

## Two Ways of Imagining Dystopia: *Nineteen Eighty Four* and *Brave New World*

**Rekha Mathews**

Associate Professor, Department of English, B K College, Amalagiri, Kottayam, India

---

### Abstract

1984 and *Brave New World* may be seen as projections into the future, of the dangerous tendencies that their authors experienced, in their contemporary society. As novels, these two works can be classified as futuristic utopias, which belong to the genre of utopianism in literature. As the stories are set in the future they can be classed with the science fiction of H.G. Wells. But their purpose is satirical and didactic and the fantasy element is kept within the framework of plausibility. *Brave New World* and 1984 are relevant still because their authors have put a tight reign on their literary mode and kept their fantasies close to the experienced reality of our modern world. They have set their actions in the actual world of humans to be precise; the fantasy serves only to project an exaggerated notion of the real. The landscapes are actual in both. The scenes are laid in London of the future and the actions convey a sense of inevitability and truth.

**KEYWORDS:** Utopia, Dystopia, Totalitarianism, Depersonalisation, Dehumanisation.

---

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four* (1948) are two novels that have many things in common. Apart from the gloomy portends about the future of mankind offered, they represent the mood of pessimism and fears about the destruction of civilization itself shared by many thinkers during the first half of the century. Utopianism in literature can be traced back to Plato's *Republic*. The term came into common usage with Thomas More's *Utopia* and Bacon's *New Atlantis*. The tradition of utopianism involves the use of an imaginary ideal world usually far removed in time or space, or both, from the real world where men and women live a happy and contented life. Later writers used the utopian genre for satiric purposes.

Arthur Pollard includes the fiction of Samuel Butler, Huxley and Orwell in the class of satiric allegories. He points out that More's *Utopia*, Butler's *Erewhon*, Mori's *News from Nowhere*, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty Four* present closed worlds allegorizing contemporary reality. Huxley gives us in *Brave New World*, an early example of science fiction, a society in which human relationships have been superseded by scientific disposition.

The satirist has often laughed at the scientist. Huxley cannot be genial about it. For him our mechanical, technological civilization is full of dangers. He sees in scientific breeding and the deity of the almighty Ford, to mention but two of his horrid fantasies, the dehumanisation of man. The burden of Orwell's fear by contrast is the depersonalisation of the individual. *Nineteen Eighty Four* is a pessimistic extension of *Animal Farm*, in which every individual is all the time aware that Big Brother is watching him,

in which all are subjected to the intrusive tyranny of the two-way television set and in which each person has an inescapable role and function in society against which there can be no effective revolt. The book is a sustained and terrifying portrayal of the ultimate horror for the individual in a politically authoritarian and technologically dominated society (Pollard 28).

Alex Zwerdling calls *Nineteen Eighty Four* a “didactic fantasy”(57) an epithet, which is equally relevant in the case of *Brave New World* also. Orwell himself in a letter to the publisher described *1984* as a “novel about the future – that is, in a sense a fantasy but in the form of a naturalistic novel”(4)

Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Orwell’s *1984* and *Animal Farm* stand out among their other works in their literary form. The authors give up the naturalistic method of narration, since the method of naturalistic narration or the documentary style is ineffective. Both these forms are fundamentally rational and depended on the writer’s ability to observe and record the events and characters of the real world with accuracy. But to convey a sense of urgency and to bring to focus the irrational forces that are distorting and destroying civilization, such a mode is more suited. Orwell wrote “This business of making people conscious of what is happening outside their own small circle is one of the problems of our time and a new literary technique will have to be evolved to meet it”(270). The writers of didactic fantasies often fall prey to fanciful imagination and may be tempted to give a free play to caprice, whim and fanciful invention. Such a work would entertain the readers by its cleverness and ingenuity, but would fail in registering the author’s vision upon the reader’s mind. *Brave New World* and *1984* are relevant still because their authors have put a tight reign on their literary mode and kept their fantasies close to the experienced reality of our modern world. They have set their actions in the actual world of humans to be precise; the fantasy serves only to project an exaggerated notion of the real. The landscapes are actual in both. The scenes are laid in London of the future and the actions convey a sense of inevitability and truth.

