Ustopian Literature: A Matter of Perspective in Twentieth Century Utopian and Dystopian Literature

Source: https://xafirah.deviantart.com/art/Utopia-Dystopia-64257226

Written by:

Nathalie Perez

S1020587

Thesis monitor:

Dr E.J. van Leeuwen

Second Reader:

Dr S.A. Polak

Literary Studies

July 1st 2018

Universiteit Leiden

Table of Contents:

Introduction:

"Better never means better for everyone... It always means worse, for some."

Margaret Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale*

The dystopian genre has had a surge of popularity in television and movies the past few years with movies such as the *Hunger Games* and series such as Netflix's *Black Mirror*. However, the genre's popularity had its beginning in the early years of the twentieth century, in particular, thanks to the contributions of Aldous Huxley and George Orwell. Their books, Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), are to this day lauded for their prophetic elements. On the one hand, *Brave New World* explores scientific progress and the negative consequences it could entail. Some of the inventions present in the novel were not yet invented at the time that Huxley wrote them, such as for example birth control for women. On the other hand, Orwell's exploration of cruelty by totalitarian regimes and the high-tech espionage of their citizens through cameras in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, well before the Soviet Union's KGB and the East-German Stasi applied them during the Cold War, prophesied the rise of surveillance technologies in modern technocracies.

These two foundational dystopian novels have their origins in the two authors' critique of optimistic utopian narratives. The works of H.G. Wells, in particular, were viewed adversely by Huxley and Orwell. Despite the negative incentive, there are clear similarities between the novels of these three public intellectuals. H.G. Wells had a ground-breaking approach to communicating his ideas about science and society to a wider audience. In his scientific romances he combined aspects of the social novel with scientific theories about the progress of human civilization in order to express his vision of how to rid the world of its ills, which ultimately inspired, on the one hand, the scientific explorations of utopia in *Brave New World* and, on the other hand, the social protest against dystopian developments in Western society that *Nineteen Eighty-four* was to become. These would ultimately become two distinct kinds of dystopian literature: Huxley's science-fiction dystopias and Orwell's social dystopias. There are of course also combinations of both. The close readings of H.G. Wells'

Men Like Gods (1923), Brave New World and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will highlight the similarities between the three novels in terms of their treatment of the utopia/dystopia dichotomy and will show that the authors' personal backgrounds played an important role in determining each different approach to the building of a utopia/dystopia in the respective novels.

Dystopian literature has been the topic of extensive research. The genre is described by Keith Booker as: "literature which situates itself in direct opposition to utopian thought, warning against the potential negative consequences of arrant utopianism (5). Utopia, being an ideal society, a term coined by Thomas More and deriving from the neo-Latin translation of no-place, similar to the Greek word eutopia, the good place (Sargent 565). However, in the essay "Dire Cartographies: The Roads to Ustopia," Margaret Atwood coined the term, Ustopia:

> Ustopia is a word I made up by combining utopia and dystopia—the imagined perfect society and its opposite—because in my view, each contains a latent version of the other. The 'dire' might at first glance appear to be connected only to the obverse or dystopic side of this coin, where unpleasantness prevails, though most utopias viewed slantwise—from the point of view of people who don't fit into their high standards of perfection—are equally dire. (66-67)

This encompasses both the Utopian and Dystopian literature, proving that both genres can be read as utopia and a dystopia at the same time. It depends on the perspective of each character, whether they are opposed to or supportive of the society they live in. There are always marginalised individuals in both set of communities and there are always content civilians, who prefer their new society to the old. All the changes that are made to a society will ultimately lead to improving the lives of some and making the lives of others worse, whether the author views his own story as a utopia or a dystopia. This thesis will show that the three novels analysed in the chapters to come are Ustopias because they contain multiple perspectives on the world described, embodied by the different protagonists that feature in each work.

The first chapter will explore H.G. Wells' utopian novel, *Men Like Gods*. The main character, Barnstaple, is transported to an alternate reality along with some other travellers from his own earth. The society that welcomes them lives three thousand years ahead of them and has evolved into almost

perfect beings due to eugenic practices and good educations. Wells' scientific background (discussed in more detail in chapter one) provides many of the ideas that led the utopians in this society to their status of perfection, such as evolution, eugenics, alternate realities and helicopters. Barnstaple's fellow travellers are less enthusiastic about the newfound Utopia as the main character is. From their perspective, this new world has lost all the things that were important to them and makes this society a dystopia in their eyes. These characters are, similar to Gulliver in *Gullivers'travels* (1726), not aware that they are the flawed individuals. Each character represents a different branch of society. The personal interests of every travel party member highlight different aspects of the utopian society. By exploring the thoughts of the most important characters in *Men Like Gods*, this chapter will show, on the one hand, the exploration of a theoretical utopia and, on the other hand, the moral damnation of the current society.

The second chapter will explore Aldous Huxley's dystopian novel, *Brave New World*. This novel, contrary to the other two, has no main character. Huxley provides his readers with several points of views that explore the society from different angles. Huxley's scientific background provides inspiration to treat this society as an experiment. There are many scientific developments and the different characters comment on the negative repercussions many of them have. These outsiders provide the needed prove to confirm this society as a dystopia, as the close readings in the chapter will show. However, there are many citizens who seem very content with their reality. Some of Huxley's social structures are meant to satirize H.G. Wells' narratives as will become clear in this chapter. Huxley's criticism of Wells' ideal society is pivotal to the narrative within *Brave New World*, because it inspired several of the society's structures as will become clear in the chapter.

The third chapter will explore George Orwell's dystopian novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The main character, Winston Smith, is the focalizer in the story and provides its reader with his subjective point of view. To Winston, the society of Oceania is one of terror and pain. Their leader, Big Brother, has control of everything that is needed to influence his citizens, such as history, language, intercourse and family dynamics. All citizens are closely monitored by cameras and microphones to detect any sign of subversion. Winston's point of view of Oceania plays an important role in determining how the reader responds to this state. If readers do not pay attention to the subjectivity of Winston's

descriptions, they can miss the fact that the majority of citizens seem content with their reality. The chaos that ruled the world before Oceania has been eliminated and the lower classes are left to their own devices, provided with enough entertainment to keep them satisfied. It will become clear that Oceania is also an ustopia, in which there are the satisfied civilians and some marginalised individuals. Orwell's journalistic background makes him passionate of social causes such as poverty and injustice, but it also demonstrates his narrow view and his attempts to appeal to the reader's emotions with an anecdotal narrative to push his political views.

The chapters of this thesis will show that Wells' utopian vision, as expressed in *Men Like Gods* and *A Modern Utopia*, stood at the foundation of Orwell's and Huxley's anti-utopian masterpieces. Secondly, the thesis shows that the different perspectives of the utopian/dystopian worlds portrayed in the novel by different characters demonstrate that subjectivity plays an important role in defining any world as a utopia or a dystopia. The author's personal background, their education and experience of class identity, is shown to be influential in the development of this awareness of subjectivity. Finally, these same perspectives prove that the worlds described in each novel should be understood as Ustopias, to borrow Atwood's term.

H.G. Wells' *Men Like Gods*: A Scientific Moral Utopia

Before discussing the dystopian novels, *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty Four*, it is important to explore the Utopian literature that inspired these dystopian novels in the first place. H.G. Wells' contribution plays an important part in this tradition. He borrowed from traditional Utopian writings, such as Thomas More's *Utopia*, literary tropes such as the journey to an undiscovered part of the globe, and combined these traditional literary tropes with new-fangled scientific theories on human evolution, eugenics and modern technologies. In doing so, Wells can be said to be the father of modern science fiction. In his book *Utopian Fantasy* (1955), Richard Gerber states how unique Wells' Utopian narrative was: "Wells creates a *Modern Utopia* which is evolutionary not only in its social aspects, but also in its technics. Scientific research and socially applied science are combined; the machine moves on and on towards ever perfection" (52). H.G. Wells had a ground-breaking approach to communicating his ideas about science and society to a wider audience. In his scientific romances he combined aspects of the social novel with scientific theories about the progress of human civilization in order to express his vision of how to rid the world of its ills, which ultimately inspired, on the one hand, the scientific explorations of utopia in *Brave New World* and, on the other hand, the social protest against dystopian developments in Western society that *Nineteen Eighty-four* was to become. Wells' Utopian novels *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and *Men Like Gods* (1923) clearly inspired Aldous Huxley and George Orwell, though their inspiration sprung from their criticism of Wells' ideas. The influence is found in the pages of the two writer's most famous dystopian texts that followed Wells' two utopian works. These novels in turn created two forms of dystopian tales, namely: the social dystopia, with clear moral judgements, and the scientific dystopia, exploring the dangers of technical advancements. The result is a dichotomy between, on the one hand, the political and, on the other hand, the experimental.

Through the means of new literary motifs such as time travel, alternate dimensions and other scientific influences, Wells was able to create undiscovered worlds where his characters could explore a utopian society. These literary devices resembled the shipwrecked plots of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) or *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), tales portrayed in undiscovered isolated communities. In his book *The*

Utopian Vision of H.G. Wells (2009), Justin Busch explains the use of unexplored settings as a necessary motif to apply new social structures: “Such freedom is vital in the creation of utopias; what utopian authors in particularly have done is created imagined settings for the whole of humanity, where we can see life in ways reality has not yet presented. Imagination is what allows us to transcend empirical fact” (46). The author can construct new forms of government without being tethered to the social conventions of his time.

In his biography Robert Gorman explains that Herbert George Wells was born on 21 September 1866 to a family striving to preserve their place in the lower middle class. His father, Joseph, owned a shop but earned most of his money playing professional cricket. Sarah, Wells’ mother, worked as a maid and housekeeper. Gorman adds that the fact that his mother worked “ended the family’s claim to middle-class status”. This is reflected in many of his characters, who often had a hard time battling for social respectability. In 1874, Wells enrolled at Thomas Morley’s Commercial Academy. He attempted to thrive in several apprenticeships: “Twice with drapers and once with a pharmacist but ultimately rejected the idea of a career as a clerk. Wells left the draper’s trade and entered, in 1883, Midhurst Grammar School as a teaching scholar. In 1884 he enrolled in the Normal School of Science in South Kensington, where he studied biology under the famous Thomas Henry Huxley, who has sometimes been called ‘Darwin’s Bulldog’ for his vigorous advocacy of evolution” (Gorman 4287). His famous grandson, Aldous Huxley, wrote the dystopian book *Brave New World*, which ridiculed Wells’ utopian ideals. Unfortunately for Wells, Thomas Henry Huxley was not able to teach after Wells’ first year due to illness, making Wells focus more on politics and his writing for the Science Schools Journal, a journal he edited. He was unable to pass his exams and was thereby forced to leave the institution without a degree (Gorman 4287).

Wells acquired a Bachelor degree of Science from the University of London in 1890. He started to focus more steadily on becoming a full-time writer. Four books in 1895 confirmed his status as a writer and over the next three years, Wells wrote four more novels, three of which are beyond question his most famous works: *The Island of Dr. Moreau* (1896), *The Invisible Man* (1897), and *The War of the Worlds* (1898), he made use of his background in science for material while also arguing the case of “order and cooperation” against “individual extremes” (Gorman 4288). Wells also made

contact with the British socialist movement, known as the Fabian Society. Wells' utopian vision "fit Fabian thinking well" (Gorman 4288). However, the Fabian society thought Wells' lacked an insight of government frameworks, which were needed to solve society's problems. The final two decades of Wells' life, he continued to write about his conviction that humankind was destroying itself and of the means needed to improve life. He died on August 13, 1946 (Gorman 4287-89).

