

Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet

Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i pedagogije

(prevoditeljski smjer)

Dijana Kamenčak

Dehumanized Society in *Brave New World* and 1984

Diplomski rad

Doc.dr.sc. Borislav Berić

Osijek, 2011.

Summary

Dystopian novel developed out of utopian as a form of negative utopia. In dystopian novels characters are commonly placed in the futuristic, urban worlds affected by violent wars, human alienation, totalitarian state control and excessive use of technology. Human labour is subordinated to machines, and nature resources are abolished as non-profitable. Superior minority controls all the information. Main protagonists try to fight the social order and to restore the old way of life. Orwell and Huxley deal with themes of dehumanization and thought control in *1984* and in *Brave New World*. Both describe human alienation, the totalitarian power of the state and lack of human will to change the state of things.

Key words: *Brave New World*, *1984*, utopia, dystopia

Contents

Introduction	4
1. Utopia as a Literary Genre.....	6
2. Utopias of Plato, More and Dickens.....	7
3. Dystopia as a Literary Genre	12
4. Dystopian Societies of <i>Brave New World</i> and <i>1984</i>	14
4.1. Dystopian Antagonists: Bernard Marx and Winston Smith	16
5. Dystopian Themes in <i>Brave New World</i> and <i>1984</i>	25
5.1. Production of Humans	26
5.2. Family	28
5.3. Religion	31
5.4. The Concept of Big Brother and Resident World Controller.....	34
5.5. The Past as the Age of Darkness and Misery	36
5.6. War as Propaganda	39
5.7. Love and Sex	42
Conclusion.....	47
Works cited.....	48

Introduction

Although dystopias developed out of utopian works, dystopian societies are unhappy, constantly controlled and totally dependent on the state. Plots of dystopian novels are usually set in futuristic times and places which are immensely damaged by the horrors of war. Dystopian environment is the post-apocalyptic world of alienated, dehumanized people controlled by the individual or the state, all in the name of overall well-being and progress. In such a world technological progress shapes the society. Human labour is subordinated to the work of the machine and in some novels the machine, is more appreciated than human life.

In the dystopian world of total subordination, there are very often protagonists who refuse to accept the status quo and who try to make changes. They fight against thought control and believe in democratic rights and freedoms. Some of the problems they face are alienation between humans, caste system within the society, excessive use of technology, urbanization, drug abuse, etc.

George Orwell and Aldous Huxley portray their concern in two of the best known dystopias of the twentieth century – *1984* and *Brave New World*. Both place their society into post-apocalyptic world. In this new world everything is different, programmed and supervised. People are not allowed to have personal thoughts or feelings. Those who do simply disappear. By representing these themes for their novels, Huxley and Orwell are making us aware of the dystopian world emerging in their time and they are calling for changes in the world. Orwell writes his *1984* after World War II when the world is shaken by the horrors of the war, when the people are hopeless, when economy is ruined and a whole new world has to be created. While Plato in the third century B.C. tries to rebuild his world in *Republic*, Orwell and Huxley try to give an example of what should not but could happen if people continue to act as they do.

Orwell was very concerned about rapid development of technology and about the impact it had on the society. That is why, in *1984*, he tries to prove that excessive use of technology destroys privacy and emotions. At the same time, *1984* can be read as a satire and Orwell's attempt to ridicule the social order of his time.

Dystopian societies have to follow the rules set by a totalitarian ruler or a party. In exchange they get to lead simple, stable life. Considering that they have experienced the

horrors of war, as Orwell and Huxley describe them, that seems like a fair deal. All they want is not to feel miserable again.

1. Utopia as a Literary Genre

Utopian literature is defined as a genre of literature which deals with social and political themes in a way that it portrays an ideal world and society. Mumford describes it as something unreal and impossible – a separate reality (11). Most utopian works are to be read as a critique of a particular culture or at least as a warning against existing customs and norms (Marty 82). The very word *utopia* is firstly used by Thomas Moore in his work *Utopia*, written in 1516. However, utopian writings have its beginnings back in classical literature when Plato imagined a perfect world in his *Republic*. Mumford separates utopias of escape and utopias of reconstruction. The former explore myths, legends and folklore, while the latter deal with political and social structures (Dawson 3). Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia* are best examples of the utopias of reconstruction, also known as "social" or "realistic" utopias.

According to Dawson, there are two stages in the development of utopian tradition: folk utopias, consisting of myths, and fantasy, and political utopias including both classical utopias (Plato and followers) and modern utopias. Classical utopias see the ideal society as theoretical standard, while modern utopias include a program for political action. Furthermore, there is a distinction between the utopian works of myth, fantasy and messianism (legends of the golden age and the Elysian fields) and political utopianism (low and high). Low utopianism gives the program for creating an ideal city-state that is supposed to be put in action in the foreseeable future, and in the meantime is to be a critique of existing institutions. The best examples of low utopianism are parts of Plato's *Laws* and Aristotle's *Politics*. High utopianism realizes that a plan for an ideal city-state is not to be literally enacted, but is more a model for reform, as Plato writes in his *Republic* and Cynic/Stoic utopias do in the third century B.C. (Dawson 7). This higher utopianism can be, according to Dawson, identified with the theory of communism: "This higher utopianism was identical with the theory of communism, a theory with very definite outlines because to Greeks it usually implied the three things mentioned by Aristotle: common property, common women, and equality between men and women" (Dawson 7). In communist utopias communism in property is accompanied by communism in family which is very similar to Greek concept of household. This type of household embraced property and family to that extent that it seemed natural for theoretical communism to embrace both.

2. Utopias of Plato, More and Dickens

Utopian themes have been present in literature since Plato's time, and continued to appear in the Renaissance and all subsequent periods of literature to the present day. Surely most noticeable examples throughout the history are Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia* and Dickens' *Hard Times*.

Plato supposedly wrote his *Republic* while Athens was at war with Sparta. His region Attica has been almost completely ruined and he saw the need for reform. The ideal size of his utopian world is a city region – a city surrounded with enough land to supply the inhabitants with food. Mumford describes Plato's society in the following way:

Plato's society arises out of the needs of the mankind; because none of us is self-sufficing and all have man wants: and since there are many wants, many kinds of people must supply them. When all those helpers and partners and co-operators are gathered together in a city, the body of inhabitants is termed a state; and so its members work and exchange goods with one another for their mutual advantage – the herdsman gets barely for his cheese and so on down to the complicated interchanges that occur in the city. (Mumford 35)

Life in the community is possible if everything functions in accordance with its purpose. As Plato says: "The good life must result when all the necessary functions are adjusted happily to each other" (Mumford 41). The recipe of perfect functioning is a place for every man and every man in his place (Mumford 41). People who live in this city region are divided into three groups: producers (craftsmen, farmers, artisans, etc.), auxiliaries (warriors), and guardians (rulers).

Plato is trying to give a firm basis to the division of classes which he favored, and so he compares the community to a human being, possessed of the virtues of wisdom, valour, temperance, and justice. Each of these values Plato relates to a particular class of people. Wisdom is appropriate to the rulers of the city. Thus arises the class of guardians. Valour is the characteristic of the defenders of the city and hence a military class, called auxiliaries, appears. Temperance, or agreement, is the virtue which relates to all classes. (Mumford 42)

More's *Utopia* abridges heavenly (medieval concept of Kingdom of Heaven) and worldly utopia. Marty comments that More's utopia is humanistic because he, as a Catholic, speaks about a city made by humans, based on intellect and reason, and not about godly creations based on church teachings (79).

As Mumford notes: "In religion there is complete toleration for all creeds, with this exception; that those who dispute violently about religion or attempt to use any other force than that of mild persuasion are punished for breaking the public peace (74)."

More's utopian society is seen through the eyes of a Portuguese scholar, educated in Greek who, leaving his family, goes to explore unknown continents. Raphael Hythloday tells More about the magnificent island of Utopia where productivity is great, where there are almost no real class distinctions, no crime and immoral behaviour. He also emphasizes how this world is better than European. The main social elements are family and economy. Everybody is included in reforming and improving those elements all the time. There is a patriarchal hierarchy in the family and improper behaviour such as adultery is sternly punished. Although More agrees with Hythloday up to a certain point, he concludes that that type of life would be impossible in England.

On the island of Utopia there are two types of pleasure. The first one is called the natural pleasure: "Nature leads us to only those delights to which reason as well as sense carries us, and by which we neither injure any other person nor lose the possession of greater pleasure "(Mumford 76). Those are love for knowledge, and music, etc. The second ones are the pleasures which have "some sting or bitterness concealed in them" (Mumford 76) such as greed and pride.

