



Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

Power and Submission in Two Dystopian Novels:
Huxley's *Brave New World* and Orwell's *1984*.

Marina González Barreiro

Tutor: Jesús Benito Sánchez

2017/2018

ABSTRACT

Dystopian literature has its origins in Utopias, but instead of representing somewhere paradisiacal, a pure and perfect society, dystopia refers to a “negative utopia” as reality develops in antithetical terms to those of an ideal society. Dystopian literature portrays a nightmarish vision of a futuristic world, commonly dominated by technology and a totalitarian ruling government which uses any possible means to exert an iron-handed control over its citizens. Both Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell’s *1984* (1949) are not only considered classics, but also archetypical of this genre and so viewed as two of the most important dystopian novels ever written. This thesis will analyse how both novels depict their dark futuristic vision. The study focuses on each author’s representation of the totalitarian state and the different methods of power, submission and control used by the government over population.

Keywords: Utopia, Dystopia, Huxley, Orwell, *Brave New World*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, power, control, submission.

La literatura distópica tiene como origen las utopías, pero en vez de representar un lugar paradisiaco, un sociedad perfecta y pura, la distopía se refiere a una “utopía negativa” ya que la realidad se desarrolla en términos antitéticos a aquellos de una sociedad ideal. La literatura distópica describe una vision del mundo futuro traumatizante, generalmente dominada por la tecnología y un gobierno totalitario en el pote que utiliza cualquier medio a su alcance para ejercer un control férreo sobre sus ciudadanos. Tanto *Un Mundo Feliz* de Aldous Huxley, como *1984* de George Orwell están considerados no solo clásicos sino también arquetipos de este género, y de este modo se las considera dos de las mejores novelas distópicas jamás escritas. En este trabajo se analizarán en profundidad ambas novelas para ver cómo cada autor describe su oscura vision de futuro. El trabajo se centrará en las descripciones del estado totalitario de ambos autores, y en los diferentes métodos de poder, sumisión y control que el gobierno emplea contra la sociedad.

Keywords: Utopia, Distopía, Huxley, Orwell, *Un Mundo Feliz*, *1984*, poder, control, sumisión.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	7
2. Dystopian Literature.....	9
2.1. Utopias as the Origin of Dystopias.....	9
2.2. Dystopia.....	13
2.3. Dystopia as Fiction.....	15
3. Aldous Huxley's <i>Brave New World</i>	17
3.1. <i>Brave New World</i>	17
3.2. <i>Brave New World Revisited</i>	21
4. George Orwell's <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	24
4.1. <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i>	24
4.2. Orwell's Premonitory Visions.....	28
5. <i>Brave New World</i> and <i>Nineteen Eighty-Four</i> , Comparative Analysis.....	30
5.1. Power and Control.....	30
5.2. Education.....	31
5.3. Sexuality.....	33
5.4. Technology.....	34
5.5. Truth.....	35
6. Conclusions.....	38
7. Works Cited.	

1. Introduction

Dystopian literature has its origin in utopias, the latter being understood as somewhere paradisiacal and pure where a perfect society can be developed. Thus, dystopia refers to a “negative utopia” as future reality develops in antithetical terms to those of an ideal community, representing an undesirable hypothetical society. Then, dystopian literature becomes not only a tool used by writers to criticise political, economic and social aspects of their time, but also a warning for their readers about the dangers of following particular ideologies of their time, mostly totalitarianism. This genre is mainly characterised by a nightmarish futuristic setting, highly developed technologically, where population suffers an iron-handed control, deprived from freedom, individuality and free will. The individual is sacrificed in order to enhance social stability. Three novels are considered the classics, representing the archetypes of dystopian literature: Yevgeny Zamyatin’s *We* (1924), Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell’s *Nineteenth Eighty-Four* (1949). This thesis will focus on the last two novels, although references to Yevgeny Zamyatin’s novel will be made as it influenced both Huxley and Orwell.

Acknowledging the importance of Huxley and Orwell’s novels in the dystopian genre, this thesis will analyse both novels and authors separately, and will explore the common features present in the totalitarian societies of both novels by identifying and describing the different methods the governments use to keep their power, focusing in particular on the strict manipulation and control citizens suffer. This analysis not only identifies dystopian features in these two novels but also explores how each author approaches them differently. Therefore, the aim of this dissertation is to compare the similarities and differences between these two dystopias, focusing mainly on the means of control, manipulation and oppression used by the ruling government to exert and maintain its position of power.

For that purpose, the methodology I follow in this research paper deals with the study of first, Huxley’s novel, along with its critical reception and *Brave New World Revisited* in 1958. Secondly, Orwell’s novel, also with its critical reception and Orwell’s premonitory visions of the future. Eventually, the study ends up doing a

comparative analysis of several features present in both novels, focusing mainly on the ones used as means of power and suppression by the government. I have selected these two novels because they are considered the most important ones in dystopian literature, having a great impact on future dystopias. Thus, this paper expects to prove how differently these authors address common issues and elements as each one has a personal and distinctive way to do it. Both depict a futuristic world, ruled by a totalitarian government that uses not only technology but also any possible means which can be used to oppress, control and manipulate population. Besides, both are seen as warnings. However, it is clear that both authors pay attention to different elements: while Huxley focuses on the behavioural psychology of consumerist society, Orwell fiercely depicts the true horrors of the twentieth century in a radically pessimistic tone.

2. Dystopian Literature.

2.1. Utopias as the Origin of Dystopias.

The term dystopia was first used by John Stuart Mill in a parliamentary intervention in the House of Commons in 1868. His exact words were: “It is, perhaps, too complimentary to call them Utopians, they ought rather to be called dys-topians, or caco-topians. What is commonly called Utopian is something too good to be practicable; but what they appear to favour is too bad to be practicable”. Then, the first time the term dystopia was used was already as an antonym of utopia, a term which was already present in European culture. Therefore, it can be stated that dystopia is born from its opposite, utopia.

Chronologically, utopia emerged earlier. It cannot be said that Thomas More invented utopia but what he did with his work *Utopia* (1516) was to connect the term with a paradisiacal where a pure and perfect society could be developed. As a result, Thomas More did not invent the concept of utopia but the term.

The important thing here is to highlight that literary dystopias exist because utopias do so too and they appear as a response to them. According to Estrella López Keller (1991, 11), in the twentieth century there is a downfall of utopia resulting in the denial of utopia, the disappearance of utopian creation, and the emergence of dystopia, which we will refer to later on.

Stating the basic features and characteristics of utopia, parallelisms and similarities between both terms will come up, allowing a better understanding of what dystopia implies. Both terms are opposites but at the same time, they are closely related.

