

The Question of Intimacy in the novels "Brave New World" by Aldous Huxley and "1984" by George Orwell

Mišić, Tomislav

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2016

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:352071>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-20**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet Osijek
Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti (prevoditeljski smjer) i
filozofije

Tomislav Mišić

**Politika intime u romanima *Vrli novi svijet* Aldousa Huxleya i
1984 Georgea Orwella**

Diplomski rad

doc. dr. sc. Ljubica Matek

Osijek, 2016.

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet Osijek
Odsjek za Engleski jezik i književnost
Diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti (prevoditeljski smjer) i
filozofije

Tomislav Mišić

**Politika intime u romanima *Vrli novi svijet* Aldousa Huxleya i
1984 Georgea Orwella**

Diplomski rad

Humanističke znanosti, filologija, teorija i povijest književnosti

doc. dr. sc. Ljubica Matek

Osijek, 2016.

University of J.J. Strossmayer in Osijek
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
MA Programme in English language and literature (Translation Studies) and
Philosophy

Tomislav Mišić

**The Question of Intimacy in the novels *Brave New World* by
Aldous Huxley and *1984* by George Orwell**

Master's Thesis

Ljubica Matek, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2016

University of J.J. Strossmayer in Osijek
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English language and literature
MA Programme in English language and literature (Translation Studies) and
Philosophy

Tomislav Mišić

**The Question of Intimacy in the novels *Brave New World* by
Aldous Huxley and *1984* by George Orwell**

Master's Thesis

Humanities, Philology, Literary Theory and History

Ljubica Matek, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2016

Abstract

George Orwell's *1984* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* have set the standard for contemporary literary dystopia thanks to their haunting representation of the bleak human future. They both depict and represent the degradation of human race to mere state-controlled slaves whose only purpose is to blindly obey the ruling regime and not to question authority. Both *1984* and *Brave New World* are considered to be prophetic pieces of literary work since almost everything described in those books became true in modern world. *1984*'s depiction of oppressive totalitarian government came to life in totalitarian regimes of the latter half of the twentieth century, especially in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Communist Russia, while *Brave New World*'s depiction of excessive carnal enjoyment and economy based state, where everything revolves around money and material possession, came to life with the rise of capitalism and the worship of money. This paper deals with literary dystopia and the traits of totalitarian regimes as represented in the two novels. It focuses specifically on the issue of intimacy and the government's abuse of it in order to achieve total control.

Keywords: George Orwell, *1984*, Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, dystopia, totalitarian regimes, intimacy

Table of Contents

Introduction	
1. Dystopia.....	4
1.1 Dystopia in literature.....	6
2. Totalitarian regimes.....	8
2.1 Intimacy and totalitarian regimes.....	10
3. The Politics of Intimacy in George Orwell's <i>1984</i>	11
3.1 Winston and Julia.....	13
3.2 The way and means of control.....	18
3.3 The Party and the Proles.....	23
4. The Politics of Intimacy in Aldous Huxley's <i>Brave New world</i>	25
4.1 Science, system and reproduction.....	28
4.2 Psychological struggles.....	34
Conclusion.....	38
Works cited.....	40

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to show how intimacy is used and abused by totalitarian regimes in dystopian worlds of Orwell's *1984* and Huxley's *Brave New World* to achieve complete control – material and psychological – over the population's behaviour and thoughts. The first chapter will define dystopia as a literary genre and as a political term which is being used more and more these days. After that the focus will shift on several historical totalitarian regimes seeing as they closely represent dystopian living conditions in real life. Later on, the paper discusses how intimacy and relationships between people are used and abused for the purposes of the ruling regimes in *1984* and *Brave New World*.

1. Dystopia

Dystopia is a community or society that is undesirable, unacceptable or frightening in some very important way. The name stems from Greek words “δυσ“ meaning “bad” or “hard” and “τόπος” which means “place”. Dystopia is sometimes also called “cacotopia” or “anti-utopia”. It is the antonym of “utopia”, a word coined by Thomas More in his 1516 *Utopia*, denoting an imaginary place or society which is better than the existing one. The word “dystopia” was used for the first time in 1868 by John Stuart Mill in one of his Parliamentary Speeches (“Adjourned Debate”). He used it to describe an inhuman way of life in relation to the state of Ireland. Jeremy Bentham is the one who coined the term “cacotopia” in his book *Plan of Parliamentary Reform: In the Form of a Catechism* (cxcii). There it denotes a life in the future where life conditions are very poor, almost abysmal, all due to some oppressive political regime, ideology or party, wars, or for some other reasons. Dystopia is often represented as dehumanised, ruled by a totalitarian government, or is hit by an environmental disaster or some other cataclysmic event which causes a general and sharp decline in human life and society. Dystopia is often used in literature and film as a means to criticise current events, political systems or certain norms in the society and can be interpreted as a warning sign for the future.

Dystopian society is marked by the use of propaganda to control everyone and to hold or sway public opinion; information, free thinking and independence are either forbidden or very limited by the ruling government; there is always a charismatic figurehead who represents the ruling regime, fictive or real one, who is worshipped by everyone; people who live in a dystopian society are in a constant state of fear either from an external enemy or from their own government; individualism is “prohibited” and people who show signs of individualism are considered to be a potential threat to the public and, especially, to the government.

There is an undergoing debate on whether the human race is slowly going towards a dystopia or utopia, but recent events show more and more clearly that dystopia, as described by Adams, seems to be not only the humanity's future, but our present as well:

In a dystopian story, society itself is typically the antagonist; it is society that is actively working against the protagonist's aims and desires. This oppression frequently is enacted by a totalitarian or authoritarian government, resulting in the loss of civil liberties and untenable living conditions, caused by any number of circumstances, such as world overpopulation, laws controlling a person's sexual or reproductive freedom, and living under constant surveillance. (Adams)

1.1 Dystopia in literature

Dystopia is a literary genre which represents a negative view of the society and future of mankind. In rare cases it can relate to present. Typically, it builds on the current situation in the society and in the world, and uses it to predict a grim future for mankind. Dystopian genre is primarily considered to be a child of the twentieth century, but its roots can be traced back to More's *Utopia* (1516) and the nineteenth century authors such as H.G. Wells (*When the Sleeper Awakes*) and Jules Verne (*The Begum's Fortune*). The primary reason why dystopian literature flourished in the twentieth century is the emergence of fascistic totalitarian regimes such as Fascism in Italy, Communism in Russia, Militarism in Japan, and National Socialism in Germany (Arendt 311). Some of the most famous pieces of dystopian literature are Anthony Burgess' *A Clockwork Orange*, Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, George Orwell's *1984* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. In these novels, the main protagonist feels something is wrong with the society and starts questioning its norms and values. The main protagonist starts questioning the existing system and through his or her thoughts and actions the reader is warned and can recognize all of the negative aspects of the dystopian society.

Dystopia in literature utilises the same narrative devices as utopian literature does. One of the primary devices is the principle of euchronia which primary refers to hypothetical or fictional time-period in the current world (alternate history), but is often set in the future. Writers use euchronia to show potential risks and traps in humanity's future, and also to show how things can go wrong. However, a glimmer of hope should always exist in order to change potential negative outcome. If there is no hope in better tomorrow or the possibility to change for the better the human kind is already living in dystopia, we are just not aware of it yet.