The writer of a futuristic fantasy is obliged to ground his stay on a plausible explanation for the creation of such a world. In both *Nineteen Eighty Four* and *Brave New World* the main historical events that helped to create the world of the future and the rationale of the new social order are not directly stated but worked into the story. The exposition of the environment is done casually as the action progresses. In this aspect both the novels differ from the earlier utopias where the adventure story method is used. The tradition of Utopian fiction predicated on the possibility of a perfect existence for man is very old, as old as the story of the Garden of Eden in Genesis, at least for the Western World. It embodies both nostalgia for a legendary Golden age and hope for the way man might live in some distant future. Although *The Republic* of Plato is older, the name for this kind of fiction comes from Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia*, published in Latin, in 1516. In it a character discovers a land called Utopia, Nowhere Land. A popular work, it was translated into English in 1551, and has since served as a model for writers who share More’s purpose. Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1626) and Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726) are further examples of Utopian novels. The nineteenth century was particularly interested in the idea of Utopia, both in Literature and in social

experiment. In English literature there are books like Samuel Butler's *Erewhon*, "Nowhere" spelled back ward (1872) and William Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1891). Tennyson in "*Locksley Hall*"(1842) writes of seeing a vision of the world in which finally man learns to live at peace with himself in a "federation of the world".

Men in the nineteenth century believed in the perfectibility of mankind and in the real possibility of an ultimate utopia, a time when all men would be able to live together in a united world in a state of peace. But the events of history in the twentieth century have undermined that belief. Both cold and hot wars have followed each other in quick succession; revolutions and civil wars have clouded the orderly progress of man toward some better future. Totalitarianism has become a fact that can hardly be ignored, from Hitler's Germany to the Russia of Stalin and later Soviet leaders. The doctrine that man can be directed for purposes other than that of developing the best in his nature is of course directly opposed to the belief in man's perfectibility.

In our time has arisen what some critics call the anti-utopian novel or the dystopian novel, the kind of fiction, which shows man at the mercy of a purpose over which he has no control. Not man perfected, but man perverted - this is the way the anti utopian novel views the future. The motive for this new kind of novel may arise from the certainty that man can now destroy not only himself as an individual but all of mankind, that governments can bend people to any kind of purpose whatsoever. Usually such anti-Utopian novels are intended as a criticism of the time in which the author lives such as was the case with nineteenth century Utopian novels. It is said by some critics that there are similarities between *1984* and Zamyatin's *We*. We certainly know that Orwell was much impressed by the novel and he read it during the time when he was thinking about his own *1984*. In his essay on *We*, Orwell himself says that it bears some resemblances to Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932).

Peter Firchow says, "*Brave New World* is the fictional extension of Huxley's earlier views on the nature of American 'culture'; It is a portent of the Joy city spread over the whole world" (455). *Brave New World* was Huxley's Swiftian response to America. In a letter to G. Wilson Knight Huxley wrote: "I have been very much preoccupied with a difficult piece of work, a Swiftian novel about the future" (Smith 353). Only Orwell's novel depicts a society whose purpose is solely that of power. For this reason *1984* has caused more discussion and has made more readers uneasy than other anti-utopian novels. The anti-Utopian or the dystopian novel is a specialized branch of fiction mainly concerned with depicting a certain kind of society. The success with which the writer, makes the reader accept the reality he has created, is the only meaningful test of his ability as a writer.

Orwell plunges straight into the world of *Nineteen Eighty Four*, and the doings of his hero, a citizen of Oceania's Airstrip No. 1 (which is England of the future). In the same way Huxley dispenses with the preliminaries, but unlike Orwell he holds his main characters and main actions in reserve. Bernard Marx, like Winston Smith in *Nineteen Eighty Four* is a citizen, but not the hero of the new world. The central argument in Huxley's novel is brought out in the confrontation between John, the savage visitor from the outside and Mustapha Mond, the Resident controller for Western Europe.

Many of the ideas discussed in these works would seem outdated when we look back on them at a later time. But the dire warnings and fears expressed in them are not to be ignored so long as there is the possibility of wars and revolutions and the chances of science and technology being abused by totalitarian regimes to establish power over men. The significance of the prophetic vision of Huxley and Orwell despite their various differences becomes clear when we read them against the background of the pre-second world war era.