The plot of *Men Like Gods* provides a strong argument in favour of the idea that different perspectives, from contrasting characters, can transform what for many can be a utopia into a dystopia for the marginalised individuals in a society, ultimately resulting into what Margaret Atwood has called an "ustopia" (66). Every earthly character transported to the utopian world in *Men Like Gods* offers a different criticism of this newfound world and the system set in place. All the characters represent a different branch of society. These embodiments of society clearly indicate H.G. Wells' criticisms of his present world. The Utopian's history lessons demonstrate all the problems that the world faced at the beginning of the twentieth century. The novel is a satire in the tradition of *Gulliver's Travels*. Like Gulliver, the stranded protagonists think they are criticising an imperfect society but are unaware of how flawed their own personalities are. Gerber explains how "the technique of the satiric foil is adopted in most utopias. The anti-utopian crank is used as a convenient means of discrediting existing institutions" (59).The novel not only demonstrates an alternate to the present society but also an opportunity to highlight the errors of the real world. In this manner Wells utilizes the two characteristics that will become invaluable to future dystopian stories such as *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Mr Barnstaple is able to discern the faults within his travel party by comparing them to the more perfect Utopians. However, he is the sole person in the party who thinks that the Utopians are faultless. The personal interests of every travel party member highlight different aspects of the Utopian society. By exploring the thoughts of the most important characters in *Men Like Gods*, this chapter will show, on the one hand, the exploration of a theoretical utopia and, on the other hand, the moral damnation of the current society. This will form the basis that will ultimately determine the two critical dystopian genres that will develop in years later.

The main character of *Men Like Gods*, Barnstaple, belongs to an unsatisfied intellectual branch. As a journalist he is daily confronted with the perils of the world without any control to

change the course of society. Tired of all the misery in the world he decides to take a vacation. He is determined to escape his reality and fate gives him exactly such an opportunity. Barnstaple is so mesmerized by the Utopian surroundings that the only manner in which he can stay sane is by holding onto the flawed company of his travel companions:

> She brought so much of the dear old world with her, and she was so manifestly prepared to subjugate this new world to its standards at the earliest possible opportunity. She fended off much of the wonder and beauty that had threatened to submerge Mr Barnstaple altogether…it degraded the luminous splendour about him towards complete credibility…it brought it in the range of the newspapers. (30-31)

Despite the positive tone in his words, Barnstaple is clearly insulting his entourage. The first chapter had demonstrated how much he hated the news he had to report in the newspaper. In this manner his opinion of the group is made very clear very early in the story.

The Utopian history confirms the negative aspects of Barnstaple's own reality: "The more he learnt of that Last Age of Confusion the more it seemed to resemble the present time on earth" (61) and offers hope that change will occur "'So it must be,' said Barnstaple, as though Utopia were not already present about him" (72). It is clear that Barnstaple sees the events in the history of Utopia as the steps his own world needs to take to evolve into what he sees as a perfect society. His presence throughout the book consists of criticising his companions and praising the Utopian ideals. His perspective and opinion reflect views of one individual and are therefore subjective, making this new reality his Utopia but not that of everyone else. He, as an earthling, has to leave it behind. Utopia is not made for normal human beings in their current state of evolution. They must keep evolving to ultimately be worthy of such a society.

The first individual from his reality to cross Barnstaple's path after the unknown accident that embarks him on his Utopian journey is Mr Cecil Burleigh, the great conservative leader:

> Exactly! said the tall gentleman in earnest, argumentative tones. Exactly! And I maintain that there is not the slightest reason for supposing that we are not still on the Maidenhead Road. The challenge of the dialectician rang in his voice. It doesn't look like the Maidenhead Road, said Mr Barnstaple. Agreed! But are we to judge by appearances or are we to judge by the

> direct continuity of our experience? The Maidenhead Road led to this, was in continuity with this, and therefore I hold that this is the Maidenhead Road. (18)

An important aspect of this exchange is the fact that "the challenge of the dialectician rang in his voice," meaning that he sounds like a philosopher. This fact is not viewed as a positive trait by Barnstaple. Despite the evidence presented to Mr Burleigh, he stubbornly retains his views due to badly applied rhetoric. He is nevertheless the diplomat in the group and often the one that speaks for the group but most importantly the one who names the new world, Utopia: "We are here in some world that is singularly like our world an singularly unlike it … Here we are in some world which is, for all practical purposes, including the purposes of our weekend engagements. Nowhere. Or if you prefer the Greek of it, we are in Utopia" (26). Wells ridicules Burleigh with his wrong translation of the Greek word Utopia when Burleigh translates nowhere as utopia instead of eutopia. Utopia's meaning actually being that of the "good place". From then on the travellers keep calling this new world Utopia and by all intents and purposes it takes on Barnstaple's ideal society and therefore becomes an actual Utopia for the main character.

Burleigh continues to be the groups elected spokesperson as he embarks to tell their reality to the Utopians:

> No one else appeared to be worthy of consideration. Mr. Burleigh rose slowly and walked thoughtfully to the centre of the semicircle. He grasped his coat lapels and remained for some moments with face downcast as if considering what he was about to say… Ladies and Gentlemen—He was going to make a speech!—as though he was at a Primrose League garden party—or Geneva. It was preposterous and yet, what else was there to be done…And they were understanding him! Which was absurd. (50-52)

The comical fashion in which Burleigh retells their history and the somewhat false humility demonstrated by his speech is something that Barnstaple finds hard to believe is taking place. In his essay "The Disease of Parliaments" (1914), Wells discusses the role of representatives in the government that is appropriate to understand the previous passage: "My answer would be that the idea of representative government is the only possible idea for the government of a civilised community. But I would add that so far representative government has not had even the beginnings of a fair trial.

So far we have not had representative government, but only a devastating caricature" (1). The sense that Burleigh is a vehicle for satire, embodied to criticize the political system, is present in the pages of *Men Like Gods*. He is the only character who refuses to offer an opinion of Utopia always trying to appease both sides when conflict seems to arise. He has the habit of doing as little as possible according to Barnstaple: "Mr Burleigh however retained a certain aristocratic sublimity. He had been a great man on earth for all his life and it was evident that he saw no reason why he should not be accepted as a great man in Utopia. On earth he had done little and had been intelligently receptive with the happiest results" (89). There is a clear moral judgement of the elite class that Burleigh belongs to and concurs with Wells' own more humble upbringing. It becomes clear that Wells condemns this character more than the others, seeing as he is intelligent but wastes his intellect by not taking proper action: "Mr. Burleigh was one of those strange people who seem to understand everything and feel nothing. He impressed Mr. Barnstaple as being intelligently irresponsible. Wasn't that really more evil than being unintelligently adventurous like Hunker or Barralonga" (190). According to Margaret Atwood: "he represented a rational being who had climbed up the ladder through ability alone, without partaking of the foolishness and impracticality of the social strata above his nor of the brutish crudeness of those below" (153). To Wells, Burleigh might belong to the useless Eloi found in the pages of his book *The Time Machine* (1895), the future's evolution of the upper classes due to years of being useless.

The character that represents the worst of Earth in Utopia is the embodiment of religion, Father Amerton. A silent character at first, he closely observes the surrounding landscape of Utopia. By virtue of his insights, the reader can establish the leading contrasts between the new reality and the old. The manner in which Barnstaple and Lady Stella describe Father Amerton gives an insight of Wells' opinion of the clergy: "the third member of the little group was also a familiar form, but for the time Mr. Barnstaple could not place him. He had a clean-shaven, round, plump face and a well-nourished person and his costume suggested either a High Church clergyman or a prosperous Roman Catholic priest" (19). The description of the overweight priest who according to Lady Stella is "dreadfully outspoken about the sins of society" (30) can be interpreted as a forewarning to the reader

that Father Amerton will be an antagonist to the Utopians. The historical description given by the Utopians of their Last Age of Confusion also supports this insight:

> And since this teacher's memory was very dear to the ignorant multitude because of his gentleness and charity, it was seized upon by cunning and aggressive types who constituted themselves champions and exponents of the wheel, who grew rich and powerful in its name, led peoples into great wars for its sake and used it as a cover and justification for envy, hatred, tyranny and dark desires. (69)

Father Amerton, however, "seemed inattentive to this communication. He was seeing it from another angle" (69). His inability to recognize his own faults adds to the satirical element within Wells' novel.

As expected, the conservative views of the father concerning the ideals of marriage and family are absent from this modern society: "a gasp of horror came from Father Amerton. He had been dreading this realization for some time. It struck at his moral foundations. "And you dare to regulate increase! You control it! Your women consent to bear children as they are needed—or refrain!" (63). This Utopia has implemented population control to solve many of their problems at once, seeing as according to the Utopians: "The overcrowding of the planet in the Last Age of Confusion was … the fundamental evil out of which all the others that afflicted the race arose" (64). Wells' manner of expressing his thoughts of the masses demonstrate his disdain for them: "Upon this festering, excessive mass of population disasters descended at last like wasps upon a heap of rotting fruit" (65). The only redeeming factor being "every effort the intelligent minority could make to educate a sufficient proportion of them to meet the demands of the new and still rapidly changing conditions of life" (64). Eugenics was a popular scientific theory on how to improve mankind at the beginning of the twentieth century. Therefore, it is not surprising that Wells includes scientific theories into his novel that closely resemble Eugenics:

> For centuries now Utopian science has been able to discriminate among births, and nearly every Utopian alive would have ranked as an energetic creative spirit in former days…the idle strains, the people of lethargic dispositions or weak imaginations, have mostly died out…spiteful and malignant characters are disappearing. The vast majority of Utopians are active, sanguine, inventive, receptive and good-tempered. (65)

The utopian speaker does not present a clarification of how these baser human beings died out, Wells' own views concerning eugenics should perhaps not be linked to such an excessive implementation of the notion as is present in Utopia seeing as according to Justin Busch: "for a brief period, probably under the influence of Plato, Wells took eugenics as both possible and desirable; this, though, changed fairly rapidly ... in 1900, Wells took a rather thoughtless supportive stance regarding eugenics; within four years, he reversed his view on the topic, adopting the critical stance he would retain ever after" (36). The fact that his own opinion of eugenics is not the same as the one adopted by the Utopians should make the reader more aware of what Wells' criticisms are concerning the Utopian society.

Father Emerton's sermon begins with what he views as an objective period of observing: "I waited—I waited to be perfectly sure, before I bore my testimony" (81). He starts lecturing the inhabitants of Utopia for their lack of moral fibre:

> But it speaks for itself—the shamelessness of your costume, the licentious freedom of your manners! Young men and women, smiling, joining hands, near to caressing, when averted eyes, averted eyes, are the leas tribute you could pay to modesty! And this vile talk—of lovers loving—without bonds or blessings, without rules or restraint. What does it mean? (81)

He keeps saying that he wants to know what all of it means but does not provide the respite for the utopians to be able to answer as one of them states: "He paused and in the pause the Utopian reply came through to Mr Barnstaple: 'In Utopia there are no bonds.' But Father Amerton was not asking questions with any desire for answers; he was asking questions pulpit fashion … I want to know … ' But he *doesn't* want to know' came a Utopian intervention" (78-79). Because the utopians do not have any form of relation, they do not recognize a church sermon and the habit a preacher has of asking rhetorical questions to his congregation. This makes the reader aware of how ridiculous the custom actually is. The utopians conclude that his mind "is very unclean" (83). This is the first indication of how the utopians deal with what they view as a deficient person: "His sexual imagination is evidently inflamed and diseased. He is angry and anxious to insult and wound. And his noises are terrific. Tomorrow he must be examined and dealt with" (83). Their dispassionate and clinical method of describing the manner in which they see Father Emerton and the unknown process in which he will be dealt with is perhaps the first moment wherein this new world resembles the most a dystopia. Despite

the fact that Father Emerton is meant to incite ridicule towards the clergy, the utopians' severity about anyone that does not resemble their perfect countenance might be an indication of a darker side to this society. In any case, Father Emerton's perspective proves that this utopia for many is a dystopia for some.