The word utopia started as a neologism (the need to name something new), more precisely, a lexical neologism. However, over the centuries and after the process of deneologization, it had different meanings according to the different fields of research

and authors. Etymologically, the term utopia comes from the Greek *topós*, which means place. Although, the prefix “u-“ does not exist as such, it can be closely related to other two prefixes: “eu-“ whose meaning is “the best”, and “ou” which states denial. Therefore, utopia could imply “the best place” that “does not exist”. This is where Ernest Bloch brings into play the idea of change from a static position to a dynamic one, from something given to something possible and thus, “this place that does not exist” opens up to the prospect of “being possible and exist” (1948, 29)

Bloch defines utopia as “a methodical organ for the New, an objective aggregate state of what is coming up” (1948, 146). With this definition, Bloch suggests that utopia is something which leads to the formation of what he calls *novum*, the new, something which does not exist yet and has never existed but it is possible. Besides, if it begins as a desire grounded in reality, then it can be later developed in the future. Furthermore, Ernest Bloch believes utopia should be understood as a process whose starting point is an individual utopian impulse and its end, a collective realisation. As we have said, every utopia starts within individual. These individual concerns are the elements which boost us to dream and imagine a better future. Ernest Bloch refers to this as the utopian impulse. Indeed, these first impulses, thoughts, will evolve throughout the years as they are inherent to humankind. According to Fredric Jameson, “To see traces of the Utopian impulse everywhere, as Bloch did, is to naturalise it and to imply that it is somehow rooted in human nature” (2009, 25). That is, in our lives we always wait for something new to come. This does not mean that it must be good though.

Besides, as Jameson states, “Utopia is a good deal more than the sum of its individual texts” (2009, 16) and so this utopian impulse governs “everything future-oriented in life and culture” (2009, 16). Therefore, the individual utopian impulse is the origin of any collective utopian manifestation. Chronologically, Thomas More’s *Utopia*, published in 1516, it is considered the utopian origin. Thomas More was inspired to write *Utopia* by the letters Amerigo Vespucci, Christopher Columbus and Angelo Poliziano wrote about the discovery of new worlds and peoples. He used “this emerging of awareness of otherness to legitimise the invention of other spaces, with other people

and different forms of organisations” (Clays, 2010, 4). We can say that early modern utopias appropriate many characteristics of travel writing:

Both travel writing and early modern Utopian literature narrate the discovery of a foreign land and describe its various flora and fauna, its inhabitants, and its social, political, economic, and religious forms, which, to the eyes of a European traveller, are marvels (2010, 4).

With More, “the word utopia came into being to allude to imaginary paradisiacal places” (Vieira, 2010, 4). However, as Fatima Vieira argues, More’s idea of utopia is not only “the product of the Renaissance, [...] but it is also the result of human logic based on the discovery that the human being did not exist simply to accept his her fate, but to use reason in order to build the future” (2010,4). In short, *Utopia* presents a detailed description of a new political order and the determination of human will.

More blames human will, rather than divine will, along with ‘problems’ such as private property and money, for human afflictions and social issues. One of the main ideas in this paradisiacal city created by More is the rejection of the social order present in Europe, precisely in England, as it was the reality More knew and experimented. Therefore, if we should identify a term with More’s work, it is freedom.

Other instances of utopian tradition are found in the 17th century, classifying them as Christian utopias. The most important ones are *The City of the Sun*, by Tommaso Campanella (1602) and Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1627). Both follow More’s thought, but the essence of their new Christian republic is radically different from More’s humanistic republic.

On the one hand, Campanella defends the construction of a philosophical republic where nature is seen as an expression of God’s art and wisdom. And indeed, investigating it would benefit humankind. Thus, this utopian society is based on a natural religion (*religious naturalis*). Moreover, Tommaso Campanella regards “religion as the mightiest bond of political unity, the source of morality and ethics, and the

standard of goodness” (New World Encyclopedia, 2018) Campanella’s work has a theological intention rather than a social interest.

On the other hand, Bacon’s *New Atlantics* is “described as a scientific utopia because its ideal order, harmony and prosperity are the results of the investigations of nature” (Cowan, 2011). However, according to McKnight:

Bacon’s program for rehabilitating humanity and its relation to nature is not a secular, scientific advance through which humanity gains dominion over nature and mastery of its own destiny but rather one guided by divine Providence and achieved through pious human effort (2005).

Both works have elements of the utopian tradition, previously presented by More, but at the same time, they differ from *Utopia* and indeed from each other.

After Campanella and Bacon, the utopian tradition continues evolving during the Enlightenment (19th century) making use of “Enlightenment discourses on progress, perfectibility, reason, sociability and reform” (Pohl, 2010, 66). The idea of changing the present started to be plausible in people’s minds. However, it was not until the mid eighteenth century that a debate about the idea of progress and future times developed. As a result, utopia starts developing in political spheres giving way to what is called utopian socialism. This meant the beginning of a collective utopian conscience, which should be understood as the cooperation of various elements, from the individual utopian impulse inherent in humankind Bloch claimed, to the collective response to necessity.

Then, in the nineteenth century, “the utopian tradition continued to prosper in the guise of utopian socialism, communitarianism and the cooperative movement” (Pohl, 2010, 75). However, the turn from the nineteenth to the twentieth century brought a change in mentality and therefore, dystopia emerged and developed. This does not imply that utopias disappeared; in fact, some utopian traces can be discerned in every

dystopia. This new century gets us into the concept of dystopia, how it developed and what it implies.

2.2. Dystopia.

Etymologically, the term dystopia comes from the Greek *δυσ* (dys), which means “bad” and *τόπος* (tópos), translated as “place”. It was first used by John Stuart Mill in a parliamentary debate, indeed as an antonym of utopia. Therefore, dystopia refers to a “negative utopia” as reality develops in antithetical terms to those of an ideal society, and it represents an undesirable hypothetical society. In the words of Gregory Claeys:

Dystopia is often used interchangeably with ‘anti-utopia’ or ‘negative utopia’, by contrast to utopia or ‘eutopia’ (good place), to describe a fictional portrayal of a society in which evil or negative social and political developments have the upper hand or as a satire of utopian aspirations (2010, 107).

So if utopia is the hope to fulfil a dream, dystopia is the desolation of seeing that dream unfulfilled. Taking Andrew Ross’ words, utopianism lays on a critique of the “deficiencies of the present”, while dystopian thinking is based on a critique perceiving “deficiencies in the future” (143). There is a process moving from hope to distress, from that dream-like state to the awakening. As a result, feelings of distress and dissatisfaction appear when it is impossible to enjoy what life brings us. Experience has nothing to do with what we were dreaming of and so reality becomes extremely disappointing (Bloch, 170). Indeed, Jameson sees the awakening as being aware that political spheres never solve particular and personal issues. Regarding the political sphere, Jameson explains the awakening as an ever lasting present in which nothing changes and unhappiness always accompanies us (2009, 111). A society based on desolation and born from an utopian desire. Notwithstanding, instead of first starting as an individual impulse later evolving into something collective as Bloch claimed for utopian feeling; in dystopia, the process is the other way around: disenchantment and deception were already general, later on turning into something individual.

Even though the birth of dystopia cannot be precisely dated, it is believed that the turn of the century promoted the development of dystopias. The twentieth century brings a break of faith in the concept of progress and indeed, an awakening of the dream-like state characteristic of the Victorian period. In the early years of the 20th century, humankind was living a key historical moment: WWI had just ended, the Soviet regime was entrenching and the Nazi movement was taking its first steps. To these must be added important technological advancements with new discoveries and inventions. As a result, some writers started being aware of the negative consequences a totalitarian regime would bring to the individual's freedom, resulting in overpopulation and de-individualisation. A feeling of pessimism was widely spread which implied a breakdown of faith in progress. For all these reasons, it is hardly surprising that utopian beliefs started changing towards an alienated and absurd future, indeed a future without freedom.