Huxley's dystopia started as a parody of H.G. Wells's *Men Like Gods* as he himself has admitted. To Wells the various developments in the field of science and the political philosophy of socialism, offered the possibility of a paradise on earth peopled by supermen and superwomen, where the evils of exploitation and class distinctions are eliminated and suffering of any kind is unheard of. Huxley's scientific rationalism coupled with his distrust of Marxian dreams made him sceptical about Wellsian ideas. Four years before the writing of his novel he wrote:

It is obvious that all the superior individuals of the Eugenic states will not be permitted to make full use of their powers for the good reason that no society provides openings for more than a limited number of superior people; No more than a few can govern, do scientific research practice the arts or lead their fellows. But if every individual is capable of playing the superior part, who will consent to do the dirty work and obey? (Huxley 120)

Wells had cleverly solved this problem by making the members of the super-race of the future take turns at doing the highbrow and lowbrow work. But Huxley was aware that the intellectually gifted are notorious for the ruthless way in which they cultivate their gifts. There will always be superior and inferior in any system and as Huxley noticed, in our century there was a greater tendency towards centralization of authority and absolute power. Unlimited scientific and technological progress could only serve to heighten these tendencies.

Hence in Huxley's world of 632 A.F. the world is controlled by a select group of biologically superior men under whom the world is divided into different co-existing collectives. A biologically determined class system of mass-produced humans - Alpha pluses, Betas, Gammas and Epsilons - inhabit the earth. Family relationships do not exist. Terms like father, mother, wife etc. are obscenities, since babies are hatched in hatcheries by principles of mass production. Everything from fertilization to the birth of the baby is carried out by means of machines and skilled workers. Each person's role in society is determined at birth. The process is called 'Bokanovskification'.

Throughout childhood and adolescence, the mass produced Bokanovsk groups are subjected to sleep teaching or 'hypnopædia' which psychologically conditions the individual members to be happy and instils into the individual, the "correct" thoughts and the tastes suitable to his particular caste. Happiness is sustained by a variety of imbecile distractions – feelies, scent, organs etc. Total promiscuity is the sexual code. Soma, the wonder drug, is rationed to each individual as a cure for any ill. In short all the

institutions, entertainments education and games and rituals of the brave new world are those that are calculated to create an absolutely hedonistic, dehumanized and soulless yet happy and stable society. The motto of the state is “community, identity, stability” (*BNW* 16). They have no history or memory or future. “History is all bunk” (*BNW* 65), says Mustapha Mond.

Orwell’s Utopia also aims at the same possibilities but with some difference of tone and emphasis, the political evolution than the technological. He too, like Huxley, was influenced by Wellsian Utopianism. But his models in writing *Nineteen Eighty Four* were Jack London and Eugeni Zamyatin. The theme of power as an end in itself, was suggested to him by Jack London’s *The Iron Heel* (1907). Zamyatin’s *We* written about 1923 needs to be discussed in some detail. Orwell himself pointed out that Huxley’s *Brave New World* “must be partly derived from Zamyatin’s novel and wondered why this had never been pointed out” (Deutscher 95). Zamyatin’s book was in his view “much superior and more relevant to our own situation. It dealt with the rebellion of the primitive human spirit against a rationalized, mechanized, painless world” (Deutscher 97).

However Orwell’s borrowing from Zamyatin is much more evident than in the case of Huxley. Isaac Deutscher comments, “Orwell’s work is a thoroughly English variation on Zamyatin’s theme” (Deutscher 97). The spiritual affinity between the two, apart from the literary, runs deep. Both of them were disillusioned by political revolutions and their disillusionment is distilled into their Utopias. Zamyatin’s experience with the revolution of 1917 parallels Orwell’s experience with the Spanish revolution.

Orwell’s Oceania of 1984 is often interpreted as his vision of the final evolution of the Stalinist kind of totalitarianism. But this is too limited a view. Though his earlier political satire *Animal Farm* was a point-to-point allegorisation of the Bolshevik revolution, *Nineteen Eighty Four* is a composite picture of all types of totalitarian systems without reference to ideology. The betrayal of socialist ideals by the Stalinists, the lies propagated by the Fascists, Nazis and Communists alike, the mass hysteria which captured even the intellectuals, and the experiences of life in England during the war shaped Orwell’s imagination. He set *1984* as the period to bring home the immediacy of the situation to the people.

The world inhabited by his hero Winston Smith is England--Airstrip No.1 of Oceania, one of the three states; Eurasia, Eastasia being the other two. They are constantly at war with each other and without any apparent reason. Oceania is ruled by “Big Brother” whose giant face stares at the citizens from posters and telescreens. The state is a rigid hierarchy consisting of the Inner party, the Outer party and finally the proles. The citizens are under close surveillance by the two way telescreens fitted everywhere. All wear identified uniforms and are forced to take part in the party demonstrations, the anti-sex league and the two-minutes hate-rituals. Privacy, intimate personal loyalties and even thoughts are banned. History as the record of past events is abolished by systematic alteration and rewriting to suit the current policy of the state. The possibility of a popular revolt against the system is completely stamped out. Service men who offer resistance “will be annihilated in the past as well as in the future” (*1984* 117).