Catskill's secretary, Freddy Mush is the second person to state his concerns about this new world:

> Another mind that was also in active resistance to Utopia was that of Mr Freddy Mush. He had no quarrel indeed with the religion or morals or social organization of Utopia … But presently he made it clear that there had been something very ancient and beautiful called the "Balance of Nature" which the scientific methods of Utopia had destroyed…Under cross-examination Mr. Mush grew pink and restive and his eye-glass flashed defensively. 'I hold by the swallows,' he repeated. 'If you can't see my point about that I don't know what else I can say'. (84)

Despite Mush's unpleasant disposition, he seems to have stumbled upon an important development in Utopia, namely the extermination of undesirable insects and animals: "So soon as the new state of affairs was securely established in Utopia and the educational state working, the attention of the Utopian community had been given to the long-cherished idea of a systematic extermination of tiresome and mischievous species" (85). The desire to create a sterile environment and the need to control nature tells the reader what environment Wells saw as an ideal: "Wells is enthusiastic about the hygienic cleanliness, perfection, symmetry and efficiency of his Utopian city. He is nearly neurotic about dirt" (Collins 352). This obsession with cleanliness would also be satirized by Huxley in *Brave New World.* In Huxley's world, diseases are indeed eradicated but the citizens are also unable to handle the dirt in the outskirts of their brave new world as the character Lenina demonstrates: "She liked even less what awaited her at the entrance to the pueblo, where their guide had left them while he went inside for instructions. The dirt, to start with, the piles of rubbish, the dust, the dogs, the flies. Her face wrinkled up into a grimace of disgust. She held her handkerchief to her nose" (75). The need for a sterile environment is in any case not shared by Mush, making this world undesirable in his perspective.

Rupert Catskill is the most rounded personality in the book. Despite Barnstaple's disagreement with his philosophies, Catskill is not ridiculed in the same way as the other members of the party. This is due to the fact that Mr Catskill is actually based on Winston Churchill as is made clear in Churchill's biography written by Henry Pelling:

> Sometime in 1921 and 1922 Wells decided to make rather more of this line of criticism, and he wrote his Men Like Gods … in which he depicted a socialist Utopia being rudely disturbed by the arrival of a group of ordinary mortals including one 'Rupert Catskill' who at once became discontented and organised a revolt. 'Catskill' had all the Churchillian characteristics. (342)

This criticism arose from the fact that Churchill called Wells a "Philosophical Romancer" after he pleaded for an understanding with the Bolsheviks. Burleigh actually calls Catskill a scientific romancer in the novel when he is first introduced: "Rupert insists that we are in some other world … He has always had too much imagination … He thinks that things that don't exist can exist … I sometimes think it would have been better for all of us if Rupert had taken to writing romances—instead of living them" (20). Despite their quarrels, Catskill is described as a romantic hero by Barnstaple: "He has lived most romantically. He has fought bravely in wars. He has been a prisoner and escaped wonderfully from prison. His violent imaginations have caused the deaths of thousands of people" (116). To Mr Barnstaple this does not mean that romance is a positive trait as he makes clear that "these things sound better in stories and histories than in reality" (116). The war hero is praised and made into a legend despite the fact that wars cause so much misery. Catskill closely resembles Aldous Huxley's Mr Savage. This is made very clear by Catskills' critique of the sterile environment:

> Ask us to give up our earthly disorder, our miseries and distresses, our high death-rates and our hideous diseases, and at the first question every man and woman in the world would say Yes! Willingly, Yes! At the first question, Sir! Mr. Catskill held his audience for a moment on his extended finger. And then we should begin to take thought. We should ask, as you say your naturalists asked about your flies and suchlike offensive small game, we should ask, What goes with it? What is the price? And when we learnt that the price was to surrender that intensity of life, that tormented energy, that pickled and experienced toughness, that rat-like,

> wolf-like toughness our perpetual struggle engenders, we should hesitate. We should hesitate. In the end, Sir, I believe, I hope and believe, indeed I pray and believe, we should say, No! We should say, No! (93)

His phrasing and message mirror that of Mr Savage who also says:

> 'All right then,' said the Savage defiantly, 'I'm claiming the right to be unhappy.' 'Not to mention the right to grow old and ugly and impotent; the right to have syphilis and cancer; the right to have too little to eat; the right to be lousy; the right to live in constant apprehension of what may happen to- morrow; the right to catch typhoid; the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind.' There was a long silence. 'I claim them all,'said the Savage at last. Mustapha Mond shrugged his shoulders. 'You're welcome,' he said (Huxley 212).

Catstkills' eloquent speech is immediately ridiculed in the book by the Utopian's reaction to it:

> We have obliterated that much of life's devouring forces. And lost nothing worth having. Pain, filth, indignity for ourselves—or any creatures…none may cheat himself out of toil or duty as men did in the age of confusion, when the mean and acquisitive lived and bred in luxury upon the heedlessness of more generous types…What is the matter with the mind of this man? (97).

With this statement the Utopians make clear that it is not their world in which some do not have to suffer while others work, but Mr Catskills' world.

As Catskill attempts an attack while the Utopians are facing an epidemic and are at their weakest, he is described by Barnstaple as the "new Cortez" (Wells 188), a ruthless Spanish colonizer who caused the fall of the Aztec empire, as Catskill is also attempting to colonize this new world. The difference and satirical pun being that unlike Cortez, who had the military arsenal as an advantage, Catskill has been dropped by the utopians on a fortress and has a three thousand year old evolutionary disadvantage. Barnstaple keeps condemning his behaviour when he manifests himself as a traitor to the earthlings and sides with Utopia:

> How unutterably silly the whole scheme of Catskill had been! But it was no sillier than the behaviour of Catskill, Burleigh and the rest of the world's statesmen had been on earth, during the last few years … They had counted their weapons and set their ambushes and kept their

> women busy sewing flags of discord. For a time they had killed hope, but only for a time. For hope, the redeemer of mankind, there is perpetual resurrection. (215)

As the novel progresses, the purpose of the book turns more into a political pamphlet condemning all political statesmen, thereby leaving all the semblance of a speculative exploration of the ideal society. By inserting rebels into this ideal society and making one of their own an advocate of Utopia, Wells inverts the concept of the marginalised individuals resisting what they view as a dystopia.

This chapter has demonstrated H.G. Wells' utopian tales to be a combination of social protest and scientific research. The use of an alternate reality to explore the idea of Socialist Utopia made possible by evolution, clearly demonstrates Wells' science fiction prowess. However, the most important characteristic of *Men Like Gods* is the satirical damnation of societies' flaws. These are the two characteristics that will define future dystopian stories. The characters that form the travel party into this alternate reality are based on different branches of society such as: the clergy, statesmen and high society. These groups are then condemned one by one for their contribution to what the Utopians call "The Age of Confusion." The aspects missing from this new world that the travel party miss are also the aspects that according to Barnstaple ruin his reality. To the travel party Utopia is a Dystopia and to Barnstaple their old world is the dystopian reality. By inserting rebels into this ideal society and making one of their own an advocate of Utopia, Wells inverts the concept of the marginalised individuals resisting what they view as a dystopia. This supports Margaret Atwood's concept of there being neither a Utopia nor a Dystopia. There are too many individuals with their own opinion to form one ideal society that would satisfy them all, so all societies are Ustopian, meaning both.

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World: A* Scientific Dystopia

The dystopic genre was particularly popularised at the beginning of the twentieth century when Aldous Huxley wrote *Brave New World* (1932). He combined the satirical genre with a grim vision of the future that became prophetic: "It was simultaneously a satire on contemporary culture, a prediction of biological advances, a commentary on the social roles of science and scientists, and a plan for reforming society" (Woiak 106). In the novel, Huxley explores the negative backlash a utopian society could have on it citizens despite the attempt to better their conditions, seeing as utopian advocates do not strive towards a dystopia when they theorize an ideal society. A chaotic period in time is then translated into an orderly society where all troubles are solved by the government: "The relationship between society in the present and its trajectory toward and within an unknown future is essential to dystopian drama. Part of this relationship is commonly forged through the theme of science; that which causes mere anxiety today is portrayed as causing dehumanization tomorrow" (Tiehen 69).Such a novel needs to be set in the future to explore how the good ideas envisioned at the beginning can ultimately lead to a corrupted society. The fear progress would pose is therefore explored in a future where one can see small traces of their own society but all that is human has been eradicated: "The family is destroyed because what is human has been destroyed. Like the modern dystopian projections of industry and the factory, post-modern dystopias feared the domination of technology. In our unbridled Promethean desire to control the world with our inventions, we fear the abduction of our reality" (Barton 13).The majority will adapt to such circumstances providing the acceptation needed to uphold the system: "… for despite the rise of the mid-century totalitarianisms that spied and starved and slaughtered at will, the seduction of pleasure is harder to notice and perhaps also harder to fight than any dictator's uniformed henchmen"(McGiveron 132). This supports the argument that for the majority of the population, the society can be a utopia and only a small minority perceives it as a dystopia.

Huxley's anti-utopian sentiments, criticized by him in Brave New World, are aimed in particular at H.G. Wells' utopian theories explored in two of his famous books *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and *Men Like Gods* (1925). The novel satirizes, for example, Wells' ideas of future societies

where social classes are divided by the task they have in society as is introduced in *Modern Utopia* or the abolition of governments due to the fact that educating children will be enough to keep society running smoothly, as is the case in *Men Like Gods*. Despite Brave New World being clearly an anti-utopian satire, Huxley provides several characters' points of views in his novel to provide the reader with as many perspectives of this society as possible. The reader can view the social constructs set in place from different angles in the novel and form their own opinion of it. There is a sense of this utopia being Huxley's experiment and the distinct characters are there to give the reader their insight of why these structures do not work for them. First, a short introduction of Aldous Huxley will provide more insight into his work. Then, the analysis of the four central characters in the novel will provide a complete exploration of *Brave New World* will support the argument of this chapter.

According to Robert Gorman's biography of Huxley, Aldous Leonard Huxley, was born on the 26th of July 1894. His parents were Leonard Huxley and Julia Frances Arnold. Aldous Huxley came from two prominent families known for their intellectual achievements in the sciences, education and literature. Gorman adds that: "Thomas Henry Huxley, the eminent biologist and advocate of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, was Aldous's grandfather. Dr Arnold of Rugby was his great grandfather, Matthew Arnold (poet and educator) was his great uncle, and the novelist Mrs. Ward was his aunt" (1961). Huxley entered Hillside Preparatory School and was afterwards enrolled in Eton. Huxley was deeply troubled by three losses which occurred in a short period of time: "In November of 1908, his mother died of cancer … In 1911, he contracted a serious eye disease that resulted in near blindness for eighteen months, forced him to leave Eton, and left him visually handicapped for the rest of his life … a third tragedy occurred in 1914 when his older brother, Trevenen, committed suicide at age twenty-four" (Gorman 1961-62). In 1919, Huxley was employed as a literary journalist and also wrote many of his novels, short stories, and essays during the same period. Huxley's satirical novels: *Antic Hay* (1923), *Those Barren Leaves* (1925), and *Point Counter Point* (1928) established him as a major writer. However, it is Huxley's science fiction story, *Brave New World* (1932) that became his most memorable novel. This novel was meant to satirize the Americanisation of the West and the naiveté present in Utopian theories. *Brave New World* proved to be Huxley's most famous and influential novel in his lifetime. In 1962, a cancer believed to have been cured two years earlier

reappeared and on November 22, 1963 he died. Gorman states: “his death was overshadowed by the death of President John F. Kennedy a few hours earlier” (Gorman 1961-1964).