Many authors agree that *Utopia* can be understood as the critique of English state, church and economy, i.e. a prophecy in disguise, mostly because More was afraid to attack problems directly, and felt more safe to express his opinion in form of an advice (Marty 82). Mumford himself, portraying the England of More's time, criticizes England's past:

The rich are fattening upon the poor; land is being gathered into big parcels and turned into sheep runs. The people who used to cultivate the land are compelled to leave their few acres and are thrown on their own resources. Soldiers who have returned from the wars can find nothing to do; disabled veterans and people accustomed to live as pensioners on the more prosperous

have become destitute. Extravagant luxury grows on one hand; misery on the other. Those who are poor beg, those who are proud, steal, and for the pains the thieves and the vagrants are tried and sentenced to the gibbet, where by dozen they hang before the eyes of the market crowds. (Mumford 62)

More's character Hythloday concludes that the only solution for happiness is to give up on all the property. On the island of Utopia gold is used by slaves and pearls are given to children to play with them. As well as Plato's city-region, More's island of Utopia relies mostly on agriculture as an economic base. However, there is a difference in people's vocations. In Utopia every job is important as well as the person doing it. Life is regulated as follows:

Utopians appoint eight hours for sleep and six for work, and the rest of the day is left to each man's discretion. They are able to cut down the length of time needed for work, without so-called labor saving machinery, by using the services of classes which in More's time were given for the most part to the idleness – princes, rich men, healthy beggars, and the like (Mumford 66).

Goods in Utopia are distributed once a month. Country people come to the city and exchange goods with town people. Unlike in today's world, there is no need for unnecessary abundance for "there is such plenty of everything among them, and there is no danger of a man's asking for more than he needs; they have no inducements to do this, since they are sure they shall always be supplied" (Mumford 67). The main reasons why people feel the need to accumulate the goods are, according to More, the fear of want, which turns humans into greedy animals, and pride in being above the rest (Mumford 67).

When it comes to government, their only concerns are regulations of travel and treatment of crime and war. People who commit crime are sentenced to be slaves. "More creates a class of slaves, and he fills this class by condemning to it people who have committed venial crimes" (Mumford 73). Again, consistent to the sixteenth-century England, More accepts the concept of slavery as something necessary for a healthy society.

Marty points out that, although More was of Catholic upbringing, his characters are not heavenly creatures, but simply morally obliged individuals. Their society is not another heaven, but rather a place where things can be made right, not because people are good by their nature, but because it says so in the laws and regulations (Marty, 84). His main concern

in Utopia is religious tolerance which was his main concern in life, too. Marty finds it ironic because More himself, later in his life, became part of religious prosecution and preached dogmatic and absolutistic approach to religion (87). Mumford interprets tasks of Utopian institutions to be to “help every man to help themselves”. The man himself has an obligation to grow to the fullest stature of his species (78).

Hard Times, written in the nineteenth century, tells the story of utopia, too, but this time the conquest of alien countries and the lure of gold is subordinated to the man’s conquest of nature. It is the time of political, industrial and social changes.

It is the world in which energy derived from coal and running water takes the place of human energy; in which goods manipulated by machinery take the place of goods woven or sowed or hammered by hand. In this new world of falling water, burning coal, and whirring machinery, utopia is born again. These industrial utopias are no longer concerned with values, but with means: they are all instrumentalist (Mumford 116-117).

The centre of life in Coketown is the mill with the factory. Human life is perceived through one’s productivity and success achieved during the working hours. Everything that has no real productive purpose is considered unnecessary and therefore abolished. Mumford comments:

There are no deviations and no allowances in the working out of this plan; never will a street serve as much as a hair’s breadth to save a stand of trees. The aim of Coketown is to get somewhere, the city is devoted to the production of material goods; and there is no good in Coketown that does not derive from this aim. The only enjoyment is mechanical achievement. All the standards of Coketown are of quantitative kind and all that does not contribute to the physical necessities of life is called a comfort. All the things that do not contribute either to comforts or necessities are called a luxury (Mumford 216).

Unlike in Plato’s *Republic*, in Dickens’ Coketown there are no limitations concerning the growth of the town. The bigger, the better is its main policy. However, even such utopias have its boundaries and are not predestined to succeed.

There are scholars who place *Hard Times* in dystopian genre saying that Coketown is really no-place, a bad place, structurally based on balancing the opposites (sane – insane, good – evil) (Sexton 17). The only utopia inside of Coketown’s dystopian world is presented in the playful character of Sissy Jupe (Sexton 29). Just like proles in *1984* and Savages in *Brave New World*, it seems that she is the only one who is truly living her life by choosing the things that makes her happy – “fancy” over facts.

Another thing that proves that *Hard Times* can be read as dystopia is the caste system that Dickens described in his novel. The rich people are the owners of the factories and have the power while the regular people work for them and can only make bare living. Thus the society is divided into castes that are not supposed to mix. The whole novel deals with the struggle between the castes, and between emotions and restraint. Only few are satisfied with their lives and the rest are controlled and not allowed to make choices. The best examples are Gradgrind’s children, Louisa and Tom who are, just like children in *1984* and *Brave New World*, conditioned and taught to behave in a certain way (always rational, never emotional). Also, the workers in the plants have almost no power over their lives, as their labour is exploited and they cannot do anything about it, but lead lives of silent misery.

Sexton says that *Hard Times* directly inspired the plot of *Brave New World*. Both novels open with the matter of education and its role in shaping the society. In *Brave New World*, Director of Hatcheries emphasizes the importance of numbers and in *Hard Times* “in Gradgrind's schoolroom, facts are what is wanted: not curiosity, not a sense of wonder“(Sexton 184). Another common idea is that “in both novels, flower images are contrasted with mechanistic ones, thereby heightening the conflict between rationalism and humanism” (Sexton 289). Coketown is, just like *Brave New World’s* London full of smoke and filth coming from the plants. The urban has completely replaced the natural and rural. Sexton concludes that both Dickens and Huxley criticize pride in human nature and self-sufficiency as well as the pride in scientific and technological achievements.

3. Dystopia as a Literary Genre

The word dystopia comes from Greek and literally means “a bad place”. In English language it was first used by John Stewart Mill in his speech before the British House of Commons in 1868. Mill used it to criticize government’s Irish land policy, calling it more dystopian than utopian or “too bad to be practicable.” Unlike utopia which describes the ideal world and society, dystopia deals with themes of ruined, misled and dehumanized societies. In cacotopia or anti-utopia plot is usually placed in futuristic time in which people are supervised by an authoritarian individual or a group. There are no individual freedoms; personal thoughts and feelings towards other people are prohibited. Order is usually obtained by use of force, mostly by police or military.

In dystopian novels society is commonly divided into castes or classes. The highest positions belong to government members and rulers, while the lowest are occupied by poor, uneducated and uncultivated masses. In lower classes emotions are not as controlled and restricted as in high classes. They are also less suspected to provoke a revolution. On the other hand, people ranked higher, or belonging to the governing party, are constantly under supervision; they are alienated and oppressed, forced to collectivism and therefore more keen to start a revolution. Conformism is one of the highest values in a dystopian society; individualism is unwanted and severely punished if noticed. At the beginning of most dystopian stories there is an explanation how the world got to be what it is, either because of the wars, outbreak of disease, revolutions caused by social inequality. As the plots are set in the future, there are often examples of use of modern technology.

The main protagonists usually question the society’s order and values; feel discomfort about the way things are managed in the state and want something different than they are offered. By trying to change order of things, the heroes usually risk their own life, but feel that it is better than passive, obedient life. Fight against the existing system is the common theme in dystopian literature.

The most known authors of dystopian literature are H.G. Wells (*The Time Machine*, *When the Sleeper Wakes*, *The First Man on the Moon*), Jack London (*The Iron Heel*), Aldous Huxley (*Brave New World*), George Orwell (*Animal Farm*, 1984), Ray Bradbury (*Fahrenheit 451*), Anthony Burgess (*A Clockwork Orange*, 1985), P.D. James (*The Children of Men*), etc.

Themes of dystopian society are also very common in films (Blade Runner, Escape from New York, Gattaca, The Matrix, Waterworld) and in music.

4. Dystopian Societies of *Brave New World* and *1984*

The way people act usually shows how a particular society functions. Dehumanization of society in *1984* and *Brave New World* is the consequence of government's interference with personal life. As any signs of affection towards other human beings are prohibited, there are no feelings of compassion, loyalty, or even hate. People function like machines; they do what they are told and act according to the rules proscribed by the government. As Wanner describes it, they are reduced to piano-keys (81). In these societies there are no institutions of religion and family, or basic human rights. There are no real friendships, just acquaintances and coworkers. People do not fall in love; they get married and have children, as ordained by the state. Children are not close with their parents and are taught to be more loyal to the state than to their parents. The only feelings that the societies of *Brave New World* and *1984* are allowed to show are towards their leader, the governing party and progress. People are alienated, but still they hate to be alone. They speak all the time, but they never talk to each other. In *1984* the state controls people completely, their lives and their minds. People who are expected to go astray are under constant surveillance and under investigation for Thoughtcrime. There are telescreens installed in every home, as well as the working places and there is no privacy even in one's sleep. Humans are constantly reminded to behave according to the rules if they do not want to be punished. War is constantly shaking their lives; government keeps distorting their reality and affecting their living standard. Every act government takes is done in the name of progress and better life for everybody. The state is run by a dominant minority and real people are just mannequins doing what they are told.

In *Brave New World* people are brainwashed, genetically engineered and conditioned to behave promiscuously. There are no relationships on any level even though sex is imperatively proscribed by the state. Children are produced in laboratories; drugs are legal and even encouraged. Socializing is a duty of every grown-up, and time spent alone is considered wasted. Even though people are conditioned and sleep-taught to hate solitude, they are constantly emotionally alone. In addition to being separated by the caste system, there is not even real connection between the members of the same caste.