The proles who are the outcasts of Oceania have no chance of a revolt since the rule of the party is forever. Orwell's work is seen as a metaphor of the irrational forces that dominated the world in the form of Nazism, Fascism and Stalinism, about which he commented. "The world is suffering from some kind of mental disease which must be diagnosed, before it is cured" (120). *Nineteen Eighty Four* serves that purpose.

The power structures of both the novels are the most highly centralized and having complete control over individual citizens. In Orwell, the mythical 'Big Brother' is God. Huxley's World Controller is the absolute dictator. In such a system freedom does not exist. It is abolished for the sake of happiness and stability of a synthetic kind in *Brave New World*. In Big brother's Oceania "Freedom is slavery" The rationale of the power structure in Huxley's novel is explained in the debate between the world controller and John, the savage, Their encounter runs parallel to the torture chamber confrontation between Winston Smith and O'Brien in *Nineteen Eighty Four*. Mustapha Mond explains to the savage "I make the laws here. I can also break them with impunity which I am afraid you can't do" (BNW 132)

Orwell's view of the future dictatorship is different in that in the novel power as explained by O'Brien is an end in itself:

The party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are different from the oligarchies of the past, in that we know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution. One makes a revolution in order to establish a dictatorship. The object of torture is torture; the object of power is power. (141)

This statement bears out Orwell's vision of the evil of absolute power. It is pointed out in this connection that he is not writing about a totalitarian system, but a post totalitarian one. All other such systems, as we have seen in our century have come to power with at least a façade of self-less motives – power to safeguard a revolution, to establish liberty or reveal supremacy, or equality.

The Controller in *Brave New World* remains in power by 'gentle means': psychological conditioning of children, sensual distractions such as erotic rituals and drugs. A hedonistic, consumerist society is kept happy at the price of their freedom. Violence is ruled out. In Orwell's World infliction of pain and suffering, humiliation, brain washing and murder are used to cow the people. As O'Brien explains to Smith... "Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing" (156).

Huxley in a letter to Orwell in 1949 after the publication of *1984* expressed his viewpoint that in the future "the ruling oligarchy will find less arduous and wasteful ways of governing and of satisfying its lust for power, and that these ways will resemble those which I described in *Brave New World* ... The lust for power can be just as completely satisfied by suggesting people into loving their servitude as by flogging and kicking into obedience" (Smith 355). He further supported his arguments in *Brave New World*

*Revisited* pointing out the fact that more than political revolution, the need for efficiency, over population, over- organization and propaganda through popular media, methods of psychological manipulation and brain washing tended to create such a world, which he believed was fast approaching. A change in the system by means of revolution is ruled out in both cases because free thought is made impossible. Science, which is the chief instrument of change is put under control. “We have our stability to think of we don’t want change. Every change is a menace to stability...every discovery in pure science is potentially subversive” (BNW 135) says the World Controller.

The Omnipotent Big Brother and the party in *1984* succeed in putting down any slight resistance by destruction of memory of human relationships and by terror. O’Brien tells Winston Smith

Already we are breaking down the habits of thought, which have survived from before the revolution. We have cut the links between child and parent and between man and man and between man and woman. No one dares to trust a wife or a child or friend any longer ... there will be no art, no literature, and no science. There will be no distinction between beauty and ugliness. There will be no curiosity, no enjoyment of the process of life. (158)

Rebellion against Big Brother is inconceivable. Against Smith’s thought of a possible revolt by the proles, O’Brien counters, “It is all nonsense. The proletarians will never revolt, not in a thousand years or a million” (158).

In both *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty Four* the basic conflict, which creates the story lies in the conflict between a free thinking individual, an outsider and the system in which he is forced to live. Huxley’s hero does not win his case. Neither does the Controller. This irresolution that we notice in the end is the result of the author’s own dilemma: the problem of a choice between the two extremes of the primitive ideal and the Utopian, which he solved, later by the shift towards the philosophy of non-attachment.

Orwell did not write another book after *1984*. He was quite certain about his position regarding ideals. Keith May points to the important difference between Orwell and Huxley here.