This particular historical moment and the immersion in the twentieth century triggers the decline of utopia. According to Estrella López Keller (1991), this is reflected in three ways: The refusal of utopia; the disappearance of utopian creation; and the emergence of dystopia.

Regarding the first point, the twentieth century brought a critical attitude towards "happy ideals" and theories claiming for a perfect society proper of utopias. There is even a denial of the suitability of these perfect societies as there is no place for struggle, risk, danger; in essence, life. People start rejecting this static character of utopias as they reflect motionless societies. They claimed that once these societies are perfect, there is no movement or progress towards something better, they grind to a halt. As a result, it is believed that having achieved perfection, the only possible change is towards something worse.

As for the second point, the twentieth century loses the utopian spirit mainly because, from a scientific and technological point of view, utopia is within reach. This means that all this hope in scientific development and imagination are now real. It can be said science has developed faster than imagination, limiting it in some way though.

Besides, the technological society portrayed by utopia has arrived, but it seems it has not brought all that happiness once promised: the hope of a free society thanks to scientific development have been dashed by, for example, the development of destruction techniques.

Thirdly and lastly, the utopian decline is evident due to the appearance of a negative utopia. Referring to Neusüss's definition of utopia as "un sueño de orden de vida justo y verdadero" (1971, 11), in this new utopian form we will find its negative: it is not a dream, but an immediate and proximate reality. Then, this new negative utopia will not deal with a fair and true kind of life, but rather an unfair and false one. Therefore, the aim is no longer an ideal but an undesirable reality seen as possible.

2.3. Dystopia as Fiction.

Mihailescu claims that "dystopia appears not only as a critique of 'cynical' reason, but also as satire on eutopia" (25: 2). It is safe to assume that the emergence of the dystopian novel can be attributed to disillusionment with actual "utopian" schemes in the real modern world. From Thomas More's *Utopia* up to the eighteenth century, the claim that "all are equal" was widely spread and believed: classic eutopias were mainly based on models of egalitarian and well-organised worlds where ideals such as freedom and equality happily coexisted. However, the arrival of modernity defines freedom as a state of individual differentiation in a disjunctive mode, giving way to the dystopian dilemma.

As a result, authors started writing hedonistic dystopias, with works such as *We* and *Brave New World*, and sadistic dystopias, *1984* and *Fahrenheit 451*, presenting equal societies as mere illusions: "it is a well-organised hierarchy of power that holds the world together by denying individuals their 'natural' freedom" (Mihailescu, 1991, 25: 2). Contrary to what utopias were looking for, to "see the levelling of individualities as the major warranty for enduring happiness, dystopias acknowledge the demise of individual differences as a way of keeping order in power and power in order" (1991, 25: 2). In addition, dystopian fiction is characterised by the failure of the main character

when trying to fight against the established totalitarian society. This failure is reflected in how society takes the character's self and identity. Therefore, many dystopian works present stories with instances of hope, deception and decay.

From the twentieth century, there have been thousands of dystopias published but there are three considered as the archetypes of what will come later: Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, published in 1924 and believed to be the beginning of modern dystopia; Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, 1932; and finally, George Orwell's *1984*, published in 1942. We will focus on the comparative study of these two latter works, firstly analysing each one separately and then, carrying out a comparative framework.

3. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*.

3.1. *Brave New World*.

Aldous Leonard Huxley was born in Surrey, United Kingdom, in 1894. He was part of the respected Huxley family and lived up to his name: he graduated at University of Oxford with a first class honours in English literature and ended up writing nearly fifty books, from essays to novels, poetry, short stories and travel books. He was nominated seven times for the Nobel Prize in Literature although he died without receiving it. Apart from being a humanist, satirist and pacifist, he was highly recognised not only as a writer, but also as a novelist and philosopher.

Aldous Huxley remains best known for his novel *Brave New World*. *Brave New World* was published in 1932 and marked a turning point in Huxley's career: it is considered to be essentially a satirical novel, but Huxley also expressed vividly his misgivings of 20th-century political and economic trends. It mirrors the decline in the faith in progress and the fear of totalitarianisms in Europe. According to Peter E. Firchow:

Brave New World is actually, therefore, a satire not so much of the future as of the present: of the future as it is implicit in the present. Huxley resorts to future remoteness for the same reasons that other Utopian satirists had earlier resorted to geographical or past remoteness (e.g. More, Swift or Anatole France): in order to gain the necessary distance and detachment to more effectively satirise the present (1967, 12:4, 451).

Besides, in the words from the editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: “The novel presents a nightmarish vision of a future society in which psychological conditioning forms the basis for a scientifically determined and immutable caste system that, in turn, obliterates the individual and grants all control to the World State” (1998). Similarly, Clays says “the world described is one in which institutionalised eugenic engineering underpins a rigidly stratified class society, the World State, based upon breeding both

intelligent rulership and complacent subservience, and governed by a privilege group of controllers” (2010, 115). Therefore, it is a clear representation of “the subordination of humanity to the machine and to the scientific ideals as such” (Clays, 2010, 115). Woiak’s words also emphasize the same ideas:

His writing [...] reflected public anxieties about the supposedly degenerating hereditary quality of the population and how this decline would affect England’s economic and political future. For Huxley at this time in his life and in this social context, eugenics was not a nightmare prospect but rather the best hope for designing a better world if used in the right ways by the right people (2007, 29:3, 106).

All these critics’s ideas help to sustain the claim that *Brave New World* presents a satire on contemporary culture along with Huxley’s foresight of biological advances, his personal view of the role of science in society and a plan showing how society should be reformed. In broader terms, Huxley’s work made accurate predictions about economic and politics, science and technology, and arts and leisure. In Woiak’s words: “it extrapolates future applications of genetic (IVF, in vitro fertilisation, and cloning via Bokanovsky’s Process), endocrinology (Malthusian belts), behaviourism (hypnopaedia) and pharmacology (soma)” (2007, 29:3, 107). The novel describes a WorldState in the year of stability A.F. 632 (After Ford). Through government control of biological and psychological research, society lives a time of absolute stability. Offspring are no longer born through viviparous reproduction, now seen as a lascivious secret from the past, but rather they are mass-produced in the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre. By using cloning, eugenic selection and conditioning, babies are born with a “predestined” future, taking over their possibility to decide what and who they want to be in life. Once they are “decanted” from artificial wombs, they have to go through a long, indeed lifetime process of brainwashing designed by “Emotional Engineers”. Therefore, society is strictly divided into five castes: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons.

The extreme scenario depicted in the book —featuring totalitarianism, suppression of emotions, ignorance, and apathy, rampant consumerism, and vacuous entertainments such as promiscuous sex and the ‘feelies’— has most commonly been read as a cautionary tale about the dehumanising effects of technology and the growing influence of cultural trends that Huxley abhorred (Woiak, 2007, 29:3, 108).