As in most dystopian novels, there are few brave characters who refuse to be part of this type of society. Those are protagonists who rebel against the governing system and who

wonder what it would be like if they were free. In *Brave New World* it is the character of Bernard Marx, and in Orwell's *1984* it is Winston Smith.

4.1. Dystopian Antagonists: Bernard Marx and Winston Smith

The main characters of *Brave New World* and *1984* can be seen as antagonists rather than the protagonists as they try to destroy the existing order of things and restore the old way of living. Beth Ravis explains that the dystopian world stands against its characters; that it is in conflict with them and because of that the characters are more of the antagonists than the protagonists (25). Both Bernard Marx and Winston Smith are unhappy with the world they live in because they feel different from the rest of the society. Hate towards the imposed rules and the government is what unites them, along with the feelings of loneliness and alienation. By trying to make changes in their society, they change their lives and experience love, fear, hate, passion – emotions forbidden by the state.

Bernard Marx is a rebellious character in *Brave New World* whose desires are greater than those of his society. Facing everyday's "normal" ways of living is horrible and unacceptable to him. He is accused of being an enemy of society, "a subverter of all Order and Stability, a conspirator against Civilization itself" (Huxley 129) because of his heretical views on soma, unorthodox sex-life and refusal to obey Ford's wishes. In a world where everybody is happy, he is the saddest and the loneliest man. Even though he would accept the solitude as his way of living, the society finds it unacceptable. Bernard Marx fights the rules and social conformity until the moment of his visit to the Reservation where everything changes.

His physical appearance separates him from his caste and this also influences his feelings of alienation from other people. The isolation makes him constantly insecure.

For whatever the cause (and the current gossip about the alcohol in his blood-surrogate may very likely – for accidents will happen – have been true) Bernard's physique was hardly better than the average Gamma. He stood eight centimeters short of the standard Alpha height and as slender in proportion. (Huxley 55)

The society perceives his physical inadequacy and often isolates him for that. Women are refusing his proposals, and men are laughing at his appearance.

“He’s so ugly!” said Fanny. “And then so small.” Fanny made a grimace; smallness was so horribly and typically low-caste. “They say somebody made a mistake when he was still in the bottle – thought he was Gamma and put alcohol in his blood-surrogate. That’s why he is so stunted”. (Huxley 39)

Bernard sometimes has to make an effort to prove his belonging to the Alpha Pluses and although he says he despises the new way of living and the caste order, he still feels the desire and need to be accepted and to belong. When addressing the lower caste members, he is very arrogant and cruel. This is due to his feelings of insecurity and fear of not being treated as an Alpha Plus. He always wonders: “Each time he found himself looking on the level, instead of downward, into a Delta face, he felt humiliated. Would the creature treat him with the respect due to his caste?” (Huxley 55).

The belief that he is intellectually different, allows him to cope with the fact that he is different physically. It enables him to justify the behavior of public towards him. In the modern society he feels like an outsider, and as a result of that, acts like an outsider, too. By behaving that way, he only deepens people’s doubts and prejudice against him. His physical defects alienate him from everybody to the point that he, at the same time, hates and envies other Alpha Plus males: “How bitterly he envied men like Henry Foster and Benito Hoover! Men who never had to shout at an Epsilon to get an order obeyed; men who took their position for granted; men who moved through the caste system as a fish through the water” (Huxley 56).

Just like him, Winston Smith, the protagonist of *1984*, although ordinary at first sight, feels different as he hates the world he lives in and constantly has to pretend to belong. Orwell describes him as follows:

He moved over to the window: a smallish, frail figure, the meagerness of his body merely emphasized by the blue overalls which were the uniform of the Party. His hair was very fair, his face naturally sanguine, his skin roughed by coarse soap and blunt razor blades and the cold of the winter that has just ended. (Orwell 4)

In his essay “The Underground Man” Wanner portrays Winston as a “mid-level intellectual in the service of a totalitarian state” who becomes a rebel against the governing

party through erotic relationship with a woman (81). In *1984* Winston Smith is one of the few who have not changed with the new world. He still believes in human values and kindness as he somewhat remembers the old days. While many dystopian heroes fight against the dictatorship of reason in the name of irrational freedom, Winston rebels against the irrationalism, in the name of reason (Wanner 83). In the world where two plus two makes five, he refuses anything but two plus two equals four. Winston's world is the world of the "controlled insanity" which he tries to fight.

In his dreams Winston sees the world the way it once was and how it came to end, he recalls his childhood and his mother. Orwell regards the ability to remember as the key feature that "constitutes the uniqueness of human personality;" deletion of memories denotes the ultimate dehumanization (Wanner 85). Winston's father was the first to disappear. He remembers that it was no shock for his mother; moreover, she was "completely spiritless" as if she was waiting something inevitable to happen. Winston felt it in her sudden strong embraces and he knew: "that this was somehow connected with the never-mentioned thing that was about to happen" (Orwell 169). He remembers insulting his mother and his sister, taking all of their food, constantly demanding something. In a way, he blames himself for their disappearance, but at the same time, he justifies his actions with the fact that he was just a starving boy who did not know better. "He knew that he was starving the other two, but he could not help it; he even felt that he had a right to do it. The clamorous hunger in his belly seemed to justify him" (Orwell 169). His family being taken from him, Winston is raised by the state and taught to love Big Brother and the Party more than his life. However, he still has the common sense to see things clearly and he rebels against the existing order. Wanner writes that Winston unsuccessfully tries to establish a link with the past through flashes of memories and dreams of his mother (85).

In the dream he had remembered his last glimpse of his mother, and within a few moments of waking the cluster of small events surrounding it had all come back. It was a memory that he must have deliberately pushed out of his consciousness over many years. (Orwell 168)

Both Winston and Bernard feel terribly lonely. Winston hates all of his co-workers; moreover, he is afraid of all of them, of their thoughts about him. The main reason why he avoids people is the fear that they will see his real feelings for Big Brother. Although never

really alone because of the telescreens, Winston's inability to share his thoughts makes him feel like the last living man on Earth. Bernard is affected by the sense of not belonging so much that even when accompanied by a woman and when in a crowd, he feels lonely. He envies the people around him for their feelings of fulfilment and belonging. The state-proscribed Solidarity Services where people are joined together to worship the Greater Being are leaving Bernard lonelier than ever, and when everybody feels blessed and at peace after the service, he remains empty and sad:

He was as miserably isolated now as he had been when the service began – more isolated by reason of his unreplenished emptiness, his dead satiety. Separate and unatoned, while the others were being fused into the Greater Being; alone even in Morgana's embrace – much more alone, indeed, more hopelessly himself than he had ever been in his life before. (Huxley 74)

Bernard's only friend is Helmholtz Watson with whom he shares his unorthodox beliefs and thoughts about the society. However, Helmholtz feels different, not because of the physical, but rather because of his intellectual "defects." The society does not accept him as he is ahead of his time; people do not understand his complex mind and they do not want to be bothered with his thoughts. Bernard and Helmholtz share the feelings and knowledge that they are individuals; their uniqueness is what brings them together.

Still, unlike Bernard, Helmholtz is more mature; his ideas are real reflections of his feelings as he does not like the new world. His deeds are the result of his beliefs, not of his feelings of inadequacy or wish to prove himself. He chooses the solitude because he wants it, not because the society pushes him to do so.

"Did you ever feel," he asked, "as though you had something inside you that was only waiting for you to give it a chance to come out? Some sort of extra power that you aren't using – you know, like all the water that goes down the falls instead of through the turbines? 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." (Huxley 59)

Unlike Bernard, Winston has no real friend in his life, only comrades – people who work with him; people who are his neighbours; people with whom he shares his love towards Big Brother. As the employee of the Ministry of Truth, he is in charge of supervising the information presented to people, making sure the slogans of the Party: “War is peace, Freedom is slavery, Ignorance is strength” are properly represented in the media. “The Ministry of Truth concerned itself with news, entertainment, education and the fine arts (Orwell 6).” Being in the described position, he is constantly in discrepancy with himself for consciously conveying the truth. Winston’s fear is actually Orwell’s fear of progress and computerization, fear of totalitarian rule. As Gessen explains: ”Orwell worries about the potential Sovietisation of Europe, but also the infection by totalitarian thinking of life outside the Soviet sphere – not just specific threats to specific freedoms, but to deeper structures of feeling” (42). That is why Orwell’s Thought Police is so strict, and why Newspeak is spreading so fast. The final goal is to narrow the range of human thoughts and with it the consciousness.

The first act of defiance Winston does is buying a diary “on the free market” with an intention to write in it all his unorthodox thoughts. In the “modern” times of 1984, handwriting is forbidden, as well as reading anything that is not state-proscribed. Shopping in the state unauthorized stores is prohibited and therefore referred to as dealing on the free market. Winston secretly buys his diary to avoid the suspicions of the Thought Police. After a while, he finds that he is not alone in his thoughts and joins his comrades, Julia and O’Brian in the fight against Big Brother. Despite the effort he makes, he still feels that the only hope lies in the proles – people who are not members of the Party and who lead lives of quiet existence. Still, he cannot just wait for them to take action so he decides to join the Brotherhood.”

