the breach of stability. This displacement is not denoting ostracization, but rather a reward. Orwell's Party brutalises even the slightest difference, in thought and deed as well. Dictate of the state is supreme. Fear and hate exist as commonplace sensations. The Inner Party is even more radical than regular members, blinded by the propaganda.

Both novels transcend mere prose, as they present a warning before the idea of the destruction of individuality and difference, as both regimes are dependent on uniformity and strict social order in a world where humanity disappears; either suppressed by fear or numbed by pleasure.

7. Bibliography

Primary literature:

HUXLEY, A., *Brave New World*, New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

ORWELL, G., *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin Books, 2008. ISBN 978-0-141-03614-4

Secondary literature:

BALDICK, Ch., *The Oxford English Literary History: Volume 10: The Modern Movement (1910-1940)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. ISBN 0199288348

BEDORE, P., *Great Utopian and Dystopian Works of Literature*, Course Guidebook, University of Connecticut: The Great Courses, 2017. ISBN 978-1629973777

BOAS, F.S., *The Warwick Shakespeare, The Tempest*, London: Blackie & Son Limited, 1897.

CERMAN, I., *Kdo byl první? K metodě a předmětu dějin lidských práv*, Opera historica 16, vol. 16, no. 1 (2015), České Budějovice: Historický ústav Filozofické Fakulty Jihočeské univerzity, 2016. ISSN 1805-790X

COLLS, R., *George Orwell, English Rebel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. ISBN 978-0199680801

CLUTE, J. – NICHOLLS, P., *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995. ISBN 031213486X

CROMPTON, S. W., *Thomas More and His Struggles of Conscience*, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 2006. ISBN 0-7910-8636-4

DAVIDSON, P., *George Orwell, A Life in Letters*, New York: Liveright, 2013. ISBN 978-0871404626

FOUCAULT, M., *The History of Sexuality*, Paris: Pantheon Books, 1978. ISBN 0394417755

HOUSTON, Ch., *Utopia, Dystopia or Anti-utopia? Guilliver's Travels and the Utopian Mode of Discourse*, Utopian Studies, Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, vol. 18, 2007. ISSN 1045-991X

KING, W., K. – THURBER, J. – ROSS, H., „*Talk In The Dreams*“, *The New Yorker*, October 7, 1933.

LOGAN, G. M. – ADAMS, R. T., *Thomas More: Utopia, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. ISBN 0521525403

MACEY, D., *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory*, London: Penguin Books, 2002. ISBN 0140513698

MONTGOMERY, M.R., *John Stuart Mill and the Utopian Tradition*. In: BACKHAUS, J. (eds) *The State as Utopia, The European Heritage in Economics and the Social Sciences*, vol 9., New York: Springer, 2011. ISBN 9781441974990

NEWSINGER, J., *Orwell's Politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999. ISBN 978-0-333-96858-1

ORWELL, S. - ANGUS, I., *The Collected Essays, Journalism And Letters Of George Orwell, Volume 4 1945-1950*, London: Secker & Warburg, 1968. ISBN 0436350157

SION, R. T., *Aldous Huxley and the Search for Meaning: Study of the Eleven Novels*, London: McFarland, 2010, ISBN 978-0-7864-4746-6

STRÍBRNÝ, Z., *Dějiny anglické literatury II*, Praha: Academia, 1987. ISBN 21-030-87

YORAN, H., *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*, Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010. ISBN 978-0739136478

Online sources:

Encyclopaedia Britannica: John Stuart Mill, British Philosopher and Economist [online]. [cit. 2017 2-10]. Available from: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Stuart-Mill>

Oxford Dictionaries: The Definition of Utopia [online]. [cit. 2017-20-9]. Available from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/utopia>

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Plato [online]. [cit. 2017-22-9]. Available from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato/>