The critical reception of Huxley’s work was mostly negative. Many critics and reviewers were not pleased with what they had been presented with and indeed, some considered everything as an “unjustified alarmism” and dismissed “the satire as a thin little joke”. “Various readers objected to its grim rendering of human nature; tone of resignation; disgusting portrayal of sex, reproduction, and child-rearing; and devastating anti-science worldview” (Nicol, 2007, 43). Besides, H.G. Wells, whom Huxley took inspiration from, especially from his 1923 *Men like Gods*, felt undoubtedly offended. Actually, Huxley himself stated he was “writing a novel about the future - on the horror of the Wellsian Utopia and a revolt against it” (2007, 43). *Men like Gods* presents “the story of a group of contemporary Englishmen accidentally transported into an alternate dimension of peaceful, passionless Utopians who are uncritically committed to scientific rationalism and self-negating collectivist state” (2007, 44). Therefore, and as the title itself suggests, the book presents “Well’s idea of the perfectible Man, achieved through communitarian ideals, technological enhancement, and an aggressive program of eugenics” (2007, 44). Huxley found this way of living and this kind of society so absurd and naively optimistic that his first idea was to write a parody, but he suddenly came up with the idea of negative Utopia; being the actual beginning of *Brave New World*. Finally, some critics agreed Huxley also borrowed from and was heavily influenced by Yevgeny Zamyatin’s *We*. The 1921 novel “depicts a technocratic OneState whose citizens are ‘numbers’ governed with absolute authority in a system where political and quantitative laws are fused” (2007, 44).

However, not everyone rejected Huxley’s dystopia. Few of the contemporaries who decoded and completely understood the novel’s messages about science were

actually scientists. Among them, Joseph Needham, a Cambridge biochemist and embryologist, wrote:

Only biologists and philosophers will really appreciate the full force of Mr. Huxley's remarkable book. For of course in the world at large, those persons, and there will be many, who do not approve his 'utopia', will say, we can't believe all this, the biology is all wrong, it couldn't happen. Unfortunately, what gives the biologist a sardonic smile as he reads it, is the fact that the biology is perfectly right (Donald Watt, 2013, 204).

Indeed, Needham claimed the novel was premonitory of how psychology and biology could condition human life and whether it is advisable to put this power in the hands of the leaders.

Huxley probably built his ideas on science and biology taking advantage of his family's scientific background: Aldous was the grandson of T. H. Huxley ("Darwin's bulldog") and his younger brother, Julian Huxley, was considered a remarkable evolutionary biologist. But not only this, he was also influenced by J. B. S. Haldane and Bertrand Russell, two important figures in the debate of technological and scientific progress. Hence, Huxley defended "the eugenic policies of encouraging higher birthrates among the 'intellectual classes' and sterilising the lower-class 'unfit', which he believed would improve the inherited mental abilities of future generations and lead to responsible citizenship" (Joanne Woiak, 2007, 29:3, 106). He believed eugenics was a revolutionary, technocratic means whose aim was to improve not only the health but also the fitness of citizens. This was an ideology widely spread among the left-leaning British intellectuals during Huxley's period. Moreover, Huxley raised a key question around this thinking: "how can scientific knowledge and technologies be used to improve human life, and in particular to create well-ordered states out of the perceived social and economic chaos of postwar Europe?". This scientific Left strongly believed "in the power of science as the means to achieve social progress" (2007, 110).

3.2. *Brave New World Revisited* (1958).

In 1958, Aldous Huxley decided to publish a sequel to his 1932 *Brave New World*; a collection of 12 essays going over the same political, social and economic concerns he dealt with in his earlier novel, considering them non-fiction rather than fiction. Therefore, *Brave New World Revisited* is not considered a satiric fable, but a “closely observed and closely reasoned appraisal of present-day trends” (S. van Dantzich, 1959, 115). Indeed, Huxley revisited these themes because he was highly surprised, and even frightened, about how fast his fantasy and predictions were becoming real. Those 30 years had proven Huxley’s limitations on several aspects, but also how accurate some of his reflections were.

One of the issues he returns to is behaviourism. In *Brave New World*, he perfectly approached mind control’s techniques such as infant conditioning and sleep teaching. However, he ‘over-looked’ subliminal teaching: our regular way of learning works through the process of repeating and practice, and this new information is stored within our minds. What subliminal teaching does is to miss this conscious practice and experience process, sending information we have not experienced directly to our minds. Huxley wishes he had included this aspect because unconscious control seems a perfect means for authoritarianism in dystopias.

Regarding the biological and reproductive issue, he claimed his prediction went too far to please literary purposes. He was proved wrong as he realised our offspring will still be viviparous. Taking his own words:

But though bottled babies are not completely out of the question, it is virtually certain that our descendants will in fact remain viviparous. Mother's Day is in no danger of being replaced by Bottle Day. My prediction was made for strictly literary purposes, and not as a reasoned forecast of future history. In this matter I knew in advance that I should be proved wrong (Huxley, 1959).

In terms of politics, Huxley acknowledges the near future appears more similar to the one described by George Orwell in *1984*. Governments and communist leaders exert complete control over the population by using fear and punishment. Therefore, “most of these states will probably be dictatorships. Inevitably so; for the increasing pressure of population upon resources will make domestic conditions more difficult and international competition more intense” (Huxley, 1959). And indeed, as the population increases “these national dictatorships will tend to become more oppressive at home, more ruthlessly competitive abroad” (Huxley, 1959).

In regards to the predictions Huxley considered he was proved right, he believed his novel perfectly portrayed what he called the “coming revolution”. According to Huxley, revolutions up to the moment he wrote his novel had been “in fields external to the individual” (1959), using ‘external’ to refer to fields such as economics, religion or political organisation, among others. Then, *Brave New World* is focused on the “coming revolution”, a revolution that “will affect men and women, not peripherally, but at the core of their organic being.” (Huxley, 1958). Huxley makes his point by saying: “The older revolutionaries sought to change the social environment in the hope [...] of changing human nature. The coming revolutionaries will make their assault directly on human nature” (Huxley, 1959).

We previously agreed Huxley missed subliminal teaching when dealing with control techniques. However, the ones he did refer to, eugenics, systematic conditioning, hypnopaedia and even propaganda, were premonitory of what would come after 1932. From recent history, Huxley refers to Hitler’s manipulation of power by means of language. Hitler had a skill to use propaganda in order to motivate people to vote for him. Furthermore, totalitarian states made use of applied psychology as well as brainwashing. Even though there were not real cases of selective breeding, infant conditioning and hypnopaedia, Huxley completely believes his predictions will come true sooner rather than later as he states:

The principles of selective breeding, infant conditioning and hypnopaedia have not yet been applied by governments is due, in the democratic countries, to the

lingering, liberal conviction that persons do not exist for the state, but that the state exists for the good of persons; and in the totalitarian countries to what may be called revolutionary conservatism - attachment to yesterday's revolution instead of the revolution of tomorrow. There is, however, no reason for complacently believing that this revolutionary conservatism will persist indefinitely (Huxley, 1959).