On one level Winston attempts to resist by activism, by rebellion, seeking out the enemies of the regime; but on another level he simply struggles to maintain his individuality” (Crick 150). Raymond Williams describes Winston as a hero-victim who moves through the squalid world in a series of misunderstandings and disappointments, trying, and failing, to hold on to the possibility of a better life. This hero victim faces the society changes and constantly has a vision or idea of truth, that the social order is determined to destroy (10).

Both protagonists experience passionate, forbidden love. Bernard is in a way even romantic. He idealizes women and becomes very angry when he hears men talking about Lenina; the woman he loves:

„Talking about her as though she were a bit of meat.“ Bernard ground his teeth. „Have her here, have her there. Like mutton. Degrading her to so much mutton.“ He would like to go up to them and hit them in the face – hard, again and again. (Huxley 39)

The roots of his actions and feelings can again be assigned to his insecurity about his physical appearance and frequent rejections from women and mockery from men. His idealization separates him from the rest of the males, but he hopes to turn this to his favour – to make women find his uniqueness interesting. Lenina Crowne manages to see him in that light of mystical, misunderstood man, but Bernard stays disappointed in Lenina. He wants her to be the one with whom he can share all his thoughts; however, Lenina is just a society product, a sleep-conditioned woman incapable of a single personal thought. Bernard's romantic feelings for her disappear after he gets to know her and realizes there is nothing more underneath her appearance and the words which she obediently repeats.

Winston acts similarly. His relationship with Julia makes him feel alive again, and even though the affair it is just a sign of disobedience to Julia, Winston feels that it has a greater cause. The real love that he feels for her makes him different from the rest of the Party members. He knows that this love is something that nobody can take away from him. This is what he has in common with his mother as he remembers that it was his mother's love that never changed when everything else did.

He did not suppose, from what he could remember of her, that she had been an unusual woman, still less an intelligent one; and yet she had possessed a kind of nobility, a kind of purity, simply because the standards that she obeyed were private ones. Her feelings were her own, and could not be altered from outside. If you loved someone, you loved him, and when you had nothing else to give, you still gave him love. (Orwell 171-172)

During his affair with Julia, Winston finally feels alive and is sure that nothing can separate them. However, when faced with his biggest fear – rats, he realizes that he loves no

one more than himself. Nussbaum concludes that Winston is not the “best case of the human spirit” as his compassion for others evolves into narcissism which leads to his miserable end (10). Winston loses the last straw that kept him human throughout the years: “Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don’t care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me” (Orwell 300) Wanner comments that Winston is somehow a flawed character; prone to sadomasochistic behaviour indicating that he has been corrupted by the system (84). Also, he unquestionably trusts O’Brien and relies on his help. “O’Brien is a first-name-less, hence universal, dehumanized and dehumanizing symbol of despotism. Smith is initially attracted by O’Brien’s urbane manner, his impressive physique, his courteous manners, and his knowing glance” (Brunsdale 145). Gleason explains that O’Brien’s complete victory over Winston shows Orwell’s pessimism about the ability of his values to endure in what he regarded as the Age of Totalitarianism (6).

O’Brien’s torture of Winston depicts how the state treats its citizens. Some dystopian party leaders (Dostoevsky’s dictator) claim that they have philanthropic motivation to make their subjects happy. However, O’Brien’s acts have only one goal – the power: “object of power is power” (Wanner 78). “O’Brien’s society is not based on scientifically maximized happiness, but, quite to the contrary, on maximized suffering” (Warren 82).

O’Brien, Big Brother’s instrument of terrorism, thrives on power and exerts a malignant charisma to acquire, maintain, and extend it. Like Goethe’s Mephistopheles, O’Brien consistently tells the truth in the service of evil. (Brunsdale 145)

Bernard Marx’s personality completely changes. In the beginning he is a rebellious man who refuses to act according the rules of society, who seeks solitude and fantasizes about different, more romantic and free world. He tells Lenina how much he appreciates the silence: “It makes me feel as though...” he hesitated, searching for words with which to express himself, “as though I were more me, if you see what I mean” (Huxley 78). The years of loneliness make him feel that solitude is a part of him. He does not feel as much himself in a crowd, surrounded by people who feel that they belong, as he does alone, in the silence – in the presence of himself only. Later on, contrary to this, his actions prove how much he yearned to be a part of something.

Both Winston and Bernard have very important business positions in the society. Being the psychologist specialized in sleep-learning (hypnopaedia), Bernard realizes that people are not really free as they think they are. The state shapes them to think they are happy. As Mustapha Mond later in the novel explains, “People are happy, they get what they want, and they never want what they can’t get” (Huxley 194). However, Bernard feels that there is more to the world than it is presented to people and he tries to convince Lenina to rationalize by asking her: “How is it that I can’t, or rather – because, after all, I know quite well why I can’t – what would it be like if I could, if I were free – not enslaved by my conditioning” (Huxley 78).

All that Bernard wants is a break in the society. That is the main reason why he wants to take the Savage with him from the Reservation. It is his opportunity to justify his existence, to prove that he is worthy of being called Alpha Plus. His objective becomes to fit in, to belong and be appreciated – to be a real Alpha Plus.

The visit to the Reservation changes his life as he sees the opportunity and takes it. His venture turns his life completely and he experiences the real life of Alpha Plus. At this point in his life, he no longer feels the desire to differ from others; he feels comfortable in his own shoes.

Bernard now found himself, for the first time in his life, treated not nearly normally, but as a person of outstanding importance. There was no more talk of the alcohol in his blood-surrogate, no gibes at his personal appearance. As for the women, Bernard had only to hint at the possibility of an invitation, and he could have whichever of them he liked. (Huxley 135)

Both Winston and Bernard get what they want at one part of the novel, but eventually everything is taken away from them. Winston gets Julia and the opportunity to join the Brotherhood, while Bernard finally gets to belong, to feel like the Alpha Plus.

Bernard Marx is, however, a completely different person at the end of the novel. His arrogance and desire for changes completely disappear and transform to need of conformity. He is even ashamed of Savage’s answer to Mustapha Mond that he does not like civilization: “Bernard started and looked horrified. What would the Controller think? To be labeled as the

friend of a man who said he didn't like civilization – said it openly and, of all people, to the Controller – it was terrible” (Huxley 192).

His actions show that all his thoughts before were false and that he had no real intentions or wish to live in a different world. All he wants is to be worthy of his caste. When finally feeling like an Alpha Plus, he no longer seeks solitude or romanticized explanations of his nature. Bernard's weakness comes to light later in the novel when he is to be sent away from the civilized society. His friend Helmholtz notices this weakness of his earlier in the novel and Bernard only proves it when cornered and facing the punishment of being sent to an island. When faced with a punishment, Bernard tries to place blame on anyone else but him, and goes so far that he even betrays his best friend Helmholtz: “I haven't done anything. It was the others. I swear it was the others” (Huxley 199). Just like Winston, he betrays his only real friend. The oppressor breaks them in the end by taking away the only thing that made them human.

Bernard finally concludes that the best way is to keep things as they are. Now, he yearns for stability and conformism; however, he must pay for his doubts and rebellion against the state. Constant change of opinion and behaviour only proves Bernard's insecurity which disables him from taking any real actions and standing up for them, and just like Winston Smith in *1984*, Bernard yields in the end. Still, unlike Bernard, Winston shows his strength by resisting O'Brian's long and cruel conversion methods.

Although they seem different, Winston and Bernard have the same goal – to change the world. During this process they fall in love, they get to fight for their life – they get to live. Even though both of them feel defeated at the end, they do not realize that they have experienced life through their attempt to overthrow the government. They try to make changes and if not for anybody else, they make life worth living for themselves.

5. Dystopian Themes in *Brave New World* and *1984*

In their dystopian novels, Huxley and Orwell do not wonder whether it would be possible to create uniformed, stable societies, but whether they are worth creating. Both authors deal with the topics of consumerism, totalitarian rule, censorship, constant monitoring, all in favour of keeping the existing regime. Individuals living in dystopian societies are dysfunctional puppets whose lives are arranged and constantly monitored by the ruling minority. They have skewed view of their identities and the world they live in. However, they cannot break loose from the control and power the state has over them. Characters in *Brave New World* and *1984* are created mechanically and expected to behave that way during their life time.

The ruling minority keeps the power by use of censorship and surveillance. The past is censored to fit the ruling party ideas. Also, everything that can make people feel or think, like music and art, is abolished because it serves as a threat to stability. In *1984* the party tries to keep citizens devoted to the supreme ruler – Big Brother. Big Brother’s regime has only one goal – to pursue power for its own sake (Brunsdale 148). In *Brave New World* everything is altered or eliminated for the sake of happiness and stability.