Orwell having no doubt that Winston Smith is right, causes his hero to be wholly broken in spirit by a wrong but all-powerful adversary. Clearly a society like *1984* has to be avoided at all costs. Huxley on the other hand presents an open case as if to say ‘here are the facts and the arguments. We must choose one or the other alternatives. (29)

What made these books important at one time was their value as prophecies; they are not to be seen as exact predictions of a gloomy future for mankind. They are to be seen as warnings to avoid such a future. The trends in the field of politics and science may not seem so threatening in the nineteen nineties as they were during the first half of the century. But the dangers foreseen by Huxley and Orwell cannot be ignored at all by those who value liberty and peace.

Since the publication of *1984* in 1949 Orwell's novel has consistently triggered heated debates about whether or not our society has become like Oceania, how accurate Orwell's predictions were and which political party's philosophies most resemble Ingsoc. The political right and the political left have both used *1984* as the basis for any number of attacks upon their counterparts. While both the right and the left have hailed this novel as exposing extreme intentions of the other political party, the fact of the matter is that Orwell was a very smart man and recognized that dictatorship is dictatorship, regardless of what political creed the government espouses. Never once in the novel do we hear mention of the party's 'uplifting the worker's struggle' or 'saving the individual rights from desecration by the Huns'. The central idea that Orwell tried to get across is the fact that Oceania can spring up from any society or Government. Orwell places the capital right in the heart of the nations that most represent freedom and individual rights, the United States and Britain.

From the historical context, Orwell looked at the savages of the World War II that had yet to be repaired, and he saw the great powers ready to do global battle again. The greatest pessimism expressed in *1984* is that war will be endless and that society will not recover its humanity. He perceived that the difference between Hitler and Stalin was negligible; a policeman looks like a policeman and the difference between that East and West could become non-existent. What makes *1984* great literature is this universal applicability. Orwell is a socialist at heart and he was a zealot for democracy in spirit. *1984* is a call for individualism and independence from a government's structural control and social organization. We must vigilantly maintain checks on unbridled power. We cannot rely on the beneficence of O' Briens of the world to keep his promise not to take us to room 101. We must trust ourselves and the paves of democracy ruled by consensus.

Orwell was amazingly accurate in some of his predictions. His perceptions about global political power shifts and emergence of permanent zones of war have proven to be all correct. He foresaw a nuclear arms build up, grossly violent movies, and the use of helicopters in warfare. On other issue, he was partly right and partly wrong. He envisioned the deification of political leaders in the West and he predicted that television would become the principal means of communication to mass audience. Truth is the important tool in the hands of the party. It is the center for controlling the populace and enforcing its desire for absolute power on the people of Oceania. The erosion of factual truth is an extremely dangerous quality in our society. Potentially our values and knowledge became undermined and we risk having a "truth" imposed upon us by an O'Brien or his party.

The bewildering and anti-human existence of a person living in a totalitarian state is likely to bring about the kind of alienation that we see in *1984*. Winston, the first and most obvious example is severely cut off from every one else in the world. He is alone and lonely. Winston's wife becomes the archetype by which Winston expresses his deep and nearly psychotic hatred for women. The party's war against love and sex has succeeded in cutting off Winston from half of human race. He has only small recollections of his father. He has terminal guilt about starving his sister to death, and he secretly feels that he killed his mother. In this context Winston's psychological and sexual life has been crippled. Julia is also alienated. This is clearly shown by her

rebellion and her lack of friends or family. Oceania teaches the individual to hate oneself. The lonely and confused person is the ideal party member for he or she is intellectually and spiritually dead. This type of person is a mindless drone that can be easily led and made to do anything.

The love that exists in *1984* expressed the moral and political issues central to understanding of the intellectual conflicts in the novel. The futility of love in a society, which is so hostile to the needs of its people, is obvious. We are assured of never being happy. The state of is opposed to any feeling that it does not control. Since emotional responses are often the foundation for thought, the state hopes that by regulating all feelings, it will control all thoughts. The goal of the party is power. If the people are unable to be happy and the state is able to continue the misery, the state is the greatest paves in the people lives. It is able to intrude itself into the most private parts of these lives and thus dominate the elemental desire and right of the individuals to associate with and love whomever they like.

Family love in *1984* is an equally hollow and empty vessel of emotional expression. The degradation of poverty, caused by the Party's power desire to enslave and insure power for the Inner party has turned the love of family into vicious fight for food, shelter, and what little affection that can be shown. Children are no more loyal than pirates. The party's power is maintained by fostering anarchy of misery and unhappiness. *1984* was meant as a warning to all of us what life can be like if we cavalierly forget what civil and human rights are and what previous privileges they are. In the character of Winston Smith, Orwell shows us the destruction of the individual who cannot adjust to on insane society.