The last aspect which resembled reality was the consumption of *soma* in *Brave New World*. By including *soma* and its effects, Huxley was able to portray some of the habits existing in cultures which help to 'escape' from the world: the consumption of soma-like drugs and proto-pharmacological substances "when we feel in need of a lift, a release from tension, a mental vacation from unpleasant reality, of drinking alcohol or, if we happen to belong to a non-Western culture, of smoking hashish or opium, of chewing coca leaves or betel or any one of scores of intoxicants" (Huxley, 1959). In essence, *soma* and these substances serve the same purpose and are consumed to achieve the same end.

4. George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

4.1. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

George Orwell, a pseudonym of Eric Arthur Blair, was born in India in 1903 as his father was a British official in the Indian civil service. Once back in England, he won a scholarship at Eton College where Aldous Huxley was one of his masters. It was there where he started to write in college periodicals. Instead of going to the university, he followed his father's steps and travelled to Burma in 1922 as an assistant district superintendent in the Indian Imperial Police. He witnessed first-hand the Empire's rulership over the Burmese and soon felt so ashamed of his role as a colonial officer that he decided to resign from his post. This decision started shaping his character as a writer. Orwell ended up writing literary criticism, fiction, poetry and polemical journalism. His work is widely respected not only for its lucid prose, but also for its disapproval for totalitarianism, its consciousness of social injustice, and its open support to democratic socialism. Orwell remains best known for his allegorical novel *Animal Farm* (1945) and the dystopian novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949).

Nineteen Eighty-Four was published in 1949 and it is considered Orwell's greatest work. It is deemed to be the third dystopian novel par excellence, after *We* and *Brave New World*. Orwell presents it as a satirical dystopia, a warning of the hazardous consequences of Communism (Stalinism) and Fascism (Nazism) through the description of a dystopian future world controlled by totalitarian states. Thus, it is not "merely a satire of totalitarianism, but the rejection of many other aspects of modernity" (Clays, 2010,119). Indeed, Orwell himself wrote that the novel was "NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour Party (of which I am supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already partly been realised in Communism and Fascism" (1968; 4, 564).

The book is set in Oceania, Airstrip One, in 1984. The established society is a totalitarian dictatorship which uses surveillance, terror, and a repressive bureaucracy to enforce total control, power and oppression over the individual. Society is divided in

three groups, the members of the “Inner Party”, whose aim is the practise and preservation of power, the middle class known as the “Outer Party”, which suffers a constant surveillance from the “Thought Police” and finally, the rest of the population (around 85% of it) known as the “Proles” who are completely ignored and out of the state’s control and education as it was believed they were not capable of rebelling or conceiving Oceania differently than it is. The protagonist, Winston Smith, belongs to this middle class who lives subjected to a stifling control and an alienating propaganda, means to demoralise and prevent people from thinking critically. The state suppresses all rights and condemns people to little more than a miserable existence, always having in mind that if they do not demonstrate enough fidelity and respect towards the figure of the “Big Brother”, and adherence to the national cause, they will lose their lives and suffer awful harassment. Indeed, showing a fanatical fervour, hate and repulsion towards Emmanuel Goldstein, the leader of an insurgent movement planning to abolish the government, is the only way to avoid omnipresent vigilance.

Therefore, the novel is an analytic description of totalitarian regimes, particularly the Stalinist one. Furthermore, it is one of the hardest criticisms ever made of a society corrupted by politics; it condemns, with a dominant pessimistic tone, every element used by the political system: the repression and imposition of ways of thinking, the removing of factual truths, the manipulation of media, the rewriting of History and the worship of the leader. Unlike Huxley, Orwell is only interested in scientific and technological advances as a service for this political power. For all these reasons, Orwell’s dystopia is one of the most important ones hitherto and many of his ideas and notions are still prevalent, both in reality and in fiction.

The influence of Eugeni Zamyatin in Orwell’s novel is self-evident. In fact, Orwell read *We* in French as there was not a translation in English yet. After doing so, he felt the impulse to examine and write about it. In his review, he applauded the novel’s “intuitive grasp of the irrational side of totalitarianism” (Orwell, 1946). Three years later, he published *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Apart from sharing common dystopian features, both novels coincide in several elements: among some of them, we find the figures of The Big Brother and The Benefactor (leaders of the OneState), characters are

similarly shaped, and *The Thought Police* and *The Guardians* share a similar role. However, each author approaches the elements differently. Characters in *1984* are named rather than numbered: Winston Smith parallels D-503, and Julia I-330. Big Brother is almost a mythical dictator while the Benefactor is more human, indeed the protagonist has a phone conversation with him. In Orwell's apartments, people are controlled and observed through an all-seeing "tele screen", implanted in all houses, while Zamyatin's apartments are simply made of glass. Critics such as Paul Owen and Sarah Stodola agree it is obvious *We* and *1984* share plot and characters, but there are obvious reasons why *1984* became one of the most important novels ever written while *We* remained in the background:

1984 is better written; Orwell's ability to inhabit Winston's daily life and have the reader experience his horror at the oppression imposed on him as if firsthand give *1984* an immediacy that *We* sometimes lacks. And Orwell never loses sight of his own story, while there are sections of *We* in which Zamyatin meanders in his depiction of the very world he has imagined, leaving the reader puzzled (Sarah Stodola, 2015).

Regarding the critical reception of *1984*, critics soon started praising Orwell's ability to depict such horrifying and frightful vision of future. They were impressed by his "gripping prose", always capturing and taking notice of details of life under a repressive regime. Due to this, as Mark Shorer said, "no real reader can neglect this experience with impunity [...] He will be asked to read through pages of sustained physical and psychological pain that have seldom been equaled and never in such quiet, sober prose" (Bloom, 2017). Similarly, the British novelist V. S. Pritchett concluded "I do not think, I have ever read a novel more frightening and depressing; and yet, such are the originality, the suspense, the speed of writing and withering indignation that it is impossible to put the book down" (2017). This will lead the reader to be "moved by Smith's wistful attempts to remember a different kind of life from his. He will make a whole new discovery of the beauty of love between man and woman, and of the strange beauty of landscape in a totally mechanized world" (2017).

There were critics who also praised the singular moral authority of the book, among them Lionel Trilling. He claimed:

The whole effort of culture of the last hundred years has been directed toward teaching us to understand the economic motive as the irrational to death, and to seek salvation in the rational and the planned. Orwell marks a turn in thought; he asks us to consider whether the triumph of certain forces of the main, in their naked pride and excess, may not produce a state of things far worse than any have even known” (2017).

That same year, in 1949, Orwell received a letter from his teacher at Eton, Aldous Huxley. At the beginning of the letter, Huxley remarks the book’s importance as Orwell perfectly built up the philosophy of the ruling minority: “sadism”. Huxley claims Orwell carried it “to its logical conclusion by going beyond sex and denying it” (1949). But then, Huxley criticises the book, saying, “Whether in actual fact the policy of the boot-on-the-face can go on indefinitely seems doubtful. My own belief is that the ruling oligarchy will find less arduous and wasteful ways of governing and of satisfying its lust for power, and these ways will resemble those which I described in *Brave New World*” (1949). In essence, what Huxley is saying is that he believes the future that lies before us will more closely resemble the one he described in *Brave New World*.