5.1. Production of Humans

In dystopian novels *Brave New World* and *1984* most of the human lives are not appreciated and can easily be taken away. Only few are privileged while the rest are expendable. Functioning as a social group is the essence of society and individuals who disobey the social order are excluded from the society, and, in some cases, punished by death. Children are predestined to lead a certain life from their very creation. Huxley describes this process as Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning shows the incubators in which male and female embryos are heated at different temperatures: "the fertilized ova went back to the incubators; where the Alphas and Betas remained until definitely bottled; while the Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons were brought out again, after only thirty-six hours, to undergo Bokanovsky's Process" (Huxley 3). Bokanovsky's Process, as Huxley later describes it, is essential for keeping and maintaining social order and stability.

One egg, one embryo, one adult – normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, 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. Essentially, bokanovskification consists of series of arrests of development. We check the normal growth and, paradoxically enough, the egg responds by budding. (Huxley 3)

The society is stratified; however, each caste is conditioned to be satisfied with its position and achievements. As Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning explains, it is one of the major instruments of social stability. A single "bokanovskified" egg will give enough people for a small factory.

When the process of creating an embryo is done, future grown-ups are treated with different chemicals in order to fit in to a certain caste. There is no real possibility of progress after a person is "decanted". "The lower the caste," said Mr. Foster, "the shorter the oxygen" (Huxley 11). Neither is there a wish to move up on the social scale. Everybody is happy with what they have. The lower caste embryos are given less oxygen than to the upper castes. Also, they are given diseases and are conditioned to lead a certain way of life.

“Heat conditioning,” said Mr. Foster. Hot tunnels alternated with cool tunnels. Coolness was wedded to discomfort in the form of hard X-rays. By the time they were decanted the embryos had a horror of cold. They were predestined to emigrate to the tropics, to be miners and acetate silk spinners and steel workers. Later on their minds would be made to endorse the judgment of their bodies. “We condition them to thrive on heat,” concluded Mr. Foster. “Our colleagues upstairs will teach them to love it.” (Huxley 12)

All children, no matter which caste they belong to, are equally conditioned to hate old things as they are sleep-taught that “Ending is better than mending, the more stitches, the less riches” (Huxley 42).

In *1984* children are still born naturally, even though the artificial insemination is highly encouraged. Bringing children to the world becomes an act of duty rather than parents’ wish for posterity. Winston remembers how his parents loved his sister and him, but nowadays everything is different. Mothers give birth to their children and that is when their part in the child’s development ends. Children’s upbringing is strictly observed by the state and their education focuses on creating servants and protectors of the state. People are encouraged to get married and have children; however, the children are taught to show loyalty to the state rather than to their parents. Winston, too, gets married, but unfortunately his wife Catherine and he are unable to “produce” a child. Catherine, former Junior Anti-Sex League member, believes that she and Winston have a duty to have children in order to repay Big Brother everything he has done for them. Great number of parents of Oceania feel the same. They agree to have children because the state asks them to; because they are brainwashed to the extent that they can no longer make decisions on their own. Another reason is fear. It is the fear of Thought Police, the fear of getting on a wrong side of totalitarian rule of Big Brother.

Society in both novels tends to abolish the old ways of living (including giving birth), and they do it by encouraging artificial insemination and conditioning people to hate any type of affection. In *Brave New World* it is done by making sex recreational, and in *1984* by making people hate sex.

5.2. Family

In dystopian societies family loses its primary purpose of loving and caring for other family members. In *1984* people, although born, rather than produced, are alienated and lonely. Family simply includes people with whom one shares residence and the only thing that family has to value is love towards the state. Also, family members are commonly afraid of each other as the state created the atmosphere of suspicion rather than that of safety and love. After birth, children no longer belong to their family; they belong to the society and to the state. Parents do not have a leading role in raising their children and, furthermore, they become afraid of the behaviour that the state encourages (such as betraying your family and aggression towards everybody, but Big Brother). Children become the enemies of their own parents as they accuse them of state treason and thought crime. Thus parents become their children's prisoners, constantly under the watch of a "hero child" and under the threat of a death penalty. Winston becomes a witness of the fear children cause to their own parents when he visits his neighbour:

Nearly all children nowadays were horrible. They were systematically turned into ungovernable little savages, and yet this produced in them no tendency whatever to rebel against discipline of the Party. On the contrary, they adored the Party and everything connected with it. It was almost normal for people over thirty to be frightened of their own children. And with good reason, for hardly a week passed in which the *Times* did not carry a paragraph describing how some eavesdropping little sneak – "hero child" was the phrase generally used – had overheard some compromising remark and denounced his parents to the Thought Police. (Orwell 27)

State takes care of the children from their birth. They are educated at schools to worship the supreme leader and the governing party. Everything else in their lives, like personal interests and desires, becomes less important and sometimes even their own well-being is exchangeable for stability of the state. Orwell describes the children of 1984 as "the gambolling of tiger cubs which will soon grow up into men-eaters" (25).

The society of *1984* glorifies the concept of hero child who develops in the following way:

At the age of three Comrade Ogilvy has refused all toys except a drum, a sub-machine gun and a model helicopter. At six – a year early, by a special relaxation of the rules – has had joined the Spies; at nine he had been a troop leader. At eleven he had denounced his uncle to the Thought Police. At seventeen he had been a district organizer of the Junior Anti-Sex League. At nineteen he had designed a hand grenade, at twenty-three he had perished in action. (Orwell 49-50)

The state creates the image of a perfect child; not interested in childish desires like toys, and activities like playing with friends. Solely purpose of this child is to serve the state in the best possible way – to be able to give life for state's stability. The Soviet Union created a legend about the hero child back in the twentieth century. Pavlik Morozov was praised as a national hero because he turned his father to the authorities for betraying the country. The boy was, supposedly, killed by his own family for reporting his father to the police. The Soviet Union made a hero of Morozov portraying how the state cares for the individuals more than their own families. In *1984* a figure of a "hero-child" is produced for propaganda, too.

In *Brave New World* belonging to a family is completely abolished as it would lead to affections and finally to the instability of the society. The society remembers the concept of family which is, at those modern times, scorned at: "Family, monogamy, romance. Everywhere exclusiveness, everywhere a focusing of interest, a narrow channelling of impulse and energy" (Huxley 34). Talking about family or even thinking about it is considered shameful as it is understood that family members share feelings amongst themselves. Emotions are undesirable because they lead to the instability of society. Instability is the worst that can happen to a society. Therefore, everything that might cause the instability is abolished as proscribed by state. People are conditioned to hate talking or thinking about the very word family, let alone do something to become a member of one.

Mustapha Mond, Resident World Controller, explains the old meaning of home as a crowded, dark place where family members are joined in their misery: "No air, no space; an under sterilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells (Huxley 31)." The modern, Ford's world finds family relations despicable and unsanitary. It is shameful to even imagine closeness

between the family members. In a world where sex is practiced recreationally and in public places, discussing family is disgraceful and even a taboo:

Home, home – a few small rooms, stiflingly over-inhabited by a man, by a periodically teeming woman, by a rabble of boys and girls of all ages. And home was as squalid psychically as physically. Psychically, it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with the frictions of the tightly packed life, reeking with emotions. What suffocating intimacies, what dangerous, insane obscene relationships between the members of the family group! The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide. (Huxley 31-33)

Dystopian worlds deny the value of family because it is a threat to their stability. Family members have feelings towards each others. They feel pain and remorse when they lose a family member. Also, they love their family members more than they love the state or the society. Mond explains why pre-modernists did not survive: "With mothers and lovers, what with the temptations and the lonely remorsees ... – they were forced to feel strongly. And feeling strongly (and strongly, what was more, in solitude, in hopelessly individual isolation), how could they be stable?" (Huxley 35) Stability is the highest value in both *1984* and *Brave New World* and one way of achieving it is through early education, conditioning and prohibiting anything that can evoke emotions.

5.3. Religion

Religion is, according to Mustapha Mond, World State Controller in *Brave New World*, a form of escapism from old age and death. The older people are, the more they feel the need to explain things. They need to know that there is more than the life that are leaving behind. Thus the spiritual becomes more important than the material.

They say that it is the fear of death and of what comes after death that makes men turn to religion as they advance in years. The religious sentiment tends to develop as we grow older; to develop because, as the passions grow calm, as the fancy and sensibilities are less excited and less excitable, our reason becomes less troubled in its workings, less obscured by the images, desires and distractions, in which it used to be absorbed; whereupon God emerges as from behind a cloud; our soul feels, sees, turns towards the source of all light. (Huxley 205)

In *Brave New World*, however, there is no need for religious salvation. There is no old age, no fears of diseases, no loss of life force. Thus, there is no need for God. Mond explains how people of the old world are independent of God while young and healthy, but as the old age and death approach, the need for salvation rises. However, in *Brave New World* where people do not grow old and do not become sick, humanity can constantly be independent of God, and that makes religion superfluous.

Mustapha Mond, however, does not go as far as to say that there is no God. There is God, but he manifests himself in his absence as he is not compatible with modern mechanistic world. People are conditioned not to believe in God, and they never feel the need for his comfort because they are never miserable or in need. If a problem emerges, there is always soma to take.