People inhabiting literary dystopian societies are under constant surveillance not only by police but also by their closest friends and family who are incited to betray them. In advanced dystopian societies science is not used to improve and enhance human life, but rather to put it

under a great deal of scrutiny, to control and enslave people, and for the selfish purposes of the chosen few. One of the important traits of dystopian societies is that all people are divided into classes and/or casts. People who are members of the upper classes enjoy a lot of privileges (such as, for example, to be able to turn off telescreen in Orwell's *1984*) and their life is easier, whereas people who are lower on the social scale are downtrodden and can barely make a living.

There are several basic categories which describe how society or the ruling regime controls its population: via corporate control where one or more corporations or conglomerates run and control society through advertising, media, or certain products; via bureaucratic control where there is endless bureaucracy, where government officials are incompetent to do their job, and through relentless regulations which serve to constrict people as much as possible; via technological control where everyone is controlled by scientific means, computers or robots; and via philosophical or religious control where everyone is controlled by some ideology which is prevalent and is enforced by any means necessary (Mišić 6).

2. Totalitarian regimes

A totalitarian regime, or totalitarianism, is a political system (or a form of government) where all power and resources are concentrated in the hands of the prevailing party or organisation. In this system, the state is the beginning and end of things and only through state can people fully realise themselves. The state decides what is wrong and what is not, and it has the power to interpret history. All individuals and groups are subjected to the state and its power. Usually all the power is concentrated in the hands of a single person who is charismatic and who represents a certain elaborate and complicated ideology. In totalitarianism, the self-proclaimed “elite” wants to rule over the “headless mass” via repressive police power and sometimes even with the help of military: “Totalitarian movements are possible wherever there are masses who for one reason or another have acquired the appetite for political organization” (Arendt 311). Some of the most notable totalitarian regimes – enabled thanks to the people’s appetite for political organization – are the Fascist regime in Italy under the leadership of Benito Mussolini, the Nazi regime in Germany under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, and the Communist regime, sometimes also known as “Stalinism”, in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Josef Stalin.

The term “totalitarianism” as a concept of total political power of the state was first used by Giovanni Amendola in 1923 which then served as a description of a totalitarian regime. Soon after, the term becomes widely accepted. Benito Mussolini himself used the term in his speech dated 22 June 1925 referring to “feroce volonta totalitaria”, meaning “fierce totalitarian readiness” (Kamenka). Shortly after, the Nazi party adopted the term, but with a slight change. Namely, Hitler preferred to use the term “autoritär”, “probably so that he wouldn’t seem to imitate Mussolini”¹ (Macan 36). The terms “totalitarian” and “totalitarianism” entered the

¹ My translation. The Croatian original is: “valjda zato da mu ne bi predbacili kako imitira Mussolinija” (Macan 36).

Oxford dictionary in 1928, and the usage of those terms increased especially after the Second World War.

In recent history, there are two types of totalitarian regimes: right-oriented totalitarian regimes and left-oriented totalitarian regimes. Fascism, Nazism, and Japanese militarism are classic examples of right-oriented totalitarian regimes. They usually emerge in industrialised countries which are going through an economic crisis, in which there are ongoing social conflicts, and which do not have a history of democratic tradition. Some of the prime examples of left-oriented totalitarian regimes are USSR, Yugoslavia, China, Cuba, and North Korea. They are communist regimes who mostly rely on the poor working class, in contrast to the right-oriented regimes who rely on the middle-class and industrials, and are in the middle of industrialisation and modernisation. Declaratively they are striving for social equality, but it often turns out that some are “more equal than others” (Orwell, *Animal Farm* 52).

The main goal of every totalitarian movement is the total domination over everyone. Extremely, the domination must extend not just over every citizen in the country, but over everyone in the world. In addition, the official ideology is above law, religion and individuals; the state has complete gun-control in order to prevent any kind of revolution; and terror is the preferred way to keep everyone under control (“Stalin’s totalitarianism policies”). In the end, totalitarianism can be described as “the most reactionary form of bourgeois dictatorship in the period of imperialism, which is characterised by unprecedented racial, national and ideological hate, the most ruthless exploitation of the working class, enslaving other people and continuous provocation of new wars”² (Filipović 336).

² My translation. The Croatian original is: “... je najreakcionarniji oblik buržujске diktature razdoblja imperijalizma, odlikuje se neusporedivom rasnom, nacionalnom i ideološkom mržnjom, najbezobzirnijom eksploatacijom radničke klase, porobljavanjem tuđih naroda i neprekidnim izazivanjem novih ratova” (Filipović 336).

2.1 Intimacy and the totalitarian regime

Oxford's dictionary defines intimacy as close familiarity or friendship, a cosy and private or relaxed atmosphere, or sexual intercourse. In a totalitarian regime intimacy is either non-existent or it is, paradoxically, made public, because the state, or the ruling party declares that the state is people and people are state. By that act the intimacy is transferred and taken away from inter-personal relations to the relation with the state. People are absorbed into the state and they can fulfil their potential and actualize themselves only through the interaction with the state.

Intimacy is, for totalitarian regimes, absolutely unacceptable. Totalitarian regimes strive to put all aspects of human life, including intimacy, under the rule of the governing party and to subordinate it to the state. They want to equalize human's private and social life with the state thus eliminating any potential threat that can come from within the state and by that act the totalitarian regime takes full control of human life. The ruling regime wants to impose single mindedness because only then can it function properly and achieve its goals. If people pursue their own personal agendas, if they socialise with their friends, if they trust each other, and if they are willing to make sacrifices for their loved ones, the regime cannot have total control over everyone and cannot achieve its goal of "world domination" (Arendt 193). According to Schmitz, totalitarian regimes wanted to "even destroy the will for privacy and intimacy" (xiv) which he supports by stating that in Moscow everyone had to live in apartments under the scrutiny of other people so that no secret could be kept. If a person cannot have space of his or her intimacy, he/she becomes isolated; there is no one to trust, and no one to share private thoughts or feelings. This is exactly what the ruling regime wants because then the person has to turn to the state in order to achieve self-actualization, whereby the state is able to take complete control of him/her and thus ensure total obedience and loyalty to the state.

3. The Politics of Intimacy in George Orwell's *1984*

The question of intimacy in Orwell's *1984* is a fairly complex one. The Party is against proper intimacy between its members, but it encourages procreation because its continuation depends on people. The main reason the Party is against intimacy is the fact that it entails closeness between a man and a woman. In the Party's eyes, this represents a major threat because when people are close and love each other, they cannot and will not show and feel the same love towards the Party. They have one another and are often not willing to jeopardize that for the benefit of the state, as true love for a partner would exceed a person's devotion to the totalitarian state. The Party allows procreation so that they can indoctrinate children from their early days and mould their minds in accordance with the Party's ideology, ensuring thus total obedience and eliminating the threat of an uprising. In fact, children are brought up to spy on their parents and report any "suspicious" activity. Moreover, with the advancement of the *in vitro* insemination procedure, which is alluring to the Party, the biological necessity for human contact, touch, and intimacy will be eliminated from the process of procreation. That means that the Party will be able to successfully create new followers without the risk of bringing people together and creating a semblance of intimacy or family – things the Party wants to destroy. People will not be able to create emotional bonds, everyone will be isolated and the Party will have full control over them.