In the novel, three characters in particular rebel against the homogenous circumstances and a sympathetic villain, who does not fit into society but provides the reader with a bird’s eye view of the whole governmental construct. Their unwillingness to assimilate in their environment turns them into outsiders within the community. Unlike the people that form this society, who have a limited intellectual depth, these outsiders set themselves apart because of their need for more intellectual stimuli than this community can provide. This is closely related to Huxley’s own anxieties regarding what he called the “degenerating hereditary quality of the population” (Woiak 106). These fears were shared by the intellectual community Huxley was a part of and are the reason why eugenics at the time was so popular. The term is explained in the article “Modernism and Eugenics” as followed:

> Called eugenics, this new science of human breeding would supplement natural selection in two ways - negatively and positively. As the philosopher and eugenist C. S. Schiller explains ‘Negative eugenics aims at checking the deterioration to which the human stock is exposed, owing to the rapid proliferation of what may be called human weeds.’ He warns that ‘negative eugenics is not enough, however, for it can only arrest deterioration’. ‘If we want improvement, progress, the creation of superior types of humanity, we must look to positive eugenics, which sets itself to inquire by what means the human race may be rendered intrinsically better, higher, stronger, healthier, more capable.’ ‘Judged unfit to propagate, human weeds are to be eliminated by segregation, sterilization, or euthanasia; judged fit to propagate, the flowers of humankind are encouraged to have large families.’ (Childs 3)

Huxley clearly shared these insights as will become clear later in the chapter.

To better understand the novel, the reader must know the two main facets which distinguish this society from the real world. First, there is the caste system that divides every citizen into five groups known as: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta and Epsilon. All children are made in bottles that determine in which class they belong to. The first two castes are individually made, while the lower three are mass produced to do menial jobs: “One egg, one embryo, one adult-normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, and will divide. From eight to ninety-six buds, and every

bud will grow into a perfectly formed embryo, and every embryo into a full-sized adult. Making ninety-six human beings grow where only one grew before. Progress" (Huxley 3-4). He has transformed the practice of birthing into an automated mass production. This closely resembles the class distinctions in H.G. Wells' *Modern Utopia*: "Four main classes of mind were distinguished, called, respectively, the Poietic, the Kinetic, the Dull, and the Base. The former two are supposed to constitute the living tissue of the State; the latter are the fulcra and resistances, the bone and cover of its body" (36).Clearly, Huxley meant to ridicule the concept Wells construed to highlight how unjust, instead of practical, actually a caste system in utopia can be for the lower classes.

The second concept in *Brave New World* that needs to be highlighted is that of hypnopaedia. To keep everyone in line and educate the children on how they should behave in this society, the government uses a form of hypnosis to influence its citizens' moral judgements:

> '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 his life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides- made up of these suggestions. But all these suggestions are our suggestions!' The Director almost shouted in his triumph. 'Suggestions from the State.' (23)

Again, there is a parallel with H.G. Wells' work in this concept. In *Men Like Gods*, Wells emphasizes the importance education has on the society and how if everyone in the community is well educated, the need for a government to monitor society becomes obsolete:

> 'Utopia has no parliament, no politics, no private wealth, no business competition, no police nor prisons, no lunatics, no defectives nor cripples, and it has none of these things because it has schools and teachers who are all that schools and teachers can be. Politics, trade and competition are the methods of adjustment of a crude society. Such methods of adjustment have been laid aside in Utopia for more than a thousand years. There is no rule nor government needed by adult Utopians because all the rule and government they need they have had in childhood and youth.' Said Lion: 'Our education is our government.' (74)

The first attempt in *Brave New World,* according to the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning, was indeed to educate but failed:

> ‘These early experimenters,’ the D.H.C. was saying, ‘were on the wrong track. They thought that hypnopædia could be made an instrument of intellectual education.’ … You can’t learn a science unless you know what it’s all about …. Whereas, if they’d only started on moral education. (20-21)

Huxley demonstrates how a utopian concept meant to focus on education to better society, can be misused by the government and lead to a policy that allows them to control their citizens by means of hypnopaedia.

First, the reader meets Bernard Marx, a joyless insecure Alpha, the highest caste one can be part of in the community. Despite his elite status, he does not seem to enjoy the same things his free spirited peers do: “Fanny: “But his reputation?” Lenina: “What do I care about his reputation?” Fanny: “They say he doesn’t like Obstacle Golf.” “They say, they say,” mocked Lenina. “And then he spends most of his time by himself-alone.” There was horror in Fanny’s voice (32). His behaviour is not the only factor that sets him apart from the others. According to Fanny, his appearance does not match his Alpha status and might be the consequence of a mistake made during his artificial conception: ““He’s so ugly!” said Fanny … “And then so small.” Fanny made a grimace; smallness was so horribly and typically low-caste … Fanny was shocked. “They say somebody made a mistake when he was still in the bottle-thought. He was a Gamma and put alcohol into his blood-surrogate. That’s why he’s so stunted.” (33). Even though he has a privileged position as a higher caste member in this world, his behaviour and appearance alienate Bernard from society: “The mockery made him feel an outsider; and feeling an outsider he behaved like one, which increased the prejudice against him and intensified the contempt and hostility aroused by his physical defects. Which in turn increased his sense of being alien and alone” (56). His insecurities often express themselves into cruelty towards other people: “Bernard gave his orders in the sharp, rather arrogant and even offensive tone of one who does not feel himself too secure in his superiority” (55). Despite this flaw in his personality, Bernard aspires to become a distinct person in the society where everyone’s thoughts are the same due to hypnopaedia: “He laughed, “‘Yes, Everybody’s happy nowadays.’ We begin giving the children that at five. But wouldn’t you like to be free to be happy in some other way, Lenina? In your own way, for example; not in everybody else’s way.’” (79). Bernard’s desire for an individual identity becomes clear in this

passage. This supports one of the known anxieties common in dystopian literature: "The "I" suddenly found itself at odds with the One, the whole, and the collective…The ultimate tragedy for the modern, dystopian, protagonist is not the loss of life, but the loss of individual identity" (Barton 8). His perspective on the negative consequences that influencing birth and hypnopaedia have had, demonstrate the dark side of these concepts. The consequence is his status as an outcast and an unhappy citizen in what the rest of the population experience as a utopia.

Whereas Bernard Marx seems to reject society because society is rejecting him, Hemholtz Watson relishes the idea of exploring literature and striving towards more than the superficial pastimes his fellow society members enjoy:

> Yes, a little too able; they were right. A mental excess had produced in Helmholtz Watson effects very similar to those which, in Bernard Marx, were the result of a physical defect. Too little bone and brawn had isolated Bernard from his fellow men, and the sense of this apartness, being, by all the current standards, a mental excess, became in its turn a cause of wider separation. That which had made Helmholtz so uncomfortably aware of being himself and all alone was too much ability. (57)

Contrary to Bernard, Helmholtz is rejected by society for being too superior. This ties in with Huxley's views of Utopia, where people are: "… anxious to reduce the maddening diversity of men's natures to some kind of manageable uniformity" (128). Helmholtz seems to represent the intellectual literary branch yearning for more than superficial knowledge. A fear that Huxley felt in his own time according to Joanne Woiak: "He defended the eugenic policies of encouraging higher birth rates among the "intellectual classes" and sterilizing the lower-class "unfit," which he believed would improve the inherited mental abilities of future generations and lead to responsible citizenship"(106). However, the mass production of Epsilons compared to Alphas in the book contradicts this view: "The optimum population," said Mustapha Mond, "is modelled on the iceberg eight-ninths below the water line, one-ninth above" (197). The Controller, Mustapha Mond, explains how an experiment with a society encompassing only Alpha's could not work:

> The land wasn't properly worked; there were strikes in all the factories; the laws were set at naught, orders disobeyed; all the people detailed for a spell of low-grade work were

> perpetually intriguing for high- grade jobs, and all the people with high-grade jobs were counter-intriguing at all costs to stay where they were. Within six years they were having a first-class civil war. When nineteen out of the twenty-two thousand had been killed, the survivors unanimously petitioned the World Controllers to resume the government of the island. Which they did. And that was the end of the only society of Alphas that the world has ever seen. (196)

Helmholtz is forced to only write menial hynopaedic hymns, as a result, he is a writer in a world where books no longer exist: "I'm thinking of a queer feeling I sometimes get, a feeling that I've got something important to say and the power to say it-only I don't know what it is, and I can't make any use of the power. If there was some different way of writing. Or else something else to write about … It's not enough for the phrases to be good; what you make with them ought to be good too" (59). Through Helmholtz, Huxley is able to exemplify the fear that existed within his own intellectual community of a society where the government would not need to prohibit books because society itself would no longer be interested in anything that would not provide instant satisfaction: "They'll grow up with what the psychologists used to call an "instinctive" hatred of books and flowers" (17). The role of Americanization plays an important part in this development. According to Margaret Atwood he was: "still in shock from a visit to the United States, where he was particularly frightened by mass consumerism and its group mentality and its vulgarities" (BNW xiii). David Bradshaw explains that: "this resurgent concern with the grotesquery of America helps us to understand why Huxley was almost thrilled to find the United States every bit as vulgar and as freakish as he had anticipated when he first visited the country in 1926" (BNW xix). Huxley predicted in a letter to his brother that "the most deplorable consequence of the First World War" would be "the inevitable acceleration of American world domination (BNW xix).

Huxley's animosity towards Americanization is apparent in several aspects of BNW's society. The new god is none other than Ford in a nation governed by mass production: "strange to think that even in Our Ford's day most games were played without more apparatus than a ball or two and a few sticks and perhaps a bit of netting. imagine the folly of allowing people to play elaborate games which do nothing whatever to increase consumption"(25). This aspect of mass production is eerily similar to

our own way of life where we are used to buying new things every few months such as the latest mobile phone or clothes that have to be replaced every few months. The Savage's mother, Linda, makes this clear: "Besides, it never used to be right to mend clothes. Throw them away when they've got holes in them and buy new. 'The more stiches, the less riches.' Isn't that right? Mending's antisocial? (81).

