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Abstract

While George Orwell’s 1984 and Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World are typically labeled dystopian literature, B.F. Skinner’s Walden Two has more of a utopian reputation. Walden Two as well as much of Brave New World are conceptually utopian, that is, the primary goal is the happiness of the people. But dystopian societies are created when the state dictates without opposition the values and morals of the society. In this regard, even the most seemingly utopian societies are not truly utopias but rather dystopias. These particular novels focus on the psychological conditioning of the mind and in effect the changing nature of man. All of the other approaches used in the novels (e.g. disintegration of family, technology, control of the body, fear of outsiders) are accessories to the state’s ultimate goal of altering human nature to suit the society as a whole. In these texts, there are no “heroes” in the traditional sense to rally behind because eventually each is defeated by the state’s power. Because these authors do not give us the happy ending we expect, we are instead left with revelations of our present world and their warnings of our future.
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Part of the challenge when discussing dystopian literature is first finding an adequate and comprehensive definition to set thematic limits and expectations. If we can determine a definition, however broad, then readers can more easily access literature for effect and purpose. In researching utopian and dystopian literature as a genre, one may find that it often appears to be a response to social climates and social concerns, making a single definition or characteristic difficult to extract. If utopian literature aims to depict an ideal world, then its characters must be ideal. But, even when exploring the ideal and what would appear to be an improved society, dystopic elements abound. Dystopian literature depicts a world in which individuality and freedoms are sacrificed for the advancement of a centralized government. Utopian literature, although its leaders claim it is in the best interest of its people, portrays the same image. To create a homogeneous society, for whatever intention, is essentially a dystopic nightmare even when the text is displayed as a utopic dream. Writers of fiction have absorbed what utopian and dystopian theorists have contemplated about the world and, consequently, utopian and dystopian literature becomes the mirror by which social ideology is reflected. Critics then sift through the texts to settle on and define a set of characteristics in order to interpret the significance of this literary genre to society.

Before we can examine these fictions as a genre, we must first examine the origin of the terms “utopia” and “dystopia.” Lyman Tower Sargent has written
several articles on the subject of utopias, including "Authority & Utopia: Utopianism in Political Thought," in which he reminds us of the roots of our terms. To describe such a genre, we use the English translations of Greek words; utopia meaning "no place." We have given this term a positive connotation to mean "expanding the universe of what is possible" by favorably depicting alternative social arrangements" (Drass 423). Traditionally, utopias focus on what exists, what is good, and what is possible. They answer questions about, and offer solutions to, the ways a society can improve itself amid ineffective practices.

"Dystopia," or "bad place," emerges as a response to utopianism and utopian thinkers. Dystopian thinkers have viewed utopias as "the sacrifice of the real for the ideal," (Sargent "Authority and Utopia" 577) therefore creating dangerous circumstances. Essentially, dystopian thinkers have supposed we could not move from the real world to a utopia without costly and unreliable violence, that we could not insure the maintenance of such a society without an oppressive leader, and further, that these ideals, which seem acceptable in the abstract, are actually destructive in the real world (Sargent "Authority and Utopia" 578). Therefore, "too much unity or identity of interests can lead to social defects, such as loss of individual identity" (Richter 5). For this reason, dystopias began to take the shape of warnings. If "a utopia is a blueprint for what the author considers to be a perfect society" then "it would require perfect people, and we know there are no perfect people," (Sargent "The Three Faces of Dystopianism Revisited" 24). Dystopian thinkers, then, warn
against the relinquishing of individual freedom for the sake of a utopic social stability that can never truly be realized.

This essential warning translates into several themes and characteristics found within twentieth century literary dystopias. Sargent states that most dystopias appearing in the twentieth century “have focused on excessive centralization of power as the primary cause of troubles in society” (“Authority & Utopia” 565). To elaborate, M. Keith Booker further asserts that dystopias are a “future society in which something has gone badly wrong, and in which technological and/or political developments have led to dehumanization and oppression” (“Post-Utopian Imagination” 6). This dehumanization and oppression make the individual completely dependent on, and thus compliant with, the reigning power. What we discover in literature, then, is a mirror of ideological and theoretical anxieties dystopian writers have concerning society. With this in mind, we can clearly see how novels such as George Orwell’s *1984* and Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* have become the poster children of dystopic fiction. Most critics agree that what the reader sees in these dystopias, we should see in other literary dystopias as well.

While these characteristics may exist in texts that are already labeled “dystopian,” we are not always aware of their existence in texts labeled “utopian.” If we look closely enough, there is a striking similarity between dystopia and utopia: those who are in power want those who are not in power to believe they live in a utopia when clearly they do not. M. Keith Booker illustrates this through the metaphor of Disneyworld. At first, one views Disneyworld as pure utopia, a dream
and escape from reality with its Magic Kingdom of castles and cartoons. But if we look closer, we would also find the crowds, as Booker describes them, milling around like ants or herded cattle under the watchful eyes of uniformed overseers. The people are “buying what they are supposed to buy, seeing what they are supposed to see, and spending countless hours standing in queues waiting for the privilege of doing so” (Booker “The Dystopian Impulse” 1-3). The creators of Disneyworld certainly do not want us to criticize the uniformed nightmare of droning conformity but rather enjoy the “utopian” experience of falling in line behind everyone else. This is the position of the ruling class not only in *1984* and *Brave New World*, but also in *Walden Two*. *Walden Two*, a fictional “utopia” was written by behavioral psychologist B.F. Skinner as a “favorable depiction of an alternative society.” However, Skinner’s text, and Disneyworld, for that matter, are the reasons why so many thinkers have become “suspicious of utopian thought, fearing that such visions can ultimately work only to the advantage of the status quo.” (Booker “The Dystopian Impulse” 3). We may be drawn to the ideal of Disneyworld, but once we arrive, is the “fun” really worth the sacrifice we have made to be there?

So enamored are we with imagining utopias and avoiding dystopias that we never anticipated utopia’s betrayal. As we will see, “too often [utopias] promise happiness without paying sufficient attention to the rights of all their members” (Richter 13). In literature, utopias tend to neglect individuality and freedom – just as we have seen in dystopias. This focus on the improvement of the group implies that utopian builders “promote fanaticism...as their proponents impatiently press forward
to achieve their predetermined ends" (Richter 9). Due to this perspective, the pressing problem now is "not how to reach utopia but how to avoid it" (Richter 7).

I chose 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two because the three fall into a kind of spectrum of dystopian/utopian literature. Most readers would not deny the long standing dystopic label of 1984, nor could one mistake Orwell's serious warnings of totalitarianism. But Brave New World is usually met with some ambivalence as it initially presents a utopia to those who do not have the insight to hear Huxley's mocking tone. Then there is Walden Two explicitly developed as a utopic alternative to current society although, maybe or maybe not unknowingly, employing the same tactics as our dystopic staple, 1984. If utopia can be a nightmare, then the intention of the ruling power, whether it is for the happiness of all, as in Brave New World and Walden Two, or power for power's sake, as in 1984, makes little difference. The end results in a society are much more significant than the intention of the state because the intention is abstract and therefore mutable, while the result is concrete and often irreversible.

If the end result is the primary concern, one must investigate the course that is taken to reach that result, for it is that course that determines the dystopic label. In these three texts, the psychological conditioning of man is the principle process and the central focus of the ruling powers. Utopians tend to believe that "man is exceedingly plastic. His 'nature' is a fiction. With very broad limits, at any rate, he can be shaped and conditioned to fit happily into whatever society one chooses to create" (Walsh 71). But if utopias and dystopias are seen as one in the same, then this
is true for dystopias as well. Granted, utopians do hope for improvements in man, while dystopians exploit and manipulate man, but again, the intention is not as important as the result. We see psychological conditioning as the predominant characteristic in *1984*, which establishes order through the implementation of thoughtcrime; in *Brave New World*, which establishes social class and desires through hypnopaedic conditioning; and in *Walden Two*, which removes distasteful emotions (e.g. freedoms) to advance the group through behavioral engineering. The paths may diverge, but they lead to the same destination.

However, thoughtcrime, hypnopaedic conditioning, and behavioral engineering alone are not enough to program or reprogram an entire community. Other tactics must be employed to reinforce the new psychology. After the initial implementation of psychological conditioning, the state attacks and disintegrates the institution of the family. The state then transfers that sense of belonging to the members' prospective social class and then from social class to the state itself. Once the state has attained a general allegiance, it creates an unsubstantiated fear of the outsider to fortify that allegiance. Because the state is then seen as the primary identity of the people, the state is at will to alter or eliminate any amount of historical and/or social information that may be necessary to keep its power over the people. Since the people already view the state not only as a protector from outsiders, but also as a font of knowledge, they consequently believe whatever they are told and act, without question, according to rules prescribed by the state.
Once the people are initially converted, the state submerges them in the new ideology by infiltrating their daily life. Technology additionally acts as a device of censorship, keeping from the people what may "decondition" them. Through the creation of laws governing daily life and the increase in technology, the community's social psychology is influenced in a way that changes its overall values and morals. Further, with the increase in some form of technology, the people are bombarded with surveillance and/or mindless entertainment. Through the control of the mind, the state is also able to control the body making the body a symbol of control. Laws are created that dictate work, sexuality, and punishments, ensuring that people will not only think what they are told, but also do what they are told.

Not surprisingly, the excessive presence these techniques work to remove individuality and dispel human nature. There is a general consensus in these texts which implies that individuality is a threat to the stability of the whole, and for these societies to continue, human nature must be discounted. This becomes a problem for any member of each society who disagrees, and in these texts there is always one such character. The rebellious character is the intellectual who can still criticize his surroundings despite the attempts of the state to conform him. Unfortunately, in these texts, there are no heroes. Proving the state's success, each intellectual is defeated by the state and brought into the herd in one way or another.

These ideas should not sound unfamiliar to the modern reader. They are not simply the makings of fiction but rather the reflections of a nonfiction world: ours. If "every author of a dystopia, like every author of a utopia, pronounces a moral
judgment upon the society in which he lives” (Richter 17), then we are likely to read these texts and question our own society. Even though “utopia” and “dystopia” have lived conceptually in our consciousness for centuries, it is only recently that we have begun to perceive our world as a slow progression toward these fictions. 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two give utopians what they ask for – change, stability, and the good of all. But as the utopian dreams have come to pass, the result is not utopian (Walsh 117) and we therefore fear the utopian as we do the dystopian. As we consider our own future, this ambiguity is unsettling. Are we willing to sacrifice our independence for the stability of the nation? Should we stifle technological progress? Are we unaware of even our own conditioning? Since there are no clear answers to these questions, we must appreciate what Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner have done for us in terms of revealing present uncertainties as well as warning, even unintentionally, of future disasters.
Psychological conditioning is not as foreign to us as it may seem. Most of us, when given something, respond with, “Thanks” or “Thank you” or we knock before opening a door. These are conditioned behaviors we have been taught which create a more pleasant, and dare I say, utopic, community. Conditioning only becomes dangerous when it is used by the powerful to manipulate the people in their favor. In order to retain power, the government at large must recondition the people of a community to fit its needs. In the cases of 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two, it is thoughtcrime, hypnopaedic conditioning, and behavioral engineering, respectively, that are prescribed to maintain order. Without these tools as a foundation, the state believes its society would surely rebel, crumble, and free itself. It is increasingly important then, to change the behavior and language of a people as a means to adjust the way they think about the state and about themselves.

Psychological conditioning begins with an understanding of a new order of science, and then propaganda techniques, such as slogans and group rituals, help to enhance that new psychology. Once the conditioning has taken place, man constitutes little more than a science experiment.

Thought Control

For Orwell’s 1984, thoughtcrime is instituted as a kind of preventative maintenance. Oceania has no laws as we understand the concept, so they revert to a
system where they eliminate "persons who might perhaps commit a crime at some
time in the future." If there are no laws, the implication is not that there are no crimes,
but the opposite; rather, everything is a crime and further, that all crimes are crimes
against the state. In fact, "nothing in Oceania was efficient except the Thought
Police" (Orwell 198). The Thought Police monitor thoughtcrime, which is, essentially,
the "crime that contain[s] all others" (Orwell 19). Winston explains the omnipresence
of the Thought Police, "Thoughtcrime was not a thing that could be concealed forever.
You might dodge it successfully for awhile, even for years, but sooner or later they
were bound to get you" (Orwell 19). It is legitimate to fear one's own thoughts
whether they are conscious or subconscious. Winston says that one would constantly
dread what was said in sleep simply because there could be no stopping it. Avoiding
"thoughtcrime, [then, was] a question of self-discipline, [and] reality-control" (Orwell
52). One had to mentally will himself to not commit thought crimes.

Considering the achievements of doublethink and Newspeak, avoiding
thoughtcrime is not as difficult as it sounds. Doublethink manipulates the language to
the effect that it confuses and destroys the intellect. Orwell describes the elaborate
psychological system of doublethink more clearly than I could summarize:

To know and not to know, to be conscious of complete truthfulness while
telling carefully constructed lies, to hold simultaneously two opinions which
canceled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them,
to use logic against logic, to repudiate morality while laying claim to it, to
believe that democracy was impossible and that the Party was the guardian of
democracy, to forget, whatever it was necessary to forget, then to draw it back into memory again at the moment when it was needed, and then promptly to forget it again, and above all, to apply the same process to the process itself—that was the ultimate subtlety: consciously to include unconsciousness, and then, once again, to become unconscious of the act of hypnosis you had just performed. Even to understand the word ‘doublethink’ involved the use of doublethink. (Orwell 35)

Doublethink is a system of contradictions in that one must know and not know simultaneously. Because doublethink is illogical, one can see the long term detrimental effects on the intellectual. Ironically, the more one utilizes doublethink, the more one becomes insane. This insanity is the exact intention of the Party.

“Doublethink is similar to ‘trance logic’ among hypnotized subjects when they try to create a rational explanation for an irrational perception” (Zimbardo 133).

Hypnotized subjects know their hallucinations are not real while simultaneously trying to believe that they are real. “Doublethink similarly induces doubt and the need for the person to convince him or herself that what is not real should be so.” (Zimbardo 133). It seems there is a natural tendency to doubt what is real, but in Oceania, the people know this is not the case and desperately try to convince themselves otherwise. Consequently, when people are intensely confused about reality, it is very easy to sway them in one direction or another.

Doublethink works as the primary device in preventing thoughtcrime, that is, until Newspeak is fully implemented. Syme, Winston’s coworker, describes
Newspeak as a stripping down of language. He says, "We’re destroying words – scores of them, hundreds of them, every day. We’re cutting the language to the bone. The Eleventh Edition won’t contain a single word that will become obsolete before 2050" (Orwell 51). Take, for example, the Party’s use of the words “ungood,” “plusgood,” and “doubleplusgood,” which essentially mean “bad,” “better,” and “excellent.” Syme explains, “In the end, the whole notion of goodness and badness will be covered by only six words – in reality only one word” (Orwell 51). If the Party limits the range of words, they also limit the range of thought. Syme further explains, “In the end we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible, because there will be no words to express it” (Orwell 51-2). People in the future will not even have the vocabulary to comprehend rebellion, let alone be able to do anything about it. In effect, “The whole climate of thought will be different...there will be no thought, as we understand it now. Orthodoxy means not thinking – not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness” (Orwell 53). “The implementing of such a language would represent a radical deindividualization...like the death of thought” (Burkowski 45). The Party wishes to create a society in which all thinking originates with the Party and one in which the people think and act subconsciously on behalf of the Party. The goal of the party is quite obviously to abolish any and all mental activity which is not beneficial to them. ..

Orwell contends that an automaton already exists in Oceania. During a lunch break, Winston observes a man talking in the cafeteria. Even though Winston could only hear a phrase here and there, he knows that:
whatever it was, you could be certain that every word of it was pure orthodoxy, pure Ingsoc... Winston had a curious feeling that this was not a real human being but some kind of dummy. It was not the man's brain that was speaking; it was his larynx. The stuff that was coming out of him consisted of words, but it was not speech in a true sense: it was a noise uttered in unconsciousness, like the quacking of a duck. (Orwell 54).

This is the image of man regurgitating repeatedly what is told to him by those in control. In Winston's conversation with Syme, Syme mentions the Newspeak word, duckspeak, which literally means to quack like a duck. Syme explains, "It's one of those interesting words that have two contradictory meanings, applied to an opponent, it is abuse; applied to someone you agree with, it is praise" (Orwell 55). In other words, if someone is speaking contrary to Ingsoc, they are speaking nonsense, like the quack of a duck is nonsense. Paradoxically though, if a person is speaking according to orthodoxy, he is still quacking like a duck; in this case, it is praiseworthy to follow the state's mandates. This is not an accidental advantage to the double meaning of the word. This kind of constant expectation of quacking like a duck, so to speak, will permanently convert the minds of the people in Oceania. Permanent change results in permanent control.

Brave New World's version of thought control is hypnopaedic and Pavlovian conditioning with the primary focus on children. Essential to hypnopaedia are the recordings that play in the ears of all the children as they sleep, conditioning them to believe specific ideals and act accordingly. Most of these hypnopaedic recordings are
messages encouraging contentment in one’s assigned social class. Huxley shows us a result of one of these messages. “Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do because they’re so frightfully clever. I’m awfully glad I’m a Beta, because I don’t work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas...” (Huxley 35). There is proof in Lenina Crowne that this conditioning works. She makes a comment to Henry Foster, “‘What a hideous colour khaki is...’ voicing the hypnopaedic prejudices of her caste” (Huxley 67). She has been conditioned to thoroughly believe the unworthiness of any social class below her own. The state believes that the “‘secret of happiness and virtue – [is] liking what you’ve got to do...[and] making people like their inescapable social destiny’” (Huxley 26). As we know, happiness in *Brave New World* is quite important; protecting that happiness is even more important.

In addition to hypnopaedic conditioning, children are molded according to Pavlovian principles. Delta infants, for example, are exposed to electric shocks when they reach out for books and flowers. Subjecting children to these shocks allows the state to subvert their love of nature and books and turn them against these things. This is a common practice exacted upon the lower classes because the love of beauty and literature will not maintain the consumer culture which is so important in *Brave New World* (Huxley 29-31). Children are also death conditioned. At eighteen months, children spend two days a week in a hospital for the dying. The best toys are there and they receive sweet treats on death days (Huxley 151). Children are conditioned to accept dying as a matter of course and not be saddened by it, which reiterates the
desire for the absence of personal ties. There is no reason to mourn the death of a person when one has no emotional connections. Huxley exposes the ridiculousness of death conditioning through the reactions of the nurse and the children upon Linda’s death. When John is sobbing at the bed of his dying mother, the nurse on duty is more concerned with John “deconditioning” the children than his apparent sadness. When John does look up, there is a small boy staring at him from the foot of Linda’s bed—eating an éclair. Although John becomes enraged at the child, Huxley shows the child’s complete innocence; he has no understanding of what he has done wrong.

Conditioned children, obviously, become conditioned adults. Because hypnopædic recordings play consistently throughout childhood, “the child’s mind [becomes] these suggestions...[the] suggestions from the state” (Huxley 36). Here, just as in 1984; there is no distinction between individual thought and societal thought. Even Huxley’s Bernard Marx, an adult Alpha, recognizes his own conditioning as he angrily replies to Lenina, “I know perfectly well why I can’t [think] – what would it be like if I could, if I were free – not enslaved by my conditioning” (Huxley 90). If Bernard knows of his enslavement, why does he not rebel? The most logical answer—he has no idea how to do so. But his discontent is cause for alarm; Mustapha Mond, one of the World Controllers, warns Bernard about his behavior, “Alphas are so conditioned that they do not have to be infantile in their emotional behavior. But that is all the more reason for their making a special effort to conform. It is their duty to be infantile, even against their inclination” (Huxley 96). This process of knowing and not acting on that knowledge is reminiscent of Orwell’s doublethink. Because the
Alphas are the privileged class, they are allowed awareness of their conditioning but they still must feign ignorance, thus confusing reality. As in 1984, the image of the automaton denying independent thought pervades Brave New World. But Bernard Marx may be proof that it is not because they want to deny independent thought, but because they do not know how to engage in it.