The characters in *1984* have no friends: "you were supposed to call everyone comrade" (Orwell 20) because labels such as these affect the people's perception of one another. No one refers to another person as friend or lover, and proper intimacy and closeness are excluded both from language and life. Even when people gather, it is always as a part of a committee or for group hikes which have the purpose of showing that one is a loyal party member who wholeheartedly supports Big Brother, the Party and Oceania.

Winston had a wife, Katherine, but there was no love, passion or true intimacy between them. They would make love to each other, but it was joyless. They would do it just for the sake of procreation and, as Katherine would say it: “our duty to the Party” (Orwell 87). She turned an act of intimacy and expression of love into pure physical act which had to be carried out once a week. This speaks volumes about the Party’s influence over people and the power of its indoctrination. Katherine left Winston after it became clear that they are not going to be able to produce a child. Interestingly, although the Party does not allow people to get divorce, they encourage people to separate if they are not able to produce a child or do not want to stay together anymore, thus only further underlining both the procreational function of “intimacy” and the irrelevance of potential feelings for the partner/spouse.

3.1 Winston and Julia

When Winston first met Julia he thought that she is a spy looking for any sign of illegal activity and/or thoughtcrime. He notices that she is constantly glancing at him and that somehow she is always there wherever he is, both in Minirec, where they both work, but also in the prole quarters, which made him become increasingly paranoid. He thought that she was either an agent of the Thought Police or just an amateur spy who wanted to turn him in. This clearly shows the mind-set of people living under constant surveillance and the sense that no one is safe in totalitarian society. Even small and random encounters and glances increase one's paranoia and make one fear for his life. There is no privacy or security since anyone you meet can be the Party's spy or a member of the Thought Police. It is impossible to lead a simple conversation with someone without being scrutinised. This makes one feel isolated and the only refuge a person has is the Party, which is the end goal of all totalitarian systems. At one point, Winston even entertains the thought of killing her, smashing her head in, just so that she would not tell on him: "He could keep on her track till they were in some quiet place, and then smash her skull in with a cobblestone. The piece of glass in his pocket would be heavy enough for the job" (Orwell 101), which only goes to show just how great his frustration and how overwhelming the feeling of fear is.

The turning point, not just in the relationship between Winston and Julia, but in the novel as well, is their meeting in the hallway of Minirec. Julia faked a fall so that she could slip a little note into Winston's hand. To his great astonishment, the note said: "I love you" (Orwell 108). He was sure that she hated him and wanted to report him to the Thought Police, so the note took him completely by surprise. Since the Party does not allow its members to have any relationship, even the most frivolous act, such as talking to each other, is always under a great deal of scrutiny which makes the arranging of place and time to meet really difficult, as they cannot be seen conversing or even looking one another in the eye: "In the same instant it

occurred to him that he did not know what colour the girl's eyes were. They were probably brown, but people with dark hair sometimes had blue eyes. To turn his head and look at her would have been inconceivable folly” (Orwell 117). This testifies as to the Party’s success in its plan to subjugate not just people’s bodies and material life, but also their private and emotional life. People are afraid to show any sign of emotion or affection to each other because it means that they will end up either at the forced labour camp or that they will get horribly tortured and then shot, because the only love allowed in Oceania is the one towards the Big Brother.

The first meeting between Winston and Julia takes place in the countryside. There they make love for the first time and Winston feels exhilarated. At first he is nervous because he thinks he is unattractive and old, but she calmly reassures him, and after some talk they start to make love. During their conversation she tells Winston that she hates the Party and that she adores having sex, which, in addition to being physically pleasant, represents a deliberately subversive activity. She confesses to him that she has sex on a regular basis with Lower Party members:

“Have you done this before?”

“Of course. Hundreds of times – well, scores of times, anyway.”

“With Party members?”

“Yes, always with Party members.”

“With the members of the Inner Party?”

“Not with those swine, no. But there’s plenty that *would* if they got half a chance.

They’re not so holy as they make out.” (Orwell 125)

This shows that although the Party is trying to extinguish any spark of individualism and intimacy, it still does not have total control over minds of their members, and it is in the mind that freedom ultimately resides. This also speaks volumes about how much of a tight grip the

Party has over its population. Not only are friends, lovers, and couples prevented from meeting in public places like pubs and talking freely, but they also cannot even meet in the privacy of one's apartment. What was once a sanctuary of intimacy has now been turned into one of the most dangerous places because TV screens are always watching and controlling everything anyone does in the privacy of their own home.

Winston and Julia continue their affair at Mr. Charrington's. In addition to being lovers, the two of them are subverting the order by consuming food reserved for the upper classes: chocolate, butter, real bread, and coffee, neither of the low-quality Victory brand which is meant for the general population and members of the Outer Party. Thanks to their forbidden happiness, Winston's health improves; he puts on some weight and his varicose ulcer gets better. His only regret is that they will never be able to have children, get married, or just simply walk down the street while holding hands because their relationship will have to remain secret: "Out of their bodies no child would ever come. That was the one thing they could never do" (Orwell 219). Paradoxically, their greatest infraction is that they truly love another, which is seen as the ultimate act of insubordination. They do not just have sex, they make love. Unlike the previous men with whom she has had affairs, Julia deeply cares about Winston and is not prepared or willing to let him go because she feels love. While the Party tolerates some infractions, love is truly forbidden and does not go unpunished. Love represents true threat to the Party and that is why they are so eager to repress any emotions which arise between people. If people start caring for each other and love one another then that means that they are not one hundred per cent loyal and obedient to the Party and will turn their focus to their loved ones instead to the Party. Thus, the most important punishment is separation as the performative act of subordination to the party. Once their relationship proves to be too serious, the Thought Police decides to end it; they surround the room at Mr. Charrington's and bust in. But, Julia is not prepared to do it: "You are prepared, the two of you, to separate and never see one another again?" – 'No!' broke

in Julia” (Orwell 173). Moreover, their arrest is preceded by their mutual realization that they are “the dead”: “‘We are the dead,’ he said. – ‘We are the dead,’ echoed Julia dutifully. – ‘You are the dead,’ said an iron voice behind them” (221). The symbolism behind the phrase refers to the fact that whoever is captured by the Thought Police becomes an “unperson”. They are brought to Miniluv – Ministry of Love, tortured, and often killed in the end. The name of the ministry which enforces loyalty to Big Brother and keeps everyone in Oceania under control has nothing to do with love and only further emphasizes the irony which arises from the discrepancy between the regime’s attitude to the implied meaning of (or the signified) “love” and its (ab)use of the signifier “love”.

In Miniluv, Winston and Julia are subjected to extreme torture and are only released after they have been finally “cured”. O’Brien uses the term “cured” meaning that they no longer have false beliefs and that they truly and deeply love only the mythical Big Brother. Defeated in his struggle to keep his common sense and integrity, Winston finally accepts that two plus two make five, and proclaims his love for Big Brother: “But it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother” (Orwell 298).