Another aspect that seems to be related to the Americanization is the sexual liberty that this community experiences. In his journey of America, and in particular Los Angeles, Huxley experienced a very different world than the one he was used to in Britain, as he states: "The thing which is happening in America is a revaluation of values, a radical alteration (for the worse) of established standards" (BNW xxxiii). In *Brave New World*, everyone is expected to share sexual favours with everyone and the act is no longer connected to procreation:

> Lenina shook her head. 'Somehow,' she mused, 'I hadn't been feeling very keen on promiscuity lately. There are times when one doesn't. Haven't you found that too, Fanny?' Fanny nodded her sympathy and understanding. 'But one's got to make the effort,' she said, sententiously, 'one's got to play the game. After all, every one belongs to everyone else.' (37)

There is, once again, a resemblance with H.G. Wells' novel *Men Like Gods*. Father Amerton is appalled to discover that the concept of marriage is no longer present in Utopia:

> In Utopia there was no compulsion for men and women to go about in indissoluble pairs. For most Utopians that would be inconvenient. Very often men and women, whose work brought them closely together, where lovers and kept very much together, as Arden and Greenlake had done. But they were not obliged to do that…'Then I was right, and you have abolished the family?'…No. Utopia had not abolished the family. It had enlarged and glorified the family until it embraced the whole world. (80-81)

Huxley has taken Wells' concept and has magnified it to the extent that everyone has to share everyone for the good of society. The exaggerated quip is thereby clearly aimed at Wells' notions of how a utopian society should occur.

The third outsider within this narrative is the actual physical outsider, John the Savage. Huxley provides the reader with a character who is also unfamiliar with this society and can express emotions

and thoughts the reader might share. John Savage is brought up in a world as similar as the 1930's reader's as is possible in the seventh century A.F. (After Ford). He has some similar traits as the monster of Frankenstein in *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus* (1818). That is to say, born in what his world views as an unnatural manner, namely born out of a woman instead of a bottle, he has no place that he can call his own. All the others are really like Frankenstein's creature and John Savage has become the freak by being the only traditional human. The savages reject him because his mother was part of the new world and the new world sees him as an attraction because of his peculiarities. Nevertheless, the reader can accompany the Savage while everyone in the society explains to him how things are constructed. This is a tradition used in satirical novels such as Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, More's Utopia and Wells' *Men Like Gods*. While everyone is numbed by pleasure, this character has an abundance of passionate feelings and melancholia that are in a manner the arguments supporting the rules of this society. All these emotions only offer suffering and alienation, which ultimately will lead to his death. This tragic suicide in the book seems to be closely related to Trevenen Huxley's, Aldous Huxley's brother, suicide: "there is very little in the surviving correspondence of Aldous Huxley to account fully for the causes of Trev's suicide. In two of Aldous Huxley's novels from the 1930s, however, he depicts two pivotal characters whose suicides are motivated at least partially by high ideals and an acute sense of sexual guilt" (Deese 29). The Savage's akin story to Aldous' brother becomes evident in a letter written by the author: "It is just the highest and best in Trev—his ideals—which have driven him to his death—while there are thousands, who shelter their weakness from the same fate by a cynical, unidealistic outlook on life. Trev was not strong—but he had the courage to face life with ideals—and his ideals were too much for him" (Deese 30). In a similar fashion, the Savage passionately describes his ideals that contradict the society he has fallen into:

> 'But I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin.' 'In fact,' said Mustapha Mond, 'you're claiming the right to be unhappy.' 'All right then,' said the Savage defiantly, 'I'm claiming the right to be unhappy.' 'Not to mention the right to grow old and ugly and impotent; the right to have syphilis and cancer; the right to have too little to eat; the right to be lousy; the right to live in constant

> apprehension of what may happen to- morrow; the right to catch typhoid; the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind.' There was a long silence. 'I claim them all,' said the Savage at last. (212)

Despite the fact that the speech clearly reminded him of his brother, there is more resemblance with Wells' character, Catskill, who makes a similar speech in *Men Like Gods*:

> Ask us to give up our earthly disorder, our miseries and distresses, our high death-rates and our hideous diseases, and at the first question every man and woman in the world would say Yes! Willingly, Yes! At the first question, Sir! Mr. Catskill held his audience for a moment on his extended finger. And then we should begin to take thought. We should ask, as you say your naturalists asked about your flies and suchlike offensive small game, we should ask, What goes with it? What is the price? And when we learnt that the price was to surrender that intensity of life, that tormented energy, that pickled and experienced toughness, that rat-like, wolf-like toughness our perpetual struggle engenders, we should hesitate. We should hesitate. In the end, Sir, I believe, I hope and believe, indeed I pray and believe, we should say, No! We should say, No! (93).

For the Savage and Catskill, the world needs to be though to make them feel more alive. Wells' Utopia is, similar to the Utopia portrayed in *Brave New World*, one of cleanliness, comfort and only bliss. According to Catskill and the Savage, these are societies devoid of humanity.

Trevenen Huxley, akin to the Savage, seems to have had trouble with his elitist family and the pressure that all these great scientists placed on his own career: "For any young person who aspired to an intellectual or professional career, having both T. H. Huxley's and Matthew Arnold's family trees was as likely to be as much of a burden as an inspiration" (Deese 30). His love life seems to also have inspired his brother's character seeing as he had a relationship with a maid, who perhaps resembled Lenina:

> Trev had become deeply attached to an attractive and intelligent young housemaid working at the new family home in Bracknell Gardens, and was secretly trying to educate her by taking her out to plays, concerts and lectures. After a time he realized the hopelessness and unsuitability of the situation; and so did the girl, who gave her notice. (Deese 29)

The love story between the Savage and Lenina suffers the same fate as the Savage attempts to infer more depth into their relationship:

> 'Outliving beauty's outward with a mind that cloth renew swifter than blood decays.' 'What?' 'It's like that in Shakespeare too. If thou cost break her virgin knot before all sanctimonious ceremonies may with full and holy rite.' 'For Ford's sake, John, talk sense. I can't understand a word you say. First it's vacuum cleaners; then it's knots. You're driving me crazy.' She jumped up and, as though afraid that he might run away from her physically, as well as with his mind, caught him by the wrist. 'Answer me this question: do you really like me, or don't you.' (167-8)

The Savage's attempt to use high art in his confession of love exposes their incompatibility and how this mindless society has turned Lenina into a depthless drone only interested in sexual acts and superficial pastimes, making her unable to even understand a conversation with the Savage. There is even a system set in place within the society to prevent the mixing between castes by means of hypnopaedia:

> Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they're so frightfully clever. I'm really awfuly glad I'm a Beta, because I don't work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, 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. (22-23)

This is another tool to prevent chaos in their society and keep everyone happy with their station in life. Huxley's opinion of his brother's relationship with a lower member of society and how that affected his happiness seems to have influenced this narrative in particular.

It is the contrast between the civilized world and the Savage's reservation that highlights how distorted and ridiculous both worlds have become. The reader will recognise elements of his own old world combined with the Native American's, creating a satirical blend of religion and customs.

> No communication whatever with the civilized world. still preserve their repulsive habits and customs. marriage, if you know what that is, my dear young lady; families. no conditioning. monstrous superstitions. Christianity and totemism and ancestor worship. extinct languages,

> such as Zuñi and Spanish and Athapascan. pumas, porcupines and other ferocious animals. infectious diseases. priests. Venomous lizards. (88-89)

Comparing two worlds highlights the faults within both perspectives. Huxley's point of view on what society he fears most is certainly difficult to discern. He seems to both ridicule the Victorian's prudish habits: "The cult of domesticity that had characterized the Victorian era was remembered as more than a little bit suffocating by a whole generation of writers and thinkers in the early twentieth century" (Deese 38) as well as the Americans' vulgarities mentioned earlier in this chapter.

Lastly, Huxley provides the reader with an intelligent leader, Mustapha Mond, who can explain how this society came to be and why it cannot function any other way: "Mond is granted the most compelling viewpoint in the novel and thus seems to represent Huxley's genuine admiration for scientifically minded leaders who could help pull the nation out of the slump" (Woiak 117). Although he seems to be part of this society, his intelligence sets him apart. He sees the rules of the society as a necessary evil to keep the peace but does not follow them himself: "'Almost nobody. I'm one of the very few. It's prohibited, you see. But as I make the laws here, I can also break them. With impunity, Mr. Marx,' headed, turning to Bernard. 'Which I'm afraid you can't do'" (192). This leader is very similar to the men he is meant to admonish. Huxley used an intellect that was "implied to have been, in his younger days, something of a failed rebel himself" (McGiveron 125):

> 'I was given the choice: to be sent to an island, where I could have got on with my pure science, or to be taken on to the Controllers' Council with the prospect of succeeding in due course to an actual Controllership. I chose this and let the science go.' After a little silence, 'Sometimes,' he added, 'I rather regret the science. Happiness is a hard master-particularly other people's happiness. A much harder master, if one isn't conditioned to accept it unquestioningly, than truth.' He sighed, fell silent again, then continued in a brisker tone, 'Well, duty's duty. One can't consult one's own preference. I'm interested in truth, I like science. But truth's a menace, science is a public danger. As dangerous as it's been beneficent. It has given us the stablest equilibrium in history.' (200)

Mond provides the society with a logical voice that explains how the means justify the results: "It is the seeming reasonableness of their arguments that makes the slippery slope so dangerous"

(McGiveron 125). After his explanation, the reader might forget the absurdity witnessed by the Savage, the reader's outsider perspective, and indeed see this as the solution for the problems faced in their reality: "As some of the best villains of dystopian literature demonstrate, the drive to crush the human spirit is not found only in blind ideologues and slogan-mongers; it can lure even the most discerning intellects"(McGiveron 125). Mond and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s O'Brien are prime examples of this fact. The most frightening part of this development could be that even intellects are not able to resist assimilation within such a society and are ultimately also the victim of loss of individualism. However, in the case of *Brave New World*, there is a more personal explanation behind this narrative. Mond and Helmholtz seem to be the only characters not ridiculed at the end by Huxley's narrative. Huxley's private views concerning the masses seem to be the reasoning behind this:

> About 99.5% of the entire population of the planet are as stupid and philistine . . . as the great masses of the English. The important thing, it seems to me, is not to attack the 99.5%...but to try to see that the 0.5% survives, keeps its quality up to the highest possible level, and, if possible, dominates the rest. The imbecility of the 99.5% is appalling—but after all, what else can you expect? (Huxley 106)

As part of the scientific and literary elite Huxley and his family were a part of, Huxley saw the benefit of trying to preserve his intellectual community. According to Joanne Woiak:

> His writing, including his dystopian novel Brave New World, reflected public anxieties about the supposedly degenerating hereditary quality of the population and how this decline would affect England's economic and political future. For Huxley at this time in his life and in this social context, eugenics was not a nightmare prospect but rather the best hope for designing a better world if used in the right ways by the right people. (106)

The resurfacing theme of human degeneration back to a more beastly form was due to the findings of Charles Darwin. He proved to society that they were not the perfect beings created in the image of God. The trends that Aldous Huxley witnessed in America seemed to have influenced his views on eugenics: "The trends in America all boded ill for the advance of true culture in the "machine age." In fact, Aldous reasoned, "unless some system of eugenics is practiced" in the future, the vast majority of

people would continue to regard the “notion that one can derive pleasure from arduous intellectual occupations” as “merely absurd”(Deese 81).This view would of course became taboo after the events of the Second World War where the Nazi practices regarding eugenics were brought too far. However, Huxley never meant the use of eugenics to advance white supremacy: “As early as 1934, Huxley condemned the ideology of Nordic superiority put forward by extremist American eugenicists and Nazi race theorists, while as late as 1958, he was still claiming that the “congenitally insufficient” were breeding more quickly than “our best stock”(Woiak 109). To Huxley, eugenics was meant to save the intellectual community.