John Atkins believes Huxley made a more accurate prediction of the future than Orwell. However, for Atkins, Huxley’s mistake “was to project his vision six hundred years into the future, thus turning it into a fairy tale” (1984, 42). About 1984, Atkins declares “there is absolutely no point in governing through pain when it is easier and less stressful to govern through pleasure” (1984, 42). Moreover, Atkins considers the novel “unrealistically pessimistic”, claiming that:

If we look at the world around us we may agree that his vision has already been realised: we are at the mercy of super-powers who play war-games with other people. But Orwell’s picture of a dreary though apparently satisfied proletariat is false. [...] The bosses, from Big Brother downwards, would use fear and

oppression to maintain their power. But this will not happen and is not happening (1984,11; 41-42).

In general, there were nearly no negative reactions or reviews to the book, with the exception of Isaac Deutscher's and Diana Trilling's criticisms. The former labelled *1984* simply as an "ideological super weapon of the Cold War" while the latter agreed she was profoundly impressed by the novel, "but she was put off by the way Orwell played upon the reader's emotions and the relentless quality of its tone" (John P. Rossi, 1981; 43, 575).

4.2. Orwell's Premonitory Visions.

After his death in 1950, Orwell was referred to as a prophet and a visionary of the future about to come; indeed giving him authority over political, moral, economic, and language concerns, having impact on many spheres of society.

One of those central concerns that Orwell highlights is the use of language as a means of control, introduced in his book as Newspeak, an element showing the high degree of control on the part of the government over population. Newspeak is the state-approved language. Orwell describes it by saying:

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought - that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc - should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words (1949).

Newspeak is initially described as an invented language whose main aim is to serve the Big Brother and the Party. It is composed of words with very limited meaning and a reduced vocabulary in order to avoid and prevent people from thinking of concepts such as rebellion and freedom. Nowadays, the term refers "to political rhetoric

that is disagreeable to the speaker, and almost never used to properly describe the kind of political speech for which it was intended” (Benjamin Secino, 2017).

In many respects, Newspeak is claimed to be one of the most rigorous and abiding visions done by Orwell. Referring again to Benjamin Secino’s words “While the overt totalitarian control seen in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has not manifested itself in the majority of modern nations, the more subtle control of thought and perception provided by the specialised twisting of language is commonplace in politics and society in general, both in the United States and around the world” (2017).

However, this subtle control and oppression is not only reduced to language, as Secino’s claimed. Nowadays every one of us is closely watched; it is done in such a subtle way that we are actually not aware to what extent though. In fact, we are satellite-observed, scrutinised by cameras, and followed by our encrypted movements via Internet. Every time we connect to the Internet or use any social network, we leave a virtual trace which can be followed by nearly anyone with basic knowledge on informatics. We are absolutely not aware of the countless consequences sharing personal information, pictures, locations and so on have. People claim that due to the rapid technological growth, we are not able to completely handle what we are facing now. As a matter of fact, we live a moment where we feel completely free but we are actually living a situation of false freedom, with narrower and more invisible limits every day. We are not able to see to what extent our lives and movements are being controlled, in ways not very dissimilar to those anticipated by Orwell. In conclusion, Orwell included several promontories visions in his novel that are the order of the day in societies nowadays. However, some claim Orwell would not be in line with this cynical interpretation of his masterpiece on these regards.

5. *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Comparative Analysis.

Brave New World and *1984* are two of the most important dystopian novels ever written, not only considered classics but also archetypical of their genre. Its authors experienced and suffered from twentieth century's large-scale wars, giving rise to feelings of disenchantment and fear of the atrocities they saw. As a consequence, each author decided to produce a forceful satire and depict a frightening vision of the future, particularly a totalitarian one. Basically, both explore the future of civilisation. Moreover, these novels are considered, as Brian Smith contends, sociopolitical warnings. However, they warn about different things. Taking Neil Postman's words, "Orwell feared those who would deprive us of information. Huxley feared those who would give us so much that we would be reduced to passivity and egoism. Orwell feared that the truth would be concealed from us. Huxley feared the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance..." (qtd. in Diken 156). This does not mean that both novels do not share common dystopian features, although each author approaches them differently. Therefore, the aim of this comparative analysis is not only to see how authors tackle these elements appearing in both novels, but also the complexity of the presented world.

5.1. Power and Control.

The major concept that is brought to mind when dealing with ideas of power and control is that of the "Panopticon." Jeremy Bentham introduced the term "Panopticon" to signify on the idea of being watched and monitored without being aware of it. It was Michel Foucault who uses the term "as an analogy for power in societies" (Keisman, 2016, 21).

This idea is linked with how *Brave New World's* population is strongly advised against solitude and spending time alone: "if our young people need distraction, they can get it at the feelies. We don't encourage them to indulge in any solitary amusements" (Huxley, 1932, 163). Solitude is discouraged because it could unleash introspection and deeper thinking. Solitary activities are even disliked, seen in how Fanny talks about Bernard, "he spends most of his time by himself—alone" (1932, 45).

The main idea behind this is that people will avoid committing dissenting acts if they are always accompanied by someone, and so what the World States are actually promoting is a permanent visibility of its population. In short, citizens are being monitored and regulated by each other without being aware of it. This is compounded by the fact that the whole society relies on maximum happiness; and so instead of using violence and the threat of death to exert control over population, the government uses positive reinforcement: “ ‘and that’, put in the Director sententiously, ‘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, 1932). Therefore, Huxley suggests suppression is more likely to cause a revolt: what Bernard wants is simply to be the ideal citizen as thinking of a revolt becomes mentally impossible due to years of conditioning, control of the past, the consumption of “soma” and so on.

On the other hand, in *1984*, this idea of the Panopticon is approached in a much more literal way. Each house and public establishment has a telescreen, except for the proles's houses as they are completely left out of society, used as both a surveillance device and television. They cannot be turned off, so people are in a continuous state of surveillance by the Thought Police. Winston reflects on this saying that “it was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in any public place or within range of a telescreen. The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself...” (Orwell, 1949, 62). This prevents citizens from even thinking and committing any act against the government. This is reinforced by the constant threat of death, the use of violence and fear by the Inner Party. However, Winston and Julia choose to revolt, or at least they try to: Winston for truth and pleasure, and Julia for pleasure. Therefore, Orwell may suggest that control through pain is less effective than control by pleasure.

5.2. Education.

Paulo Freire, an educator and philosopher, analyses in his work “The Banking Concept of Education” the traditional education system. Freire characterises it as being a passive education, robbing students of any real analysis or thought, and turning them

into mere containers where the teacher deposits his knowledge (2006, 244). The primary form of education in *Brave New World* is hypnopaedia. This way of teaching is passive and depository to such a level that its recipients are even unconscious when the process takes place. With this passive education, “students” are limited to the act of listening, they do not do any further reading, discussion or problem solving; their high-order thinking tasks are taken away. Therefore, citizens never learn how to analyse, evaluate or synthesise; they are devoid of critical thinking. Hence, the World State is interested in this form of education because it wants to prevent citizens from evaluating and analysing the situation they live in. The World State is fully aware that an active education would shatter the whole system.