The main conclusion we can draw from Winston and Julia’s relationship is that love does not stand a chance in a totalitarian system. One can argue that love exists in totalitarian systems, such as love for the leader or the party, but that is not true, intimate love. The prime example is Winston’s “love” of Big Brother at the end of the book. It is not natural love, it is a love forced through relentless torture and mind manipulation. Moreover, the dedication of all other people to Big Brother and his regime is a product of mass propaganda, brain-washing and force. If one does not love Big Brother, one dies and vanishes both from history and memory. What is more absurd is that not even the dedication to Big Brother can save you from the regime’s violence, as shown on the example of Syme. Winston describes Syme as “venomously

orthodox” (49). Although Syme fervently supports the Party, his biggest problem and mistake is that he speaks too openly about things and is too intelligent for his own good, which are not desirable traits in the eyes of the Party, so he is subjected to torture and becomes an “unperson” very soon:

Syme had vanished. A morning came, and he was missing from work: a few thoughtless people commented on his absence. On the next day nobody mentioned him. On the third day Winston went into the vestibule of the Records Department to look at the notice-board. One of the notices carried a printed list of the members of the Chess Committee, of whom Syme had been one. It looked almost exactly as it had looked before--nothing had been crossed out--but it was one name shorter. It was enough. Syme had ceased to exist: he had never existed. (Orwell 147)

Intimate love, the love between Winston and Julia, is doomed to fail from the start because the Party, as the novel suggests, always finds out about it, and puts an end to it. Love does not stand a chance, nor is there any hope of one in totalitarian systems. Posner sums it up the best: “any kind of intimacy is a potential threat to a totalitarian society, which seeks to mobilize the population for selfless communal projects” (20).

3.2 The ways and means of control

The Party, the ruling regime in Oceania, always wants and strives to control everything, including personal relationships between its members. Its main focus are members of the Outer Party while members of the Inner Party have more freedom. It is conjectured that members of the Inner Party have more freedom than the members of the Outer Party because they are true believers in the system, hold important places in the upper echelons in the Party, and because they have proved their worth. The prime example would be O'Brien who admits that they have gotten to him a long time ago, possibly indicating that he maybe had some thoughts against the Party, like Winston, but now is loyal and devoted to the Party because he understands the Party's motives and goals perfectly and acts in accordance to them, but probably he is only manipulating Winston into believing him while actually setting a trap for him: "He told her of the strange intimacy that existed, or seemed to exist, between himself and O'Brien, and of the impulse he sometimes felt, simply to walk into O'Brien's presence, announce that he was the enemy of the Party, and demand his help" (152). In the end, it is O'Brien who leads the questioning and allows for both of them to be tortured.

The Party keeps control via various mechanisms such as Junior Anti-Sex League, Junior Spies, ARTSEM, constant surveillance, and so on which keep people busy, keep them together in large, monitored groups, and thus effectively kill any possibility of intimacy between them. One of the most wide-spread surveillance and media devices which the Party uses is the telescreen. Every house and apartment have one; it is constantly on, and only the members of the Inner Party are allowed to turn it off, but for no more than 15 - 30 minutes otherwise it would raise suspicion. Most of the proles do not own one and the Party does not insist on them having it. The Party can track everything one is doing in the "privacy" of their own home via telescreen. It serves both as a telescreen (television) through which the Party publishes carefully crafted, manipulative announcements regarding the economy or latest victories on any of the

fronts, and as a camera thanks to which the Party can monitor what people are doing and hear what they are saying inside their homes: “The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made, above the level of a very low whisper, would be picked up by it; moreover...he could be seen as well as heard” (Orwell 3). People are not safe even when they were outside of their homes because there were hidden microphones everywhere, even in nature (in trees, meadows and so on). The origins of total control over everyone and everything date back to the age of revolution when INGSOC came to power, and it is the first time in history that the ruling regime has the power to control everyone, even in the privacy of their own home: “With the development of television, and the technical advance which made possible to receive and transmit simultaneously on the same instrument, private life came to an end” (Orwell 205). The Party wants and aspires to have such control over its population that they arrest and punish people not for the crime they did commit, but for the one they might commit in the future. O’Brien says it out loud clearly when he was “curing” Winston from his disease, as O’Brien liked to call it. The Party could not care less about the act itself, they are only concerned with the thought, with what happens inside the head of people: “The Party is not interested in the overt act: the thought is all we care about” (Orwell 253). Its aim is to change their enemies into their worshipers, like they did it with Jonas, Rutherford, Aarons, and in the end, with Julia and Winston himself.

Sexuality is also a matter of public interest and sexual intercourse-is only tolerated when its purpose is to either make a baby or to prevent “ownlife”, an individual life which is not under control of the Party nor does it take the Party into consideration when making choices: “there was a word for it in Newspeak: *ownlife*, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity” (Orwell 82). Sometimes the Party would encourage prostitution “as an outlet for the instincts which could not be altogether suppressed” (Orwell 65), but only if it was kept secret, the party member would not enjoy it, and if the sexual act was done with a “prole” – a

member of the lowest class in Oceania, a person who is not a member of the Party. Although they are perceived as low, the proles, ironically, have more freedom than the Party members. The Party understands that sexual drive is one of the basic human needs, so the Party has found a way to turn sex into its favour by denying it its playful nature. Sex is no longer something that people enjoy or do for fun, because fun is forbidden, but instead it was turned into a mere mechanical act, a show of loyalty towards the Party. Sex is no longer a sign of affection or attachment to another human being, but a means of control.

Paradoxically, although intimacy and having friends was strongly discouraged, it was also not advisable to be alone unless one was sleeping. A good member of the Party never had enough time to be alone since they had to join community hikes, participate in the work of a committee, or spend their “free” time in community centres. Time alone fosters reflection and contemplation, both of which is undesirable since the Party “thinks” on behalf of everyone. Consequently, despite spending time in large groups of people, characters feel alone and isolated, especially Winston. He feels so desolated that even a momentary equivocal exchange of glances between O’Brien and him means a lot to him: “but even that was a memorable event, in locked loneliness in which one had to live” (Orwell 18). Winston was, at times, so lonely that he even risked being punished, either by a death sentence or by being sentenced to years in a forced labour camp, just to fulfil his carnal and emotional needs through having sex with prostitutes who were neither young nor pretty: “When I saw her in the light she was quite an old woman, fifty years old at least. But I went ahead and did it just the same” (Orwell 69). The consequence of the Party’s attempt to prevent meaningful relationships is seen in the fact that people are not looking for their soulmate or best friends anymore; they just want an outlet for one of their most primal needs, and are prepared to risk a lot just to have a semblance of intimacy through meaningless sex, let alone to have sex with someone they love or feel deep connection with. This applies to every totalitarian regime, not just the one depicted in *1984*; the party wants

total control not only when it comes to political matters, but also when it comes to private life. They want to control every person's life, isolate him/her, remould him/her by their standards, and make him/her think what they want him/her to think.