The third method of thought-control is Skinner’s behavioral engineering in Walden Two. T.E. Frazier, the community’s founder and visitors’ guide, explains the essential questions of behavioral engineering to the group of visitors to Walden Two. He asks, “What’s the best behavior for the individual so far as the group is concerned? And how can the individual be induced to behave in that way?” (Skinner 95). Frazier, the behaviorist, believes, “You have to set up certain behavioral processes which will lead the individual to design his own “good” conduct when the time comes. We call that sort of thing “self-control.” But don’t be misled, the control always rests in the last analysis in the hands of the society” (Skinner 96). While the people are engineered to maintain self-control, they are not the ones supervising their own actions, the state is. But Frazier justifies, quite frequently we will see, that this supervision is not forceful aggression, but an act of love. Frazier compares his work at Walden Two to that of Jesus in the New Testament. He, and the other leaders, are leading their “sheep” and promoting a “heaven on earth” for the members of their society. This indirectly makes Frazier a Christ-like figure and Walden Two a kind of heaven. The implied message is that one cannot have a heaven on earth with “natural” people; one must have a heaven on earth with “engineered” people.
According to Frazier, the engineered man is free of negative emotions and adopts complete self control. *Walden Two*, like *Brave New World*, focuses on the development of children for this practice to succeed. In order to groom the children effectively, behavioral engineers stage adversity to build strength in the children. Frazier comments, ""We had to design a series of adversities, so that the child would develop the greatest possible self-control. Call it deliberate, if you like, and accuse me of sadism; there was no other course"" (Skinner 105). For example, the lollipop experiment requires that children ages three and four wear a lollipop around their neck and must not touch it until they are told to do so. When the children are distracted from their temptation, they learn that nothing is lost or gained by waiting to have the lollipop, thus learning the value of self control. Additionally, the soup experiment teaches them not to be jealous or envious. While the soup is front of them, some of the children are forced to wait five minutes before sitting down to eat while others may eat right away. The children are aware, however, that those who must wait are selected randomly. This way, no child resents another for not being chosen to wait. The visitors, specifically Castle, are curious as to how the children feel about this. Frazier responds, ""They get escape from the petty emotions...they get the satisfaction of pleasant and profitable social relations on a scale almost undreamed of in the world at large"" (Skinner 102). In return for the luxury of conditioning, the ""community must gain [the children's] loyalty"" (Skinner 102-3). Conditioning is not, therefore, necessarily for the good of the people individually, but rather for the
growth of the community. This line of thinking breeds loyalties without questioning practices, a process of which the Party in 1984 would surely approve.

But Frazier must admit there is a special problem with members who come to the community as adults. He explains, ""It's easier with members who are born into the community and pass through our school system. With new adult members we have to appeal to something like conversion"" (Skinner 149). One would be unable to assimilate immediately; the only way this ""utopian"" community works is through behavioral engineering, which speaks volumes of the naturalness with which the community is designed. The ""conversion"" Frazier refers to implies a forceful change; at least that is the way Burris and Castle interpret it. But Frazier contends, ""you can't enforce happiness... We don't use force! All we need is behavioral engineering"" (Skinner 149). But this is merely a matter of semantics. What is behavioral engineering other than a force of some kind? The fact that it happens inside the mind instead of outside does not make it any less forceful.

Walden Two does take the enforcement of ""The Code"" rather seriously as it is implemented in order to supplement and solidify behavioral engineering. Many parts of the Code involve simple social graces: do not gossip, explain your work to anyone interested, and be honest when you are bored. However, no straying from the Code is accepted. When the Code is changed, the change may be discussed, or it may be posted without discussion. The point here is that people are apathetic about the Code. The members are so distracted by their ""personal interests"" of studying, painting, building, or whatever else, that they are incapable of caring about the overall design
of Walden Two. This is how behavioral engineering is made to last. There may be an appearance of happiness, but no one actually knows how real that happiness is; after all, it is practically manufactured. "Social harmony in Walden Two is built through experimentally based science of human conditioning. Man is never free but always acts in obedience to some law. Understanding these laws enables one to control the socialization of citizens and so bring things under control" (Davis 38). It makes little difference if the members of Walden Two believe they are free; the fact is, they are not. Frazier understands that man, regardless of his happiness, needs laws. Out of necessity, then, the members of Walden Two have a Code to follow on which they have no real influence, and a set of behaviorally engineered emotions of which they do not know the orientation. Conditioning them to feel happy is not a justification for doing so. Frazier imagines a world in which people have complete self control and are free of all negative emotions—there is no unhappiness. In this regard, Skinner very much reflects Huxley, although Huxley never intended to defend his community as a utopia when it clearly was not.

**Slogans, Mottos, and Titles**

Once the difficult task of reprogramming the masses is complete or, at least, in progress, slogans and/or mottos best serve the purpose of reminding the people of their new psychology. Slogans and/or mottos are easy to remember and thus easy to repeat. Repetition is the key to memorization and memorization is the key to internalization. In 1984, we see the Party’s mottos not far into the text, which shows
their significance. Winston Smith, the novel’s protagonist, is attending a Two Minutes Hate as the words, “WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH” (Orwell 16) appear on a telescreen. At first read, these phrases are obviously contradictory. But really, these slogans represent truth for the Party: continuous war with other-countries means continuous peace within Oceania (no revolution against the Party); the people’s freedom would mean slavery for the Party members; and the ignorance of the people means strength for the Party. However, this is doublethink and the lack of traditional logic in the slogans eludes the masses entirely. Moreover, these phrases are posted throughout the society including an immediate and predominant location in Winston’s apartment building as he enters the door. Previously, in the Two Minutes Hate, while Winston is watching the telescreen along with everyone-else, the words fade from the screen as the face of Big Brother appears. This visual image directly connects these slogans with Big Brother. Presumably, the words represent him and he represents the words.

*Brave New World*’s slogans are much less illogical and cryptic in nature. Their societal chant is, “Community, Identity, Stability” followed closely by, “Everyone belongs to everyone else,” “Ending is better than mending,” and “I take a gramme and only am.” Each of these mottos solidifies the state’s new orders of belonging to the community, continual materialism, and escapism through drugs. Huxley’s mottos are much more positive in tone than Orwell’s slogans due to the amount of rhyme employed. The rhyming of the phrases simulates the mood of a nursery rhyme, thus making the ideas seem innocent and harmless and therefore
much more likely to be followed blindly. In addition to the mottos, Huxley includes the use of “Ford,” as in Henry Ford as an idol in the community. The name, “Ford,” has actually seeped into casual expression. When the Director believes he has woken the children while giving a tour, he casually exclaims, “Oh, Ford!” (Huxley 36). This is not an accident but a well placed and well used form of propaganda to remind the people of their priorities.

We may search long and hard to find slogans or mottos in *Walden Two* but we would be searching in vain. As *Walden Two* sees itself as a utopia, it consequently named itself accordingly. Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden* describes a purposeful life free from the constraints of conventional society. *Walden Two*, then, pays homage to that idea. Therefore, Skinner may not have thought that slogans or mottos were necessary in his creation due to the ever-present, positive, and even superior, implication of its very name. Though Walden Two may not feel it necessary to propagandize with slogans and mottos to its own people, it does propagandize to the outside world. The Manager of Public Relations finds it necessary to invite all of the local clergy to Walden Two every year. The clergy receives the same pamphlets, “‘little masterpieces of behavioral engineering,’” that are given to the ten year-olds of Walden Two. These pamphlets are a sort of ethical refresher course and show the clergy that at Walden Two they are more religious than anything; a life the clergy cannot discount. Frazier calls this, “‘anticipatory counterpropaganda’” (Skinner 185). Because of these charades, the community has avoided prejudice and discrimination that it would otherwise encounter. Skinner would argue that this form of propaganda
is acceptable because it keeps people safe from outsiders. But, admittedly in a less logical and less sane way, Orwell’s Party could make the same argument: that propaganda serves to keep them safe – from themselves. And we certainly do not envision Oceania as a utopia.

Rituals

In connection with the mottos and slogans, institutionalized rituals keep the people focused on the state’s ideals. *1984*’s Two Minutes Hate is, literally, two minutes, randomly and mandatorily spent throughout the day, when people focus their hatred on one man: Emanuel Goldstein. Goldstein’s role in the novel is simply to act as the symbol of a traitor and absorb hatred from the people for being such. The Two Minutes Hate has the capability to lure even the most skeptical who, in this case, is Winston Smith. Orwell vividly describes Winston’s emotions as he reluctantly participates in the Two Minutes Hate:

Winston had begun crying out, “Swine! Swine! Swine!” and suddenly he picked up a heavy Newspeak dictionary and flung it at the screen...Winston found that he was shouting with the others and kicking his heel violently against the rung of the chair. The horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was not that one was obliged to act a part, but that it was impossible to avoid joining in...A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current...And yet the rage that one felt
was an abstract, undirected emotion which could be switched from one subject
to another like the flame of a blowlamp. (Orwell 14)

Winston is clearly caught in the emotional wave of hatred even when he actually feels
no particular hatred towards Goldstein. “It is that irrational, chaotic, libertine aspect
of every human being that bursts free from the control...by joining in the revels of the
mob mentality. The Two Minutes Hate exercise lured even the reluctant” (Zimbardo
134). The lull of the chanting crowd generating so much hatred is impossible to resist
even for Winston, who secretly hates the Party. The ritual creates utter hatred and
focuses it on someone concrete and not on the current government. Any hatred
deflected away from the state and onto someone or something else, however irrational,
is the primary objective of the Party. Because the people are denied any other kind of
emotion, this ritual is effective as it allows for an acceptable release of emotion
without breaking any of the rules; this encourages and sanctions hatred as the Party’s
primary emotion.

There is a different kind of ritual in Brave New World, one which involves sex
as the primary performance. The “Solidarity Service,” as the name implies, promotes
solidarity by way of an orgy in the name of Ford. The service is held at the “Singery”
where men and women alternate seats around a table. The President makes the “Sign
of the T” and the group sings hymns to honor Ford. They drink and eat soma ice
cream and celebrate “to the imminence of his coming” (Huxley 83). People, in their
soma-induced hallucinatory state, begin to believe they can actually hear Ford coming.
The service climaxes with singing and stomping, “Round they went, a circular
procession of dancers, each with hands on the hips of dancer preceding, round and round, shouting in unison, stamping to the rhythm of the music with their feet, beating it, beating it out with hands on the buttocks in front; twelve pairs of hands beating as one" (Huxley 85). Then the service ends in an orgy of sexuality. They sing, ""Orgy-porgy, Ford and fun, / Kiss the girls and make them One. / Boys at one with girls at peace; / Orgy-porgy gives release"" (Huxley 85). At this point, "The circled wavered, broke, and fell in partial disintegration on the ring of couches...tenderly the deep voice crooned and cooed; in the red twilight it was as though some enormous negro dove were hovering benevolently over the now supine dancers" (Huxley 85). Huxley portrays a trance like scenario where drugs and cult worship abound. The people are so caught up in the ritual, the drugs, and the sharing of each other that they do not question the validity of this ritual. In fact, it would seem, some come to depend on it to refresh them and instill the ideals of their great society—unity and solidarity.

Walden Two’s “Sunday Meetings” are very different in tone from Orwell and Huxley, yet achieve the same ends. At the meetings, Frazier explains, "there’s a brief ‘lesson’ – of the utmost importance in maintaining an observance of the Code. Usually items are chosen for discussion which deal with self-control and certain kinds of social articulation” (Skinner 185). Occasionally, Frazier says, they play music and sing together as well. It is no coincidence that the meetings are held on Sunday, or that they discuss the Code, or self-control. The meetings are modeled after religious rituals just as is Huxley’s “service.” It is possible that Huxley and Skinner have realized the success of the Christian Church and have borrowed liberally from its
rituals. Possibly without Frazier’s awareness, he shows the visitors the delicate balance that engineering has created in Walden Two. For all his bragging of utopia at work, any departure from the Code is unacceptable and, therefore, Frazier goes to great lengths to ensure his constituents are reminded of their duty to the community. While both Orwell’s and Huxley’s rituals center on one person and on one emotion—Goldstein and hatred, Ford and sexuality—Skinner focuses on the group. All three, though, engage in a kind of worship. Orwell’s characters worship hatred and loyalty to the state, Huxley’s worship sexuality and group belonging, while Skinner’s worship self control and the improvement of the group. Even here, we see the three texts as a continuum from dystopian to utopian.

The Structure of the State

In order to maintain this level of psychological control over its constituents, the state must itself be in perfect order and how the state is structured is often reflected in the metaphorical image portrayed to the reader. In 1984, Oceania’s inhabitants are cut off from the outside world. Winston describes Oceania “like a man in interstellar space” (Orwell 198) where the Party can “twist reality into whatever shape they choose without any question or opposition from any country or any of its people” (Orwell 199). The image of floating in space with no anchor to the rest of the world, gives the Party free range to do what it pleases because there is, literally, no one to whom they must answer. It is not enough to have control over its own people; it must also protect itself from other countries who may want to “free” the people of
Oceania. To combat that potential scenario, the Party simply shuts down communication to and from any other place by waging continuous war with other countries. The object of the war, therefore, “is to keep the structure of society in tact” (Orwell 199). War arouses in the people the same emotions as the Two Minutes Hate. In Oceania, overwhelming anger and hatred pervade.

One cannot forget the infamous Big Brother that looms throughout the novel. Big Brother is the image of the state. Winston takes out a coin with Big Brother’s face on it, “the face gazed up at him, heavy, calm, protecting, but what kind of smile was hidden beneath the dark mustache? Like a leaden knell the words came back at him: WAR IS PEACE / FREEDOM IS SLAVERY/ IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH” (Orwell 104). Big Brother’s smile is a devious and secretive smile. Everything in Oceania is attributed to that smile, to Big Brother, yet no one has ever seen him in the flesh. He “is the guise in which the party chose to exhibit itself to the world” (Orwell 208). Every government has a figurehead that does not hold nearly as much power as one would assume. Although he is the sole-recipient of all love, fear, and reverence in Oceania, Orwell implies that even Big Brother is a sham.

*Brave New World* and *Walden Two* are strikingly similar in structure and metaphorical imagery. Neither has a central leader that we know of and both reflect the image of a well-oiled machine. In *Brave New World*, we encounter Directors and Controllers who are similar to Inner Party members who are privileged with knowing the secrets of their society and are awed by what they have accomplished. The Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning leads a tour of the hatcheries to explain the
processes undergone there. There is an unmistakable tone of excitement as he explains Bokanovsky’s process, “‘Scores,’ the Director repeated and flung out his arms... My good boy!... Can’t you see?’ He raised a hand; his expression was solemn. ‘Bokanovsky’s process is one of the major instruments of social stability!’” (Huxley 18). Frazier has this same feeling towards his work. He tells Burris, “‘Only one side of Walden Two really interests me. To make men happy, yes. To make them productive in order to assure the continuation of that happiness, yes. But what else? Why to make possible a genuine science of human behavior!’” (Skinner 274). Frazier even goes so far as to view himself as the “God” of Walden Two, “‘Of course I’m not indifferent to power!... And I like to play God!... After all, man, even Jesus Christ thought he was God!’” (Skinner 281-2). What the two fictions have in common is a sense that their systems are progressive, innovative and ideal for their people. In essence, science will bring about the stability of society and, thus, a utopia. If the image the state intends to portray is one in which there is heaven on earth in need of a God, those in power in Brave New World and Walden Two are more than willing to fill the role.

While those in power are busy admiring their creative genius, there is another metaphor at work—that of the machine. Brave New World’s Mustapha Mond is explicit and honest about running society as a machine:

The machine turns and turns and must keep on turning — for ever... wheels must turn steadily, but cannot turn untended. There must be men to tend them, men as steady as the wheels upon their axles, sane men, obedient men, stable
in contentment... and if they cannot tend the wheels... the corpses of a

thousand thousand thousand men and women would be hard to bury or to burn.

(Huxley 47-48)

The machine of men must keep turning because if it stops, it would mean death to the kind of society they have created, although not necessarily to society altogether. For Huxley, the metaphor of the machine reflects the technological world he has created from psychological conditioning and bioengineering. The image of the machine also “hints at conquest... [of men] whose idea of leisure have been subsumed into the larger work of the community” (Gable 2 of 13). Men become nothing more than mere parts of a whole; separate they are worth nothing to society but together, they can turn the wheel for all time.

While Frazier would never say it, Walden Two functions as a machine as well. Augustus Castle, the novel’s only true humanist, thinks of Walden Two as an automatic chess player. He tells Burris, “‘The audience sees a lot of dummy gears and levers, but all the while some midget chess champion is lurking in one corner of the machine’” (Skinner 172). Essentially, and Castle would agree, Walden Two “is an iron fist in a velvet glove” (Gable 6 of 13) that hides the “mechanisms of machine-state power behind a pastoral mask” (Gable 8 of 13). This is the real behavioral engineering; there is someone behind the scenes making the production successful and this is Frazier. But Frazier is not dedicated to “the production of goods per se but of ‘happiness’: not happiness of the individual, but happiness of the whole” (Gable 2 of 13). Just as in *Brave New World*, for the society to work efficiently, it must be run
as a unit in which every part must be as dedicated as the creator to keep production moving. In the simplest terms, psychological conditioning, of any kind, keeps the people silently turning the wheels.

Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner have shown that psychological conditioning is not just a process to gain control, but a science to be honed and mastered. According to J.C. Davis, "Science is power and it may be one of the most difficult forms of power to control precisely...Either willfully, or unintentionally, scientific power can damage nature, individuals, the social order, or all three...Either science will jeopardize the good society or, paradoxically, it will be corrupted unless society is good" (24). Unfortunately, it is the former that rings true in these fictions. Society has been corrupted by the science of psychological control. In a corrupt society we are left with this image of man: "science in its application to society...can create an environment so mechanized, so systemized, and ultimately so controlled that man begins to appear a mere component in a machine" (Davis 25). Science has not simply changed the thinking of people, or controlled their thoughts in alignment with the state, or convinced them that the group is better than the individual, but it has reduced man to automaton; one that cannot think for himself unless programmed to do so.
Chapter Two
Group Mentality:
From the Family to the State

Transferring loyalties from the family to the state is the second phase in the complete restructuring of the individual. To feel a part of the group, individuals must, ironically, relinquish many personal relationships for the state to fully accept them into their society. *Nineteen Eighty-Four, Brave New World,* and *Walden Two* all eliminate the institution of family, the group one feels most naturally connected to, in order to relocate that devotion towards the state. However, “when social bonds are broken, social isolation becomes common, and individuals exist in ‘locked loneliness’ that diminishes the human spirit” (Zimbardo 133). To combat that social isolation, people are organized into social classes and taught to accept them on the premise of loyalty to the state. But once the state has its social structure working efficiently, the state instills the fear of outsiders to secure those loyalties. When people become afraid of others that are said to be unlike them, they look to their country, or community, or government to protect them. The government protects the people and the people unquestioningly deliver their trust to the government. This is just one more turn in the road to dehumanization.

**Disintegration of Family**

In *1984*, family initially breaks down with the desensitization of marriage. Marriage becomes a lawful union created to produce children for the advancement of the Party. “The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from
forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act... the only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party," (Orwell 65). Winston’s experience with his former wife, Katherine, illustrates how deeply this duty was felt. Even though Katherine despised sex, she refused to stop trying to conceive, “They must, she said, produce a child if they could... She had two names for it. One was ‘making a baby,’ and the other was, ‘our duty to the Party’” (Orwell 67). The Party did not eradicate the presence of marriage, but worse, they eradicated intimacy and commitment and replaced them with duty and loyalty to the state.

Children are the real targets in the dismantling of the family. Children are used by the Party as integral pieces in “war” on thoughtcrime. Winston tells us, “It was almost normal for people to be frightened of their own children. And with good reason, for hardly a week passed in which the Times did not carry a paragraph describing how some eavesdropping little sneak – ‘child hero’ was the phrase generally used – had overheard some compromising remark and denounced his parents to the Thought Police” (Orwell 24). The children were systematically turned against their parents and taught to spy on them and report any deviation from the Party. In Oceania, “The family had become an extension of the Thought Police. It was a device by means of which everyone could be surrounded night and day by informers who knew them intimately” (Orwell 133). As an example, Orwell shows Parsons, Winston’s neighbor, as a prisoner in the Ministry of Love; his daughter had turned him in for denouncing Big Brother in his sleep (Orwell 233). Thomas F.
Cooper describes this kind of spying as a web of vertical communication as the Party uses everyone to betray each other. “In such a vertical model, an enormous inequity comes through an eavesdropping superstructure which destroys the power of confidential communication in all... The loyal and lobotomized are promoted and praised; the thoughtful and threatening are demoted and denied public expression” (96). People that would naturally be allies, i.e. family members, quickly become enemies in this web. If the Party removes family bonds, then it also removes any guilt one may have about turning in their family members. One wouldn’t feel any more connected to them than perfect strangers. In the end, the only true reason for the Party to decimate the family is to avoid thoughtcrime.

