

وزارة التعليم العالي و البحث العلمي

MINISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE

UNIVERSITE MOULOUD MAMMERI TIZI-OUZOU

FACULTE DES LETTRES ET DES LANGUES

DEPARTEMENT D'ANGLAIS

جامعة مولود معمري - تيزي وزو

كلية الآداب واللغات



**Domaine : Lettres et Langues Etrangères**

**Filière : Langue Anglaise**

**Spécialité : Langue, Cultures des Pays Anglophones et Médias**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master in English**

**Title:**

**Open and Closed Society in Herbert George Wells's The Open  
Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our  
Lives ?(1928) and Aldous Huxley's Brave New World (1932)**

**Presented by:**

**Amine Djeglou**

**Fatma Boudjemli**

**Supervised by:**

**Dr.Hacene Benmechiche**

**Board of Examiners:**

Mouloud Siber

**MCA**

Chair,

Department of English UMMTO

Hacene Benmechiche

**MCB**

Supervisor,

Department of English UMMTO

Brahim Henna

**MAA**

Examiner

Department of English UMMTO

**Promotion : 2016/2017**

N<sup>o</sup> d'Ordre : .....

N<sup>o</sup> de série : .....

**Laboratoire de domiciliation du master : Etude des Langues et Cultures Etrangères**

## Contents

Contents.....	I
Abstract.....	II
Acknowledgments.....	III
<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Review of literature.....	2
Issue and Working Hypothesis.....	3
Endnotes.....	5
<b>II. Methods and Materials.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1. Methods.....	7
Karl Popper's <i>The Open Society and its Enemies</i> 1: <i>The Spell Of Plato</i> .....	7
2. Materials.....	12
Summaries of the books.....	13
Endnotes.....	14
<b>III. Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>16</b>
1. Chapter One: The Open Conspiracy(1928) as a Reflection of its Socio-Historical Context...	18
Endnotes.....	27
2. Chapter Two:The situation of the society in <i>The Open Conspiracy:What Are We To Do With Our Lives?</i> in Terms of the closed and open society criteria.....	29
Endnotes.....	41
3. Chapter Three: Brave New World as a satirical Echo To The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To With Our Lives?.....	44
Endnotes.....	59
<b>IV. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>V. Bibliography.....</b>	<b>64</b>

## **Abstract :**

This research paper focuses on H.G Wells's *The Open Conspiracy : What Are We To Do with our lives ?* (1928) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) in terms of the type of society the two authors describe in their works. It sheds light on the authors' concern about the underlying principles of the societies they describe and how *Brave New World* echoes satirically *The Open Conspiracy*. Throughout our analysis, we have relied on the dichotomous concepts of the "Closed" and "Open society" criteria developed in the first volume of Karl Raimond Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies1 : The Spell Of Plato* (1945) with reference to Plato as the first advocator of a return to a closed society. Popper distinguished between an open and closed society which helped us to depict the type of society sought for in Wells's and Huxley's works. Hence, after the examination of the two works we have reached the conclusion that the utopian society of the World State in *Brave New World* is a satirical attack to Herbert Geoge Wells's utopian thoughts. In *the Open Conspiracy* Wells hold optimistic expectations towards science and technology and calls for the creation of a utopian World State with an ideal society that would end conflict that is sparked off by exacerbated nationalism, where all populations are unified into one, and every individual finds his happiness and his place. Unlike Wells's utopian ideas, Aldous Huxley was clearly mocking by describing how people are engineered to become subservient to the World State. Huxley advocates the right for critical thought and a society that is conducive to progress and change.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our deep gratitude and sincere thanks to our supervisor **Dr. Hacene Benmechiche** to whom we owe this interesting theme. His constant guidance and unceasing encouragement were of a crucial role in accomplishing this modest work. We would like to thank him for being compassionate in sharing his knowledge throughout the entire process. We are profoundly thankful for the members of the board of examiners composed of **Dr. Mouloud Siber** and **Mr. Brahim Henna** for their acceptance to participate in the assessment of this dissertation. We would like also to thank all our teachers who were always ready to help us all along our Master studies.