This chapter has illustrated Huxley’s anti-utopian sentiments, criticized by him in *Brave New World* and particularly aimed at H.G. Wells’ utopian theories explored in two of his famous books *Modern Utopia* (1905) and *Men Like Gods* (1925). Huxley provides several characters’ points of views, who do not fit into the society, to provide the reader with as many perspectives of this society as possible. The reader can thereby have a more objective outlook of the social constructs set in place in the novel and form their own opinion of it. There is a sense of this utopia being Huxley’s experiment and the distinct characters are there to give the reader their insight of why these structures do not work for them. The characters that are not willing to integrate into this society are but a fraction of the whole, Mond makes clear how these constructs are what is best for the community as a whole. Despite the fact that the government measures sound ridiculous to the Savage, the current constructions have led to a peaceful and prosperous society. This book also proves to be an ustopia, both utopia and dystopia in one.

Chapter 3: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: A Moral Dystopia

Whereas Huxley's *Brave New World* paints a picture of society saturated in pleasure and instant satisfaction, George Orwell's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), explores the boundaries of human nature's penchant for cruelty and depravation. These two classic novels form the two opposite ends of the dystopian spectrum when it comes to the treatment of their citizens. The common ground these societies share pertains to the inability for individuals to deviate from the laws concerning their personal space. The individual is thereby forced to submit his freedom of choice for the benefit of the whole society. The marginalised individual, who seeks personal freedom, experiences said society as dystopian. Nevertheless, the reader needs to question the main character's perspective offered in dystopian novels and wonder if the benefits for the majority of such a society do not outweigh the disadvantages for the minority. The third-person limited perspective in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* can prevent the reader from seeing a different side, namely the dystopian society as the actual utopia it can be for the majority of the population. Many twentieth-century dystopian narratives, such as the two discussed in this thesis, respond to the fin de siècle utopian movement embodied by several of H.G. Wells' books, such as *Modern Utopia* (1905) and *Men Like Gods (*1923). This chapter will not only expose the differences between *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* but will also demonstrate how, like Huxley's novel, Orwell's criticizes Wells' utopian optimism and the appeal for a technocracy.

Twenty-seven years after *BNW* the world had changed drastically due to the Second World War and the start of the Cold War. Unlike the book analysed in the previous chapter, set in a distant future, this story takes place thirty-five years in the writer's future. Orwell's anti-communist' sentiment cannot be separated from the dystopic world described in the novel. Whereas his predecessor, Huxley, refrained from judging the flawed world he created, Orwell does not shy away from expressing his own moral viewpoint on the political issue raised in the novel. He judges and condemns where Huxley only explores and experiments. Through the novel, he denounces all totalitarian regimes and in particular the Communist threat to society as he knew it. This fact classifies *Nineteen Eight-Four* as a political dystopia meant to horrify its audience and stir them into political

action. The book also displays criticism towards the nineteenth-century utopian narrative of a society led by scientists. The replacement of politicians by scientists as the governerns of a society is present in many of H.G. Wells' books. These technocracies develop into better societies due to the fact that they are tethered to scientific progress meant to facilitate the population's lives. Kadar explains that: "Orwell parodies the progress-fetishism and intellectual narrow-mindedness of Wells as well, and suggests that a worldwide desolate industrial milieu sooner or later produces human beasts that do not care about the world, about happiness or ethics, because the only thing they care about is power exactly like in Nineteen Eighty-Four" (56). This chapter will not only demonstrate H.G. Wells' influence of using his novel to incite social change by illustrating a society that is the direct consequence of their present civilization. It will also explain the main characters, keeping in mind the propaganda aspect that might be hidden in plain sight. This will clarify the distinction between utopia and dystopia and how it relies on a matter of perspective in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell frames Winston's narrative to emphasize the negative aspects of Oceania. However, that is not the only angle the reader can interpret Oceania in: "Few would trade our world for the one described by Orwell, but part of the reason we feel this way is because the story is artfully presented so that we identify with Winston, a disaffected intellectual. The difference between a dystopia and a utopia is largely a matter of personal preference" (Horan 55), thereby corroborating Margaret Atwood's notion of ustopia, both utopia and dystopia in one.

Eric Arthur Blair, aka George Orwell, was born in India in 1903, where his father worked for the Civil Service (Davison 1). From the age of five Orwell knew he wanted to become a writer (Orwell 1). His many essays provide a clear picture of the reasons behind his writing as he himself said: "I give all this background information because I do not think one can assess a writer's motives without knowing something of his early development" (Orwell 4). This provides the reader with an intimate view of a writer's perspective on how they enter the writing process. Throughout his life, his personal experiences were certainly influential to his writing and demonstrate Orwell's engagement with the political subjects present in his book. In his essay "Why I Write" (1946), Orwell justifies the political purpose of his writing when he speaks of: "Desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter other people's idea of the kind of society that they should strive after. Once again, no book is

genuinely free from political bias. The opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude" (Orwell 5). An important experience that contributed to his "natural hatred of authority" (Orwell 6), as he himself stated, was his struggle in the Indian Imperial Police, which made him aware of the existence of the working classes and the nature of imperialism (6). The power behind his writing could not have had the same impact in the literary community were it not politically motivated, a fact he himself stated when he said: "I see that it is invariably where I lacked a political purpose that I wrote lifeless books" (Orwell 10). This passion for a Socialist cause and his efforts to champion the marginalised in totalitarian regimes is what ultimately contributed to his reputation: "By the time of his death from tuberculosis at 46 years of age in January 1950, Orwell was regarded by many as the finest political writer in English since Jonathan Swift. Two generations later, many would class him as one of the most influential political writers of the twentieth century" (Shaw 72).

The question remains if Orwell's personal experiences of social injustice and his own perception of himself as an outsider should be taken as the general trend of the time. Orwell's futuristic narrative should be read by the reader as a subjective anecdote that does not portray factual research. The anecdotal approach taken by the writer is meant to incite pathos meaning an appeal to the emotions of the audience (Leith 274). All manner of emotional appeals are made to convince the audience to agree with the speaker: "Orwell often conceived of himself as a minority of one who had to stand firm against the crowd … his knack for turning a phrase and for describing a scene both offer obvious clues as to why he was, and is, regarded as one of the great stylists of the twentieth century" (Eppstein 51). He has to make sure to choose incentives, the audience can care about or they will not show interest. Orwell knew the power of emotions would always exceed any rational thought, as he stated in his article "Wells, Hitler and the World State" concerning H.G. Wells' belief of Hitler's lack of power: "The energy that actually shapes the world springs from emotions — racial pride, leader-worship, religious belief, love of war — which liberal intellectuals mechanically write off as anachronisms, and which they have usually destroyed so completely in themselves as to have lost all power of action" (Orwell). This statement is a blow aimed at Wells' scientific approach to politics and its existence solely present in the realm of theory instead of practice.

It was H.G. Wells' emphasis on reason over emotion that made him unable to understand the

emotional response of the masses and the inevitable failure of his utopian theories. Orwell understands the rhetorical power of the appeal to emotion to convince others of his point of view. Richard Eppstein thereby questions, not the power, but the veracity of Orwell's message: "Yet what I found troubling about Orwell's approach is his easy willingness to generalize from his own experiences: "To Orwell, private pain was the source of his public knowledge" (51). Being conscious of this fact is not meant to dissuade the reader from being affected by Orwell's message but does provide a more complete and objective view of the book.

Orwell's emotional appeal to the reader played with the line between literature and blatant propaganda, a factor every shrewd reader should be aware of. Despite the fact that literature can be interpreted by every reader in a different manner, and Orwell's authoritarian regime in the book could be used as a justification of how governments are likely to misuse their power, Orwell did not leave any doubt as to what his writings were meant to fight: "Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, against totalitarianism and for democratic Socialism" (8). His own use of words such as "push the world in a certain direction" and "alter other people's ideas" (Orwell 5) suggests some of his literary work to be a form of propaganda. The veracity of this claim is one supported by the manner in which Orwell's books would be used by the American and British governments during the Cold War. They became an important tool in the fight against communism as they were brought to the big screen: "the American and British governments appropriated Orwell's works and image assiduously during the first decade of the Cold War. First in print, then on the small and big screen, official and unofficial propagandists exploited *Animal Farm*(1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as they did no other books, trading on Orwell's status as an independent-minded icon of the left who had definitively exposed Soviet style communism, and 'clarifying' his powerful rhetoric and vision for the masses" (Shaw 72-73). This proposition will prove *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to be the type of literature that appeals to the emotions compared to the analytical approach Aldous Huxley used in *Brave New World*, nevertheless also criticizing utopian thought.

As in many other dystopian tales, there are marginalised individuals in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, who stand out in society and try to rebel in their own singular manner. The Romantic protagonist,

Winston Smith, imagines a rebellion led by the middle class using the proles as an army. His love interest, Julia, rebels through sexual promiscuity but does not share Winston's hope for revolution. These singular characters who are the minority still ingrained with a sense of individuality are ultimately destined to fail under the pressure of this sadistic society, which leaves no space for resistance.

The protagonist, Winston Smith, the focalizer in *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* can provide a good view of the society due to his position in the Ministry of Truth where history is changed daily to provide the government with a complete control of the media and therefore all of the facts: "And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed— if all records told the same tale—then the lie passed into history and became truth. 'Who controls the past,' ran the Party slogan, 'controls the future: who controls the present controls the past" (37). An important factor that facilitates the government's ability to change the past without needing to justify themselves to their constituents lies in the construct present in Oceania known as double think:

> To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which cancelled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them, to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of democracy, to forget whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again: and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself. That was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to induce unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word 'doublethink' involved the use of doublethink. (37)

Oceania's society and its Inner Party have not only reached complete control over their whole society but are also in control of its citizens' thoughts. In a society where according to Winston: "… nothing was illegal, since there were no longer any laws" (8) the citizens had to be aware of their thoughts or they could be sentenced to death for thought crimes: "the essential crime that contained all others in itself. Thoughtcrime, they called it. Thoughtcrime is not a thing that can be concealed forever. You

might dodge successfully for a while, even for years, but sooner or later they were bound to get you" (Orwell 21). This control of human beings is made possible by the technological advances set in place by Orwell such as the telescreens, which are not only able to project images but are also filming and recording everything said by the person watching the screen. This society, which has no word for science, could clearly not function if it would have no knowledge of these technological advancements and what seems to be a good scientific knowledge of psychology meant to break their citizens into submission. This criticism of scientific leadership can be directly correlated with the twentieth-century intellectual elite's criticism of H.G. Wells nineteenth-century idea's concerning Utopia's led by scientists: "Wells argues that scientists make ideal rulers because their rational dispassionate ways of thinking allow them to resist attractive but socially destabilizing concerns like religious fundamentalism, nationalism, militarism and -above all- individualism" (Horan 57). Orwell demonstrates what could occur if Wells' technocracy would have the opportunity to develop and the negative consequences that would derive from said society.