The idea of family and the participation in family are considered perversions in *Brave New World*. Because people are created without viviparous birth, birth is viewed as disgusting. In the past, Mustapha Mond explains, “The world was full of fathers – [and it].was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide” (Huxley 44). The idea of living as a group, as a family, is described as filthy, and “understerilized” (Huxley 43) and actually makes the students on Mond’s tour sick to think of it. This is because the people in this society are designed to not need family – they have all of their desires met through entertainment, drugs, [and] copulation (Holmes 29). *Nineteen Eighty-Four* sees family as an impediment to the state’s devotion, but *Brave New World* sees family as
an impediment to happiness and thus fills in that unhappiness with manufactured pleasures.

John, sometimes called "The Savage," and his birth mother, Linda, are used as symbols of the disintegration of family and the unhappiness family can cause in any other society. Linda accidentally became pregnant on a trip with the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning to the reservations in New Mexico. The Director left her behind on the reservation and Linda was forced to experience natural child birth. Because Linda hailed from the new society in and not the Reservation, she was unaccustomed to the family structure. Therefore, John was taught to call his mother, "Linda," because "mother" was a disgusting word to her. As John grows up, his relationship with Linda is unstable at best, as she cares for him physically, but not emotionally or maternally. Even on her death bed, Linda calls out for her lover and not for her son, John. John is hurt upon realizing that his mother may not love him in the same way he loves her. At times it appears as if they are from two different worlds. The significance of their relationship is that John and Linda could have been a natural family but they were torn apart by the conventions of the new world. Eliminating the family works so well that Linda's long-term removal from the society from which she came does nothing to reverse her conditioning. Because John alone feels the effects of Linda's conditioning, he resorts to anger. Thus, the family is not a unit.

Walden Two takes a seemingly more subtle opposition to family as Skinner actualizes the concept of the community raising the child. After babies are born, they
live in the nursery for a year, not with the parents or any family members. It is very important that they are “‘cared for as a group’” (Skinner 86). Walden Two emphasizes the group and therefore distances children from their biological parents. The baby experiences a “‘community love’” (Skinner 90) not limited to just a mother and father. This enables the child to feel more loyalty to the community rather to the family. They avoid “‘strong personal dependency’” by having “‘every adult member of Walden Two regard all our children as his own, and to have every child think of every adult as his parent...You may spend as much time as you like with your children, but to do so exclusively is taboo’” (Skinner 132). Of course, Castle argues that Freudian “identification,” the personal relationship between a mother and child that formulates the child’s personality, is imperative to the normal development of the child (Skinner 90). But Castle does not understand that Frazier is reconditioning the individual to precisely avoid “normal development.”

Frazier’s intention, as it had been all along, is to refocus the identification with the family to the community. Frazier says, “‘A community must solve the problem of the family by revising certain established practices...Walden Two replaces the family...as a social and psychological unit’”(Skinner 128) and that “‘ethical training belongs to the community’” (Skinner 105). However, even use of the word ‘belongs’ implies a sense of ownership and control. According to Frazier, “‘love and affection are psychological and cultural, and blood relationships can be happily forgotten’” (Skinner 133). The plan for the future is one in which the “‘the hereditary connection will be minimized to the point of being forgotten. Long before
that, it will be possible to breed through artificial insemination without altering the personal relation of husband and wife. Our people will marry as they wish, but have children according a genetic plan” (Skinner 133). And here is where Walden Two merges with Brave New World. Both place a superficial happiness and love for the community above a love for the family. People naturally need to feel they belong to something larger than themselves. Ironically, by removing the identity of family, the state has an easier time filling the gap with other identities and loyalties.

**Social Classes**

When society is purposefully stratified, the purpose is typically to organize people efficiently and effectively. Because that social structure will not change, the people come to depend on that organization. In addition, if people are prescribed a social class from birth rather than having to earn one, they are more likely to accept that class as part of their identity much like we do on the basis of our ethnicity. We are born into a particular group of people and consequently find that we belong there, largely due to our conditioning.

This is the case in 1984. In Oceania, “There is far less to-and-fro movement between the different groups” (Orwell 209). The Inner and Outer Party members are not socially mobile and especially not the Proles. The Proles, in fact, can never become Party members. The Inner Party members, though, enjoy a myriad of luxuries because they are, as their name suggest, the innermost circle of the Party. Actually, the reader presumes that the Inner Party rules Oceania by having created the society
and keeping order. The Inner Party possesses all of the luxuries such as real coffee, real sugar, and bread. Julia, Winston’s lover, remarks, “There’s nothing those swine don’t have” (Orwell 141). The Inner party also has the privilege of turning off their telescreens for thirty minutes at a time, because even for them, any longer would be suspicious. A few of the members, O’Brien and Charrington, even play double roles. They “are men whose lives consist in being both fanatical members of the Party and at the same time men who can enter into and understand the views of those they are fighting to destroy” (Burkowski 46). This is seen through both of their interactions with Winston and Julia. Winston and Julia trust them as if they were secret rebels of the Party as well, but of course, they are not. If the focus of 1984’s society is psychology, and I think we can safely say that it is, it is not surprising that these men would be able to understand both perspectives and manipulate one for the other.

The Outer Party members receive and experience most of the difficulties inherent in being citizens of Oceania. They are not allowed private emotions or thoughts and also must have the right instincts since “many of the beliefs and attitudes demanded of [them] are never plainly stated” (Orwell 211). They must avoid thoughtcrime by participating in *crimestop*, “the faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought” (Orwell 211). They don a “protective stupidity” as it is extremely dangerous to recognize any errors or lapses in logic that the Party may present to them (Orwell 212). “All the repression and terror is designed to ensure that the thirteen percent in the Outer Party make no attempt to displace those in power” (Burkowski 41). Even though the Outer Party makes up a
very small percentage of the population, they hold a fragile position in society. They receive none of the luxuries of the Inner Party members and none of the freedoms of the Proles. Therefore, they have the most obvious reasons to rebel. There must be people to do the work and the Outer Party members must do it happily. The only way to keep them happy in the middle class is to condition them to love the Party and their respective position in it.

The Proles are an interesting component to Orwell’s societal structure in 1984. Superficially, “proles are not seen as players in the struggle for power” (Burkowski 41). They are granted freedom and intellectual liberty because they are seen as having no intellect. According to Winston, there are entire departments in the Ministry of Truth that produce proletarian literature, music, drama, and general entertainment. All of their literature contains nothing of substance—mostly sports, astrology, and some sentimental songs. However there is also Pornosec, a department devoted to producing pornography for the proles at which other Party members are forbidden to ever look (Orwell 43). The proles, even though they were perceived as the lowest creatures—Syme says, “The proles are not human beings”—(Orwell 53), they were given the most freedom and entertainment. The real reason, however, that the proles are permitted this material, is to keep them distracted from the real issues.

The proles also live the poorest and simplest of lifestyles. The proles, “were born, they grew up in gutters, they went to work at twelve…they married at twenty, they were middle aged at thirty, they died, for the most part at sixty. Heavy physical work, the care of home and children, petty quarrels with neighbors, films, football,
beer, and above all, gambling filled up the horizon of their minds” (Orwell 71). For the Party, “it was not desirable that the proles should have strong political feelings” (Orwell 71). If the proles actually did have strong political feelings, as the majority of the population in Oceania, they might actually be able to do something. But as Winston will think later, the proles will never rebel. Winston believes that “the proles stayed human. They had not become hardened inside” (Orwell 72). They have stayed human because their social class dictates it. The irony in the existence of the proles is that they are simultaneously the least importance social class and the biggest threat to the larger structure; they just have not realized it. They are born proles and they die proles. If they have no desire to fight the entire structure of society, they will go about their lives in the kind of harmony that suits them.

Huxley chooses to bioengineer his social classes in *Brave New World*. As we have seen earlier, society determines your social class in order to ensure happiness with your given position. “Social harmony is converted into a eugenics problem” (Burkowski 40) meaning that each social class is bioengineered to accelerate or stunt those within it. As the Director explains on the student tour, society “predestine[s]...[by] decant[ing] our babies as socialized human beings, as Alphas or Epsilons...’” (Huxley 23). An individual is physically altered according to the class prescribed to them. For example, “The lower the caste...the shorter the oxygen’’ to the brain (Huxley 24). The Epsilons do not need intelligence, but strength and therefore, “an Epsilon embryo must have an Epsilon environment as well as an Epsilon heredity’’” (Huxley 24). We can only assume, then, that the Alphas undergo
the same kind of treatment, just in the opposite direction. As justification for manipulating DNA, Mond explains that Alphas having to do Epsilon work would create unhappiness (Huxley 200) and therefore, there must be a lower caste created specifically to do lower caste work. But if the “labourers are physically and mentally stunted; they are incapable of imagining a revolution let alone contemplating one. No doubt their work could be done by machines; they really exist mainly as mouths to be fed by the consumer economy in the novel” (Burkowski 40). As individuals, the lower classes especially have no other existence except for the state. Essentially, all of Huxley’s biotechnology is just to “fit the individual human being to the state’s requirements” (Deery 260). If we are bioengineered with limits on our capabilities, there would be no way for us to know. And if we do not know what we are missing, there is nothing to be unhappy about. Huxley thinks, we are not as free as we may believe.

Because Walden Two desperately wants to be a utopia, there are no obvious signs of the kind of social stratification we have seen from Orwell and Huxley. Skinner even references Huxley in the hopes of separating his utopia from Huxley’s well known dystopia. Frazier denies, “‘No, Walden Two is not that kind of brave new world’” (Skinner 46). But is it not? Granted, Walden Two may not give honorific titles to doctors or dentists as we do in our world, but they do make distinctions for Planners, Managers, and Scientists. The fact that these groups have titles in a community that claims not to have social classes, implicitly marks them as superiors. This is especially so because those who do have titles are not just workers, they are
those who plan the community, manage the community, and scientifically develop the community emphasizing what the community truly cherishes. Additionally, if you are not one of the above, you are a worker and forcibly so. Frazier believes that if they did not have the workers, “‘A leisure class would grow like a cancer until the strain upon the rest of the community became intolerable” (Skinner 50). It appears that there still is need to force people to work because most people would not choose menial labor over other activities. They may need “encouragement.” By being workers, though, people do gain a sense of solidarity because the same structures and rules apply to all workers. They contribute to a better life and will take pride in that life to build a better community. If they believe they have built a better community, they will remain loyal to that community.

Outsiders

Alignment in a social class is only a symbolic microcosm for the alignment to the state. Patriotism is usually positively connoted, however, nationalism is patriotism gone blind. It is not enough that one is patriotic in 1984, Brave New World, or Walden Two; one must be nationalistic. These societies create an image of the ‘other’ to instill fear in the people of anyone who is different from them. Vamik D. Volkan calls the ‘other’ a “‘suitable target of externalization’… [and, that] such targets play a part in the genesis of ethnicity, nationality and other similar phenomena, and are the foundations for building up concepts of enemies and allies” (Volkan 231). The people of these states come to fear outsiders as enemies that will invade their nation and
change it. Because they have been conditioned to reject change, they rely on the protection of their government. Suddenly, the state is the hero and the people further owe their loyalties to them.

The Party in *1984* creates a constant state of war which creates a constant state of fear of the other and a constant state of loyalty to the Party. From Goldstein’s book, Winston learns that all three superstates, Oceania, Eastasia, and Eurasia, must cut off all contact with foreigners because they are always an enemy in one way or another (Orwell 196). This is because “if he were allowed contact with foreigners he would discover that they are creatures similar to himself and that most of what he has been told about them is lies.” (Orwell 196). Keeping the people isolated, then, advances the concept of nationalism. Orwell considers nationalism to be “the habit of identifying oneself with a single nation...and recognizing no other duty than that of advancing its interests” (qtd.in Volkan 221). If the people are unaware of their similarities to outsiders, they will assume that these outsiders are different and inferior to them. Furthermore, actually, Goldstein points out, all three superstates are essentially the same. Oceania has Ingsoc, Eastasia has “death-worship,” and Eurasia has Neo-Bolshevism. These are just different types of the same totalitarianism. One can assume, then, that the tactics employed in Oceania would also be employed in the other superstates, creating three isolated nations all fearing each other, but proving radically loyal to themselves.

The Party creates an enemy out of whichever superstate they claim to currently be at war with. Reinforcement of this enemy surrounds the people of
Oceania on the telescreen. When Winston is watching he sees, “a Eurasian soldier who seemed to be advancing [out of the telescreen], huge and terrible, his submachine gun roaring and seeming to spring out of the surface of the screen, so that some of the people in the front row actually flinched backwards in their seats. But in that same moment, drawing a deep sigh of relief from everybody, the hostile figure melted into the face of Big Brother” (Orwell 15). The people are to associate fear and danger with the enemy and to attach relief and calmness to Big Brother as the hostile image “melts” when Big Brother appears. Ironically, though, Orwell probably intended that the reader view the Eurasian soldier and Big Brother as the one in the same. The people lack insight into this subtle shift due to their conditioning and go on hating the outsider enemy just the same. Additionally, it makes no difference which state is the enemy of Oceania at any time. In the middle of Hate Week, the Party announces that Oceania has been at war with Eastasia the whole time, not Eurasia—Goldstein’s agents are rumored to having been at work putting up the wrong posters and banners (Orwell 180). Frighteningly, “the hate continued as exactly as before, except that the target had been changed” (Orwell 181). As long as that target exists outside the limits of Oceania, the Party has accomplished its goal and the people remain loyal.

But the Party does not stop at present enemies, they also warn of the enemies from the past, from people who may want to rebel and revert to pre-revolutionary times. Children’s history textbooks, for example, describe the capitalists from the past as money hungry, enslaving, cruel masters and kings who have sex with whatever
woman they want (Orwell 72-73). The capitalists are depicted as the horrible enemy that no one would ever want to see back in power. It is significant that this information is printed in a children’s textbook demonstrating the target audience of this mentality. If the Party influences the children’s opinion of past social structures, the children will also reject those structures, having neither experience of anything different nor any proof that this image of capitalists is itself propaganda. Targeting the children’s loyalty from the beginning of their lives will solidify their future loyalty as adults who promote the continuation of the Party.

The “savages” in *Brave New World* are used as a comparison device to promote the greatness of the people’s new world. The people of *Brave New World* are allowed, with permission, to visit the reservations in New Mexico to view their lifestyle. As Bernard and Lenina prepare for their trip to the reservation, the Warden gives them an introduction to savage life. The Warden, with a warning tone designed to instill fear in Bernard and Lenina, lists all the values that make the reservation “savage.” For instance, people are *born* there, and as we know, once you’re born there, you die there. There are 60,000 Indians and half breeds that believe in marriage, family, superstitions, Christianity and Totemism. They have no conditioning and many poisonous animals exist (Huxley 100). But the savages will not harm any visitors because they have previously experienced, and are further threatened with, gas bombs if they do (Huxley 102). The significance here is that even though the savages are free to live as they please largely untouched, the state still controls them.
Visitors may come and gawk at them at leisure while the savages are not allowed to react.

Once on the reservation, Bernard, but especially Lenina, have horrified reactions to savage life. Lenina is particularly horrified at the aging of the people and the quasi-induction ceremony they witness. In the new world, people never age; for this reason, Lenina is stunned when she can see herself in the old women on the reservation, namely Linda, who, by our standards, is not even “old” (Huxley 112). When Bernard and Lenina talk to Linda they discover that she had no choice but to try to assimilate to life on the reservation. Even then she was not successful as she continued to be promiscuous and therefore shunned and beaten. She maintains a dislike for them and a misunderstanding of them. She says, “It’s all different here. It’s like living with lunatics. Everything they do is mad” (Huxley 114). Ironically, the reader would believe that everything in Brave New World is “mad” and Huxley seems to be playing with this dual perspective. The hope is, however, that by visiting the reservations, the citizens of Brave New World will find solace in their newly “civilized” society and, consequently, want it to remain untouched by others.

Just as in 1984, Brave New World constructs a fear of past practices. Mustapha Mond explains the history of the pre-Moderns that existed before the Nine Years War. Because the pre-Moderns had families, personal relationships, and monogamy, Mond asks, “No wonder these poor pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable...They were forced to feel [emotions] so strongly so how could they be stable?” (Huxley 47). Here Mond reiterates the society’s motto: “No civilization
without social stability. No social stability without individual stability’’ (Huxley 47).
The pre-Modems are then considered uncivilized when compared with the new world.
Making an “other” of the pre-Modems, the current citizens are afraid of ever going
back to that past. In fact, Mond sees the ancestors as stupid and short sighted because
“‘when the first reformers came along and offered to deliver them from those horrible
emotions, they wouldn’t have anything to do with them’” (Huxley 50). The ‘first
reformers’ is a probable reference to the socialists during Huxley’s time. So not only
were the Pre-Modems unstable because of their emotions, they were also stupid not to
institute this new society when it was first presented years before. Having no respect
for the past and certainly no understanding of anyone outside of their society, the
inhabitants of *Brave New World* are perfectly content to let their Directors and
Controllers protect the lives they are living with as little interruption as possible.

*Walden Two* intends to remain isolated and influenced as little as possible by
the outside world as well. The community of Walden Two does not particularly view
themselves as part of the outside nation and therefore have little to do with outside
affairs. In return for remaining isolated, Walden Two asks only that the larger
government let them exist in peace. But there is one very important rule in the Code
that the members of Walden Two must follow above all—“‘Don’t talk to outsiders
about the affairs of the community. Planners are exempt, and others are allowed to
violate the rule in certain cases’” (Skinner 150). Forbidding members to speak about
the community is a sign of shame and secrecy. Frazier explains, “‘Our Manager of
Public Relations would have a bad time of it if visitors were misled by remarks which
might be misinterpreted. We aren’t quite sure of ourselves in the eyes of the world, and must take precautions” (Skinner 150). The precautions may be valid, but the rule alone creates an oppositional mentality—that an outsider may feel hostility toward a member of Walden Two. By following the rule, the members of Walden Two perpetuate this concept even if they do not recognize it consciously.

Similarly to *Brave New World*, the Planners and Managers of Walden Two must promote their own society among its members in the face of the outside society. Frazier claims to use fair and unbiased information when comparing Walden Two with other societies (Skinner 191), but in reality they do not need heavy-handed propaganda because their members have already been engineered. Nevertheless, Walden Two exposes its children to life outside of their community. Frazier adamantly contends that they show the children the truth of the world, “‘Nothing more is needed...they also see the other side of the tracks – the city hospital, the missions, the home for indigents, the saloons, the jail’” (Skinner 192). In other words, the children, for the most part, experience all of the awfulness of current society without admitting this is not the *only* way to live. As far as outsider propaganda reaching the children inside Walden Two, Frazier says, “‘We explain that advertisements almost always show pleasant and attractive people, and interesting and beautiful landscapes, beaches, and homes’” (Skinner 192). Of course, the children are not going to be jealous or envious of the people in the photographs because they have been programmed differently. Their conditioning will only raise a sense of distaste for this culture and a sense of appreciation for their own. In a sense,
taking them outside of Walden Two is testing the success of the experiment. If the children remain loyal members of Walden Two, the conditioning has worked. There is no mention of failure.

When we look at the progression from the family to the state, we learn that loyalty is easily transferable under the proper conditions. "Individuality is displaced by common identity" and then, the only notable occurrence is the success of the group (Volkan 226). Due to their initial programming, individuals in these societies exchange their personal loyalties for those of the state. Chad Walsh says, "Even in those inverted utopias that keep some semblance of a traditional family system, the children are brought up not as sons or daughters but as citizens" (142). The children then are raised to be sons or daughters of the state and to be a part of the larger effort of the group. Further, "group psychology is concerned with persons as members of a race, nation, caste, profession, or institution; or as a component part of a crowd of persons who have come together for a specific purpose" (Volkan 226). Group mentality cultivates a common interest—he state as "family." The state will not accept us if we have not cut personal ties and succumbed to our place in the social structure. If the citizens comply, and they have no other psychological choice, the state promises protection from outsiders. The fear of this ghostly enemy is just enough to convince the people they are where they should be—home.
Chapter Three
Hiding History and Information

When people pledge their devotion to the state, the state will naturally want to keep firm hold of it. To do so, they must systematically censor information that could possibly affect that devotion. If one is aligned to the state and trusts them wholeheartedly, one will accept everything the state tells them as truth. This is rarely the case in nonfiction, let alone in dystopic fiction. Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner all utilize a system which ignores historical data and contains or edits current information. In some instances, these societies not only keep information from their citizens but replace it with false information that would convince the people even more completely that the state is benevolent. But as we will see, “to be lied to, to accept being lied to, or to rationalize and defend lying for the sake of a better world—all of that, taken to extreme, will produce a sick and divided soul” (Aldeson 117). As the people of 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two, are continuously lied to, another part of their psychology is eroded away. However, as is the case in other areas, most people, most of the time, rarely recognize the deceit.