Another major method of prevention of intimacy in the Party's arsenal is artificial insemination, also called ARTSEM in Newspeak. The Party tries to minimize the desirability of and the need for sexual intercourse, so that no intimate bond between two persons can ever possibly develop. The logic behind that is simple. If people do not get attached to one another then the Party can control them more easily and turn them into mental slaves. Sex and emotions are often intertwined. If people have feelings for each other, and have sex which only deepens the emotions, the Party cannot control them as they wish and see fit because party is no longer the central focus of their lives. On the contrary, they might even start to think and act subversively because the Party's values are designed to prevent and obstruct their private happiness: "The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control...the only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party... all children were to be begotten by artificial insemination and brought up in public institutions" (Orwell 65). The Party has so much success when it comes to indoctrination, especially regarding the sexual intercourse that Katherine, Winston's wife, calls having sex "our duty to the Party" (Orwell 67). In addition, the Party only allows young women to work in Pornosec, the department of Minitrue – Ministry of Truth which produces cheap pornography for the proles, because girls are considered to be pure: "He learned with astonishment that all the workers in Pornosec, except the head of the department, were girls" (Orwell 131). Not a single member of the Party was allowed to look at the finished "product", so to say, because of fear it might corrupt them.

The final goal of the Party is to control everyone and create a world more vicious than this one. They want to eradicate all emotions except “fear, rage, triumph, and self-abasement” (Orwell 267). O’Brien boasts with their terrifying accomplishments and plans:

We have cut the links between child and parent, and between man and man, and between man and woman. No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer. But in the future there will be no wives and no friends. Children will be taken from their mothers at birth, as one takes eggs from a hen. The sex instinct will be eradicated. Procreation will be an annual formality like the renewal of a ration card. We shall abolish the orgasm. Our neurologists are at work upon it now. (Orwell 267)

The Party has numerous organisations like “Junior Anti-Sex League” or “Junior spies” where children are conditioned to spy, report and tell on any suspicious activity made by their parents. The prime example of the effectiveness of that organisation is Parsons whose daughter reported on him. She is only seven years old but she is already perfectly obedient to the Party. Terrifyingly, Parsons is proud of her for telling on him, even though there is no proof that committed a thoughtcrime; he had supposedly yelled “down with Big Brother” while he was sleeping, but there is no proof of that apart from the girl’s claim which, even more terrifyingly, is enough to have him convicted. In the end, the Party already achieves the half of what it set out to. They have convinced people that emotions do not matter, especially the ones regarding the people closest to them. The only “love” that matters is the love for the Party: “The terrible thing that the Party had done was to persuade you that mere impulses, mere feelings, were of no account, while at the same time robbing you of all power over the material world” (Orwell 164).

3.3 The Party and the Proles

Quite interestingly, the Party cares very little about the proles. They see them as an irrelevant mass of people, a lower working class tasked with the difficult and dirty work in factories, coal mines, and so on. They are not under the Party's scrutiny and the Police and Thought Police is almost non-existing in places where the proles live. They do not have telescreens in their houses; they are allowed to move freely without any permissions or checks and they are allowed to get married, have sex and even divorce freely if they want to. The Party does not impose their doctrine on them. They are even allowed to practice religion if they want to. The Party's slogan "Proles and animals are free" is rather ironic as it shows that the lowest classes are the freest: "The majority of proles did not even have telescreens in their homes. Even the civil police interfered with them very little...the sexual puritanism of the Party was not imposed on them" (Orwell 71-72). Proles are also allowed to have free time, watch football, go to pub and talk openly, something the members of the Outer Party would never be allowed to do.

Nevertheless, the Proles are still somewhat influenced by the Party. They sing songs which the Party wrote; they read books and watch movies which are made just for them by the Party's machines. The machines are used so that the members of the Party would not become "corrupted" by the stuff that is in those books (especially pornography).

The reason the Party allows the Proles to have such freedom is because they make up around 85 per cent of the Oceania's population. They need them not just to do heavy and dirty work, but also if they would rebel they could easily bring down the Party. In order to prevent any uprising the Party gives the Proles a lot of freedom to do anything they want, but they also keep them in constant state of fear against the other nations by bombing them which keeps up Proles patriotic spirit and their passion for Big Brother. Proles have the biggest power in

Oceania, but they are not aware of it and the Party keeps them busy and occupied with various things so that they may never realise that and start a revolution.

4. The Politics of Intimacy in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*

There is seemingly a stark contrast regarding the intimacy between George Orwell's *1984* and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. Whereas intimacy, in the real sense of the word, is almost eradicated in *1984* and the Party does everything in its power to control it, the approach to interpersonal relations and intimacy is vastly different in *Brave New World* where intimacy is encouraged, but purely in its carnal form. There is a strong focus on sexuality as a recreational activity, and "Everyone belongs to everyone" is a mantra which everyone is taught through hypnopaedic techniques since the early age. However, both authors seem to echo Plato who argues in Book 5 of his *Republic* that family should be abolished and everyone should belong to the state:

...the best men will lay with the best women and the worst men with the worst women.

Children of the best should be educated and children of the worst should not be educated...That should be only known to the rulers in order to preserve peace. Rulers will decide on the number of marriages to keep the same number of citizens as much as possible taking into consideration wars, diseases and all that, so that our republic is not too big or too small. (Plato 459 e)³

There are five casts in *Brave New World*, and they are marked by the colour of their clothes:

1) Alphas – they are the most intelligent people and highest social class. They only do intellectual work like teaching, working on new hypnopaedic songs, being Predestinators or, in some cases, World Controllers (there are only ten of them). Alphas wear grey colour of clothes. They also possess most imposing physique.

³ My translation. The Croatian original is: "...trebaju najbolji što češće općiti s najboljim ženama, a najgori s najgorima obrnuto, i djecu onih treba izobraziti, a ovih ne...I to sve ne smije biti poznato osim vladarima da bi se opet stado čuvara što manje bunilo. O broju brakova dat ćemo odlučivati vladarima, da je što moguće više održavaju isti broj građana, uzimajući kod toga obzir na ratove, bolesti I sve slično, tako da nam država po mogućnosti ne bude ni prevelika ni premalena" (Plato 459 e).

2) Betas – Betas are slightly less intelligent than alphas and they usually do some sort of manual work, but not one which is too menial. They wear mulberry colour of clothes.

3) Gammas – They are not very intelligent, but they are given tasks which require some level of thinking and they are usually good with people. They wear green colour of clothes.

4) Deltas – They are not intelligent. They only do single tasks which require repetition and that is their maximum. They are, unlike aforementioned three groups, mass produced. They wear khaki colour of clothes.

5) Epsilons – They cannot read or write and are often referred as semi-morons. They work only most menial jobs and are, with deltas, mass produced. They wear black colour of clothes.

Like any other totalitarian regime, the government in *Brave New World* also reorganized and changed how the previous system worked. They united all the nations, ensuring them complete control over everything, excluding a couple of reservations which were not worthy to assimilate into the existing society, and named the new state “The World State”. Unlike various other totalitarian regimes this one does not seek to create chaos, but its primary goal is stability and community. The World State motto is “Community, Identity, Stability” which reflects the goal of the government. Although its goal sounds benevolent, in order to achieve it, human freedom must be taken away. People must be indoctrinated since the earliest age, their freedom to do what they want and wish must be either restricted or taken away, and some areas of scientific activity must be stopped so that every scientist works on designated primary goal. Words like community, identity and stability sound nice in theory and invoke positive feelings, but here they are just pretext to take away freedom and to enslave people to the government’s goal.