In *1984*, we can also identify this passive education system in several forms. Slogans are of great importance in this concern, as citizens repeat and internalise them mindlessly: “War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength.” These three ideas are fundamental pillars to the Party’s control over the population. To these should be added certain ideas and ways of thinking imposed by the Party which citizens have to accept uncomplainingly. An example of this is double thinking: citizens are required to have “the ability to hold two completely contradictory thoughts simultaneously while believing both of them to be true” (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016). However, the main character of the novel, Winston, is unable to perform it. There is a clear example at the end of the novel where Winston was being interrogated by O’Brien. O’Brien shows him four fingers and asks Winston how many he sees. Obviously, Winston answers four, to which O’Brien responds, “And if the party says that it is not four but five—then how many am I holding?” (Orwell, 1949, 249). As a result, this is another form of passive education: citizens are presented with information which they are supposed to accept and absorb brainlessly, turning the process of learning into a mere “passive acceptance of information” (Molly Keisman, 2016, 28). Therefore, O’Brien is in a position of power in contrast to Winston. O’Brien is the one implanting in him the information he considers Winston needs to know.

5.3. Sexuality.

In *Brave New World*, there are two different ways of dealing with sex. First, we have the people belonging to the World State, in whom the World State has completely conditioned and controlled their idea of sex, to the point of building their sexual and reproductive habits. Exclusive relationships have been abolished by the promotion of a widely known slogan 'Everybody belongs to everybody'. Besides, two intrinsically-linked elements have been completely separated: sexual intercourse and reproduction. Indeed, fertile women are obliged to wear what is known as 'Malthusian belts' and to use birth control methods to prevent having children. Therefore, the World State is not only promoting promiscuity, but also it is destroying the family unit as well as turning sex into a meaningless and mindless act without any affection between the individuals.

In *1984*, sexuality is treated in a radically different way. Sexual activity is not only discouraged and deprived of pleasure, but even repressed by the government of Oceania. The government believes sexual desire and affective relations challenge one's loyalty to the Party. Therefore, the government promotes the notion that the only purpose of sex is procreation and they use it as a means to ensure the Party's future. Then, once the children are old enough, they are taught and trained to even control and spy their own parents, breaking any familial, parent-child relationship. For all these reasons, Winston sees sex as a political act, a rebellion against the Party's influence and control, an idea clearly seen and represented in this quotation:

In the old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl's body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act (Orwell, 1949, 145).

However, due to his affair with Julia he is captured by the Inner Party and eventually, he ends up embracing the Big Brother with love, something he would have never imagined.

5.4. Technology.

Technologically speaking, *Brave New World*, and indeed Huxley, gives much importance to sciences affecting human beings, the human individual. Thus, he focuses his ideas of technological progress on physiology, chemistry, biology and psychology, mainly eugenics. The traditional way of breeding has been replaced by a replica of Henry Ford's production line: babies are born through in vitro fertilisation, in mass production, having their whole existence determined from the very beginning. But not only that, a complex system of social determination, hypnopedia and the use of soma to prevent any conscious thought contribute to the idea that the technological progressions presented in *Brave New World* only lead to and cause the degradation of the individual as well as the eradication of his feelings and thoughts within the community. This is represented by the World State's slogan, "Community, Identity, and Stability". What these three terms depict is that World State's society can only ensure stability and solidarity by removing its citizen's personal peculiarities and characteristics, trying to make everybody identical. Basically, the established system goes against individual freedom.

Otherwise, *1984* uses technological advancement as a means to remove any instance of personal privacy from the individual as well as to eliminate any possibility of individual action or thought. Similarly to the World State, the government uses technology for its own sake. The Party uses it as a method of control by the use of telescreens, keeping constant watch over the citizens. Even when Winston believes he is isolated and saved from the Party's control, his actions are constantly monitored; these actions seem to be born freely from Winston, but it is finally proved that even Winston's rebellion was all promoted by the Inner Party, being a ritual to enter this restricted circle. Although Winston seems to have an individual autonomy and therefore, an identity, it is only superficial. This is due to the Party's unlimited control over citizen's lives thanks to technological development. The following quotation perfectly depicts this idea:

It was terribly dangerous to let your thoughts wander when you were in any public place or within range of a telescreen. The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself – anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example) was itself a punishable offence (Orwell, 1949, 71).

5.5. Truth.

Brave New World is full of situations where characters try to avoid facing the truth and reality. The clearest example of this is the consumption of the drug soma, which helps individuals detach themselves from reality by creating self-delusion. Soma blurs real situations and changes them for happy hallucinations. Thus, it is used as an instrument to ensure social stability. Besides, as the World State prioritises happiness to truth, it seeks to eliminate the former in different ways: citizens are prevented from any sort of empirical or scientific truth as this will cause uncertainty among citizens, leading them to rethink and reevaluate the established conventions and truths. In Mustapha Mond's words from the book we can see this idea:

I'm interested in truth, I like science. But truth's a menace, science is a public danger. As dangerous as it's been beneficent. It has given us the stablest equilibrium in history. [...] But we can't allow science to undo its own good work. That's why we so carefully limit the scope of its researches [...]. We don't allow it to deal with any but the most immediate problems of the moment. All other enquiries are most sedulously discouraged" (Huxley, 1932, 200).

In the same way, the government tries to eradicate “human” truths; in other words, friendship, love and personal connections. These represent two kinds of truths: the objective one, leading to rational and independent thinking and the “human” one, which can only be felt and explored by oneself. Then, the book describes a search for both kinds of truth, the individual self does not only try to find the objective and scientific

truth distorted by the government for its own benefit, but also the search of his own self, his real personality and free thought. Taking the words from a conversation between the Savage and Mustapha Bond:

‘But I don't want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin. In fact’, said Mustapha Bond, ‘you’re claiming the right to be unhappy’. ‘All right then’, said the Savage defiantly, ‘I’m claiming the right to be unhappy’ (Huxley, 1932, 200).

Concerning the theme of truth in Orwell's *1984*, the term is ironically used: what is referred as truth is in fact lies created by the government, the Inner Party. They create an unreal world which benefits them, for their own sake. A good example of this is the belief that two plus two equals five (instead of four). Therefore, people going against this world created by the government, such as Winston or Julia, are considered ‘insane’ and should be helped to think according to the established conventions. The Party's method, along with physical and psychological torture “for the imposition and maintenance of its ‘Truth’ is the manipulation of language” (Conlin, 2017). This is what Winston actually does in the Ministry of Truth: his job is to rewrite history, past events on the behalf of the Inner Party. In this way, history becomes a dynamic activity which can be distorted and manipulated. Likewise, the government is in control of the interpretations of the future. In fact, there is a party slogan claiming that “who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past” (Orwell, 1949, 44).

Thus, controlling language does not only implies rewriting an event or changing its perspective, but it also allows the Party to have control over how people refer to and describe personal and individual experiences. Indeed, they are completely determining “the nature of the perception of reality”. Therefore, “it is in this control of reality through language that Orwell presents his most convincing and terrifying manifestation of the (mis)use of power” (Conlin, 2017).