In 1984, information is in a constant state of flux. With a Party tenet that states, “who controls the past...controls the future: who controls the present controls the past,” how could any person distinguish fact from fiction? As we have already seen, the targeted enemy can change without a moment’s notice. Winston knew quite well that “it was only four years since Oceania had been at war with Eastasia and in alliance with Eurasia. ...Officially the change of partners had never happened.
Oceania was at war with Eurasia and therefore Oceania had always been at war with Eurasia” (Orwell 34). And Winston, more than any other character in the text, is familiar with the process of manipulating information. He is an official employee of the ironically named, Ministry of Truth. The Party euphemistically calls these changes “slips, errors, misprints, or misquotations which it was necessary to put right in the interests of accuracy” (Orwell 40). Correcting those “slips and errors” is Winston’s job. Orwell gives a detailed example of Winston’s job:

As short a time ago as February, the Ministry of Plenty had issued a promise (a ‘categorical pledge’ were the official words) that there would be no reduction of the chocolate ration during 1984. Actually, as Winston was aware, the chocolate ration was to be reduced from thirty grams to twenty at the end of the present week. All that was needed was to substitute for the original promise a warning that it would probably be necessary to reduce the ration at some time in April. (Orwell 40)

And the facts need to be changed throughout all forms of media – newspapers, books, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, films, soundtracks, cartoons, photographs— anything with social or political significance (Orwell 39). The fact that information changes rapidly does not much matter because the information could have been false in the first place. Those who support the Party will choose not to investigate, and those who do not support the Party will not find anything to investigate. The Party wins either way.
Whether or not the chocolate ration has changed seems minor in comparison to the Party's involvement in document changing and forging. In the case of Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford, the three men were convicted of conspiracy against the Party, and were released on the grounds that they promised to make amends. Winston remembers seeing Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford in the Chestnut Tree Café shortly after their release. They were motionless and speechless, suffering from broken noses. A few days after Winston saw the three men, they were captured again and this time they confessed to being on Eurasian soil on a particular date undisclosed to the reader. Winston remembers this date because it was the same date transcribed on a previous photograph of Jones, Aaronson, and Rutherford that he was given orders to alter weeks ago. This photograph shows them in New York on the same date they confess to being on Eurasian soil. The only conclusion Winston could draw was that their confession was a lie which proves that the Party could alter history: "If the Party could thrust its hand into the past and say of this or of that event, it never happened – that, surely, was more terrifying than mere torture and death" (Orwell 34). Winston remembers that as he sat at his desk holding evidence of the Party's changes, he contemplated rising up against the Party. He did not, however, deciding that one piece of evidence would not change the Party's hold on society, but only result in his death. Even Winston, the Party's most significant dissident at the time, is frightened of what may happen if he rebels against the Party.

In contrast to Winston, who seems to remember information, details, and experiences from the past, the proles cannot remember the past at all. When Winston
asks an old man in a bar of the changes he has seen, the old man replies, “The beer was better...before the war” (Orwell 89). When Winston asks which war he is talking about, the old man responds, “It’s all wars” (Orwell 89). The proles, who are almost completely unaffected by Party control, still cannot compare any past to the present. The old man with whom Winston speaks, has no idea what Winston is talking about – freedom, the capitalists, slavery, etc. Winston reflects, “Within twenty years at the most...the huge and simple question, ‘Was life better before the Revolution than it is now?’ would have ceased once and for all to be answerable. But in effect it was unanswerable even now, since the few scattered survivors from the ancient world were incapable of comparing one age with another” (Orwell 93). If no one remembers the past, no one can demand it back, and if no one makes this demand, the Party remains effective in maintaining the status quo.

In *Brave New World*, there is reverential place for history. Students in *Brave New World* are not taught history, as Ford apparently declared, “History is bunk” (Huxley 40). Mond explains that they used to be concerned with knowledge as the highest good, and truth as the supreme value, but not after the war. The onset of worshipping Ford “shifted the emphasis from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness...[and] one can’t have something for nothing. Happiness has got to be paid for” (Huxley 205). This happiness Mond refers to “signals humanity’s quiet and irreversible self-destruction” (Deery 260) in the sense that have already given up freedoms they will never get back for the sake of happiness they do not really have. Huxley shows a society in which “the abolition of history...[implies an] unchanging
future (Burkowski 39). By ignoring history, the citizens of the new world have condemned themselves to an eternity of this superficial “happiness.” Again, they may not realize it, but it is a self-destructive prophecy they uphold.

It is not just history that is withheld from the people; culture is withheld as well. As Laura Frost asserts, “Brave New World is a cautionary tale about a world in which artifacts of high culture are held under lock and key” (447) unavailable to the populace as a whole. The high culture Frost alludes to is William Shakespeare. Mond must defend the absence of Shakespeare to John who, as a child, found consolation within his works. Shakespeare’s work is banned because it is old; they have no use for old things, particularly those that have beauty. Mond says, “Beauty is attractive and we don’t want people to be attracted by old things. We want them to like the new ones” (Huxley 197). Attractions to new things keep production and economic progress moving forward. It also enforces the ideal of transience. In specific reference to Shakespeare, Mond adds, “You can’t make tragedies without social instability” (Huxley 197). Because Shakespeare wrote many tragedies, and the new world aims for stability, the two are not compatible. Ironically though, Mond agrees with John, “Stability isn’t nearly so spectacular as instability. Happiness is never grand” (Huxley 199). He may feel that way, but it is still Mond’s job to know the degree of ignorance society should have. In the interest of happiness, Shakespeare is not exactly an ideal choice.

Mond is also in charge of hiding religious texts from the citizens of the new world. Huxley clearly understands the purpose of religion as Mond expounds on the
reasons the new world must avoid it to stay in power. Religious philosophers, such as Maine de Biran referenced in the text, propose that man does not belong to himself but to God, that independence is an unnatural state, and that old age and sickness create fear. Fear ultimately leads us to religion (Huxley 208-9). Mond adds that in old age our reason becomes less troubled and less obscured by desires, so we turn to God as an absolute truth to compensate for all the hardships endured on earth. The new world, however, extinguishes all of the hardships and no longer has a use for God (Huxley 209-210). Because Mond admits he believes in God, he can therefore believe it God’s absence (Huxley 210), “‘God isn’t compatible with machinery, scientific medicine and universal happiness. You must make your choice’” (Huxley 210). Mond knows that “‘one believes things because one has been conditioned to believe them’” (Huxley 211). Mond adds, “[the gods’] code of law is dictated...by the people who organize society. Providence takes its cue from men’” (Huxley 211). Law, even spiritual law, originates with men. As citizens, people really have no idea what truth is from years of being told a version of truth. People have no evidence to believe anything and yet they do. People believe in truth due to their conditioning and conditioning keeps stability.

Skinner’s *Walden Two* also disregards the importance of history. Frazier feels that “‘history tells us nothing’” so why should they waste time exploring it? (Skinner 181). History is not in the school, “‘We don’t teach history...We don’t keep our young people ignorant of it, any more that we keep them ignorant of mythology, or any other subject. They may read all the history they like. But we don’t regard it as
essential in their education. We don’t turn them in that direction and not many take it!” (Skinner 223). Frazier says this as if the members really decide, but in reality, it is his influence keeping them from history. He continues:

I don’t care how well historical facts can be known from afar. Is it important all? I submit that history never even comes close to repeating itself. Even if we had reliable information about the past, we couldn’t find a case similar enough to justify inferences about the present or immediate future. We can make no real use of history as a current guide... What we give our young people in Walden Two is a grasp of the current forces which a culture must deal with... The present is the thing. (Skinner 224-5)

With all the focus on the present, and without knowledge of history, there are no comparisons between the two to be made. As in 1984 and Brave New World, Walden Two eliminates the past to eliminate any identification with the past. If the idea that history allows a clearer perspective of the present is denied, the society must favor an illogical control of the present stability.

Unknowingly, Frazier admits to having control over individual members’ choices. Even though there is a focus on the present, the members of Walden Two do not participate in the present sociopolitical affairs. The Political Manager “informs himself of the qualifications of the candidates in local and state elections. With the help of the Planners he draws up what we call the “Walden Ticket,” and we all go to the polls and vote it straight” (Skinner 183). Frazier contests that members of Walden Two should not have to waste their time thinking about politics and
candidates, but Frazier is only reiterating the lack of confidence he has in people, even engineered ones, to make “correct” decisions. Walden Two members yield complete trust to their community leaders to make choices for them while the community only shields them from any other influences.

The individuals in 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two live in a society in which truth is insignificant and history is irrelevant. Neither issue truly matters because devotees will remain devotees as long as the state demands it. The people in these communities have been conditioned to view the state as a protector of the current society and because of that “people are... trapped in an eternal present, with no recourse to a past by reference to which they could construct alternate futures” (Burkowski 39-40). If alternatives are eliminated from the equation, the future remains the same as the present. The only reason Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner, as authors, can even imagine a fictitious community is through their knowledge of history and politics. By removing that knowledge, one does not have the tools to even conceptually construct a disparate culture. Conditioning removes the desire to rebel.
Chapter Four
Technology: The Extension of the State

The next stage in the paradigm of dystopian psychology is to create an atmosphere conducive to the state’s new psychology. All three texts use technology, albeit differently, to create the appropriate climate for their needs. Thomas W. Cooper references Nietzsche’s “perspectivism” in his article, “Fictional 1984 and Factual 1984.” Perspectivism is as an approach to culture that essentially determines how a group may gain power through controlling the perspective of its constituents (91). Governments in dystopias are widely guilty of perspectivism. They use a variety of techniques, namely psychological conditioning as we have seen, to institutionalize what the universally “correct” perspective is for their society. In these texts, perspective is governed by the use and manipulation of technology. While 1984 uses technology in frightening proportions, and Brave New World mocks the overextended influence of technology, Walden Two eliminates technology altogether and reverts to manpower. What all three have in common, however, is the creation of diversions so that the people are consistently focused on other aspects of society such as the invasion of surveillance, entertainment, or personal goals. The degree to which the people are distracted by the increase or decrease in technology, effectually changes their values and culture. The objective, of course, is that the people share the same perspective as the state. By shifting their focus either towards or away from technology, the state can then distract the people from the real issues at stake.
Technology in any form infiltrates the mind of the people, forming their perspective and thus their culture.

Media exploitation was the chosen method for the Party to take control of society after the revolution. Because of new technologies, privacy and individual thought came to an end rather abruptly. The Party was able to manipulate print, film, and radio to manipulate public opinions. "Only electronic voices, plaque and poster replicas of 'Big Brother,' and Party-composed music saturate the senses" (Cooper 91). Moreover, there was no escape from the saturation. Technological media seems to be omnipresent as "microphones are hidden everywhere and the telescreen, which only Inner Party members may briefly turn off, constantly informs, educates, and persuades all Party members" (Cooper 84). With all of this white noise, it seems one could hardly focus on any independent thought for very long, if at all. The technology of media, then, became the arm that reached from the Party and into one's head.

_Nineteen Eighty-Four_ places all of its technological eggs in one basket, finding it to be the most effective for their purposes. Just as the only advanced system of law is the Thought Police, the only advanced system of technology is surveillance. Along with Big Brother, the telescreen also functions as a central image and metaphor in the novel. The telescreen "could be dimmed, but there was no way of shutting it off completely" (Orwell 2). The people are in a constant state of surveillance with no way to escape it. Winston explains how the telescreen becomes the extension of the Thought Police and essentially of the state:
The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously. Any sound that Winston made...would be picked up by it; moreover, so long as he remained within the field of vision which the metal plaque commanded, he could be seen as well as heard. There was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. How often, or on what system, the Thought Police plugged in on any individual wire was guesswork. It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time. But at any rate they could plug in your wire whenever they wanted to. You had to live – did live, from habit that became instinct – in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and except in darkness, every moment scrutinized.

(Orwell 3)

With the telescreen’s constant presence, people live in fear of making any error. This is so ingrained, Winston says, that awareness of your thoughts and actions becomes instinct. “Surveillance has a psychologically ‘chilling effect’ in suppressing individual actions through intimidation and feelings of powerlessness, above and beyond the objective facts of the surveillance itself” (Zimbardo 133). The feeling of powerlessness leads to concession to the rules, whatever they may be. Giving up means giving up power to the state.

The focus on surveillance is really a focus on psychology and the focus on psychology is so dominant that there are few mental resources left in a person to comprehend anything else. “In spite of hardware like automatic novel-writing machines and telescreens, the world of 1984 is considerably less sophisticated
technologically” (Burkowski 40). Oceania is not technologically sophisticated in the ways we would expect; the Party chooses to advance only one specific scientific area. Orwell describes to the reader the Party’s frightening interest in psychology:

The empirical method of thought, on which all the scientific achievements of the past were founded, is opposed to the most fundamental principles of Ingsoc. And even technological progress only happens when its products can in some way be used for the diminution of human liberty. In all the useful arts the world is either standing still or going backwards... The scientist of today is either a mixture of psychologist and inquisitor, studying with extraordinary minuteness the meaning of facial expressions, gestures, and tones of voice, and testing the truth producing effects of drugs, shock therapy, hypnosis, and physical torture; or he is a chemist, physicist, or biologist concerned only with such branches of his special subject as are relevant to the taking of life.

(Orwell 193-194)

The Party has learned the best way to control people is to read their thoughts and threaten them with death. These are the only areas worth cultivation because any other area of science develops an individual’s mind. The Party does not want psychological development; they want psychological degeneration.

1984 also has very little technological entertainment. The war “flicks” are the closest thing to movies Oceania has and these are filled with propaganda. The one war film that we witness through Winston shows a man trying to escape a helicopter that is chasing him. The audience finds hilarious a man being shot repeatedly and
breaks out in roaring laughter as the man sinks into the pink water. From the helicopter, a bomb is dropped onto a raft holding women and children; again, the audience responds with more laughter. A lone prole woman cries out and is escorted out of the theater. No one else in the audience, or anywhere else, cares or worries about a prole’s reaction or opinion (Orwell 8-9). We can see that “the main function of cinema in 1984 is one of political propaganda...The glory shots of the ‘war films’...stimulate the elated response of an audience conditioned to the point of enjoying the sight of a ‘child’s arm severed by a bomb” (Varricchio 5 of 15). The war films serve two purposes: one is to distract the people by monopolizing their leisure time; another is to create a social climate replete with hate and violence.

Huxley depicts a world that has been overrun by technology. Perhaps the most startling is the creation and widespread use of soma. Soma is a drug specifically engineered to allow people to escape reality. With soma one has “all the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; [and] none of their defects;...[one] come[s] back without so much as a headache or mythology...stability was practically assured” (Huxley 60). Soma is just another device used by the elite to control the people’s temperaments. “In this case the aim is simply to keep the machinery turning and maintain all citizens, male and female, in a state of calm through superficial contentment” (Deery 260). People about to take soma often affirm, “I take a gramme and only am.” Even though the state claims there are no side effects of the drug, we know this to be false after watching Linda overdose on soma upon her return to her former society. After a certain number of doses, the brain becomes senile. But even this is a side effect the
state can appreciate; senility also leaves the individual confused and oblivious to their surroundings.

Huxley further creates the “feelies” in *Brave New World* to demonstrate the amount of distraction the people tolerate in this society. All one has to do is hold onto individual metal knobs in the theatre and all of the physical sensations depicted in the film are experienced. The feelies, interestingly, mostly depict sexual sensations. Lenina and John go to see a feely, *Three Weeks in a Helicopter*, about a Beta blonde damsel in distress. She is, of course, rescued from a crazed black man by three white Alphas who, at the conclusion of the movie, participate in an orgy with her (Huxley 154). Huxley reflected his own views about the cinema into *Brave New World*. At the time the “talkies” came out, some felt that the “mass culture consumption was described as intoxication, addiction, deluded reverie, and gluttony” (Frost 445). The feelies in the new world represent those same societal values. For Huxley, the talkies “induce[d] the audience into ‘a kind of hypnotic state’…Both hypnosis and intoxication influence the mind and body, suggesting that the cinema spectator is vulnerable on two fronts” (Frost 445). Huxley clearly believed that the cinema’s only purpose was to delude the audience and completely engross their senses, leaving their minds incapable of other thoughts and values.

Huxley further contests that the cinema in general, and the feelies specifically, promote passivity in the viewer that infiltrates other areas of life. In Huxley’s popular 1923 essay, “Pleasures” he writes about the cinema and argues, “In place of the old pleasures demanding intelligence and personal initiative, we have vast organizations
that provide us with ready-made distractions...no personal participation and no intellectual effort of any sort...Countless audiences soak passively in the tepid bath of nonsense. No mental effort is demanded of them, no participation; they need only sit and keep their eyes open” (qtd. in Frost 446-7). Huxley’s strong opinions towards the early movies are obvious in *Brave New World*. John is disgusted by the sexual vulgarity depicted in the feely that he and Lenina see. Because the audience has become accustomed to the mechanisms of the feelies, they come to expect and demand instant gratification which changes the values of the society, as Huxley predicted. Mond says that “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 150). Of course not, solitary amusements would result in independent and clear thinking, of which they get little in *Brave New World*.

The rise of technology in *Brave New World* is accompanied by a sterilized atmosphere. From the opening lines of the novel, “Wintriness responded to wintriness. The overalls of the workers were white, their hands gloved with a pale corpse-coloured rubber. The light was frozen, dead, a ghost” (Huxley 15). This scene significantly sets the tone for the rest of the novel. It is the “‘cold’ science of *Brave New World*...[that] is cut off from, and even hostile to, nature; in *Brave New World* this means aggression, competition, and triumph over natural processes. The talk may be of fertility rates, but the society as a whole is sterile” (Deery 268). As natural processes have become obsolete, so have the emotions that rule them. There is proof of this emotional sterility in society’s reaction to John’s suffering and turmoil.
Because society is desensitized to violence, emotions, and inner conflicts, Darwin Bonaparte, a societal filmmaker, exploits John’s suffering. Bonaparte captures on film John flagellating himself and titles the piece, *The Savage of Surrey*. This film could be “seen, heard, and felt in every first class feely-palace in Western Europe” (Huxley 226). Swarms of people come to see him in person making a mockery of John and his actions calling it, “the whipping stunt” (Huxley 228). Portraying John’s affliction on film “emphasizes the metamorphosis of personal tragedy into a spectacle for the masses… [It is] journalistic malpractice… a cynical exploitation” (Varricchio 4 of 15). This society cannot grasp conceptually the purpose of self-mutilation and therefore cannot take it seriously. The depiction of John in the film proves the desensitized and self-gratifying culture in which the people of *Brave New World* live.

*Walden’s Two*’s technology leaves much to be desired especially when compared to *1984* and *Brave New World*. In Walden Two, any improvements to society are highly encouraged. For example, one improvement Frazier discusses is the shift to glass cafeteria trays and utensils. This way, one could see the mess sooner and clean it faster. They have also improved upon the standard drinking glass. A larger glass, with a strap attached allows one to carry their drink without spilling it. If these inventions seem trivial as the output of their society, it is because they are and society is merely patronizing. Frazier says, “The actual achievement is beside the point. The main thing is we encourage our people to view every habit and custom with an eye to possible improvement. A constantly experimental attitude toward everything – that’s all we need. Solutions to the problems of every sort follow almost
miraculously” (Skinner 25). Creating a climate of experiment and invention leaves open opportunities to suggest other experiments and inventions however radical—including behavioral engineering. While people are wasting their time and energy on insignificant inventions, the state is inventing thought control.