One of the reasons why the government puts so much effort in maintaining stability is because if there is ever any sign of instability or turmoil people automatically choose their loved ones over their rulers. Human instinct, no matter how much indoctrinated the person is, is to

always protect your loved ones and focus solely on them. But if there is no war, hunger or disease like in *Brave New World* then people do as they are told and blindly obey the government

Furthermore, the government is so determined to have complete and utter control over everyone that they even created universities for emotional engineering and every caste has its own newspapers adjusted to them and their intelligence. They cater to everyone, but only to appease them and placate them, not to make them happy. If every caste is happy, then there are no reasons for revolt or instability and the government can keep total control over everyone.

4.1 Science, system and reproduction

One of the first things that catches the reader's attention in *Brave New World* is that everything regarding procreation (the conception, babies, and upbringing) is based on and revolves around science. Shockingly, no one is born in the traditional way – by a mother – anymore. Everyone is “produced” in large buildings known as hatcheries and conditioning centres. Babies are produced on a mass scale and they are being predestined into certain castes even before they are born. This process is called “Bokanovsky's Process” and implies tampering with the human eggs, which have already been fertilized in vitro. The process causes them to split and create identical genetic copies of the original egg, which is essentially cloning: “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...the principle of mass production at last applied to biology” (Huxley 5). The process is applied to Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons, in other words inferior eggs, whilst not on Alphas and Betas, the superior eggs. Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons are carefully engineered to have lower intelligence. During the process of creating an embryo, embryos are interrupted a certain number of times (the more interruptions the lower the caste); they are doused in alcohol and their oxygen supply is cut at certain intervals: “Where the Alphas and the 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. The lower the cast, the lower the oxygen” (Huxley 3).

The population is strictly controlled by the Predestinators. They are the members of the Alpha cast in charge of the “production” of embryos and they decide how large the population should be by sending the exact number of embryos to be fertilized to the directors of hatcheries and conditioning centres who then do as instructed. In hatcheries, while being decanted, embryos are automatically vaccinated against various diseases and are health conditioned to better withstand the climatic conditions they will be “born” into or to which they are predestined

to go: “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. We condition them to thrive on heat” (Huxley 12). The process of artificially making people is so advanced that the people working in hatching and conditioning centre could even recognize very early on what gender the embryo will be. The bottles containing males are marked with the letter T, whereas the bottles containing females are marked with the circle, and freemartins - women who have deliberately been made sterile and who comprise around seventy per cent of the female population – are marked with a question mark: “The others get a dose of male-sex hormones every twenty-four meters for the rest of the course. Result: they’re decanted as freemartins – structurally quite normal, but sterile. Guaranteed sterile” (Huxley 10). Nothing is left to chance and government, with the help of science, is thus able to control every part of the society and to unwillingly subjugate them to the system. Artificial procreation (cloning) has enabled the regime to dispense with parenthood and family members with which the baby could develop an emotional tie. In addition to this, due to hypnopædic sayings and indoctrination, the baby cannot develop any bond with anyone. That way, the system makes all the decisions for everyone even before they are born and is in total control of everything, although it maintains the illusion that people are free to make their own decisions.

Prior to this, the system tried to carry out the new ideology by force. There were massacres, shootings, and the destruction of historical monuments. It tried to break the ties to the past forcefully, but soon it realised that slower and scientifically driven approach is much better, so they turned away from aggression toward something completely different: “The slower but infinitely surer methods of ectogenesis, neo – Pavlovian conditioning and hypnopædia” (Huxley 43). Here, science has played integral part in creating modern day society and although it is widely considered that it brought them peace and stability, it, in fact, only brought them peaceful enslavement.

One of the most significant scientific breakthroughs was the creation of a new drug – soma. It gives ultimate pleasure without any negative side effects such as headaches or nausea: “The perfect drug...Euphoric, narcotic, pleasantly hallucinant...All the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects” (Huxley 46). In addition, taking soma does not affect (change) one’s personality; one only becomes happier and carefree which allows the government to control the population more easily, as soma suppresses all negative emotions and thus-reduces, or practically annihilates the risk of rebellion. The name could very well be symbolic since soma is a Greek word meaning body, and human relations in *Brave New World* revolve around physical (sexual) contact. Soma keeps everyone happy and enthralled, and, together with hypnopaedic sayings, it is one of the main reasons why there is stability and order.

Thanks to science and various treatments, everyone looks young and pretty, even people who are older than forty. In fact, people are mortified by those who look old. Everyone feels pretty so they act like young people, engage in frivolous activities, and do not question what is happening with and in the society. This gives the government free reigns to do whatever they want. If everyone is preoccupied with themselves, then no one is paying attention to what is going around them, so the people’s egocentrism enables the perpetuation of the system.

Since they have no parents, children are no longer raised at home in the traditional way, but are conditioned in “State Conditioning Centres”. From the earliest of age, they are conditioned to indulge in consumerism and spending of goods and people: to love shopping, to be very open about sex, to accept death as a natural part of life, and to simply throw away old or torn clothes; for example, one of the hypnopaedic sayings goes: “ending is better than mending” (Huxley 42), meaning that it is better just to buy new clothes, a new car, or household objects than to repair them. By means of electro-shocks and loud noises children are conditioned not to like flowers or nature, and not to read books.

That way children instinctively reject books, flowers, and other things marked by the government as undesirable:

Shriller and ever shriller, a siren shrieked. Alarm bells maddeningly sounded. The children started, screamed; their faces were distorted with terror...now we proceed to rub in the lesson with a mild electric shock. “Offer them flowers and the books again.” The nurses obeyed; but at the approach of the roses, at the mere sight of those gaily-coloured images...the infants shrank away in horror...They’ll grow up with what psychologists used to call an “instinctive” hatred of books and flowers. (Huxley 16)

This is done because there is no profit in watching flowers or casually strolling through the parks: “We condition masses to hate the country...but simultaneously we condition them to love all country sports. At the same time, we see to it that all country sports shall entail the use of elaborate apparatus. So that they consume manufactured articles as well as transport” (Huxley 18). Everything is driven by economy in the system’s capitalist society, which also relies on people liking what they do for living: “And that, that is the secret of happiness and virtue – liking what you’ve *got* to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny” (Huxley 12). The state’s malevolent interference is clearly visible, but unlike in *1984*, it does not seem as violent. The government’s actions are presented as a means to human happiness, not as enforcement of loyalty to an icon.

Moreover, children are encouraged to play sexual games with one another and not to be ashamed of their bodies. There is even a saying “everyone belongs to everyone”, which reduces human relationships to the physiological level and rejects the possibility of monogamy or exclusivity which would foster emotional attachment. Everything is purely carnal and nothing more is expected. In fact, any deviation such as going out with the same person (and only with him) for months is considered “unnatural” and antisocial. The expected norm is to regularly

have sex with different people, without making emotional attachments to anyone. This is, of course, quite in contrast to the old ways (the ones which predated the Nine Years' War) when monogamy was the expected norm. Although having sexual intercourse is a part of intimacy, according to the linguistic definition of the term, in *Brave New World* sexual relations are not a part of a more complex relationship in which a person has feelings towards their partner, but they are merely being practiced as a way to demonstrate and prove to others that they are "normal", and fully functioning members of the society. There is no real intimacy there.