In dystopian societies God is replaced by the ruler or head Party member. In *1984*, Big Brother is the new deity, “the sacred leader” (“Brainwashing and Mind Controlling in Orwell’s *1984*”). He is worshiped on a daily bases and he is the main theme of every hymn, news and conversation. Anybody working against or not showing enough affection to Big Brother is considered a traitor and has to be punished. The punished people serve as an

example of how those who disobey the rules are punished. Big Brother's name is chanted on every occasion as a proof of love and devotion.

But the face of Big Brother seemed to persist for several seconds on the screen, as though the impact that it had made on everyone's eyeballs was too vivid to wear off immediately. The little sandy-haired woman had flung herself forward over the back of the chair in front of her. With a tremulous murmur that sounded like 'My Saviour' she extended her arms towards the screen. Then she buried her face in her hands. It was apparent that she was uttering a prayer. At this moment the entire group of people broke into a deep, slow, rhythmical chant of 'B-B' 'B-B' (Orwell 18)

Although Orwell believed that Christianity was, like totalitarianism, a threat to individual autonomy, in *1984* there are elements which indicate sympathizing with Christian ideas. Although there is no presence of God in Winston's society, there is a clear contrast between good and bad, white and black characters, between followers of the opposite parties – those of Big Brother and those of Goldstein. Goldstein is constantly under the attack of Big Brother's hatred words, but he remains silent and never directly strikes back. Gleason, Goldsmith and Nussbaum explain that the influence of Christianity is best seen through the evolution of Winston's and Julia's relationship: "Winston and Julia's passion is quickly transformed into a quasi-marital domesticity, and the mode of their lovemaking similarly changes, from sadism to tender concern" (10). Wanner adds that Winston and Julia are the only "repositories of positive values" as they represent private concerns, family life and nature – they are more conservative than revolutionary (85). Winston transforms from an adulterer and thought-criminal (he was thinking about murdering Julia) to caring and loving figure. Some authors imply that Winston and Julia would have gotten married had their plans not been interrupted.

In *Brave New World* Henry Ford is the almighty creator, the Alpha and Omega of everything. His achievements are considered to be the works of miracle and are appreciated more than human life. People are conditioned from their childhood to obey and worship the mechanical progress, mass production – Henry Ford himself. Instead of Christian cross, people use a T sign in honour of Henry Ford and his Model T – the first car to be

manufactured by purely mass-production methods. Religion is repressed by production and consumption.

Big Brother and Ford are worshiped as deities in different ways. People are afraid of Big Brother and they are forced to love him by participating in public worships on a daily bases (Two-Minutes Hate). Ford is adored for different reasons. The characters of *Brave New World* honestly believe in his supreme power, and they feel affection towards him because of his achievements. It is debatable whether they would feel the same if there was no soma.

5.4. The Concept of Big Brother and Resident World Controller

The societies of *Brave New World* and *1984* are not controlled by their inner emotions and yearnings but the outer power, the power embodied in a totalitarian ruler – Big Brother in *1984* and Resident World Controller Mustapha Mond in *Brave New World*. Mustapha Mond acts in the name of Henry Ford, “the cultural hero” (“Dystopian Fiction”). Ford is praised for his technological achievements and often regarded as a deity by the citizens of the World State. Although Big Brother and Mustapha Mond treat their subjects in different ways, they still have a common goal – keeping a stable society. By conditioning, brainwashing and intimidating people, they take all necessary precautions and measures to prevent anything or anyone from disturbing the order of things.

Big Brother is described as a monstrous tyrant. “At the end of it a coloured poster, too large for indoor display, had been tacked to the wall. It depicted simply an enormous face, more than meter wide: the face of a man of about forty-five, with a heavy black moustache and ruggedly handsome features” (Orwell 3). It is even more concerning that Big Brother is never seen in person. Wanner argues that Orwell’s dystopia is of somewhat different character than those of his predecessors (Zamyatin, Dostoevsky) because his party rulers have abandoned “the utopian ideal of universal happiness altogether, although they still may pay lip service to it for propaganda purposes” while, in contrast, *Brave New World*’s society represents not abandoned, but realized utopias (79). Mustapha Mond’s appearance is more appealing to the reader, as he is portrayed like a living person, not mere an idea. In fact, later in the novel, he shows that Mond is a real man who faces the same difficulties in life as other characters. He also had wishes and made choices in life:

I was given a 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 Controllorship. I choose this and let the science go. (Huxley 200)

Mustapha Mond shows his human side when Bernard and Helmholtz are to be punished after committing a crime against the state. While Big Brother shows his brutality through O’Brian’s torture of Wilson, Mond shows his affection towards humans by giving Bernard and Helmholtz what they wanted from the beginning. The main difference between

the two would be that Mustapha is a real person, while Big Brother is just a concept, an idea, and therefore cannot be easily escaped and defeated. By making him so distant, Orwell makes the reader anxious and suggests characters are rebellious and prone to defiance. Nobody ever sees Big Brother in person. All they know is his face on the poster, but still they know he is the machine which turns whole society around.

By showing affection to and glorifying Big Brother, the society of *1984* creates a cult of personality, while in *Brave New World*, Ford, the creator of better times, is worshiped because of his achievements in a field of technology, not because of his personality. The people of *Brave New World* believe that the real progress began with Ford's invention of Model T car which meant the beginning of mass-production. There is also a difference between the feelings which Big Brother and Ford (through Mond's acts) evoke. People of *1984* are scared and cautious as they realize that they are under constant surveillance of their tyrant ruler Big Brother. In *1984* people disappear or are "vaporized" when misbehaving, while in *Brave New World* individuals are just sent away from civilized society. Although dealing with rebellion differently, both Big Brother and Mustapha Mond successfully maintain the stability in their societies and eliminate the threat to their power.

5.5. The Past as the Age of Darkness and Misery

The characters in *Brave New World* often remember the old days in comparison to the new, wonderful world of progress. The old world was the world of misery, of “every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity” (Huxley 33). “No wonder those pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable. Their world didn’t allow them to be sane, virtuous, happy”. (Huxley 35) Savages who still live in the past are considered to be primitive, dirty, uneducated and uncivilized.

The past is retold like a fantasy story. Mustapha Mond in his lectures remembers the old concepts of democracy and liberalism:

There was something called liberalism. Parliament passed a law against it. The records survive. Speeches about liberty of the subject. Liberty to be inefficient and miserable. Freedom to be a round peg in a square hole. Or the Caste System. Constantly proposed, constantly rejected. There was something called democracy. As though men were more than physic-chemically equal. (Huxley 40)

Further on, he explains how everything that brought pleasure to people in the old days is replaced with even better things in the modern world. There is no need for Shakespeare’s works, God and Christianity, cocaine and alcohol when there are Ford’s Day celebrations, Community Sings, Solidarity Services and soma (“One cubic centimetre cures ten gloomy sentiments”) (Huxley 46). Even old age is not an issue any more.

One of the reasons why old things are abandoned is because they are beautiful and can evoke feelings of nostalgia in humans: “We haven’t any use for the old things here. Particularly when they are beautiful. Beauty’s attractive, and we don’t want people to be attracted by old things. We want them to like the new ones” (Huxley 193). Nostalgia about the old things makes people unstable. Also, new things are to be preferred in order to keep the production going.

All the values of the old world are sacrificed in the name of stability. People are well off, safe, not afraid of death or illness, they do not grow old. However, they are also ignorant of high art, love and excitement. As Mustapha Mond says:

Actual happiness always looks pretty squalid in comparison with the over-compensation for misery. And, of course, stability isn't nearly so spectacular as instability. And being contended has none of the glamour of a good fight against misfortune, none of the picturesqueness of a struggle with temptation, or a fatal overthrow by passion or doubt. Happiness is never grand. (Huxley 195)

Equally as art, science is dangerous because it may result in a discovery – a change. The culture is dead in a way that works of art, literature, music are prohibited. This prohibition and censorship are results of fear. The fear of strong emotions that art evokes forces the ruling minority to take control. Thus the lower caste children are conditioned to hate books so when they grow up they feel comfortable with manual work. The upper castes, which are allowed to read, have access to only certain books, usually manuals. Mustapha Mond argues that the society had to sacrifice high arts for happiness; replace *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Othello* with feelies and the scent organ – all in favour of stability.

Only few languages are still spoken. French, German, Polish – all dead languages. Everything that makes a person unique is destroyed. In *1984* Newspeak is introduced to narrow person's consciousness and oppress individual's identity. If you cannot think against the party, you cannot act against it; and if you cannot think, you have to let the state do that for you.

Big Brother creates the past in *1984*. History is rewritten every day to correspond to the teachings of the government. Children are taught in school that the old life was miserable existence. Winston finds children's history book explaining the old days:

In the old days, before the glorious Revolution, London was not the beautiful city that we know today. It was a dark, miserable place where hardly anybody had enough to eat and where thousands of poor people had no boots on their feet and not even a roof to sleep under. Children no older than you are had to work twelve hours a day for cruel masters... (Orwell 75)

Orwell here describes Dickens' England at the beginning of capitalist era. Even though times portrayed above are terrible, the reality of *1984* is even worse. The Party controls the present,

as well as the past, and Watson does it in its name. According to Party's statistics everything is better nowadays since most of the population is educated and not hungry.