Skinner invents thought control to create a society in which perfection is the ultimate objective. Skinner creates an atmosphere of striving for perfection. Perfection, according to Frazier, cannot happen without the work of the community. He says, “we simply make mass production available to everyone as a consequence of cooperative living” (Skinner 43) but these labor-saving practices require cultural engineering. As we have heard him say earlier, Frazier wants to create a science out of human behavior and human engineering. He declares, “That we shall eventually find out; not only what makes a child mathematical, but how to make better mathematicians! If we can’t solve a problem, we can create men who can!” (Skinner 275). In this regard, Walden Two sounds a lot like Brave New World. Both emphasize man’s flaws and strive to perfect them through science of any kind. If the people are distracted by their inventive contribution to society, they feel they have chosen to be there freely. The perfect human being, according to Frazier, would be someone who follows his or her own behavioral engineering without significant errors. By allowing them to feel free, but unaware of whether they are actually free or not, Frazier creates a perfect climate for people to accept their engineering.

If we discuss perspective in terms of what the people see around them, then in these texts, the people only can see the state. They see the state in their movies, on
their radios, on their screens, and in their minds. The first objective of technology is to distract the people either through the fear of being watched, through entertainment, or through societal improvements; the people are distracted by what surrounds them. Because the presence or absence of technology is strong, technology holds political implications. “Both Huxley and Orwell strongly denounce visual conditioning and the political use made of it...[it constitutes a] fundamental means of exercising mental and physical dominance over people” (Varricchio 13 of 15). We can see this in Skinner as well. All three authors determine the role that technology is going to play in their societies. They have determined that the only reason for technology is to transform the culture of a previous society into a culture that is aligned with the current group in power. Orwell and Huxley make extensive use of advanced technology in order to influence and remind their people of a particular value system, while Skinner takes it away largely to reduce the people to a different value system. The intentional or unintentional warnings from the authors concerning technology are clear: either technological extreme, too much or two little, could prove to be our demise.
Chapter Five
The Body as a Symbol of Control

When those in power have created an atmosphere and culture that is to their liking, they attack the body, searching out and fixing errors. Having penetrated the mind through endless conditioning, the mind emerges as a pathway to the body. For the state, then, the body functions as a symbol. What the state can do with the body represents the enormity of their power over the individual. One would think that after so much effort put into conditioning, the state would have no need to control the body as it would thus control itself. While this may be true in some ways, the state is relentless and unwilling to let a mistake escape the conditioning. Collectively, the states in 1984, Brave New World and Walden Two mandate long lists of corporeal concerns: creation, appearance, sexuality, labor, and punishment. While bioengineering is exclusive to Brave New World, and labor exclusive to Walden Two, the remainder apply to all three works. Because the mind already belongs to the state, it is much easier to stake claims on the physical representation of man that is in itself a symbol of individuality, not community. It is through this lens that we must view the state’s attack on the physicality of its society members.

The Standard

As we have discussed previously, Big Brother’s is omnipresent in 1984, showing that there is little a person can accomplish physically without Big Brother or the Party knowing about it. But there is not only thoughtcrime to worry about, there is
also facecrime. Before Winston and Julia officially meet, she gives him a look in the cafeteria that initially worries Winston. Winston is immediately concerned with his own reactionary facial expressions:

He did not know how long she had been looking at him, but perhaps for as much as five minutes, and it was possible that his features had not been perfectly under control. 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 punishable offense. (Orwell 62)

Because any deviant facial expression is seen as a symptom of thoughtcrime, Winston ignorantly feels, “Nothing was your own except a few cubic centimeters inside your skull” (Orwell 27). Winston is right in one respect, the Party does control all of ones thoughts and actions; the only thing left would be is a few centimeters of ones mind, not the entire mind. As we have seen, Winston is ignorant to think he even has that. But because Winston believes he has “few cubic centimeters,” he ventures to break the rules by writing in a diary: “This was not illegal...but if detected it was reasonably certain that it would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced labor camp” (Orwell 6). Writing in a diary is itself a symbol of the entanglement between psychological and physical actions in that it contains both. First, one has a
private thought, and, second, one acts upon that thought by writing it down. It is this progression the Party is trying to thwart by instituting facecrime – the first signal that something is awry.

Huxley takes a much more aggressive approach to controlling the body in that *Brave New World* literally constructs people to suit society’s needs perfectly. As the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning leads a group of students around the Fertilizing Room, Huxley describes the fertilization process:

> Opening an insulated door, he showed them racks upon racks of numbered test tubes...[he] showed them how this liquor was drawn off from the test-tubes; how it was let out drop by drop onto the specifically warmed slides of the microscopes; how the eggs which it contained were inspected for abnormalities, counted and transferred to a porous receptacle; how...this receptacle was immersed in a warms bouillon containing free-swimming spermatozoa.

(Huxley 16-17).

What we witness is the “miracle” of birth. The process used here is not the same process that is used for everyone. We know that this process is altered to determine social class by mentally stunting the lower classes and mentally advancing the higher classes. It is also used to cause sterility. There are many females that are chosen as “freemartins” that is, barren. The Director says to the students:

‘In the vast majority of cases, fertility is merely a nuisance. One fertile ovary in twelve hundred – that would really be quite sufficient for our purposes. But we want to have a good choice. And of course one must always have an enormous
margin of safety. So we allow as many as thirty percent of the female embryos to develop normally. The others get a dose of male sex-hormone every twenty-four metres for the rest of the course. Result: they’re decanted as freemartins – structurally quite normal (except, ‘he had to admit, ‘that they do have the slightest tendency to grow beards), but sterile. Guaranteed sterile.’ (Huxley 23)

Huxley has created a world in which conception and fertility have become scientific processes designed to avoid variances and create the ideal individual for the state’s purposes.

But beyond creating man, *Brave New World* seeks also to preserve man. In the new world, there is no aging. The process is similarly cold and scientific as they use “gonadal hormones, transfusion of young blood, magnesium salts...All the physical stigmata of old age have been abolished. And along with them of course...along with them all the old man’s mental peculiarities. Characters remain constant throughout a whole lifetime” (Huxley 61). Men have the same mental and physical capabilities at sixty as they did at seventeen, which allows people to remain productive, not economically burdensome or wasteful to society. But socially, Mond further explains, “Old men in the bad old days used to renounce, retire, take to religion, spend their time reading, thinking – *thinking!*” (Huxley 61). All decisions made concerning the mind and body return to the idea of what is best for the society; thinking is obviously not one of those things, and neither is being wasteful. Even in death, people are used for the betterment of the community. When a person dies, for example, the new world burns their body so that the body itself can still be useful. Henry explains to Lenina
that the smoke stacks are "'Phosphorous recovery...P_2O_5 used to go right out of circulation every time they cremated someone. Now they recover...more than a kilo and half per adult corpse...Fine to think we can now go on being socially useful even after we're dead. Making plants grow'" (Huxley 76). The state has an interest in the body for both perfection and usefulness. And because the members of society are conditioned to believe in the state's motives, the people allow their government to maintain dominion over their bodies.

Skinner's approach to physical labor is contradictory at best. When examining the issues related to social class, in one part of the text, it was found that people must be coerced into working; a leisure class must not grow in the community of Walden Two. But in another section of the text, Frazier states, "'Our plan was to reduce unwanted work to a minimum, but we wiped it out...When we're not being imposed on, when we choose-our work freely, then we want to work'" (Skinner 147) and that work occupies approximately four hours per day. There's no value placed on rest, because members of Walden Two rarely, if ever, feel over-exerted. On the one hand, Frazier decides a leisure class would "grow like a cancer" and so must be avoided, and on the other hand, says that a leisure class would never happen because people very much want to work. Contradiction is a symptom of a guilty conscience. Even medically speaking, if the community leaders are concerned about an illness, they can quarantine the people who are ill or perform random physical check-ups upon citizens without warning. The community dieticians, not the people, determine the food served, because healthy individuals are less stressful on the group. While having
someone else choose what one eats is not menacing in nature, it is symbolic of further control. It is obvious that much of what Frazier tells his visitors is an attempt to convince that that Walden Two is a utopia. Walden Two still dominates the individual’s body just as much as they do his mind.

**Sexuality**

Sex is the most intimate of actions and yet is manipulated and publicly denounced by the Party in *1984*. The Party extracts sexuality from the people to perform two functions: one is to avoid personal, intimate connections; the second is, to channel that energy into devotion to the state. Winston believes, “The Party was trying to kill the sex instinct, or, if it could not be killed, then to distort it and dirty it” (Orwell 66). The Party, though, appears surprisingly ambivalent towards prostitution: “Mere debauchery did not matter very much, so long as it was furtive and joyless, and only involved the women of a submerged and despised class. The unforgivable crime was promiscuity between Party members” (Orwell 65). Julia, more than Winston, understands the reasons the Party denies sexual activity: “sexual privation induced hysteria, which was desirable because it could be transformed into war fever and leader worship” (Orwell 133). Essentially, all of their hate and chanting and flag waving is “simply sex gone sour” (Orwell 133). “The full regulation of sex practices and attitudes seems to be just another facet of totalitarianism. However, Orwell’s implication is that sex is political; power motivates and activates sex. Hence, such energy should not be wasted or enjoyed. Once again the psychological and
consequent physiological effects of ideologically contrived mating patterns may be both severe and largely unperceived" (Cooper.101). While the people may not realize that their hysteria stems from sexual repression, the state is actually manipulating their emotions by depriving them of natural sexual expression. If the Party can control the mind during sex, by dirtying the act itself, they control the body by restricting the action and funneling those emotions elsewhere.

We have already seen glimpses of the kind of sexuality that is encouraged in *Brave New World*. In fact, all sexuality is encouraged: their films are generally about sex, citizens are encouraged to engage in numerous sexual relationships, and Ford worships often end in orgies. As Fanny and Lenina are talking in the locker room, Fanny expresses disappointment in Lenina because she is *still* going out with Henry Foster (Huxley 45). This illustrates a fundamental principle of the state – promiscuity. Fanny adds, that it is “‘horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man’” (Huxley 46). The state’s motto, “Everyone belongs to everyone else” furthers the idea, although indirectly, that sex with a variety of people is not only acceptable, but expected and desirable. As is the case in *1984*, sexuality may lead to intimate bonds of loyalty and trust and, therefore, the perception of it must be changed. Mond says of the past, “‘Family, monogamy, romance. Everywhere exclusiveness, a narrow channeling of impulse and energy’” (Huxley 45). Mond connects sexual exclusivity to emotional and social instability; therefore, there must be promiscuity and a loss of family to combat the radicals.
While there is no direct explanation of the Malthusian Drill, we know it is a contraceptive precaution ingrained in the women of the new world. After her date with Henry Foster and despite the heavy dose of *soma* she has taken, “Lenina did not forget to take all the contraceptive precautions prescribed by the regulations. Years of intensive hypnopaedia and, from twelve to seventeen, Malthusian Drill three times a week had made the taking of these precautions almost as automatic and inevitable as blinking” (Huxley 80). Considering the rampant promiscuity, one is bound to get pregnant; one such example is Linda, who is impregnated by the Director while visiting the reservation with him. Her testimony demonstrates the mentality of her people, “‘Though it wasn’t my fault, I swear; because I still don’t know how it happened, seeing that I did all the Malthusian Drills – you know, by numbers, One, two, three, four, always, I swear it…and of course there wasn’t anything like an Abortion Center here’” (Huxley 113). The state does not have to legislate for or against abortion because it has already ingrained in the women’s consciousness not to give birth and to use the Malthusian Drill. By way of conditioning, the state has been able to control the body by increasing sexuality, but also whether or not women choose to carry their own children.

*Walden Two* widely accepts sexuality, at an even younger age than Huxley’s *Brave New World*. In Walden Two, sex is actually encouraged beginning at the age of fifteen as are marriage and childbirth. Frazier argues that it is society at large that has made sex a problem: “‘Sex is not a problem in itself. Here the adolescent finds immediate and satisfactory expression of his natural impulses’” (Skinner 121).
Women can have as many babies as they desire, at any age they desire, leaving most of their adult lives available to do as they please. Additionally, sex is not seen as a secretive act so there is no awkward ridicule from teenage boys or feelings of violation from teenage girls (Skinner 212). This may seem an enlightened notion, especially because citizens of Walden Two are not required to raise their children. The ulterior motive is to further the population particularly in the early stages of the community. The sooner Frazier can have a fresh generation to engineer, the sooner he can experiment and perfect what he has been creating. It resembles reverse psychology; by giving the people “freedoms” of the body and letting them believe they chose them, people are actually doing exactly as he wants.

**Punishment**

When one does not follow the rules of society as expected, one is usually punished; that punishment affects the body first. In these texts, punishment usually comes in the form of physical harm to the body or expulsion of that body from the community. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is most vivid in its depiction of bodily harm. After Winston is caught by Mr. Charrington, he is taken to the Ministry of Love. Winston’s first taste of physical pain is when he is delivered a hard blow to the elbow with a truncheon. Winston narrates, “Never for any reason on earth, could you wish for an increase of pain. Of pain you could only wish one thing: that it should stop...In the face of pain there are no heroes, no heroes, he thought over and over as he writhed on the floor” (Orwell 239). Winston’s thoughts here foreshadow later events in the
Ministry of Love when Winston’s character flaws and failures are exposed. Winston endures a series of beatings that we learn are only a means of coercion because O’Brien, his torturer, will not kill him. The beatings only serve to gain power. The beatings are so powerful that Orwell writes, “The mere sight of a fist drawn back for a blow was enough to make him pour forth a confession of real or imaginary crimes (Orwell 240). Winston acknowledges that pain can make him do anything even admit to crimes of which he is innocent.

Because the body is a symbol of control, the Party tortures it in order to facilitate its reentry into the mind of the member gone astray. Orwell recognizes that “the aim [of it] was simply to destroy his power of arguing and reasoning” (Orwell 241). O’Brien’s objective with Winston in the Ministry of Love is to break Winston mentally. O’Brien tells Winston that two plus two can equal four, but sometimes two plus two equals five. Every time Winston is asked how many fingers O’Brien is holding up, he replies “four,” which is the truth, and not five, which is what he is being told. But when he responds this way, Winston’s body is racked with pain from an intense electric shock. The pain is ultimately used to convince Winston that, in fact, two plus two does equal five (Orwell 250) as O’Brien remarks, “It’s not easy to become sane” (Orwell 251). What is sane to the Party is clearly insane to Winston and to anyone else outside of Oceania. Incidentally, the pain Winston experiences literally blurs his vision to such a degree that Winston is physically unable to prove that two plus two equals four or accurately see how many fingers O’Brien is holding up (Orwell 251). Therefore, one cannot know the truth based only on what is
presented. The pain can distort even one’s physical perception. Once Winston finally responds, “Five,” O’Brien eliminates the source of pain and Winston’s physical condition begins to improve. However, “He seemed to have lost the power of intellectual effort, now that the stimulus of pain had been removed. He was not bored; he had no desire for conversation or distraction. Merely to be left alone, not to be beaten or questioned, to have enough to eat, and to be clean all over, was completely satisfying” (Orwell 275). Through the abuse of Winston’s body, the Party has reduced him to a simple and solitary desire basic necessities, necessities that Winston depends upon the Party to fulfill.

*Brave New World* takes a less aggressive approach to the body when punishment becomes necessary. If, for example, the Alphas are exhibiting behavior beyond their conditioning or feeling too constricted in society they are threatened with expulsion. The Director says to Bernard:

‘And I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Marx…of saying that I’m not at all pleased with the reports I receive of your behavior outside working hours. You may say that this is none of my business. But it is, I have the good name of the Centre to think of. My workers must be above suspicion… I give you fair warning… If I ever hear of a lapse from a proper standard an infantile decorum, I shall ask for your transference to a Sub-Centre – preferably in Iceland.’ (Huxley 95-96)

Bernard is quite upset about being forced out of society onto an island. His reaction, “Oh please don’t send me to Iceland. I promise I’ll do what I ought to do. Give me
another chance. Please give me another chance” (Huxley 203) expresses a simple desire to remain a part of society. But what Bernard does not understand is that the punishment is truly a reward. Removal is for “all the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community-life. All the people who aren’t satisfied with orthodoxy, who’ve got independent ideas of their own. Every one, in a word, who’s any one” (Huxley 204). Expulsion is more about the damage to others and to the structure of society than about the individual. Society does not care what happens to the person, the individual, only that it does not cause a chain reaction that could affect the other citizens. There is still a subtle threat because expulsion from the society means leaving behind all the luxuries to which they are accustomed. These luxuries are what lure them into obedience to the state in the first place. If society cannot control your actions or your body, they do not want you. The message is clear—comply or leave.

Skinner’s approach to deconditioned individuals is a blend of Orwell and Huxley. At first, “Frazier is careful to avoid any discussion of punishment, but it lurks as a specter in the background throughout Walden Two” (Gabel 6 of 13). But when he is forced to discuss it, Frazier admits that at Walden Two they first try to rehabilitate a member that has gone astray. The community Planners or Directors see a problem in engineering as an illness or as degeneration; therefore, the person is in need of treatment. Frazier explains, “The doctor seldom expresses sympathy for his patient—and wisely, I think. We simply treat the illness as an objective fact” (Skinner 160). The group discusses laziness as an example of degeneration of
engineering. If a man begins to do shoddy work, then Walden Two’s leaders suggest he switch jobs. If switching jobs does not improve his performance, the man is required to visit the psychologist. Harvey Gable asserts that:

Skinner is honest enough, however, to at least hint at human costs of...redefinition: those members of the society who resist Walden Two’s model of happiness are sent to psychiatrics for reeducation; those who still resist after treatment are expelled from the community...But this darker, dystopic side of Walden Two is left largely unexplored – an intellectual sleight of hand that is possible because the outside ‘natural’ world continues to exist as a choice that the narrator could make. (Gable 4 of 13)

Even when Frazier attempts to place the rose-colored glasses on the eyes of his visitors, one can still see the darker side. Just as in *Brave New World*, expulsion is a threat that is usually effective because of the utopian ideals they seem to present to their members. The state believes this is a worthy trade-off and claims the right to remove one physically if he or she chooses not to conform. The protection of the community is the primary objective and trumps any individual’s physical rights.

Once the state has seeped into the psychology of the individual, triumph over the body comes easily. The standard of perfection must be met in order for the society to create a homogenized group. What we see, then, is that the mind-body connection is extremely powerful in controlling the people. When the mind changes, the body responds accordingly. But the body is also used as a reinforcement tool; if they control specific aspects of the body, the state can get into the mind as well. People
must act perfectly, look perfectly, and perform perfectly; otherwise the state exerts its power over the body and either trivializes it or removes it.
Chapter Six
The Individual and Human Nature

We can safely say at this point, that the individual has not only been depreciated but virtually eliminated. The loss of individuality and the distortion of human nature are the results of the previous issues discussed, primarily psychological conditioning, the removal of intimate bonds, technology as a weapon, and the abuse of the body. These tactics bring us to the pinnacle of transformation as the ultimate goal of the states is to abolish individuality and human nature. In some ways, the primary objective has worked like an undertow, pulling from beneath the surface, but at a point in each novel the heads of state, O’Brien, Mond, and Frazier, and therefore Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner, make this objective overtly clear. The loss of individuality is nothing new in dystopian fiction, nor is the idea that individuality poses a great threat to the community and must be eliminated. But these novels also raise the question of human nature; how far can human nature be changed, reversed, or even abolished? Essentially, psychological conditioning and its army of reinforcements target human nature as the ailment of a diseased individual. This modification of human nature is portrayed in these novels as a grand experiment. It is the success of this experiment which defines the future.

**Losing Individuality**

In *1984*, individuality translates to exerting any kind of independence from the Party. Orwell tells us, “It was assumed that when he was not working, eating, or
sleeping he would be taking part in some communal recreations: to do anything that suggested a taste for solitude, even to go for a walk by yourself, was always slightly dangerous. There was a word for it in Newspeak: ownlife, it was called, meaning individualism and eccentricity” (Orwell 82). The fact that they have a term for being alone and that it carries a negative connotation means that because of the psychological implications restrictions are placed on being alone. It's not just a law or a rule, but a mental restraint. Further, when Winston and Julia are first alone in the field, they hear a bird singing; “For whom, for what, was that bird singing? No mate, no rival was watching it. What made it sit at the edge of the lonely wood and pour its music into nothingness?” (Orwell 124). For Winston, the bird symbolizes individuality in that it sings only for itself, not for anyone else. The bird wants to sing and so it does; it is a simple impulse and pleasure. But “Orwell presents a political system whose unlimited power over the individual leads to the strangling of virtually every normal human impulse” (Burkowski 40). Every inclination to be independent or individual, to be oneself, is stifled because it is not conducive to the state’s objectives.