If you are having sex with only one person that means you are selfish because you are not giving yourself to other people who want to have you and in that way you are subverting the system and working against society. The main point of previously mentioned solidarity services is to lose one self's identity and to become one with everyone, which further signifies that everything revolves around community, not around individuality "...not so completely a part of something else. Not just a cell in the social body...Everyone works for everyone else. We can't do without anyone." (Huxley 78).

Important thing to note is that everything outside of workplace is eroticised. People go to feelies – films enhanced by external stimuli (Leth 16) where there are always some sexual innuendos, saxophonists are called sexophonists, music is created artificially and is devoid of any strong emotions or sense of intimacy. Everything revolves around erotica and meaningless sex. Even solidarity services, which is just substitution for religious service of the old days is transformed into an orgy. The main point of those solidarity services is to lose one self's identity and to become one with everyone, which further signifies that everything revolves around community, not around individuality.

The driving point behind that philosophy is also economy. Instead encouraging people to stay at home and spend time with their loved ones, people are conditioned to go out and

consume goods, services and people. Spending money on all this boosts the economy marked by the slightly changed saying: “spending is better than mending”.

The conditioning is so successful that words such as “family” almost do not exist anymore, “mother” and “father” are embarrassing terms, and the word “home” either causes nausea or they do not even know what the word means: “And do you know what a “home” was? They shook their heads” (Huxley 30). The system has managed to replace family with society, creating a state similar to the one suggested in Plato’s *Republic*: “The greatest care is taken to prevent you from loving anyone too much” (Huxley 209). The goal is to prevent close familiar bonds to develop because they tend to work against the system and, as Buchanan says, “against the social solidarity which is the key to peaceful life” (77). Consequently, having family or being a parent is considered awful and it is a great embarrassment for anyone, especially for someone from the higher caste. For example, Linda’s return to London and the revelation that John is D.H.C Thomas’s son proves to be the Director’s undoing and he submits resignation on his post. The word family has become a mockery, even more so – a dirty word: “He couldn’t look more upset if I’d made a dirty joke – asked him who his mother was, or something like that” (Huxley 50).

4.2 Psychological struggles

Although the society in *Brave New World* is designed to be perfect and that everyone should be happy, upon closer inspection it becomes evident that every character is undergoing difficult psychological struggle. Although they know they are expected to be satisfied and at peace with the world, in practice this is not the case.

Bernard Marx is a rather indecisive character in its nature. He wants to do something, but he is either afraid to do it or just cannot bring himself to do it. On the one hand he is driven by noble ideas such as individuality and is defiant to the system, while on the other hand he is simply a coward. He has a tremendous complex regarding his height and stature, because he is shorter than the other Alphas, and that makes him feel isolated. In addition, he is a psychologist and understands the mechanics of how the system works, and he disapproves of the manipulating method. However, at the same time, he is very eager to fit into the system he criticises so much. He attends solidarity services, sings Orgy-Porgy and even takes soma in order to feel better, but it does not help him. He sees himself as superior to others because he likes to think for himself and spend some time alone with his thoughts but when the time comes to actually do something and stand by his words he is easily scared and does not know what to do. He acts superior to D.H.C. Thomas, but when he threatens to move him to Iceland, he falls back and loses all of his courage. He displays the same lack of courage and indecisiveness when John causes trouble at the plant. His friend Helmholtz⁴ rushes to help John, while Bernard panics helplessly and fears for his life. One can conclude that Bernard does not fight the system; he is fighting against himself and his deficiencies for which he blames others. It is clear that he has no problem against and does not criticise the system when he is popular and has every girl he wants, but when that changes, he blames it is on others, not himself. He takes out his misery

⁴ His last name is Watson, which may be a pun on Sherlock Holmes' partner because of their respective relationships and mutual perceived superiority/inferiority. Bernard thinks highly of himself and that he is better than most of the people but never has the courage to act accordingly, while Helmholtz who is supposed to be his helper, is the exact opposite of him.

on his friends: “One of the principal functions of a friend is to suffer (in a milder and symbolic form) the punishments that we should like, but are unable, to inflict upon our enemies” (Huxley 156). He wants to be happy and fit in, like everyone else, but he just does not have the courage to admit that to himself.

John (the Savage) is constantly trying to fit into the Reservation society but he keeps getting rejected on the count of his mother and the colour of his skin. When he is brought to the “civilisation” he is seen only as a toy or something to amuse oneself, not as a person. This shows that the new and “advanced” society is almost the same as the one in Reservation. In both contexts he is seen as the Other, a ridicule or an outcast. John represents humanity and human values, something which is lost in the new world. He returns to the nature and wants to be self-sufficient: “By next spring, his garden would be producing enough to make him independent of the outside world” (Huxley 218). He does not want to rely on the modern world and its commodities. He does not want to be a slave in this new world, whose whole life revolves around being happy and making others happy. He truly wants to live, to feel all the range of emotions, not just the artificially induced happiness (soma). His emotions and actions are pure because they are genuinely human, not a product of hypnopaedia, peer pressure, society, or drugs. He would rather be unhappy but be a human than happy all the time but controlled like a slave:

“All right, then,” said the Savage defiantly, “I’m claiming the right to be unhappy.”

“Not to mention the right to grow old and ugly and impotent; the right to have syphilis and cancer; the right to have too little to eat; the right to be lousy; the right to live in constant apprehension of what may happen tomorrow; the right to catch typhoid; the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind.”

There was a long silence.

“I claim them all,” said the Savage at last. (Huxley 212)

John's behaviour and wishes are the exact opposite of what any totalitarian system wants. They all want total devotion to the system or the party and single-mindedness. World State in *Brave New World* does not differ in that regard from any other totalitarian system. The only difference is that it chose to keep everyone in control by making them (seemingly) happy, not by force or violence like in *1984*. It chose pleasure as an ally, instead of fear, to achieve obedience.