The reader can become aware of Winston's flawed character by the manner in which he discusses the lower-class proles. This fact should play a part in how the reader perceives him. Orwell presents the reader with one unidentifiable mass of proles. They represent eighty-five percent of the population and seem to live in their own separate world:

> But the proles, if only they could somehow become conscious of their own strength. would have no need to conspire. They needed only to rise up and shake themselves like a horse shaking off flies. If they chose they could blow the Party to pieces tomorrow morning. Surely sooner or later it must occur to them to do it. (73)

Even though Winston has high hopes of the proles rising up and inciting a revolution, the government seems to keep them satisfied in every aspect. Anthony Burgess criticized *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s attempt at describing this community as a dystopia and thereby only showing one side of the coin. In his novel *1985* (1978) he stated:

> Consider the situation for eighty-five per cent of the community—the proles. There is a war going on, but there is no conscription…there are pubs, with beer sold in litre glasses, there are cinemas, a state lottery, popular journalism and even pornography…there is no

> unemployment, there is enough money, there are no oppressive regulations—indeed, there are no laws at all. The entire population, prole and Party alike, is untroubled by crime and violence on the democratic…there are no worries about inflation. One of the major issues of our time, racial intolerance is lacking…there are no stupid politicians time-wasting political debates, ridiculous hustlings. The government is efficient and stable. There are even measures devised to eliminate from life the old agonies of sex and the oppressions of family loyalty. No wonder the system is universally accepted. (42-43)

Burgess hereby argues for the benefits of utilitarianism in the novel, the system of thought that states that the best action or decision in a particular situation is the one that brings most advantages to the most people. The middle-class party members are indeed closely watched and live a life of paranoia, hatred and unhappiness. However, the eighty-five per cent majority benefits from those restrictions set up on the middle class. The fact that Winston is under the delusion that the masses are as dissatisfied with this arrangement as he is, proves his detachment with this lower class. The manner in which he speaks of them is also a clear indicator of Winston's elitist's views towards the proles:

> And yet——! He remembered how once he had been walking down a crowded street when a tremendous shout of hundreds of voices women's voices—had burst from a side-street a little way ahead. It was a great formidable cry of anger and despair, a deep, loud 'Oh-o-o-o-oh!' that went humming on like the reverberation of a bell. His heart had leapt. It's started! he had thought. A riot! The proles are breaking loose at last...There was a fresh outburst of yells. Two bloated women, one of them with her hair coming down, had got hold of the same saucepan and were trying to tear it out of one another's hands. For a moment they were both tugging, and then the handle came off. Winston watched them disgustedly. And yet, just for a moment, what almost frightening power had sounded in that cry from only a few hundred throats! Why was it that they could never shout like that about anything that mattered? (73)

Winston's disgust at watching the proles fight over what he views as an insignificant matter demonstrates his own flawed view and lack of empathy for them. To him the proles are nothing more than a means to an end to be discarded afterwards. This is also explained later on by O'Brien as a repetitive vicious circle of past revolutions:

> The aim of the High is to remain where they are. The aim of the Middle is to change places with the High. The aim of the Low, when they have an aim—for it is an abiding characteristic of the Low that they are too much crushed by drudgery to be more than intermittently conscious of anything outside their daily lives—is to abolish all distinctions and create a society in which all men shall be equal. Thus throughout history a struggle which is the same in its main outlines recurs over and over again. For long periods the High seem to be securely in power, but sooner or later there always comes a moment when they lose either their belief in themselves or their capacity to govern efficiently, or both. They are then overthrown by the Middle, who enlist the Low on their side by pretending to them that they are fighting for liberty and justice. As soon as they have reached their objective, the Middle thrust the Low back into their old position of servitude, and themselves become the High. Presently a new Middle group splits off from one of the other groups, or from both of them, and the struggle begins over again. (210)

The question that remains unanswered in the book is whether this vicious circle would have continued, had Winston been able to set of his desired revolution. The manner in which he spoke about the proles suggests that he did not see them as more than animals, too unintelligent to know their strength. Orwell's intentions for providing the book with such a flawed character would seem to of criticism towards a romantic intellectual elite yearning for revolutions to topple the high class without a contingency plan for after the act. However, a flawed hero is better than no hero when there are but a few left with the will to fight, as Margaret Atwood points out: "The position of odd man out is always an uneasy one, but the moment we look around and find that there are no longer any odd men among our public voices is the moment of most danger—because that's when we'll be in lockstep, ready for the Three Minutes' Hate" (148).

Another very important character is Winston's love interest, Julia. Winston's first impression, the reader's introduction to the character, provides an indication of Winston's ability to judge and how subjective one character's outlook can be:

> Winston had disliked her from the very first moment of seeing her. He knew the reason. It was because of the atmosphere of hockey-fields and cold baths and community hikes and general

> clean-mindedness which she managed to carry about with her. He disliked nearly all women, and especially the young and pretty ones. It was always the women, and above all the young ones, who were the most bigoted adherents of the Party, the swallowers of slogans, the amateur spies and nosers out of unorthodoxy. But this particular girl gave him the impression of being more dangerous than most. Once when they passed in the corridor she gave him a quick sidelong glance which seemed to pierce right into him and for a moment had filled him with black terror. The idea had even crossed his mind that she might be an agent of the Thought Police. That, it was true, was very unlikely. Still, he continued to feel a peculiar uneasiness, which had fear mixed up in it as well as hostility, whenever she was anywhere near him. (12)

Julia has been able to camouflage herself in society as a passionate supporter of the regime. The beginning of their relationship set in motion Winston's true revolutionary ambitions and his acts of rebellion occur mostly after their first encounter. The first act of rebellion was their love for each other, as that is apparently an act of disobedience against the regime. Sexual acts are not meant to be pleasurable and Winston is still married to an assigned wife he despises. Julia seems to set Winston in motion towards seeking an underground movement, despite the fact that in her opinion a revolution will never take place and their simple acts of rebellion satisfy her need for disobedience. Winston's first impression of her demonstrates her intelligence and her ability to blend into society while also being very aware of Oceania's propaganda tactics:

> In some ways she was far more acute than Winston, and far less susceptible to Party propaganda. Once when he happened in some connexion to mention the war against Eurasia, she startled him by saying casually that in her opinion the war was not happening. The rocket bombs which fell daily on London were probably fired by the Government of Oceania itself, 'just to keep people frightened'. This was an idea that had literally never occurred to him. (193)

Unlike Winston, who was born before Oceania existed, Julia is a child of the totalitarian regime and cannot imagine another world. Whereas Winston can romanticize the past, she can only really mould

the present to make it acceptable enough for her to survive in it. This makes her a more of a realist and perhaps the sanest person in the book.

There are also characters, who integrate and support the society but are nonetheless punished by the regime of Oceania despite their cooperation. Orwell does not provide the peace other conformists' characters have enjoyed in similar dystopias. Nonetheless, to these characters the society they live in is not a dystopia but a utopia. Perspective is thereby of outmost importance when it comes to characterizing a society.

Syme, a philologist, is a true fanatic in Oceania: "In an intellectual way, Syme was venomously orthodox. He would talk with a disagreeable gloating satisfaction of helicopter raids on enemy villages, and trials and confessions of thought-criminals, the executions in the cellars of the Ministry of Love" (52). This character provides the reader with an insight into the language, Newspeak, being introduced in Oceania. The fact that Syme is an intellectual but still blinded by fanaticism critiques the idea that rational intellectuals are the most reliable governors. Wells' argued that: "…their rational dispassionate ways of thinking allow them to resist attractive but socially destabilizing concerns like religious fundamentalism" (Horan 57). Nevertheless, it is clear that Syme has an abundance of fanaticism despite his intellect or perhaps because of it:

> Don't you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? 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. (54)

His pursuit of a language scientifically manipulated into a sterile compact package can indeed be linked to what Wells described as "rational dispassionate ways," seeing as Syme does not care about the effects this might have on people. During the Second World War, Orwell had stated that it was foolish of H.G. Wells to assume scientists always chose the side of reason in a conflict. There is clearly a parallel with the intelligent Syme and later on O'brien as intellectuals choosing the wrong side and Orwell's words aimed at Wells:

> But unfortunately the equation of science with common sense does not really hold good. The aeroplane, which was looked forward to as a civilising influence but in practice has hardly

> been used except for dropping bombs, is the symbol of that fact. Modern Germany is far more scientific than England, and far more barbarous. Much of what Wells has imagined and worked for is physically there in Nazi Germany. The order, the planning, the State encouragement of science, the steel, the concrete, the aeroplanes, are all there, but all in the service of ideas appropriate to the Stone Age. Science is fighting on the side of superstition. But obviously it is impossible for Wells to accept this. (Orwell)

Despite the fact that Orwell states in this article how totalitarian regimes could not survive without the help of fanatic intelligent citizens willing to do anything for their nation, in the novel itself Winston is convinced that Syme will not survive due to his intelligence: "One of these days, thought Winston with sudden deep conviction, Syme will be vaporized. He is too intelligent. He sees too clearly and speaks too plainly. The Party does not like such people. One day he will disappear. It is written in his face" (56). Ultimately, Winston is proven right and Syme disappears without a trace.

A similarly fanatic character is that of Parsons, who unlike the intelligent Syme, seems to be the perfect person to survive in such an environment due to his lack of intelligence:

> Parsons was Winston's fellow-employee at the Ministry of Truth. He was a fattish but active man of paralysing stupidity, a mass of imbecile enthusiasms—one of those completely unquestioning, devoted drudges on whom, more even than on the Thought Police, the stability of the Party depended. (24)

Whereas the more intelligent citizens might notice the inconsistencies within the government and detect the propaganda lies, Parsons believes and supports every aspect of society. From his perspective Oceania is indeed a well-organized Utopia. Nivedita Bagchi states a similar argument concerning the citizens that abide by such a totalitarian regime in her dissertation: "…they desire some consistency in a world which is often chaotic and therefore, acquiesce with a regime that pretends to provide them with it even when though they are aware of the falsity of this claim" (143). The people that assume yielding will provide security are thereby sorely mistaken and punished for their complacency, as is Parsons near the end of the book when he is also arrested by the Love ministry:

> 'Are you guilty?' said Winston. 'Of course I'm guilty!' cried Parsons with a servile glance at the telescreen. 'You don't think the Party would arrest an innocent man, do you?' His frog-

> like face grew calmer, and even took on a slightly sanctimonious expression. 'Thoughtcrime is a dreadful thing, old man,' he said sententiously. 'It's insidious. It can get hold of you without your even knowing it. Do you know how it got hold of me? In my sleep! Yes, that's a fact. There I was, working away, trying to do my bit—never knew I had any bad stuff in my mind at all. And then I started talking in my sleep. (245)

Parson's faith in the system remains intact even after his imprisonment. This is truly difficult to understand but explained by Allan Weiss as follows: "Contrary to the impression some historians of dystopian fiction seem to have, dystopian regimes are not so much imposed from above as sought from below…particularly in that most residents of dystopias are happy or at the very least satisfied, and the supposed rebels are anomalies in their societies (127-28). This supports the argument that Orwell may indeed have been generalizing when he meant to make Winston's opinion the universal one.