Instead, the concept of the individual is replaced with the dull intelligence of the masses. While Winston is talking to Julia he realizes:

The world-view of the Party imposed itself most successfully on people incapable of understanding it. They could be made to accept the most flagrant violations of reality, because they never fully grasped the enormity of what was demanded of them, and were not sufficiently interested in public events to
notice what was happening. By lack of understanding, they remained sane. They simply swallowed everything, and what they swallowed did them no harm, because it left no residue behind, just as a grain of corn will pass undigested through the body of a bird. (Orwell 156)

These statements apply to almost everyone in Oceania. Orwell’s message is that when the masses are so ignorant of the larger ideas, problems can go unnoticed. Winston also knows that “if there was hope, it must lie in the proles, because only there, in those swarming disregarded masses, eighty-five percent of the population of Oceania, could the force to destroy the Party ever be generated” (Orwell 69). But that’s just the problem; they are the “swarming disregarded masses” without faces, speaking only in duckspeak, incapable of anything else but the proliferation of the state. Once, Winston believed the proles were actually rebelling when he hears them shouting in a group. But the commotion was only prole women fighting over a cooking pot. Disappointed, Winston thinks, “And yet, just for a moment, what almost frightening power had sounded in that cry from only a few hundred throats! Why was it that they could never sound like that about anything that mattered?” (Orwell 70). He further writes in his diary, “Until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until they have rebelled they cannot become conscious” (Orwell 70). This is a version of doublespeak in a sense. Is it? One cannot happen without the other and yet the other will never happen without the first. It is a constant paradox that goes round and round without action. The masses—the proles—with all the power, are concerned only with cooking pots.
Huxley's *Brave New World* goes so far to disintegrate individuality that it mass-produces its population. Bokanovsky's Process can produce ninety-six human beings from one embryo, all of whom share the exact same DNA. This is mass production with a vengeance (Deery 259) as individuality is trivialized. But mass production is also a major instrument of social stability (Huxley 18) as people are "grown" for specific purposes. In the future, "men will come to be valued more and more, not as individuals, but as personified social functions" (Holmes 26). This cloning to the extreme is terribly repulsive to John when he sees a Bokanovsky group working in a factory. He becomes physically ill at the unnatural duplication of human beings and has to run out of the factory. Huxley wants us to see what John sees for at the end of the first chapter of *Brave New World*, the readers "gaze" over the embryos that lie under the red light; "In the red darkness glinted innumerable rubies" (Huxley 62). There is an eerie sense of artificiality, as if the embryos are a glistening and innumerable treasure that will continue into the future.

The unorthodoxy of an individual must be obstructed for fear that it will infiltrate the masses. As we have seen earlier, the Director warns Bernard of his erratic behavior. The Director reminds him, "‘The greater the man’s talents, the greater his power to lead astray. It is better that one should suffer than that many should be corrupted...after all, what is an individual?...We can make a new one with the greatest ease – as many as we like. Unorthodoxy threatens more than the life of a mere individual; it strikes at Society itself’" (Huxley 137). There is even a concern over Bernard’s scientific paper, "A New Theory of Biology." Mond labels it,
"dangerously subversive" (Huxley 162) and says it should not be published because it gives rise to purpose; and purpose "might easily decondition the more unsettled minds among the upper castes—make them lose their faith in happiness as the Sovereign Good and take to believing, instead, that the goal was somewhere beyond, somewhere outside the present human sphere" (Huxley 162). Mond actually agrees with Bernard but he cannot express this because it conflicts with society’s “purpose” of creating happiness just to have happiness. As the leaders appear to worry about Bernard, Huxley is really commenting on the leaders’ perceptions of rebellion. It is ironic, though, because it is not Bernard that is the rebel in *Brave New World*; he is actually quite weak. He may be unhappy, but he is certainly not one to lead a rebellion.

For Frazier in *Walden Two*, individuality is equated with questions of freedom and choice. It is not surprising that Castle asks the questions, "What about the dignity and integrity of the individual? ...What about personal freedom?" (Skinner 227). Frazier denies that "freedom exists at all. I must deny it—or my program would be absurd" (Skinner 241). Castle’s argument is that people should feel free—he feels free, and knows that he is free because he can make any decision he wants to make. Unfortunately, that is also Frazier’s argument:

We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled, though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system, nevertheless *feel free*... That’s the source of tremendous power of positive reinforcement – there’s no restraint ad no revolt. By a careful design,
we control not the final behavior but the inclination to behave – the motives, the desires, the wishes. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises. (Skinner 246)

The people of Walden Two feel free and that is enough for them. Frazier justifies that as long as they feel free there should be no problems. Frazier says, “Our members are practically always doing what they want to do – what they ‘choose’ to do – but we see to it that they will want to do precisely the things which are best for themselves and the community. Their behavior is determined, yet they’re free” (Skinner 279). Actually, “Walden Two never really addresses the degree to which Frazier’s members know they are being manipulated, and if so, how they justify to themselves this unnatural relinquishing of autonomy (Gable 5 of 13). The members can justify giving up their personal freedoms because they have absolutely no idea of the significance of their loss.

In following the conditions placed on them in society, the members of Walden Two also become the masses with one mind rather than a group of individuals with individual minds. The metaphor of the sheep bookends the fictitious journey in the novel and is deeply significant. As the group of visitors—Burris, Castle and others—first arrive, they see a fold of sheep surrounded by a single length of string tied onto sticks. Frazier informs them that the older sheep have learned through behavioral engineering not to cross the string as it was once an electrified fence. The younger sheep, in turn, follow the example set by the older sheep, “It has become a tradition among our sheep never to approach the string. The lambs acquire it from their elders,
whose judgment they never question” (Skinner 16). Just as most of the group is convinced of the success of Frazier’s experiment, the end of the tour returns to the sheep. The group notices that one of the sheep has indeed escaped the fold, and chaos has ensued. The sheep dog, Bishop, is chasing and the escaped sheep as it veers in various jagged paths, while some of the members of Walden Two have formed a ring around the remaining sheep to keep them together. All the characters in Walden Two see the implication of the escaped sheep as the “weakness of behavioral control in the face of nature” (Gable 6 of 13). Even Burris sees this as failure when he questions why the engineering has failed to transfer from humans to sheep. Frazier replies, “it couldn’t convert because it’s not raising sheep for the good of the sheep...nothing short of an insurmountable fence or frequent punishment will control the exploited” (Skinner 283). Other than proving sheep are inherently different from humans, this scene implies that if the members themselves felt exploited, negative reinforcement would be the only means to keep them in line. But because the members of Walden Two *feel* free, they do not recognize their own exploitation as a means to be a happier group and they are much less likely to revolt against the system. As Frazier says, “Protest is unthinkable here” (Skinner 245), which is much more literal than Frazier may have intended. The members of Walden Two have become one enormous herd of sheep following their leader and doing as they are told without questions.

According to Frazier, having a focus on the individual exhibits poor judgment as it distracts from the true purpose – the community. Frazier must admit, “What the plan does is to keep intelligence on the right track, for the good of society rather than
the good of the intelligent individual. It does this by making sure that the individual will not forget his personal stake in the welfare of society”” (Skinner 239). The welfare of the state is determined by the degree of control over the citizens. Frazier declares that “‘we not only can control human behavior, we must’” (Skinner 241). “[Frazier regulates the society] in the name of serving his people…[his] greatest desire is to serve; but—only that which has been fully subdued can be fully served” (Gable 8 of 13). Frazier’s servitude consists then of making all of the decisions for everyone and once those decisions are made, the members must follow them.

Human Nature

The Party in 1984 does not set out to just control one’s thoughts, they are determined to change human nature permanently. The most heightened discussions of human nature occur between Winston and O’Brien in the Ministry of Love after Winston’s capture. Winston argues that human nature can and does exist even in the face of the Party, despite their tactics. O’Brien says very matter of factly, “We control life, Winston, at all its levels. You are imagining that there is something called human nature which will be outraged by what we do and will turn against us. But we create human nature” (Orwell 269). This is perhaps the most frightening of thoughts. People typically believe that they always have their basic human nature to lean on to save them. People believe that their minds are their own and that they will instinctively know that something is out of order; that at some point, something inside of them will rise up and keep power from conquering them. According to O’Brien, though, this is
not true. He asks Winston, "Will you understand, Winston, that no one whom we bring to this place ever leaves out hands uncured?...We do not merely destroy our enemies; we change them." (Orwell 253). He also describes to Winston that Winston is a "flaw in the pattern" and that the Party makes the "flaw" one of themselves before they kill someone, "We make the brain perfect before we blow it out’’ (Orwell 255). It appears then, there is no escape. Human nature cannot defend us if we do not even know when we are being controlled or if human nature even exists.

People tend to believe that what they know is truth and that truth is sanity. We rely on our instincts to distinguish between logic and chaos, truth and falsehood. When Winston mentions the Aaronson photograph, O’Brien tells Winston that he is "mentally deranged" and has a “defective memory” (Orwell 245). O’Brien shows Winston-the-photograph and Winston reasserts that he remembers, but O’Brien says that he, himself, does not remember it; therefore the photograph does not exist. This, as we may remember, is doublethink. “[Winston] believes that he is unique and thus precious in possessing a store of personal memory which defines him and which cannot be taken away from him. It is a claim O’Brien dismisses contemptuously, telling him that men are malleable, and infinitely so” (Adelson 118). If Winston’s memory remains unaffected by doublethink, the state will continue to work to prove that men can be easily shaped and molded. O’Brien says, “Power is tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing” (Orwell 266-7). By this, O’Brien means that the Party will not stop until everyone is instinctually changed, not just superficially so. O’Brien presents a final image, “if
you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face – forever”’ (Orwell 267). It is this image Orwell leaves with the reader – the vision of the future is nothing but oppression and the destruction of man.

William Shakespeare becomes a symbol of forgotten emotions, values, and instincts in *Brave New World*. When John is a child on the reservation, he finds a complete set of Shakespeare’s plays. As he learns to read them, he finds solace within the stories. Shakespeare’s are composed of notions such as love, family, dreaming, imagination, and tragedy. When John had difficulty understanding his resentful feelings toward his mother, he read *Hamlet* for comfort. When he is restless and yearning for Lenina, he reads *Romeo and Juliet*. For John, “Now he had these words, these words like drums and singing and magic” (Huxley 123). When John is about to leave the reservation for London, he even quotes *The Tempest*, from which Huxley takes the title, “O brave new world that has such people in it” (Huxley 130). But Bernard cautions him and responds, “Hadn’t you better wait till you actually see the new world”’ (Huxley 130). This is actually a warning from Huxley that the new world will not be what he expects it to be, thereby drawing a connection to both John’s ignorance and to that of Miranda in *The Tempest*. Back in London, John cannot convince even Helmholtz Watson, who wants to rebel, of the significance and beauty in Shakespeare. Helmholtz actually laughs at John as John reads to him from *Romeo and Juliet*. Helmholtz thinks it comical, the Capulets forcing Juliet to marry Paris; the very idea of loving only one person is absurd to him (Huxley 168). But one cannot blame Helmholtz, for “love, chastity, marriage, and other Shakespearean
social-ethical concepts are, until John presents them, almost totally unknown” (Holmes 30). This is why Helmholtz laughs and why John despises the new world more than he could have ever imagined.

*Brave New World* contends that happiness is enough of an end to justify any means. They remove Shakespeare simply because there are too many tragedies. But John wants the “right to be unhappy” (Huxley 215). Initially, this sounds absurd, but John just wants the right to have any emotion, the good and the bad. “Only a savage, as Huxley ironically points out, claims the right to be unhappy” (Kessler 572). But unhappiness is not an option in the new world as it would disturb the community’s stability. “Emotions are what separate men from robots, giving us both our animal and our human nature, and when the State wants people to act as its robots, then emotions must go” (Zimbardo 134). All emotions must be eliminated, except, of course, happiness, which, in *Brave New World*, is more like numbness.

“Happiness...becomes a technique of power. Society makes people happy (rather than allowing them to be happy) and thus habituates the status quo” (Kessler 572). In this way, the individual’s human nature is altered to focus on happiness and the stability of the community, not on tragedy and the perpetuation of individual interest. By only developing one aspect of human nature—being happy—people become one-dimensional; these are the people that blindly follow a leader.

Skinner’s *Walden Two* most explicitly considers human nature by explicitly denying its presence. For Skinner, the primary goal of the reformer “is to disintegrate (human) nature, because nature is inconvenient when it conflicts with the cultural
values one wishes to instill” (Gable 2 of 13). Castle, Frazier’s constant antagonist, believes that “moral law would be moral law even if a mechanistic view of human behavior proved to be expeditious in achieving the Good Life” (Skinner 161). For Castle, living the “good life” is not justification for breaking the moral code of human nature. Frazier continues that Walden Two wants a “government based upon a science of human nature” and “now [they can] deal with human behavior in accordance with simple scientific principles. The trouble with the program of anarchy was that it placed too much faith in human nature” (Skinner 182). Obviously, Frazier has no faith in human nature, “But we do have faith in our power to change human behavior. We can make men adequate for the group living – to the satisfaction of everybody. That was our faith, but now it’s a fact” (Skinner 182). Skinner’s community therefore “plans to introduce a new age in which man’s (so called) ‘nature’ is disintegrated and remolded by reflexive conditioning into a new entity” (Gable 1 of 13). This new version of human nature is comprised of the state not the individual.

Human nature, then, should be molded in accordance with state standards. Frazier would argue that happiness is not a bad standard by which to lead a community. Burris points out, “Your people are going to be too happy…Can we expect real achievements from them? Haven’t the great men of history been essentially unhappy or maladjusted or neurotic?” (Skinner 115). While Frazier’s members at Walden Two believe they are happily cultivating their minds and their individuality by doing whatever it is they like to do, they are actually being restricted
even in their own natures and emotions. As we have seen in the conditioning of the children; they are taught to not feel jealousy, resentment, or anger. There is no personal rivalry among them. Frazier says, “‘We accept our...limitations without protest and are reasonably happy in spite of them, but [in the outside world] we may spend a lifetime trying to live up to a wholly false conception of our powers in another field, and suffer the pain of a lingering failure. Here we accept ourselves as we are’” (Skinner 117). But their current state, is not their natural state. Similarly to John in *Brave New World*, people naturally experience tragedies and weaknesses and failures, and most grow and develop strength because of them. Walden Two removes this natural emotional progress at the expense of nature. According to Kenneth M. Roemer, “Skinner...dispute[s] ‘cherished’ humanistic values related to concepts of free will, responsibility, guilt, innocence, good, and evil” (127). Neither Skinner, nor Frazier would deny that. It is the purpose of expelling these emotions that is problematic. It is for the sake of the group’s happiness, not the happiness of the individuals.

All three texts declare that individuality is not as important as the group and that human nature can be revised for the sake of the group. The Party, the new world, and T.E. Frazier all believe in a kind of determinism that says human nature does not exist and therefore those in control can determine the nature of man as they wish. “When the findings of behavioral science are regarded as the *sufficient* ground for public policy, as they are by Skinner and others who see determinism as ‘real’ rather than as a methodological postulate, the range of human possibilities is restricted”
(Kariel 341). The Party overtly acknowledges the restrictions on the individual and human nature. O'Brien even seems proud of what they have accomplished in that field. While the new world and Walden Two claim to be relieving man of hardships and freeing him, they are only placing different restrictions on him in terms of emotions. Members of these societies experience very little emotional range to curb differentiating individuality and human nature. But when people are differentiated and seen as individuals, they are much harder to control and therefore create a fractured state. The state perpetuates society as a large homogenized group, one that will follow their leader and remain behind the fence.
Chapter Seven
The Intellectual, Rebellion, and Defeat: The Protagonists

Considering the degree of psychological control present in these texts, it is difficult to imagine any deviants. But Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner make strong arguments for the intellectual, the intellectual who tries to reason a path through the psychological chaos of the state. They emphasize the holes in the state’s logic, defend basic human rights and individuality, question authority, and mentally fight for change. However, the reader is primed by the authors only to be let down. Throughout their novels, Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner develop Winston, John and Burris, to be our intellectual crusaders. But just when we come to instill our faith in them and in man in general, they fail. Winston is captured and tortured into submission, John tries but cannot escape the hysteria of the crowd, and Burris is the most disappointing, as he fully commits himself Walden Two of his own accord. Sadly, these are not “feel good” novels written to inspire our own revolution. These are novels that warn us; when society goes this far, there is no going back.

The Intellectual

Winston Smith is 1984’s protagonist and would-be hero. In Part One of the novel, Winston thinks elaborately on his past dreams during sleep. Because Winston acknowledges his dreams at all, he is seen as a romantic and an idealist, traits we do not see in other people of Oceania. He remembers a dream from seven years earlier: “Someone sitting to one side of him [says] as he passed: ‘We shall meet in the place
where there is no darkness” (Orwell 25). Winston interprets the dream symbolically; ‘no darkness’ means a better place than Oceania. Later, we see that ‘no darkness’ is literal; it is a place with bright lights—the Ministry of Love. Before O’Brien becomes Winston’s torturer, Winston believes the voice in his dream is O’Brien’s. Winston is not altogether inaccurate in his interpretation, either. There will be O’Brien’s voice and there will be “no darkness”, it will just not be in the romantically enlightened way Winston imagines. Winston also experiences repeated dreams of “the Golden Country.” The Golden Country is in sharp contrast to the urban decay of Oceania. In Winston’s dream, there are beautiful fields and a young woman who freely removes her clothing. For Winston, this disrobing symbolizes her disregard for the rules and restrictions of their society. This, too, comes true for Winston in the form of Julia, although, ‘not in the romantic way he imagines. As Winston awakes from his dreams of the “Golden Country”; he awakens with the word “Shakespeare” on his lips. As in Brave New World we see Shakespeare taking on an iconoclastic and symbolic role encompassing the wide range and complexity of human nature, all of which have been extinguished here.

As we have seen, Winston values his memory extensively. It is his memory that reminds him of truth and the need for truth in society. Winston may not be able to specifically remember if life was different in the past, but he thinks to himself, “Why should one feel [the conditions] to be intolerable unless one had some kind of ancestral memory that things had once been different?” (Orwell 60). Winston is desperate for a comparison to the current times. He asks the old man at the bar, he
searches the antique shop, but alas, there is no real evidence to use to rally change. Here, Winston begins to catch on to what the Party is doing. He realizes that “if both the past and the external world exist only in the mind, and if the mind is controllable — what then?” (Orwell 80). What comes after is our future, a future Winston is currently experiencing in Oceania. He also writes in his diary, “I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY” (Orwell 80). For Winston, power may be an obvious and therefore unlikely choice, but in 1984 that is precisely the only reason. For all that he does understand about the Party, Winston must know this is the case.

In *Brave New World*, John is the true dissenter and intellectual. Because he is an outsider to both communities, the reservation and the new world, he can objectively judge the new world’s society against other standards. To John, most of the practices of the new world are disgusting and horrible. As I stated, the Bokanovskys make John physically sick to look at due to the immoral nature of their creation (Huxley 147-8). John hates the feely that he and Lenina see together. John calls it “base” and “ignoble,” while Lenina finds the film “lovely.” John believes that as a woman, Lenina should not be exposed to such vulgarity and is even more puzzled to find she enjoys it. John also sees similarities between the feely, *Three Weeks in a Helicopter*, and *Othello*, and leaves Lenina at the end of the evening to read the Shakespeare play (Huxley 154-7). John is further disgusted with Lenina’s behavior when she tries to seduce him because John would rather earn her honor and marry her. He finally gets so angry with her sexual assertiveness, he calls her an “impudent strumpet” (Huxley 177) and slaps her. John cannot release himself from a
higher morality to accept these new ideas of sexuality. Later, when talking to Mond, John quotes King Lear, ""The gods are just and of our pleasant vices make instruments to plague us"" (Huxley 211). Through John, Huxley is warning the reader of materializing what we think we want in a society. John is proof that if one is not conditioned to accept the culture present in Brave New World, one would also be repulsed.