The level of alienation that pervades a society is an indication of the lack of overall wholesomeness of life in that society. A sick or depraved society will engender far more alienation them a healthy one. Orwell shows us that life in Oceania is dreary agency. The people have been reduced to a lower level of civilization; they have become little more than urban savages. The war that is supposedly being fought with East Asia or Eurasia is mirrored by the war between individuals within the party. Love and hatred rule the world. A true totalitarian state will attempt to intrude into these areas of our lives. We must never allow our personal feelings and relationships to be subdued by others especially by a government. In order to prevent Ingsoc from intruding into our life, we must prevent government from having any interference with our personal relationships. We must hold on to our freedom to love whomever we choose to. This is the only way we can avoid the terror of *1984*.

The initial impulse for writing *Brave New World* was in the form of an amused reaction to H.G. Wells' scientific chiliasm, and a resolve to burlesque it (Dick 58). In the face of the grim memories of the recent War in which the implications of technology had been seen manifest at their worst, Wells persisted in arguing that science remained "the liberal angel, laying the ghosts of superstition, working unceasingly at the task of preparing of the heavenly city of future" (Hoffman 388). Such extravagant faith in science did not go unchallenged by the post-war generation which had become wary of "progress" and dubious collective purpose.

Dismissing Wells as irrelevant, the generation of Aldous Huxley found its representative utterance in writings, which were radically pessimistic in their premises about human nature, particularly in relation to its exploitation of social possibilities of science and technology. By taking recourse to history Huxley attempts to show that the moral discontinuity in the “new society” was the consequence of a continuous “chain of crime and madness which binds the present world to its past” (Huxley 204). Fourteen thousand aeroplanes advancing in open order, dropping anthrax bombs, killing and destroying, followed by the great economic collapse and the death of liberalism... the sequence of events recounted by Mustapha Mond reads like a summary recreation of the events of the years 1911-14 onto the Great Depression followed by the emergence of the totalitarian states (“The Nine years war” broke out in A.F.141. With the missing number 9 provided and slight rearrangement 141 would read as 1914).

The novel opens on a scene in which one basic tenet of man’s humanness is shown as scientifically superseded; he is no longer born of woman. He is conceived, grown and “deanted” in hatcheries. There is a long description of an embryo factory where the eggs are mass – produced. Subjected to different chemical processes and infants finally decanted, Huxley’s interest in elaborating upon the nonviviparous creation of human beings is to insinuate the reader into a fantastic perspective. “Decanting” is accompanied by a host of concomitant development. Motherhood is abolished, family is gone out of existence and so are the love, the passion, the tenderness, which accompanied the institution of motherhood and family. A society capable of sustaining itself by controlling birth and creation must have a technology of a very advanced order to underpin it. But as the narrative proceeds Blake’s words: “dark, satanic mills” are called to mind and the sinisterness of the “advanced” technology begins to darken the mind.

In Mustapha Mond’s axiom; there can be “No civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability” (Watt 41). The creation of Alphas, Deltas, Betas and Epsilons is also a satirical recreation of the Wellsian ideal based on the unequal distribution of intellectual gifts. At a subtle level Huxley’s classification of human types is a criticism of the Wellsian ideal of managerial elite armed with the authority to make decisions affecting the care of other’s being. Utopias are “efficiency mad” states, and hedonism is their ethos. A technological world (the kind Wells had envisioned) would thus create an imperative for its existence, which might also become its bane- the ideal would spite itself in order to remain efficient and prosperous by creating and depending on a commanding elite. The ‘utopia’ of *Brave New World* is a society of incredible skills but no vision, extraordinary technology but serving no human purpose. The divorce of technique from value is total.

## Works Cited

Deutscher, Isaac. “*We and 1984.*” *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984.* Ed.

Hynes, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Firchow, Peter E. *The Satire of Huxley in Brave New World.* London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965

Hoffman, Frederick. *The Twenties: American Writing in the Post war Decade.*

London: Penguin, 1968.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World and Brave New World Revisited* New York:

Hunter and Bros, .1960.

Orwell, George 1984 England: Penguin Books, 1954.

Orwell, George. "As I Please" *The Collected Essays and Journalism and Letters of George Orwell.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Pollard, A.W. *Satire.* London: Methuen, 1970.

Watt, Donald. *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World.* London: Macmillan, 1982.

Zwerdling, Alex. "Orwell and the techniques of Didactic Fantasy" *Twentieth Century Interpretations of 1984* ed. Hynes, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall' 1971.