Lastly, there is O'Brien, who similar to *BNW*'s Mustapha Mondt stands above the law and can provide the true purpose of this society. Once more, the reader is led to believe wrongly how a character might develop due to Winston's narrow perspective. The first impression one has of O'Brien is that of hope due to him being a potential ally:

> O'Brien was a large, burly man with a thick neck and a coarse, humorous, brutal face. In spite of his formidable appearance he had a certain charm of manner. He had a trick of resettling his spectacles on his nose which was curiously disarming—in some indefinable way, curiously civilized. It was a gesture which, if anyone had still thought in such terms, might have recalled an eighteenth-century nobleman offering his snuffbox. Winston had seen O'Brien perhaps a dozen times in almost as many years. He felt deeply drawn to him, and not solely because he was intrigued by the contrast between O'Brien's urbane manner and his prize-fighter's physique. Much more it was because of a secretly held belief—or perhaps not even a belief, merely a hope—that O'Brien's political orthodoxy was not perfect. Something in his face suggested it irresistibly. (12)

Winston invokes the image of a past nobleman to describe O'Brien once more romanticizing a by gone era into a character that will ultimately prove to be the epitome of the regime. Winston is proven

himself an untrustworthy narrator, once again, by not being able to distinguish the government supporters from the revolution sympathisers. The resemblance between O'Brien and BNW's Mustapha Mond lies in their similar intelligence and their high position in their regime. Both are set to point out the futility of the main characters' resistance against the regime while still showing a slight of sympathy. However, the difference in their approach could not be more distinct. Whereas Mond defends the need to provide the best environment for the majority of the people while still providing a refuge for the outsiders, O'Brien is completely unapologetic concerning the motivations behind his governments' cruel tactics. There is no distinct political ideology behind their actions except the desire to maintain power and that will allow them to toy with their citizens:

> 'How does one man assert his power over another, Winston?' Winston thought. 'By making him suffer,' he said. 'Exactly. By making him suffer. Obedience is not enough. Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing. Do you begin to see, then, what kind of world we are creating? It is the exact opposite of the stupid hedonistic Utopias that the old reformers imagined. A world of fear and treachery and torment, a world of trampling and being trampled upon, a world which will grow not less but MORE merciless as it refines itself. Progress in our world will be progress towards more pain. The old civilizations claimed that they were founded on love or justice. Ours is founded upon hatred. In our world there will be no emotions except fear, rage, triumph, and self-abasement. Everything else we shall destroy—everything. (279)

The frightening part of this passage lies in the recognition that the reader is sure to experience. This idea of a regime imparting sheer terror to its citizens is certainly not a new concept known to humanity. Margaret Atwood describes this in her essay "George Orwell, Some Personal Connections": "The torturer's room 101 has been with us for millennia. The dungeons of Rome, the Inquisition, the Star Chamber, the Bastille, the proceedings of General Pinochet and of the Junta in Argentina—all have depended on secrecy and on the abuse of power" (148). Humanity is flawed whether we call it a Utopia or a Dystopia.

To conclude, this chapter has shown the importance of perspectives when it comes to the distinction between utopia and dystopia. The different views expressed by great writers such as H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell demonstrate how even in the intellectual spheres opinions are a dozen. The characters in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are a good model of reality and how in one society the opinions of the same mode of governing can be viewed quite differently. To Winston, Julia and even O' Brien, Oceania is clearly a dystopia, a bad place. However, even though the government might indeed agree with this term that does not mean that a majority is not satisfied with the structure. Characters such as Syme, Parsons and even the proles are content with their situation—even preferring it to a democratic system immersed in chaos.

Conclusion

This thesis has analysed three dystopian novels written by these authors that concern the relationship between scientific and social progress and have shown that all three belong to the category Atwood's calls the Ustopia. Wells', Huxley's and Orwell's work prove how H.G. Wells' ground-breaking approach of communicating his ideas about science and society to a wider audience were influential to the other two authors. In his scientific romances he combined aspects of the social novel with scientific theories about the progress of human civilization in order to express his vision of how to rid the world of its ills, which ultimately inspired, on the one hand, the scientific explorations of utopia in *Brave New World* and, on the other hand, the social protest against dystopian developments in Western society that *Nineteen Eighty-four* was to become. H.G. Wells' utopian tales are a combination of social protest and scientific research. The use of an alternate reality to explore the idea of a socialist utopia made possible by evolution, clearly demonstrate Wells' science fiction prowess. His lower middle-class upbringing inspired his narratives of social injustice and his scientific education influenced his science-fiction plots. Huxley's more privileged upbringing within a family known for their scientific and literary accomplishments also influenced his narrative. He applies an objective scientific approach to his plot, providing the reader with several perspectives, to exhibit as many angles of his imagined society as possible. On the contrary, Orwell's journalistic background influences his narrative towards a more subjective story line meant to appeal to the reader's emotions in order to incite social change. Orwell attempted to warn his audience of the dangers that totalitarian regimes can pose.

The societies described in the three novels can be defined along the lines of Atwood's concept of Ustopia, a society that is both utopia and dystopia. The perspectives within the novels are essential to this concept, seeing as it is the fact that there are too many individuals with their own opinion to form one ideal society that would satisfy them all. H.G. Wells' travel party in Men Like Gods sees this new utopia as a dystopia and to Barnstaple their old world is the dystopian reality. Huxley also provides several characters' points of views, who do not fit into the society, to provide the reader with as many perspectives of world as possible. There is a sense of this utopia being Huxley's experiment and the

distinct characters are there to give the reader their insight of why these structures do not work for them. Despite the characters that are not willing to integrate into this society, Mond makes clear how these constructs are what is best for the community as a whole. The majority enjoy a blissful existence and are provided with all the comforts this ideal society offers. In Orwell's narrative Winston is blinded by his own feelings towards what he views as everyone's dystopian society. However, the majority of the citizens are content with their society and have no need for the revolution Winston would like to see happen. The control of the government provides the stability that was not present in their chaotic past. The three novels show how a utopian reality can create a better world for some while forming a worse reality, dystopia, for others. Every world has a portion of both utopia and dystopia.

This thesis has shown the importance of taking note of the narrative perspective when it comes to understanding the distinction between literary utopias and dystopias. With respect to characterisation, the interplay between both insider and outsider perspectives is crucial in determining the exact portrayal of the future society depicted as either a utopia or dystopia. Similarly, focalization within third-person narratives plays an important role in determining the portrayal of future socio-political developments in society as desirable or undesriable. Employing Atwood's concept of the ustopia, this thesis has also highlighted the existence of a utopia/dystopia spectrum, on which the ustopia occupies the middle position. The ustopian novels of Wells, Huxley and Orwell all pose a challenge for the reader when it comes to determining where to position them on the utopian/dystopian spectrum, left or right of the Ustopia, or, as my analysis in the previous chapters suggests, directly on the median. Above all, the futuristic literary imagination of Wells, Huxley's and Orwell shows that every society, no matter how perfect it seems, will have its negative aspects, thereby forcing readers to distinguish between what is desirable in a society and what can be sacrificed in order to achieve the desired end. Simultaneously, every dystopia has its redeeming features. Further research into the portrayal of futuristic societies in science fiction could explore narratives that are differently positioned, further left or right of the Ustopian median on the utopian/dystopia spectrum, in order to further develop our understanding of the complex relationship between the utopian future and the dystopian present, which Wells, Huxley and Orwell brought together into their pioneering ustopias.

Bibliography

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human imagination*. Anchor, 2011.Print.

Bagchi, Nivedita, and Klosko, George. *A Perfect World for Imperfect People?: Theories of Human Nature in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction* (2009): ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Web.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*. Helsinki : Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society ; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006. Print. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 92.

Beaumont, Matthew. *The Spectre of Utopia : Utopian and Science Fictions at the Fin De Siècle*. Bern [etc.]: Peter Lang, 2012. Print. Ralahine Utopian Studies ; Vol. 12. 322451051.

Booker, M. Keith. *Dystopia*. Ipswich, Mass.: Salem, 2013.Critical Insights 327081163.Print.

Brander, Laurence. *Aldous Huxley: A Critical Study*. London: Hart-Davis, 1969. Print.

Brome, Vincent. *H. G. Wells : A Biography*. London, 1951. Print.

Burgess, Anthony. *1985*. London: Hutchinson, 1978. Print.

Busch, Justin E.A. *The Utopian Vision of H. G. Wells*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland &, 2009. Print.

Childs, Donald J. *Modernism and Eugenics*. Cambridge UP, 2007. Web.

Deese, R. S. *We Are Amphibians : Julian and Aldous Huxley on the Future of Our Species*. Place: University of California Press, 2015.Web.

Dickson, Lovat. *H. G. Wells : His Turbulent Life and Times*. London: Macmillan, 1969. Print.

Dima-Laza, Stăncuţa Ramona. "A DYSTOPIAN SOCIETY OR THE MORAL DECAY OF HUMANITY." *Societate Si Politica* V.1 (2011): 40-53. Print.

Franko, Carol S. "The Productivity of Ambivalence: Dialogic Strategies in the Utopian Narratives of Wells, Huxley, Lessing, and Le Guin." Order No. 9033768 The University of Wisconsin – Madison, 1990. Ann Arbor: *ProQuest.* Web. 21 June 2018.

Gerber, Richard. *Utopian Fantasy : A Study of English Utopian Fiction since the End of the Nineteenth Century*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955. Print.

Gleason, Goldsmith, Nussbaum, Gleason, Abbott, Goldsmith, Jack, and Nussbaum, Martha C. *On*

Nineteen Eighty-four : Orwell and Our Future. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2005. Print.

Goodwin, Barbara, and Keith Taylor. *The Politics of Utopia : A Study in Theory and Practice*. New Ed.]. ed. Oxford [etc.]: Peter Lang, 2009. Print. Ralahine Utopian Studies ; Vol. 5. 322451051.

Gordin, Michael D., Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash. *Utopia/dystopia Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010. Web.

Gorman, Robert F. *Great Lives from History*. Salem Press, 2008. Great Lives From History. Web.

Graff, Ann-Barbara. "`Administrative Nihilism': Evolution, Ethics and Victorian Utopian Satire *." *Utopian Studies* 12.2 (2001): 33. Web.

Higdon, David Leon. *Wandering into Brave New World*. 2013. Costerus New Ser. Web.

Hillegas, Mark R. *The Future as Nightmare : H. G. Wells and the Anti-utopians*. New York: Oxford UP, 1967. Print.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Stockholm: Continental Book AB, 1945. Print. Zephyr Books ; Vol. 15 850919819. Perennial, 2010. Print.

King, Stephen. *Stephen King's Danse Macabre*. New York: Everest House, 1981. Print.

Limpár, Ildikó. *Displacing the Anxieties of Our World : Spaces of the Imagination*. 2017. Print.

MacKenzie, Norman Ian, and MacKenzie, Jeanne Daisy. *The Time Traveller : The Life of H. G. Wells*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. Print.

Moylan, Tom, and American Council of Learned Societies. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 2000. Print. Cultural Studies.

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974. Print.

Oizerman, T.I. "Introduction to Marxism and Utopianism." *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 44.2 (2005): 5-23. Web.

Orwell, George. , Duncan. Macmillan, and Robert. Icke. *1984 (Nineteen Eighty-Four)*. London: OBERON, 2013. Print.

Orwell, George. *Why I write*. London: Penguin, 1946.Print.

Orwell, George. *Politics and the English Language*. London: Penguin,1946.Print.

Pelling, Henry. *Winston Churchill*. Place: Springer, 1989.

Rabkin, Eric S., et al. *No Place Else : Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

Sargent, L.T. *British and American Utopian Literature, 1516-1975 : An Annotated Bibliography*. Boston, Mass: Hall, 1979. Print. A Reference Publication in Science Fiction.

Shaw, Tony. "Projecting a Prophet for Profit." *Hollywood's Cold War*. Edinburgh UP, 2007. Hollywood's Cold War, Chapter 4. Web.

Sviland, Solbjørg. *Instinct or Insight in Dystopia. Reading Margaret Atwood and Octavia Butler through a Darwinian Lens* (2011). Web.

Wells, H.G. *Men Like Gods*. London: Cassell, 1923. Print.

---. *The Time Machine, and The Island of Doctor Moreau*. Edited by Patrick Parrinder. New York: Oxford UP, 1996. Print. The World's Classics 840224516.

West, Alan George H. "The Natural History of the Future: The Related Importance of History and Nature to the Work of Richard Jefferies, William Morris, H. G. Wells, and Aldous Huxley." Order No. NQ68011 University of Ottawa (Canada), 2001. Ann Arbor: *ProQuest*. Web. 21 June 2018.