Technology is advanced and life is impossible without it. Every room in *1984* has a telescreen. As Orwell did not appreciate the technology there are not many descriptions of it in his novels. He merely describes the telescreen as the terrible machine receiving and transmitting simultaneously. Some authors argue that Orwell's fear of technology was unjustified and even absurd. The telescreens are transparent because people know when and where they are monitored. The Internet, today's threat to privacy, gathers data without one's knowing and never loses or forgets about it. Brim adds that people cannot escape the elite (government, corporations) monitoring no matter what they do (Gleason, Goldsmith, Nussbaum 8).

The overuse of technology is directly connected with the intrusion of privacy. As Posner in his essay acknowledges: "Nineteen Eighty-Four successfully recognizes that the human desire for solitude is inimical to totalitarianism, and that the suppression of thought and inquiry are inimical to scientific and technological progress (Posner, quoted in Gleason, Goldsmith, Nussbaum 8)." However, he feels that Orwell is more satirical than prophetic about the future.

When thinking about the past, Winston feels nostalgic. Lerner claims that Winston is lucky enough to feel the nostalgia for the past days.

The attempt to recover the past is constantly recurring obsession with Winston, not only because of its direct political significance (...), but more interestingly for the way physical objects surviving from the past retain an aura of complex, sensuous experience (72).

Even though people are conditioned to think that the past was terrible and full of suffering, some protagonists feel that those were the times of freedom and joy, and they try to restore the old days. The nostalgia they feel incites them to try and change the present.

5.6. War as Propaganda

The societies in *Brave New World* and *1984* are dehumanized because they suffered the horrors of war and faced the terrible consequences that left them feeling regretful and empty. In *Brave New World* there was a Nine-Years-War after which people just wanted the restoration of peace and stability. Mustapha Mond, Resident World Controller, describes that the Nine Years' War began in 141 A.F: "The noise of fourteen aeroplanes advancing in open order (...) the explosion of the anthrax bombs is hardly louder than the popping of a paper bag. The Russian technique for infecting water supplies was particularly ingenious" (Huxley 40-41). Economy collapse followed the war leaving people desperate and in need of order. The most important thing was to restore stability and a normal way of living. This left no room for progress in the field of art, literature, music.

People still went on talking about truth and beauty as though they were the sovereign goods. Right up to the time of the Nine Years' War. That made them change their tune all right. What's the point of truth or beauty or knowledge when anthrax bombs are popping all around you? That's when the science first began to be controlled – after the Nine Years' War. People were ready to have even their appetites controlled then. Anything for a quiet life. (Huxley 201)

In *1984*, however, the war is still going on. It is no longer war for the territory or freedom; it is simply propaganda. Brunsdale explains that the Inner Party, the "privileged parasitic minority" maintains itself by constant war (146). People still hear the news from the fronts; there are occasional bomb attacks and constant reductions of goods for the sake of helping the army and defending the state. However, Winston reads about the real reasons of war in Goldstein's book:

War, however, is no longer the desperate, annihilating struggle that it was in the early decades of the twentieth century. It is a warfare of limited aims between combatants who are unable to destroy one another, have no material cause for fighting and are not divided by any genuine ideological difference. This is not to say that either the conduct of war, or the prevailing attitude towards it, has become less bloodthirsty or more chivalrous. But in a physical sense war involves

very small numbers of people, mostly highly-trained specialist, and causes comparatively few casualties. (Orwell 193-94)

Goldstein goes on explaining that it is always the same war because there are no longer real reasons to fight. Also, every state is equally powerful and has enough of its material resources. The main reason for keeping the war conditions is the labour power. There is a region in *1984* which is well populated and is not under one constant jurisdiction. Nations constantly fight over it, not only to exploit its labour possibilities, but also for valuable minerals that those territories contain: "The inhabitants of these areas, reduced more or less openly to the status of slaves, pass continually from conqueror to conqueror, and are expended like so much coal or oil" (Orwell 195).

War, fuelled by the regime's mind-twisting collective demonstrations of Hate, keeps Oceania's industries working while draining the nation's wealth from its citizens. War sustains the Inner Party's exclusive power provides an emotional basis for the hierarchies of this society, and uphold Party morale by creating a population of paranoid, dependent, "credulous," and "ignorant" fanatics. (Brunsedale 146)

The other aim of the war is to prevent surplus in the state. Therefore, constant fighting enables constant use of the machinery, i.e. constant production.

The essential act of war is destruction, not necessary of human lives, but of the products of human labour. War is shattering to pieces, or pouring into the stratosphere, or sinking in the depths of the seas, materials which might otherwise be used to make the masses too comfortable, and hence, in the long run, too intelligent. Even when weapons of war are not actually destroyed, their manufacture is still a convenient way of expending labour power without producing anything that can be consumed. In principle the war effort is always so planned as to eat up any surplus that might exist after meeting the bare needs of the population. (Orwell 199)

Although people are repeatedly reminded that the war is happening for their own good, they only feel more miserable. The ruling party refuses to put a stop to it because they are making profit and control the masses. In *Brave New World*, stability is achieved and maintained through control of emotions and use of drugs so that there is no longer need for

constant battles. In *1984*, however, war is needed to fool people into behaving properly and praising the governing party and Big Brother. Some authors argue that Orwell's descriptions of propaganda as means of social control relate more to the USA than to the closed societies like the Soviet Union. The American elite allows some controversy, but only up to a certain point; "freedom of markets" is more important than the political freedom, and it was common for people to become "unpeople" during the wartime (Gleason, Goldsmith, Nussbaum 6).

5.7. Love and Sex

Love towards another human being usually does not exist in dystopian societies. If some of the characters show affection for other persons, they are considered weird, unorthodox, rude or even disobedient to the state.

Sex is another thing showing the dehumanization of societies in *Brave New World* and *1984*. It is recreational or done out of duty towards the society rather than out of love and affection towards other individual. In *Brave New World* orgies are organized as obligatory part of Solidarity Service, described as series of chanting, singing, dancing, finally ending in mass love-making, all accompanied by large amounts of soma. The service is done in the name of Ford for the purpose of reuniting with the Great Being: “Ford, we are twelve; oh, make us one / Like drops within the Social River; / Oh, make us now together run / As swift as thy shining Flivver. Orgy Porgy, Ford and fun / Kiss the girls and make them One. / Boys at one with girls at peace; / Orgy-porgy gives release” (Huxley 71;73). People are sometimes treated like possessions and the concept of “having someone” is quite common. Those like Bernard Marx who refuse to be promiscuous are scorned at. It is a world in which everybody belongs to everybody else more than they belong to themselves.

Gleason, Goldsmith and Nussbaum write that Orwell’s novel deals with a sexual passion at odds with totalitarianism; it contains many suggestions about the likely relationship between political repression and sexual repression (9). In *1984* sexual intercourse is shameful and considered dirty; it destroys the power of the state by evoking emotions in people.

The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party. Sexual intercourse was to be looked on as a slightly disgusting minor operation, like having an enema. The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it. (Orwell 68-69)

Brunsdale explicates that human sexuality threatens Oceania's ruling elite the same way as the expressions of ultimate intimacy and genuine love does (144).

Big Brother tries to stamp sex out by converting it into a mechanical child-producing function devoid of emotion. The regime wants to remove any vestige of rebellious traditional values in which a whole system of thought like Big Brother's could be swept aside by one consciously heroic individual human gesture, like Julia's flamboyant disrobing in Smith's dream. (144)

Teenagers are to join Junior Anti-Sex League in order to be conditioned to live in celibacy. Katherine, Winston's wife, is the best example in the novel of brain washing. She believes that sex is work that needs to be done. Winston calls her human soundtrack as she only repeats Party's slogans and is incapable of coming up with her own thought.

As soon as he touched her she seemed to wince and stiffen. To embrace her was like embracing a jointed wooden image. And what was strange was that even when she was clasping him against her he had the feeling that she was simultaneously pushing him away with all her strength. (Orwell 70)

Not until meeting Julia does Winston experience the real seduction. At the beginning Winston believes that Julia is a perfect Party member as she represents herself as "the troop leader in the Spies" (Orwell 128), voluntary worker for the Junior Anti-Sex League, always carrying one end of the banner in the processions, always looking cheerful and yelling with the crowd and never shirking anything. He is even thinking of killing her. However, when he finally meets her, he starts falling in love with her for she is so different from his ex-wife Katherine and above all, she hates the Party as much as he does. He characterizes her as motivated by her pursuit of forbidden pleasures, sexual desire compounded with thrill-seeking, lying, and opportunism (Brunsdale 144).

A thing that astonished him about her was the coarseness of her language. Party members were supposed not to swear, and Winston himself very seldom did swear aloud, at any rate. Julia, however, seemed unable to mention the Party, and especially the Inner Party, without using the kind of words that you saw chalked up in dripping

alleyways. He did not dislike it. It was merely one symptom of her revolt against the Party and all its ways, and somehow it seemed natural and healthy, like a sneeze of a horse that smells bad hay. (Orwell 129)

Winston is ten or fifteen years older than Julia and his way of thinking is quite different from hers. His beliefs and reasons for revolt are more mature, more thought through, more reasonable. The only thing that connects them is their hate towards the system, the Party, Big Brother. This hate taken away, they have nothing in common. During one of their meetings, Winston realizes that Julia's rebellion is just a sign of immaturity and sort of caprice.