The question of an intellectual protagonist is less defined in Walden Two than in the other texts. We are told the story through the narration of Professor Burris who has taught with T.E. Frazier at the university. But Augustine Castle also exhibits a strong presence. While we are to assume Burris is the protagonist of the story, Castle often emerges as the stronger voice for intelligence. He immediately finds Walden Two disturbing and controlling. After seeing the children’s lollipop and soup conditioning he says of Walden Two, ""I find myself revolted by this display of sadistic tyranny"" (Skinner 99). He could have been commenting on any aspect of Walden Two, on any part of the tour. Even though Burris is largely impressed with Walden Two early on, he still feels, ""a sudden sharp concern that Walden Two might have some fatal flaw"" (Skinner 71). Burris and Castle are right; the fatal flaw is the spell that the members of Walden Two are unaware they are under. Burris and Castle especially, embody the skeptics’ voice. As we have seen in previous chapters, they are the only two that question Frazier’s practices and motives. They are able to question because they have another culture with which to compare Walden Two, whereas the members do not.
Rebellion

Winston’s first official act of rebellion is thoughtcrime. He somewhat subconsciously writes over and over in his diary, “DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER,” and then panics when he realizes what he’s done; it’s not the writing, but the thought itself. But even Winston’s rebellions retain remnants of his conditioning. Winston’s “DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER,” resonates as a party slogan because “the solitary disbeliever can only hold his own linguistically by using the Party’s forms: for every slogan a counterslogan. To a great extent, the Orwellian protagonist is so dominated by those forms, and the way they have already organized reality, that he cannot replace them, but only subvert them. His achievement is more negative than creative” (Good 61). Just as Winston writes in terms of the Party linguistically, he thinks about a rebellion organizationally. Winston believes there is a “Brotherhood,” no doubt a derivation of Big Brother, in which people have organized against the Party as the Party had once organized against the people. He believes O’Brien is the head of the Brotherhood as well.

When Winston and Julia meet with O’Brien under false pretenses, assuming that he is the leader of the brotherhood, their admissions, essentially, implicate them. Winston acknowledges to O’Brien, “‘We believe there is some secret organization working against the Party...we want to join it and work for it. We are enemies of the Party’” (Orwell 170). At that moment, Winston and Julia officially seal their fate. In addition, Winston and Julia agree to perform violent acts in the name of the Brotherhood without knowing the reasons for performing those acts. Again, the
Brotherhood appears to resonate with the Party as the Party would also ask one to perform acts without reasons. Since Winston and Julia are used to following their leaders blindly, why would they begin to question now? They are proof that if people believe in something, they will follow whoever leads them, for good or for bad.

But for Winston and Julia, their admissions to O'Brien are not as personally significant as their rebellious sexuality. When they first meet in the field to consummate their relationship, Winston thinks of Julia, “When she flung [her clothes] aside it was with that same magnificent gesture by which a whole civilization seemed to be annihilated” (Orwell 125). Their sexual act, therefore, symbolizes a powerful rebellion simply because the Party forbids it. Winston thinks, “Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act” (Orwell 126). Because Winston views sex as a political act, the more sex Julia has had with other men, the more Winston loves her. Each act is a sign of rebellion and “anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope” (Orwell 125). For Winston, hope is equated with corruption.

Winston knows that rebellion may not create significant changes in his life time, thus, Winston feels he is rebelling for the sake of future generations. Julia believes she can beat the Party by pretending to be the most fanatic Party member while not internalizing all of their propaganda. But we have seen that this is only ignorance. Winston knows, “the only victory lay in the far future, long after you were dead, that from the moment of declaring war on the Party it was better to think of yourself as a corpse” (Orwell 135). Winston misinterprets death, however, because
death does not necessarily mean physical death, as he will learn later. At the same time that he rebels for the future, he is also aware of the futility of that rebellion. No one of his time will read the diary, and if someone in the future reading it, chances are the Party will be gone and there will be no need for these warnings or explanations. Winston is writing the diary for himself in the hopes of escaping the reality of his recurring nightmare where there is a “wall of darkness” and on the other side “something unendurable” (Orwell 144). Although Winston has always awakened before he was able to realize what it was that was so unendurable, the nightmare foreshadows what Winston will endure in the Ministry of Love after he is caught.

Throughout *Brave New World*, we see John slowly becoming less and less tolerant of the unfamiliar societal values and culture. His breaking point comes after Linda’s death; “[John] woke once more to the external reality, looked around him, knew what he saw—knew it with a sinking sense of horror and disgust, for the recurrent delirium of his days and nights, the nightmares of indistinguishable sameness…” (Huxley 189-990). Again, John thinks of Miranda in *The Tempest* only this time, he believes that Miranda is evoking rebellion, “It was a challenge, a command” (Huxley 190). John now thinks that *this* is not the brave new world, but that he must create a brave new world. He tries to induce a revolt by throwing out soma rations for a group of Deltas and lecturing them about freedom and manhood. The Deltas stare at him blankly because they do not understand the terms “manhood” and “freedom” let alone to know that they may want them (Huxley 192). Clearly, John’s realization is Huxley’s realization, the one he wants readers to share. By
writing *Brave New World*, it seems Huxley desires a revolution. Maybe not the kind of revolution that John incites, but a revolution that prevents this new world from existing.

Because John is so disgusted with the new world—even more so after his discussion with Mond—John decides to leave the society. John is allowed a small hermitage outside the metropolis where he can be alone and live a simpler life. When he first arrives there, his mission is only to purify himself from the luxuries he left in the new world. His purification is self-punishment as he deprives himself of sleep, performs self-flagellation, drinks mustard water to throw up, and holds out his arms as if on a cross for an excruciating amount of time (Huxley 218-221). In addition to his masochistic behavior, every time he thinks of Lenina, he whips his back with a hazel switch (Huxley 225). This in itself is a kind of conditioning, although, what we will see is John’s ultimate failure in trying to recondition himself. Huxley shows us that we can easily be conditioned without our knowledge, but that once we are, there is no deconditioning or reconditioning.

The fundamental rebellion in *Walden Two* comes not only in the form of confrontational questions from Burris and Castle; but also in their direct confrontation and attack on Frazier’s practices. Castle says to Frazier, “‘I accuse you of one of the most diabolical machinations in the history of mankind!’” (Skinner 236). He further calls Frazier “‘a modern, mechanized, managerial Machiavelli…whose greatest art is to conceal art. The silent despot’” (Skinner 237). Castle references anthills and beehives as metaphorical representations of Walden Two because there is absolutely
no room for change there either. Castle continues on a long-winded diatribe of Frazier’s despotism:

But you were behaving as a despot when you first laid your plans – when you designed the social structure and drew up the contract between community and member, when you worked out your educational practices and your guarantees against despotism – What a joke! Don’t tell me you weren’t in control then! Burris saw the point. What about your career as organizer? There was leadership! And the most damnable leadership in history, because you were setting the stage for the withdrawal of yourself as a personal force, knowing full well that everything that happened would still be your doing. Hundreds – you predicted millions – of unsuspecting souls were to fall within the scope of your ambitious scheme. (Skinner 238)

What the reader thinks, Castle expresses. Castle cannot believe that Frazier’s true motive is to free the individual from society’s constraints by giving them happiness. In fact, it is too altruistic to be true, as Frazier himself admits. So far, though, this is the only expression of rebellion that Castle or the reader is capable of displaying. The members of Walden Two would not believe Castle even if he told them directly.

Burris cannot quite determine what it is that restricts him from fully believing in Walden Two and in Frazier’s work. Frazier confronts him and wants to know why Burris has not joined. Burris can only reply, “‘I don’t know Frazier. I really don’t. I won’t say I’m very happy about the academic life, but I’m not sure that all my motives are on the surface. How can I be sure that a very different life will satisfy me
at all?...at the moment I’m not sold. There’s a certain resistance – I can only be honest and tell you so. I don’t know why’” (Skinner 232). It is Burris’ human nature, the voice we rely on to signal a warning that restricts him. Here, Burris has the courage to listen to his voice and confront Frazier with truth; something Frazier is unaccustomed to hearing. Frazier, in his arrogance, thinks Burris will not join because he does not like Frazier. But Frazier assures him that he is only skeptical because Frazier is not actually a product of Walden Two and therefore cannot be perfect (Skinner 233). We can see, though, that if Burris joins Walden two, Frazier will feel a sense of validity in his experimentation. Because Frazier forces the issue and becomes frustrated that Burris will not concede, it appears that Frazier only accepts visitors to Walden Two in order to convert them.

**Defeat**

As we know, Winston is, in fact, caught and captured by the Party for his unconventionality of thought. The first sign of his breakdown is in the Ministry of Love when he first views his own body—or what remains of it—after ceaseless rounds of physical torture. Winston’s body is broken, deteriorated, diminished, disgusting, and repulsive; Orwell shows us this picture of “the last man” (Orwell 271). As the body is the symbol of the power and control the state can assert, we see in Winston’s body very little hope. At this point, what could he physically accomplish let alone mentally accomplish? Winston accepts everything O’Brien has told him and “set to work deliberately at the task of re-educating himself” (Orwell 276). Here we
see that Winston “does not finally abandon illusion for truth, he abandons his truth for illusion” (Cooper 84). Winston has been mentally and physically abused so that now “he had grasped the frivolity, the shallowness of his attempt to set himself up against the Party” (Orwell 276). Winston thinks, “Perhaps that lunatic dislocation in the mind could really happen: that was the thought that defeated him” (Orwell 247). For all of his fervor against the Party, when Winston is defeated by the overwhelming power of the Party, he proves that human nature can be malleable as O’Brien says it is.

As much distress as Winston has already endured, it is the rats that finally crush him. Room 101 is the wall in Winston’s nightmare which keeps something unendurable behind it. For Winston Smith, the unendurable happens to be rats. When Winston is bound, O’Brien presents a cage containing carnivorous rats which he places meters away from Winston’s face. O’Brien describes the process, “‘When I press the other lever, the door of the cage will slide up. These starving brutes will shoot out of something missing? like bullets. Have you ever seen a rat leap through the air? They will leap onto your face and bore straight through it. Sometimes they attack the eyes first’” (Orwell 285). The fear builds in Winston; he becomes an “insane, screaming animal” (Orwell 286) until finally Winston screams, “‘Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia! I don’t care what you do to her. Tear her face off, strip her to the bones. Not me! Julia! Not me!’” (Orwell 286). At this confession, O’Brien receives what he desires and the Party has just won the battle over Winston’s mind, his body, and his loyalties.
Winston’s life after his time at the Ministry of Love is reduced to
meaninglessness. Orwell gives us a snapshot of him: He’s at the Chestnut Tree Cafe,
drunk, has accepted every lie (e.g., Oceania is at war with Eurasia and has always
been), and is currently interested in the war bulletins (Orwell 287-9). There is nothing
left of Winston’s former mind. Orwell reminds us that Julia had said, “‘They can’t
get inside you,’...But they could get inside you. ‘What happens to you here is
forever,’ O’Brien had said. That is a true word. There were things, your own acts,
from which you could not recover. Something was killed in your breast; burned out,
cauterized out” (Orwell 290). Winston even sees Julia again, but this is insignificant
because the Party no longer takes an interest in him, nor does he take an interest in
her. The last scene of the novel is perhaps the most pathetic. As Winston sits at the
Chestnut Tree Cafe, the telescreen reports that Oceania has gained victory over Africa.
Everyone cheers including Winston. He sees the Big Brother poster and sees “healing
change” within it (Orwell 296-7). It is this moment that Orwell tells us, “the long
hoped for bullet was entering his brain (Orwell 297). All along it had been a
metaphorical bullet. The Party has not physically killed Winston unexpectedly from
behind as Winston thought they would. But they do kill him psychologically and he
does not see it coming. Ironically, Orwell states, “[Winston] had won the victory over
himself. He loved Big Brother” (Orwell 297). But the true winner is, and always will
be, the Party. “Winston Smith...is finally destroyed for not even the strongest man
can withstand the new state. But there will be others. They will be crushed, of course,
but still the cells and torture chambers of the Ministry of Love will never be empty”
(Kessler 574). Future citizens of Oceania may try to defeat the Party but the Party will always win therefore, the psychological death of Winston is the death of the last man.

Even though John retreats to his hermitage in *Brave New World*, the society finds him and draws him back. John is discovered by Darwin Bonaparte and exploited for his “strange” behavior. After the film is broadcast, crowds begin to grow at John’s hermitage. They taunt him with names and invade his privacy. When the crowds overwhelm him he thinks he sees Lenina among the people gathered. It is unclear whether John really does see Lenina or whether he imagines her presence in the crowd. Regardless, he runs toward her and begins to whip her shouting, “O the flesh!...Kill it! Kill it!” (Huxley 230). For John, Lenina has come to symbolize the pleasures of the flesh that he believes to be filthy and disgusting. Then suddenly, “Somebody started singing ‘Orgy-Porgy’ and, in a momentum they had all caught up the refrain and, singing, had begun to dance. Orgy-Porgy; round and round and round, beating one another in six-eight time” (Huxley 230). When John awakens, “stupefied by soma, and exhausted by a long-drawn out frenzy of sensuality” (Huxley 230), he remembers—everything. He covers his eyes with his hands and shouts, “Oh, my God! My God!” (Huxley 230). John is utterly horrified by his own actions and weaknesses.

The very last scene in *Brave New World* is of John’s lifeless, hanging body. John’s suicide is a symbol of our own self-destruction. “The brave new world has trapped him once and for all. His superego collapses in an orgy, and the only thing left for him is self destruction...John’s suicide, motivated by guilt, symbolizes the fact that in this world no true self can survive,” (Holmes 32). Huxley further makes a
note of the directions in which John's body is swinging, "North, north-east, east, south-east, south, south-south-west; then paused, and, after a few seconds, turned as unhurriedly back towards the left. South-south-west, south, south-east, east..."

(Huxley 231). These directions are rather cinematic as Huxley shows John's lifeless body swinging in one direction, stopping, and swinging back in reverse. This symbolizes John's attempted escape out of the society that eventually fails as he is "reversed" and brought back into their world. The emphasis on direction also indicates the dangerous direction of the society; a direction Huxley does not want to follow as it can only lead to the death of man or at least the death of the last man to fight for "unhappiness."

_Walden Two_ manages to lure Burris into the sheep fold as well. About halfway through the text, we begin to see Burris falling into Frazier's line of thinking when he says, "In some strange way Frazier had undercut all the standard issues in political science, and they seemed scarcely worth debating" (Skinner 261). There is even a point where Burris takes on Frazier's role in debating Castle. He tells Castle that Castle is "the philosopher" and could not understand science (Skinner 265). Burris lets Frazier infiltrate his mind and confuse principles that Burris had previously established for himself. And later, alone is his bed, Burris' mind runs away from him:

> I could not escape from myself. My mind was a chaotic jumble. The music mocked me with its distressing order and simplicity and added to my confusion. I could not listen to more than a few bars at a time, nor stick to any
one line of thought for more than a moment...Then I would realize that I had never any thought of signing up, and I damned Frazier for maneuvering me into a position in which I had to make a decision...my own judgment was...distorted. (Skinner 266)

This is an experience similar to Winston’s in the Ministry of Love when he comes to believe that two plus two equals five. Frazier distorts Burris’ truth, and suddenly Burris is defending and rationalizing the very issues he questioned at first. Burris thinks, “Unlike Thoreau, Frazier would pay his taxes and compromise whenever necessary. But he had found a way to build a world to his taste without trying to change the world of others, and I was sure he could carry on in peace unless the government took some monstrously despotic turn” (Skinner 289). At this point, Burris is starting to feel sympathy for Frazier and understand the scope of possibilities that Frazier has been impressing upon the visitors.

When Burris has traveled home and returned to the university, it suddenly occurs to him to return to Walden Two. It is so sudden that Burris cannot even explain its origination: “It was all too clear that nothing could be made of it. I would go back to Walden Two. I do not remember actually reaching the decision. I simply knew that at last, that only one course of action lay before me” (Skinner 294). Burris leaves a notice of resignation at the university and is determined to walk back to Walden Two. “Burris himself, the prejudices of his intellectual training finally dissolved, succumbs to the logical force of Frazier’s utopia vision” (Gabel 1 of 13). It is not his intellect that leads him back, but a force only Frazier and now Burris could
understand. This is however, much less a utopian ending when Burris arrives back at Walden Two. When he is greeted by Steve, one of the other visitors who had converted, Steve says, “‘I’ve been watching for you...Mr. Frazier told me you were coming back’” (Skinner 301). But since Frazier did not know of Burris’ decision, there is a tone of arrogance in Frazier that seems oddly placed for a “utopia.” Frazier was able to interpret Burris’ personality and insecurities so completely that he took advantage of them at every turn. In some ways, this transformation is the most frightening in that Burris seems to have decided on his own to go back to Walden Two; but, as we have seen, the other members of Walden Two feel as though they are making their own decisions as well.

Winston, John, and Burris hold such high standards for human life and human nature that it is a difficult to accept their demise. With the amount of psychological conditioning surrounding them, it is striking they attained any degree of rebellion at all. Their attempts to defeat the states, remove themselves, or prove the state wrong should be considered valiant efforts. However, through the malleability of human nature “the destruction of personal identity in objective reality is thus complete – or nearly complete, as [Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner] introduce exceptions...[we cannot, however, derive] any comfort from these essentially impotent rebels” (Kessler 568). These “impotent rebels,” for all of their deviant intentions, are eventually defeated by the state. Winston’s and John’s collapse are especially tragic while Burris’ is plain idiotic. While these protagonists are not heroes conquering the unconquerable, they are further a different kind of rebel than we traditionally see. “The rebel in all [these]
twentieth century ‘scientifically’ based social constructs...is always someone who embraces passion and achieves a heroic moment in the restoration of contingency. It is an act which is not only profoundly anti-social or criminal. It is also anti-scientific” (Davis 39). Because these literary societies are so heavily steeped in science, the anti-scientific hero will be sought after with the most vengeance. When he is caught, as he inevitably will be, he is either reconstructed or “killed” because of his anti-scientific, and thus humanistic, stance; and he will be brought under control through the very science he denied. Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner do not end their novels with hope for mankind, because in these novels, mankind has already relinquished its right to retaliate. The only recourse for the present is to avoid the future.
Conclusion
Warnings and Revelations

Literature plays an important role as one method of criticism of the world in which we live. Often, it models people’s feelings, people’s actions, and people’s thoughts. We should learn of literature that “imaginative writing can be both literary and political simultaneously, and inevitably is, to varying degrees. In its own way, fiction can accomplish…the creation of works that define and better the world socially, politically, culturally” (Christini 1). As we examine 1984, Brave New World, and Walden Two we should investigate the authors’ attempts to define our world socially, politically, and culturally, because that is what they perceive themselves to be doing. The astute reader feels as if the text holds within it a crystal ball in which he or she can see our future reflected. For all of their seemingly foreign strategies (e.g., psychological conditioning, fearing the outsider, controlling the body, omitting information, surrounding technology), these constructed societies are actually predicting our impending doom. Orwell and Huxley were convinced of this, fearing current conditions they could not have been aware of at their time, but Skinner, fancying himself a utopian, hopes his vision is the future. Orwell, Huxley, and, unintentionally, Skinner, warn readers of this eventual fate. These texts should awaken a sense of clarity for the reader as we can no longer ignore a close examination of our current world. What follows, then, is an inquiry into current practices in the United States. The examples I cite below in no way comprise an exhaustive or comprehensive list of similarities between fact and fiction. With these
similarities in mind, we should read *1984*, *Brave New World*, and *Walden Two* as road maps to navigate contemporary society. When applied, their warnings from roughly fifty years ago reveal the same issues and practices that have remained hidden from the forefront of our consciousness. These authors aim to remove the veil.

Psychological conditioning is as prevalent in modern society as it is in dystopias. Our immediate reaction is to defend ourselves and our independent thoughts. But Mond would tell us, "As if any one believed anything by instinct! One believes things because one has been conditioned to believe them" (Huxley 211). Whether we admit it or not, we are as easily molded. We believe that we are independent and free from conditioning, but even that is conditioning, as we have seen in *Walden Two*. We have a dual tendency to "overestimate individual strength and character while underestimating the force of subtle aspects of the social situation when we try to understand what causes us to act as we do" (Zimbardo 128). We overestimate our intelligence and, in doing so, underestimate our predisposition to be coerced. In fact, every polite mannerism we display is an example of our conditioning: opening doors for others, whispering in a library, following a schedule. These are actions we perform subconsciously and without question. Children learn these manners, along with the American mantras, "America the Beautiful," and "Home of the Brave" in academic institutions across the nation. It is not accidental that we are taught these things when we are young. Children are taught these things because they are malleable and easily conditioned to not question authority. Philip Zimbardo explains, "more crimes against human nature have been committed in the name of
obedience than in the name of rebellion. The blind obedience to authority that characterized Eichman’s defense and that of other Nazi criminals was not fashioned by Hitler or Himmler; it was occasionally nurtured by elementary school-teachers issuing coercive rules to stay seated until given permission to move, and a host of other forms of authoritarian and sometimes mindless rules of discipline” off-set quote? (Zimbardo 131). It should not be unfamiliar, then, to see children as the focus of educational conditioning in *1984*, *Brave New World*, and *Walden Two*. Our conditioning also begins early in life and continues on into adulthood.