For how could you establish even the most obvious fact when there existed no record outside your own memory? He tried to remember in what year he had first heard mention of Big Brother. He thought it must have been at some time in the sixties, but it was impossible to be certain. In the Party histories, of course, Big Brother figured as the leader and guardian of the Revolution since its very earliest days. [...] There was no knowing how much of this legend was true and how much invented. Winston could not even remember at what date the Party itself had come into existence (Orwell, 1949, 41).

6. Conclusions

Regarding power and control, and indeed both governments' applications of the Panopticon, the difference lies in how overt and obvious manipulation and control are, as well as citizens's awareness of them. The World State in *Brave New World* does a subtle use of it: the government has carefully constructed the idea that solitude is repulsive and offensive, even making citizens take this thought as their own, so as Molly Keisman says, "they fully embrace it" (2016, 22) without being aware of the extent to which they are observed. However, in *1984*, people are very much aware of the telescreens and their purpose, and governmental manipulation and control are fairly overt. Taking Molly Keisman's words: "the World State succeeds at a greater degree in its control of its citizens because they do not even realise that their aversion to solitude is their government's form of panoptic control" (2016, 22).

In terms of education, both the World State and the Party apply the banking concept of education introduced by Freire. Similarly to the application of the Panopticon, The World State does so in a more covert, discreet and less invasive way. Any form of critical thinking is snatched from every citizen. We can conclude then that regarding education, Huxley's work is even more dystopian than Orwell's. In *1984*, the reader gets the feeling that at some point, citizens attend school (for example, when Winston retains this history textbook). However, in *Brave New World*, education is based in hypnopaedia, there is no interaction as it is a passive and solitary process. For these reasons, The World State's citizens are even more mindless than the ones in Oceania.

In regards to sexuality and sex, both novels deal with it in a quite opposite way. While *Brave New World's* government promotes promiscuity, the Party distorts and represses sex. Yet, both authors represent sexuality similarly: as something that leads to corruption and demise of life. In essence, both demonstrate the huge power that sexuality has over human beings and that in the long run, humans cannot live with sex.

Moving on to the development of technology, both novels portray it as representative of the demise of the individual, and therefore its personality and freedom. The presented worlds would not be considered futuristic if they lack technological advancement, but we do not see the positive implications of these advancements, rather the negative ones: scientific development has gone too far, eugenics (*Brave New World*), and how technology can be used as a means of control, preventing any instance of privacy (1984).

Last but not least, truth is a key element which has to be in the hands of the government or leaders in order to ensure their power and control. Both regimes are in control of truth but they have different ways and methods of doing so: on the one hand, the World State advocates for the repression and elimination of truth as knowing it could challenge social stability as well as will give free will and thought to citizens, something that is fiercely avoided. On the other hand, what the Inner Party does is to manipulate truths and past events for its own benefit through language. This also enables them to completely manipulate and control people's perception of reality as you are referred to experiences by using language, describing them.

On the whole, Huxley's futuristic nightmare is "clean, efficient, complacent, defined by pleasure, Orwell's clumsy, crude, brutal and focused on pain" (Gregory Clays, 2010, 124). While Huxley paid much more attention to the psychological implications of consumer societies, Orwell focused on representing and depicting the horrors of the twentieth century.

7. Works Cited

Atkins, John. *Orwell in 1984*. College Literature. College Literature, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1984), pp. 34-43.

Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Aldous Huxley." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 13 Apr. 2018. Web.

Bloch, Ernst. *El principio esperanza*, Tomo I, TROTTA, 1948.

Bloom's Modern critical views: *George Orwell* — Updated Edition. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. Chelsea House Publishers. 2007.

Brigham Young University Studies, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Winter 1984), pp. 3-17.

Claeys, Gregory. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Conlin, Stephen H. *Language, Power and the Reality of Truth in 1984*. Voguelinview. July 2017. Web.

Cowan, Jacqueline L. "Francis Bacon's 'New Atlantis' and The Alterity of The New World."

Literature and Theology, vol. 25, no. 4, 2011, pp. 407–421. JSTOR.

Dantzich, S. van. *Brave New World Revisited by Aldous Huxley*. The Australian Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Dec., 1959), pp. 115-118.

Firchow, Peter E. *The Satire of Huxley "Brave New World"*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Vol. 12, No. 4 (Winter 1966-1967), pp. 451-460

Freire, Paulo. "The "Banking" Concept of Education." *A World of Ideas: Essential Readings for the College Writers*. 7 ed. Boston: Bedford St. Martin's, 2006.

“George Orwell's Letter from His Former French Teacher, Aldous Huxley, about Nineteen Eighty-Four.” *Boing Boing*, Boing Boing, 22 Aug. 2016. Web.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Vintage. Penguin Random House UK. 1932.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World Revisited*. Chatto & Windus, 1959.

Jameson, Fredric. *Arqueologías del futuro*, AKAL, 2009.

Keisman, Molly. "Power and Control in Brave New World and 1984," *Prologue: A First-Year Writing Journal*: Vol. 8 , Article 4. (2016).

Londonhua WIKI. “The Modern Impacts of George Orwell’s 1984”. 22 June 2017. Web.

López Keller, Estrella. "Distopía: otro final de la Utopía". *Reis: Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 1991 (pág. 11).

McKnight, Stephen. A. “Religion and Francis Bacon’s Scientific Utopianism”. *Zygon®*, 42: 463–486. (2007)

McKnight, Stephen A. *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacons Thought*. University of Missouri Press, 2006.

Mihailescu, Calin Andei. *Mind the Gap: Dystopia as Fiction*. Volume 25, No. 2, Summer 1991.

Mondolfo, Rodolfo. “La Política y La Utopía De Campanella: La Ciudad Del Sol.” *Revista Mexicana De Sociología*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1944, pp. 213–223. *JSTOR*.

Neusüss, A. *Utopía*, Barcelona, Barral Eds., 1971.

Nicol, Caitrin. *Brave New World at 75*. Center for the Study of Technology and Society Stable The New Atlantis, No. 16 (Spring 2007), pp. 41-54.

Marina González Barreiro. Universidad de Valladolid.

- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Modern Classics. 1949.
- Bott, George, ed. *Orwell, George: Selected Writings*. London: Heinemann. p. 103. (1968) [1958].
- Owen, Paul. "What George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four Owes Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 8 June 2009.
- Orwell, Sonia and Angus, Ian's Review. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. Volume IV. 1945-1950.
- Rossi, John P. *America's View of George Orwell*. Cambridge University Press for the University of Notre Dame du lac on behalf of Review of Politics. *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (Oct., 1981), pp. 572-581.
- Stephen A. McKnight, "Francis Bacon's God," *The New Atlantis*, Number 10, Fall 2005, pp. 73-100.
- Stodola, Sarah. *We: The Novel that Inspired Orwell's 1984*. 16 June 2015. Web.
- Thorp, Malcolm R. *The Dynamics of Terror in Orwell's "1984"*. Brigham Young University.
- Watt, Donald. *Aldous Huxley, the Critical Heritage*. Routledge, Sep 5, 2013.
- Woiak, Joanne. *Designing a Brave New World: Eugenics, Politics, and Fiction*. University of California Press. Vol. 29, No. 3 (Summer 2007), pp. 105-129.