In the ramifications of party doctrine she had not the faintest interest. Whenever he began to talk of the principles of Ingsoc, doublethink, the mutability of the past and the denial of objective reality, and to use Newspeak words, she became bored and confused and said that she never paid any attention to that kind of thing. One knew that it was all rubbish, so why let oneself be worried by it? She knew when to cheer and when to boo, and that was all one needed. (Orwell 163)

Crick argues that Julia was never actually in love with Winston, and that he just misinterpreted her actions:

Indeed that Julia really loves him is shown in the story to have been a mistake on Winston's part. She falls asleep when he reads Goldstein's testimony and she is bored by his tale of the photograph; and for her part promiscuity is a gesture of contempt for the regime. (151)

She knows nothing about the past, and although she says she is deeply against the Party, her state-governed upbringing appears in her statements unconsciously.

But she only questioned the teachings of the party when they in some way touched upon her own life. Often she was ready to accept the official mythology, simply because the difference between the truth and falsehood did not seem important to her. She believed, for instance, having learnt it in school, that the Party had invented aeroplanes. (Orwell 160)

Click explains why Julia, unlike Winston, does not really care for the changes:

She is closer in her behaviour to the proles than is Winston, because she has come from the proles, but not in sympathies – she wants to get away from them. She is no intellectual, but she is shrewd, tough and courageous. But Winston is more the middle-class intellectual who is determined to find hope amid the common people. (151)

Winston, being quite older than her and his job being changing the facts in Party's favour, remembers the truth about the inventions, about the wars. It seems shocking to him that Julia does not really see and care how mislead the public constantly is, how the past is changed, and how the truth is distorted. They belong to different times:

As a member of a younger generation than Smith's, she has become cunning and practical, less susceptible to propaganda than older citizens are, and she feels that rebellion is possible only through secret disobedience or isolated acts of violence, so her lovemaking is politically, not emotionally, driven, though it catalytically inspires changes in Smith. (Brunsdales 144)

He is firstly attracted to Julia only physically, and even when he thinks about killing her, he desires to go to bed with her. Their relationship is in the beginning based on sexual pleasure and joint hate towards the Party. As any kind of showing affection and having sex for pleasure is scorned at and prohibited, Winston and Julia feel that they are acting against the Party when sleeping together. In their heads, sex becomes a political act:

In the old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl's body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act. (Orwell 133)

Totalitarianism thrives on the repression of sexual drives; chastity supports political orthodoxy. It is for this reason that the choice to have sex outside the Party's strict rules can be connected with political freedom (Gleason, Goldsmith and Nussbaum 9).

Sex in *Brave New World* and *1984* is considered to be an obligation and a duty, or a political act against the state. Also, it is done for recreational purposes, like something that needs to be done. Lerner notes that sex in *1984* has an ideological function:

Though Orwell is curiously coy in describing the sexual act, even italicizing it as *that*, he considers it extremely important because of its concentration on pure pleasure. Julia is an anarchic element in Ingsoc because of the lack of interest in ideology. Her intense hedonism is a rejection of the whole society, and Winston's sexual embrace with her therefore becomes (...) a political act (72).

In *Brave New World* monogamy does not exist outside the Reservations, and in *1984* it is proscribed by the state, although sexual act is to be replaced entirely by artificial insemination. By these two opposite solutions, the state is trying to completely control its citizens. When sex is proscribed as a duty by the state and when everybody belongs to everybody there are no yearnings and desires for another human being – there are no emotions and frustrations. When people are taught from an early age, that sex is dirty, unnecessary and shameful, they are discouraged from procreating and again conditioned to neglect their feelings, needs and basic instincts. Dystopian societies keep themselves alive by denying human emotions and conditioning their societies to hate everything that makes them human.

Conclusion

Dystopian worlds of *1984* and *Brave New World* are characterized by human production in laboratories, state upbringing of children, alienation of family members and humans in general. Love and affections are unacceptable. Well-being of the state comes before the well-being of the individual. The world is run by individuals or by the party – the government is totalitarian, leaving no room for people's voices. Those who act differently simply disappear. However, there are still some individuals who refuse to accept that kind of living. Winston Smith in *1984* and Bernard Marx in *Brave New World* have the strength to fight the imposed living conditions. Although they do it for different reasons, they share the same feeling of being individuals, their own persons. Both of them feel the concern because the society is passive and unwilling to act differently from rules proscribed by the state. Winston finds comfort in his alliance with Julia, Bernard in his friend Helmholtz and John the Savage.

In dystopian worlds there is no privacy, everything is public, and everybody belongs to everybody. There are no concepts of individual time or thought. It is the tendency of totalitarian rule to subordinate individual's actions and reduce them to the state proscribed level, and that is barren existence. In *1984* there is even a new language limiting person's understanding and imagination. The excessive use of technology enables the governing party to supervise its citizens. Heroes of dystopian novels try to make change in the world; however, they fail because the totalitarian rule is too powerful. Through constant surveillance and cruel punishments, the dominant minority manages to fully control people and keep the power in its hands. Although these themes appear in both *1984* and *Brave New World*, Huxley satirizes equality achieved through enforced happiness while Orwell emphasises pretensions of hierarchy.

Works cited

Bhabha, Homi K. "Doublespeak and the Minority of One." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Edited by Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase publishing, 2007. August 2010

http://books.google.hr/books?id=XNPiuSgL2kC&dq=Doublespeak+and+the+Minority+of+One,%22&source=gbs_navlinks_s

"Brainwashing and Mind Controlling in Orwell's 1984." *Essay Depot*. December 2010

<http://www.essaydepot.com/essayme/18223/index.php>

Brunsdale, Mitzi, M. "In Front of Our Noses." *Student Companion to George Orwell*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000 August 2010

<http://englishtips.org/1150835764-student-companion-to-george-orwell-student.html>

Crick, Bernard. "Nineteen Eighty-Four: context and controversy." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. ed. John Rodden. Cambridge University Press, 2007. August 2010

<http://englishtips.org/1150842347-the-companion-to-george-orwell.html>

Dawson, Doayne. *Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

"Dystopian Fiction." *Essay Depot*. January 2011

<http://www.essaydepot.com/essayme/4181/index.php>

Frodsham, John David. "The New Barbarians: Totalitarianism, Terror and the Left Intelligentsia in Orwell's 1984." *World Affairs*. Volume 147, No3. November 2010

http://www.flatheadreservation.org/images/phs/The_New_Barbarians-edited.pdf

Gessen, Keith. "Eternal vigilance." *New Statesman*. 28 May 2009. August 2010

<http://www.newstatesman.com/books/2009/06/orwell-essays-64257-spain>

Gleason A., Goldsmith, J., Nussbaum, M.A., eds. *On Ninety Eighty-Four: Orwell and Our Future*. August 2010

<http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/i7968.pdf>

“*Hard times* by Charles Dickens.” *OPPapers.com*. November 2010.

<http://www.oppapers.com/essays/Hard-Times/17678?topic>

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Vintage Books. 2004

Lerner, Laurence. “Totalitarianism: A New Story? An Old Story?” *Bloom’s Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell’s 1984*. ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase publishing. 2007. September 2010

http://books.google.hr/books?id=XNPiuSgL2kC&dq=Doublespeak+and+the+Minority+of+One,%22&source=gbs_navlinks_s

Mumford, Lewis. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: Boni and Liveright.

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/utopia/sou/sou00.htm>

Orwell, George. *1984*. London: Penguin Books. 2008

Ravis, Beth. “The Making of the World.” 31 May 2010. November 2010

<http://leaguewriters.blogspot.com/2010/05/making-of-world.html>

Rothstein, E., Muschamp, H., Marty, M. Utopijske vizije. *Neostvarive, no vrijedne razmatranja. Ironijsko poimanje utopija*. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk. 2004

Sexton, James. “Dickens’s Hard Times and Dystopia.” 11 September 2010

<http://www.victorianweb.org/authors/dickens/hardtimes/sexton1.html>

Taylor, DJ. “Defeat into Victory”. *New Statesman*. 1 June 2009. August 2010

<http://www.newstatesman.com/books/2009/06/orwell-novels-himself-nineteen>

Utell, Janine. “Why We (Still) Read Orwell.” *College Literature*. Fall 2006. August 2010

[http://georgeorwell.t35.com/articles/3/Why%20We%20\(Still\)%20Read%20Orwell.pdf](http://georgeorwell.t35.com/articles/3/Why%20We%20(Still)%20Read%20Orwell.pdf)

Wanner, Adrian. "The Underground Man as Big Brother: Dostoevsky's and Orwell's Anti-Utopia." *Utopian Studies*. Vol 8. , 1997. August 2010.

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_7051/is_n1_v8/ai_n28700104/

Williams, Raymond. "Afterword: Ninety eighty-four in 1984." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Infobase publishing. 2007. September 2010

http://books.google.hr/books?id=XNPiuSgL2kC&dq=Doublespeak+and+the+Minority+of+One,%22&source=gbs_navlinks_s