We have substantial problems relating to the family that, admittedly, may only be indirectly related to the state. These days, families appear to have a difficult time having a meal together, let alone feel loyal and akin to one another. The divorce rate is higher than ever before, causing more and more fractured families that include step-mothers, step-fathers, step-brothers, and step-sisters; these bonds are not as recognized as biological ties. Further, the state’s constant battle over the legalization of gay marriage seems to reiterate that “family” can only consist of the state’s ideals. If the state does not support certain personal connections as “family,” they are in line to designate our personal connections for us; we have seen the ramifications of losing those ties in the aforementioned literary dystopias. As a country, we are responsible for a changing culture, one in which marriage is expendable and family is either replaceable or forbidden. The state perpetuates this culture of instant gratification just as in *Brave New World*. When the members of *Brave New World* say, “Ending is better than mending,” it is not just a recitation of an economic policy, but of a familial
value as well. The state projects an image protecting “family values,” but on whose standards are these “family values” based?

With the notion of family disintegrating, it is natural to want to fill that void with another group with which to belong. Group mentality is an extremely powerful and, therefore, frightening force in America. In fact, Philip Zimbardo manufactured his own experiment, the Stanford Prison Experiment, to prove it. The details of this experiment follow:

College students enacted randomly assigned roles of prisoners and guards within the setting of a simulated prison, in an experiment planned to run for two weeks. But I had to terminate the study prematurely after only six days because it had gotten out of control. Young men we had pre-measured on a battery of psychological tests, and had been selected because of their normality across many dimensions, were suffering emotional break downs and irrational thinking if they were powerless mock prisoners. Those enacting the mock guard role became abusive and hostile, and some even qualified as sadistic torturers -- despite being avowed pacifists and normal on all prior personality measures. The inhumanity of the evil prison situation had come to totally dominate the humanity of most of the good people who were trapped in that total situation. (139)

This experiment clearly demonstrates the power of an assigned role within a group. No matter what their inherent traits are, if one identifies themselves with a particular group, they will inevitably behave according to that role. This power is manipulated
in 1984, Brave New World and Walden Two. The states in these texts understand the power of the group and use it by giving everyone a label with which to identify themselves. The proles, party members, Alphas, Betas, Deltas, Epsilons, and "workers" all fill particular roles given to them by the state.

In addition to the Stanford Prison Experiment, we see the same type of imitation among American soldiers. "Cultural wisdom acknowledges that for young men to kill other young men in wars, usually fashioned by old men, the most effective preparation is to arrange for them to make an external transformation of identity so they can do normally evil deeds with impunity" (Zimbardo 138). This transformation is most certainly organized by the military, an extension of the state. It is in particularly militaristic environments that people develop identities to align with the state’s expectations. When one subconsciously knows what is expected of a particular role; one also subconsciously plays that role as those who have become before have done. One typically does not question authority.

As much as we want to believe that our government provides us with a viable enemy against whom to fight and that we are not coerced into believing what we are told, neither is necessarily true. The Bush administration has employed similar tactics to those of the Party in 1984 in changing the face of our enemy several times since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Zimbardo writes that it is evident, "that the Bush administration plans to make this war on terrorism a long war...the original enemy, al Qaeda forces, was expanded to include Afghanistan’s Taliban; then the net widened to all governments that supported terrorism in any way, then to countries that
qualify as belonging to the ‘axis of evil’ because they make weapons, have not been friendly to the United States, and may be supporting terrorists” (153). As in Hate Week, we raise the banner of “Homeland Security” as our most important value and concede to mild inconveniences in the name of that value. Our president appears heroic as America becomes the victim in the “War on Terror.” Further, if one does not become tear-y-eyed at the “9/11” t-shirts, posters, or poems declaring that “We will never forget” hanging in offices and schools, ribbons that are worn on the anniversary, or disagreed with the president’s decision to go to war with Iraq, one is labeled “unpatriotic.” And when we found out that there really were no “weapons of mass destruction” in Iraq the end justified the means because Saddam Hussein, “was a bad guy and the world is better off without him” (Zombardo 154). And yet, no rebellion and very little public outcry. We trust the state because we have no choice in the matter.

It is not just the explicit enemy from whom our government “protects,” us, but the faceless outsider as well. Brave New World and Walden Two worry over outsiders invading the minds and culture they have worked so hard to establish. Our recent increased interest in immigration laws seems to be on equal footing with Huxley and Skinner. We patrol and desire to keep out those who are different and who may bring with them different cultures and values. In 1954, “the ill-named ‘Operation Wetback’ effort used neighborhood sweeps to arrest and deport a large portion of the illegal Mexican population, in an attempt to prevent the huge Bracero temporary worker program from resulting in permanent settlement” (Kirkorian 2). And in 1986,
“Congress enacted the immigration reform and Control Act (IRCA), which traded an illegal-alien amnesty for a first-ever ban on the employment of illegal aliens. The point was to turn off the magnet of jobs that is the main reason illegals come here in the first place” (Kirkorian 3). We also have increased border enforcement. “The Border Patrol has doubled in size over the past decade, accounting for the lion’s share of increased resources for enforcement. Its 10,000 agents are better equipped and doing a better job than ever before” (Kirkorian 3). One may argue that this legislation focuses on the illegal immigrant, not the immigrant himself, but I argue that the message is largely symbolic as none of these methods seem to be working particularly well. It is the illegals that the state cannot control, or even find in most cases, and therefore they equate to the most significant problem. The America that was once considered a utopia in its own right, declaring “Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses! Yearning to breathe free” appears to want to chase them down and chase them out as our government implements new isolationist policies.

Information is deliberately censored in order to maintain the status quo. Mond’s stash of books in Brave New World contains religious texts and Shakespeare; essentially, any writings including topics of dissention from conventionality. This is true for us as well. The Bible has always been a target of censorship, and religion in general “was most frequently cited for the censorship of written works” (NCAC). The National Coalition Against Censorship lists many other reasons for unofficially banning specific titles in more recent times:
Books as varied as Judy Blume's *Forever*, Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita*, and Maya Angelou's *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*, among many others, have been challenged by parents and school boards who deem certain sexual passages inappropriate for young people. Works such as *It's Perfectly Normal* by Robie Harris and *Heather Has Two Mommies* by Leslea Newman, among others, frequently face demands for removal from library shelves for their focus on gay/lesbian issues. And such books as the *Harry Potter* series by J.K. Rowling and the *Scary Stories* series by Alvin Schwartz, among others, have been challenged by dozens of parents, administrators, and clergy for their scary, violent or occult themes. Written works on evolution have also faced censorship, as have books that represent race in a way that is deemed objectionable by certain groups. (ncac.org)

The presence of censorship appears, then, to be in place for the benefit of children. The message is that children should not be exposed to sexuality, homosexuality, violence and/or racial issues. And yet, when they become adults, we expect them to be perfectly capable of understanding these very issues we have been keeping from them. But more importantly, censoring these issues from children only promotes a homogenous group of people all abide by the same standards that are given by the state.

We gather that the boards of education and parents spearhead these decisions regarding censorship. But with state support of the Parents Music Resource Center (PMRC) founded by Tipper Gore, Susan Baker, Pam Howar, and Sally Nevius (the
“Washington Wives”) as well as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), it seems the state is not far from the decision. The results are “Parental Advisory” stickers on CD covers and the V-chip in televisions. The FCC is now “requiring all television sets...to be equipped with features to block the display of television programming based upon its rating. This technology is known as the ‘V-Chip.’ The V-Chip reads information encoded in the rated program and blocks programs from the set based upon the rating selected by the parent” (fcc.gov). Parents can buy devices for their computers and televisions that will restrict children from watching particular programs. One would assume that children’s parents have the final say in the conditioning of their children. But what about the parents who speak out against censorship? Are there any? Parents are given a very subtle message; if they are not constantly patrolling and censoring their children, they are, in effect, “bad parents.” With the increasing fear of outside influences on children, parents do not want their children deconditioned from societal “norms” given to us by the state and so they comply—often with a vengeance. While there is nothing wrong, per se, with sheltering a child, the real significance lies in the potentiality of censorship. If we allow it under these circumstances, how can we be sure it would not also be used against us?

Any status quo is also largely maintained by encouraging an uneducated or undereducated population. There is hardly a cultural value placed on knowledge. If you were to watch an episode of *Are you Smarter Than a Fifth Grader?* on the FOX network, you would find that sadly, most adults are not. The general public cannot
remember which presidents’ faces are etched on Mt. Rushmore, or the name of the ship that brought the Pilgrims to Plymouth, or the first president to be impeached. The history of our country, and history in general, is trivialized. But more than a culture without history, we have become a culture without books. A report released in July of 2004 by the US National Endowment for the Arts says “a total of 89.9 million adults did not read books in 2002. The NEA chairman, Dana Gioia, said the findings were shocking. ‘We have a lot of functionally literate people who are no longer engaged readers. We’re seeing an enormous cultural shift from print media to electronic media, and the unintended consequences of that shift’” (literacytrust.org). As a nation, we no longer assign a value to history and literature. Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner show the danger this shift presents. Although the state did not physically take this information away from us, we create a culture that allows electronic media to overrun our senses distracting us from that history and literature.

The state endorses myriad distractions to divert our attention from history, literature, and politics. Tony Swartz’s book *The Second God* argues that man has made a god out of the media. If we say that God is everywhere, inside and outside of us, and that we never really understand him and his mysterious workings, we could also say the same about the media. Swartz says, “‘Radio and television are everywhere and they are always with us. Millions listen to the same networks, hum the same commercial jingles’” (qtd in Cooper 92). Just as electronic media surrounds those in *1984*, we are also surrounded by constant advertising. In 1951, C.H. Sandage, the founder of the first Department of Advertising wrote an article in praise of
advertising due to its simple effectiveness. He says, “Political parties, governments, churches, business institutions, and labor groups are making greater and greater use of advertising as a means of informing people and persuading them toward a particular philosophy or point of view” (264). It sounds as though Sandage had a positive purpose and a hopeful vision for advertising as he feels it “promote[s and] broadens the concept and influence of free speech” (264). Like in utopians, _Walden Two_ or _Brave New World_, what begins as an idealistic theory, ends in dystopian failure. We are now more aware of the negative effects of advertising. As the medium has been associated historically with wartime propaganda, as in _1984_, and consumer materialism more recently, as in _Brave New World_.

But it is not just advertising that distracts us; it is also entertainment. In _Brave New World_ they have the feelies, in America we have American football. This past Super Bowl XLII “earned the record for total viewership as 148.3 million watched all or part of the content, supplanting the 144.4 million that eyed Super Bowl XXXVIII on CBS in 2004 (Reynolds 1). Additionally, “NFL paid attendance totaled 1,106,818 for 16 games in [2003], the highest total in league history” (nfl.com). This turnout for American football is in bleak comparison to the record high of voter turnout in 1996 of 114 million, which decreased to 111 million in 2000 (census.gov). “Among registered voters who failed to cast ballots, 1-in-5 reported they were ‘too busy’ to vote” (Bergman 1). This implies that Americans want to be entertained, not political. The state must promote entertainment as a value, for we saw “President George W. Bush become the first United States President to be involved in an NFL regular-
season pre-game coin toss as he helped kick off the 2001 season from the White House” (nfl.com). Just as the proles play the lottery that no one wins, and the members of the new world attend the feelies and take soma, Americans watch football and of course, a plethora of other entertainments. Politics is not in the forefront of Americans’ minds, which allows those in power to run on an extended leash.

When we think about a culture that manipulates the body simply because it is a symbol of power and control, we should not only look at Brave New World but also at ourselves. I am sure most people alive at the time remember Dolly, the ewe that was cloned in 1996. Nancy Gibbs from Time magazine reports:

No one thinks the mechanics of cloning are very hard: take a donor egg, suck out the nucleus, and hence the DNA, and fuse it with say, a skin cell from the human being copied. Then, with the help of an electric current, the reconstituted cell should begin growing into a genetic duplicate…the consensus among biotechnology specialists is that with in a few years – some scientists believe months – the news will break of the birth of the first human clone. (1 of 11)

While cloning has not come to fruition within that time frame, it is still close at hand. So far, the state has actually impeded progress on biotechnology, but Huxley wants us to imagine the likely consequences of the state beginning to condone biotechnological practices as he believes it some day will. Nevertheless, we live in a culture of productivity and a desire for results. Some people argue in favor of human cloning as
it could save someone’s life; for example, bone marrow could be duplicated for leukemia patients who cannot find a suitable donor. We may believe this to be a great idea, but can it be controlled? The state would have to step in to take control.

But we are also a *Brave New World* of perfectionism. In our country, there are increasing numbers in favor of plastic surgery. Figures released from the American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery (ASAPS) on March 9, 2008 show significantly high numbers of completed procedures. In 2006 alone, 138,245 people had facelifts; 172,457, Abdominoplasty (tummy tuck); 3,181,592, Botox; and 993,071 had Microdermabrasion (cosmeticplasticsurgerystatistics.com). To be fair, these procedures are certainly not mandated by the state, but perfectionism is a culture perpetuated by the people. We have begun, as Lenina does, to look at our own aging bodies with horror. We no longer want to grow old, look old, feel old; we want to be young forever. Huxley’s world is a frightful reminder of what could happen if we allow biotechnology to progress: In *Brave New World*, the people value happiness. If we continue to equate happiness with a youthful appearance, we may be closer to the new world than we think.

Perhaps the most significant contradiction in America is our quest for individuality. We rely on an artificial notion that we embrace differences. But we can see in our country as we see in *1984*, *Brave New World*, and *Walden Two*, that “individuality is attacked as a threat to the stability of the community” (Burkowski 39). One does not need to look further than American high schools to hear kids calling other kids, “freak,” “nerd,” or “loser” because they do not shop at
Abercrombie and Fitch or play sports like everyone else does. In more urban areas, one hears on the news that a teenager did not buy the “right” sneakers and was therefore bullied or beat up after school. As John in Brave New World, explains, “If one’s different, one’s bound to be lonely. They’re beastly to one” (Huxley·128). And John is right; for all of the “melting pot” propaganda, what we would really like to see is conformity. And in most cases, the country has conformed. Drive through a suburban neighborhood and notice the cloned homes, shopping malls, chain restaurants, and Walmarts. We are a mass-production culture pretending to appreciate individuality. We clearly want the herd, not the individual animal.

The psychological conditioning facilities present in 1984 and Walden Two are similar also to our own mental health establishments and facilities. In the last fifty years, we have become much more dependent on mental health facilities and research to somehow “cure” our biological defects. “It is hard to rebel against something that is being done ‘for you’ and not ‘to you.’ . . . [something that is] designed to make people fit in the norm, achieve the social ideal” (Zimbardo 142). Again, perhaps we work the hardest on fixing our youth. Thousands of students each year are diagnosed with ADD, ADHD, and other behavioral and learning disabilities; in fact, ADHD has become “the most commonly diagnosed behavioral disorder of childhood” (surgeon general.gov). However, pediatricians report that although “approximately 4 percent of their patients have ADHD...in practice the diagnosis is often made in children who meet some, but not all, of the criteria recommended in DSM-IV” (surgeon general.gov). The fact that a diagnosis is made based only on “some” of the symptoms
and not all of the symptoms signals a problem. It is possible, even likely, then, that the children who exhibit only some symptoms of ADHD, but are treated with Ritalin, Lexapro, or Strattera may not actually need medication. But as Americans, we are quick to diagnose and medicate a problem, whether it is truly present or not, in the name of conventionality. Walden Two and the Party, send their deviant citizens to psychologists in order to be “cured,” while the new world just passes out soma rations. It seems that psychology and corrective psychology are the focus in changing inherent qualities of individuals. If Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner agree on only one thing, it is that “human nature is infinitely malleable” (Burkowski 44). No mental condition, especially in children, goes unnoticed. We want adjusted children, so we have adjusted adults that will not rebel against the status quo.

When the “intellectual rebels” of the texts, Winston, John, and Burris, are uncovered, we see characters that are largely alone, desperately trying to resist the force of society upon them. When these radicals are eventually lost to the state, we should ask ourselves how we treat the radicals of our time. When someone speaks out, really speaks out against our country’s practices, what do we call them? A fanatic, a crazed anarchist, an extremist. The best example today is Michael Moore. According to a website aptly titled MOOREWATCH, the hosts say, “We’ve all known for years that Michael Moore is a sociopath who cares about nobody but himself.” They go on to call his documentaries on socialized medicine and the war in Iraq “bullshit,” to quote one of the nicer adjectives. You do not have to be a Michael Moore supporter to perceive America’s treatment of the radical. So while I may not support Michael
Moore, I do support radicals. Granted, most radicals have radical ideas that rarely materialize. However, some people once deemed "radicals" have drastically changed our world. Susan B. Anthony, for instance, was arrested in 1872 for voting; Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated because he promoted civil rights; Betty Friedan the founder of the National Organization for Women, Malcolm X, were all considered radicals of their time. While I am not suggesting Michael Moore be considered the same caliber of radical, I am suggesting that we not be so quick to dismiss a radical voice. Once we dismiss any idea of change, "What standard of judgment, indeed, remains but power and the system as it now exists? No principle of dialectic opposition can leverage changes, and the ideal of 'character' is replaced by that cooperation. This is an image of a social system in the late stage of decay" (Gable 7 of 13). As their radicals are never heard by the public, Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner certainly believe we are in those late stages. Chances are we will not know if they are right until it is too late.

As readers, we are outsiders that look for to recognize ourselves within texts. The "rebels" that we are given from Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner represent an "everyman" to the reader; what we see them experience throughout the text is what we might expect to experience ourselves. We think the Party is lunacy and the tactics exaggerated, we believe we should not be cloned or without tragedy and family; we also feel we should have freedom and to question practices that take it away from us. We look to connect with the protagonists as they seem to feel, act, and question as we believe we would under the same circumstances. The reader, as well as Winston, John,
and Burris, "commonly believe that we have more strength to resist behavior-modifying attempts than we really have. We rely on the abstractions of 'force of character,' 'spirit of determination,' 'ego strength' to steel us against assaults on our personal values and beliefs... But at the same time we entertain a second misperception by underestimating the true power of social pressures to make people conform, comply, and obey" (Zimbardo 136). We think, "It will not happen to us," and that we are personally invulnerable to these influences. But in fact, we are not. For this reason, the defeat of the novels' protagonists is our defeat. This defeat is powerful because in these texts, and in Winston, John, and Burris, we see all facets of humanness. We see all our fears exploited to remove that humanness until there is very little, if anything, left to call our own.

In the end, Orwell, Huxley, and Skinner, transform themselves from authors to-aesthetic dissenters. Each felt it was his personal mission to speak out against what he believed was occurring and to speak out for what he believed should occur. But the role of the artist is not solely to entertain. Howard Zinn writes of this role:

I suggest that the role of the artist is to transcend conventional wisdom, to transcend the word of the establishment, to transcend the orthodoxy, to go beyond and escape what is handed down by the government or what is said in the media.... It is the job of the artist to think outside the boundaries of permissible thought and dare to say things that no one else will say.... It is absolutely patriotic to point a finger at the government to say that it is not doing what it should be doing to safeguard the right of citizens to life, liberty,
and the pursuit of happiness.... We must be able to look at ourselves, to look at our country honestly and clearly. And just as we can examine the awful things that people do elsewhere, we have to be willing to examine the awful things that are done here by our government. (socialit.org)

It is the role of the artist to draw attention to what the people, or rather the masses, may miss through the drudgery of daily life. That is the place for and the importance of literature. But I would also argue that it is not just the role of the artist to bring these issues into focus. It is the role of the reader to recognize and to apply these illuminations to our own familiar landscapes. It may be that these dystopias will never be actualized but "it is to [their] credit that [they] have the courage to show us [a] vision of hell without giving...us a way to escape what we have seen" (Burkowski 47). Perhaps then, when we are faced with those questions—Are we willing to sacrifice our independence for the stability of the nation? Should we stifle technological progress? Are we unaware of even our own conditioning?—we will be better equipped to answer them. Having looked into the crystal ball of dystopian fiction, our eyes will open anew.
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