Lenina, on the other hand, is a complete opposite to John. She is in most ways an epitome of that society. She reacts in perfect accord to the hypnopaedic sayings that she has been taught as a baby when she sees someone from lower caste. She quotes all that she has been taught in any appropriate situation; she is available to anyone who asks her out, and her only concern is that she is not pneumatic enough, meaning that she only worries if she performs well enough in bed. One can use her character as an excellent example of indoctrination by the ruling power. She blushes when she sees another woman breast feeding in the Reservation and quickly looks away. This shows how successful the concept of home, family, and parents is erased from the minds of every “civilised” person. She takes soma every so often in order to entertain herself and displays a lot of prejudice towards the other casts: “What a hideous colour khaki is, remarked Lenina, voicing the hypnopaedic prejudices of her caste” (Huxley 53). She is a very shallow person who only judges people by their looks. Although it may seem to be out of her character that she wants to be with Bernard, it is only because she is bored with Henry, and Bernard promised her to take her to the Savage Reservation. The only reason she likes John is because of his looks, not because of his intellect or experiences. Despite all this, she actually represents biggest hope in the novel. In the end, when John is living in the old lighthouse and the crowd gathers around him and cheers him on to whip himself, Lenina also shows up. When she sees him, she starts crying, presses both of her hands to the left side of her chest and then stretches her arms towards John. Although, at first, it may seem insignificant, it is the biggest

show of emotions in the book, not counting the people from the Reservation. Tears mean that she does truly care about John and what happens to him, and when she puts her hands on the left side of her chest it may be a sign of love since heart is located on the left side. If a woman like Lenina, who is a prime example of successful indoctrination, manages to show true emotions about someone else then it means that maybe there is hope for that world. Not all humanity is lost in the dystopian world of *Brave New World*.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper is to explore how totalitarian systems in Orwell's *1984* and in Huxley's *Brave New World* treat its citizens, with the focus on the issue of intimacy and control through the invasion of home privacy and the disruption of private relationships which include friendship, romantic relationship and love, and family. In both cases, private relationships are unacceptable as they prevent people from devoting themselves to Ford or Big Brother completely.

In both cases, emotional control is far more significant than mere physical control. Only by controlling people's emotions and mental processes can the system ensure complete control and minimise the risk of free thinking which would inevitably lead to revolutions and overthrowing of the government. Freedom and liberty are biggest threats to totalitarian systems and it is the main focus of those systems to try and limit, if not completely control, the freedom of action and the freedom of thought.

Although the Party and World State may seem to have very little in common, they, in fact, share a lot of similarities. Both totalitarian regimes desire and demand firm and total control over the population. Individuality and free thinking are kept at minimum and people are expected to blindly believe whatever the government tells them. They are preoccupied by their jobs, social duties and other mundane things so heavily that the only time when a person can be truly alone, and has time to think, is when he/she is asleep, and therefore is unable to question the government and its actions.

In both *1984* and *Brave New World* there is an iconic figurehead represented as a saviour and worshipped by people almost like a deity. In *1984* this is the immortal Big Brother, the founder and the president of the Party. He is said to have led a glorious revolution in which he liberated the people of Oceania from its former bourgeoisie oppressors and led them into a new age of prosperity. In *Brave New World* people worship Henry Ford and Sigmund Freud. Henry

Ford is celebrated because his car, Model T, started the process of mass production and Sigmund Freud is venerated because he is considered to be a revolutionary in the field of human sexuality which is very important to people in Huxley's *Brave New World*.

The main difference between *1984* and *Brave New World* is in the approach to controlling population. The Party relies on the mechanism of fear and constantly instils paranoia in the minds of people. There is always some invisible enemy lurking in the dark, waiting to tear down and destroy the great nation of Oceania. The enemy can take the shape of Emmanuel Goldstein, Eurasia or Eastasia, enemy spies, one's neighbour, or even in some cases – oneself. Nobody feels safe, so people turn to the Party for protection.

World State takes a different approach. Instead of by means of fear and prosecution, control is achieved by constantly preoccupying people with various pleasures, mostly carnal ones. It brainwashes its people by offering joy, happiness, and frivolous things as a distraction. In *Brave New World* no one has reason to complain or to bother questioning things when all that people do is have fun, including work as people like their jobs. The motto of World State is “Community, Identity, Stability”, and everything is done to ensure stability, whilst in *1984* everything is done to create instability and uncertainty so that the only option for the people is to seek protection and refuge in government.

In the end, it is obvious that dystopian novels depict a state which interferes with the various aspects of the private lives of its citizens with only one goal on its mind – total control over everyone. Free thinkers and liberty are unacceptable and inherently dangerous for every totalitarian state because they have the ability to exposes it for what it truly is – a dangerous malevolent regime dedicated to the reduction of human freedom for the benefit of the few.

Works Cited

- Adams, John J. "Introduction." *Brave New Worlds*. Ed. John J. Adams. N.p., n.d. Web. 4 July 2016.
- Arendt, Hanna. *Totalitarizam*. Zagreb: Politička kultura, 1996. Print.
- Bentham, Jeremy. *Plan of parliamentary reform: in the form of a catechism, with reasons for each article, with an introduction, shewing the necessity of radical, and the inadequacy of moderate, reform*. London: R. Hunter, 1817. Digital file.
- Buchanan, Brad. "Oedipus in Dystopia: Freud and Lawrence in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 25. 3-4 (2002): 75-89. PDF.
- Stableford, Brian. "Ecology and Dystopia" *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Cleys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. PDF
- Gregory Cleys. "The origins of dystopia" *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Ed. Gregory Cleys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. PDF
- De Vroome, Marthe. *On Constructed Enemies in Dystopian Fiction*. Utrecht: Utrecht University, 2015. PDF
- "Dystopia". Oxford Dictionary. Oxford Dictionaries, nd. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Filipović, Vladimir. "Totalitarizam". *Filozofijski rječnik*. Ed. Vladimir Filipović. 2nd ed. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, 1984. 335-36. Print.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Vintage, 2014. Print.
- "Intimacy". Oxford Dictionary. Oxford Dictionaries, nd. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Kamenka, Eugene. "Totalitarianism" *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Eds. Goodin, Robert E., Philip Petit, and Thomas Pogge 2nd ed. Vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Koenigsberg, Richard. *Psychology of Totalitarianism*. Library of Social Science. N.p., 22 Oct. 2013. Web. 6 July 2016.

- Leth, Corina. "What is the Meaning of Meaningless Sex in Dystopia?" MA Thesis. Högskolan i Gävle, 2013. PDF file.
- Macan, Ivan. "Filozofska analiza totalitarizma." *Obnovljeni život: časopis za religioznu kulturu* 51 (1996): 35-47. PDF file
- Mallory, Jeff. *Dystopia*. Gordon State College, nd. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Mill, John Stuart. "Adjourned Debate." UK Parliament. (Hansard, 12 March 1868). N.p., 1 Mar. 2011. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Mišić, Tomislav. "Knowledge, History and Art in Dystopian World of George Orwell's *1984*". BA Thesis. University of Osijek, 2013. Print.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. London: Penguin Books, 1987. Print
- . *1984*. New York: Signet Classic, 1950. Print
- Plato. *Republic*. Trans. Martin Kuzmić. Ed. Jure Zovko. 6th ed. Zagreb: Naklada Jurčić, 2009. 213-214. Print.
- Posner, Richard A. "Orwell versus Huxley." *Philosophy and Literature* 24.1 (2000): 1-33. PDF.
- Schmitz, Kenneth L. *The Texture of Being: Essays in First Philosophy*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007. 820-21. Web. 6 July 2016.
- "Stalin's totalitarianism policies". Thinkquest. Oracle Education Foundation, nd. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Trueman, Chris. "Life in USSR under Stalin." *History Learning Site*. N.p., 25 May 2015. Web. 6 July 2016.
- Wheeler, L. Kip. "Literary Terms and Definitions". *Dr. Wheeler's Website*. Carson-Newman College, nd. Web. 6 July 2016.