## **I. General Introduction :**

Ancient Greeks reached the threshold of an ideal society, and they managed to some extent to use this model to form a good society mainly in the city state of Athens. Plato's philosophy in *The Republic* best exemplifies this account of an ideal society. Plato's work, as Karl Popper explains, dates back to the time of both the social disintegration that the Peloponnesian War had provoked and the degeneration of the democratic system which had been established since Pericles<sup>1</sup>. Yet, the specific literary expression of this dream of a 'perfect society', came in the Renaissance period with Thomas More's *Utopia* 1515. Through the rediscovery of Greek thought, Renaissance thinkers owe their ideas to Greeks.

From ancient to the modern history of Western World, social chaos and discontent have been prevalent in every place. So, persons of intelligence and social spirit of all times realized this social phenomenon. They searched for causes and sought solutions for the complications that seemed to ruin daily life, and they sought ideals of perfection which may lead to the good society. This was true in Plato Thomas More's time, it is true for the modern era too. In modern times, the 1920s and 1930s marked an era of turmoil in which the world underwent tremendous changes and upheavals both socio-economically and politically.

The period witnessed the spread of American, German, British, and Italian Nationalisms as well as a competition over control of resources that led to WW1. Herbert George Wells and Aldous Huxley in their works entitled *The Open Conspiracy :What Are We To Do With Our Live* (1928)<sup>2</sup> and *Brave New World* (1932)<sup>3</sup> envisioned conspiracy theories to establish a new world system and organization, as a solution to the social troubles of their times.

## Review of Literature :

H.G Wells's *The Open Conspiracy : What Are We To Do With Our Lives ?* (1928) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) have been subject to criticism. Concerning Wells's book, it was reviewed by Michel Steinberg in his article *H.G Wells Plots the World Empire* (2004),<sup>4</sup> in which he claimed that "The *Open Conspiracy* is Wells's "mein kampf-a recipe" for how to establish a World Government that would, over time, perhaps even over generations, recruit individuals and set up institutions to create a "world directorate" to run a "New World Order".<sup>5</sup> More clearly, Steinberg in his critical view presents Wells's essay as a doctrine in which Wells explains the methods he advocates and gives his answer to the question : how to achieve a World State ?. In fact, Steinberg considers that "Wells has one essential enemy that the *Open Conspiracy* must destroy : that is, the sovereign nation-state".<sup>6</sup>

James Christie observes that "this book is a call to treat *The Open Conspiracy* as a call to a new religion : a religion of service, of liberation, of hope, like all the healthy religious impulses, it must exist in and of the light".<sup>7</sup> More clearly, *The Open Conspiracy* is Wells's personal "bible" where he attempts to outline his "conspiracy of modern religion against the established institutions of the world",<sup>8</sup> that is "globalization" ; a new religion that will end wars, abolish nationalism and sovereignty and replace them by a World Government. Thus, just as Auguste Comte did with his *Religion Of Humanity* (1842) where he exhorts the human race to unite under a single spiritual authority and form what he calls " The Great Being"; Wells, through his blueprint develops the same apology as Comte did; a call to a single government. In fact, one of the foremost aims in Wells's *The Open Conspiracy* is to reunite all humans under one religion that will preach universalism and cosmopolitanism : the ideology which claims that all men are citizens of one state : the World State.<sup>9</sup>

*Brave New World* has been the center of interest of many critics. In their *Huxley's Brave New World*,<sup>10</sup> Charles and Regina Higgins focus on the pessimistic view of Huxley as it is

presented in his novel. They argue that the latter portrays a dystopian fictional world where “uniqueness is useless and uniformity is bliss”.<sup>11</sup> According to them, Huxley aims to introduce a new world by challenging the old norms of the utopian satire. They claim that through his ironic criticism of the idealized society, Huxley “creates a world in which all the present worrying trends have produced terrible consequences”.<sup>12</sup> Besides, in *Bloom’s Guide: Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World*;<sup>13</sup> Jerome Meckier revises Huxley’s utopian satire claiming that one of the reasons behind the writing of *Brave New World* is to “discredit, if not discourage the sort of utopian writing [Huxley] was familiar with”.<sup>14</sup> This implies that Huxley’s novel comes as a response to the traditional utopian thought that cherishes the imaginary ideal future. According to Meckier, Huxley’s work is “a monster of rationality”<sup>15</sup> in the sense that the novel does not adopt the utopian social norms of the idolized future but instead it embraces a reasonable reality. Moreover, in *Brave New World: Context and Legacy*;<sup>16</sup> Laura Frost depicts Huxley’s descriptive vision of pleasure as satiric. She states that throughout his novel, Huxley tends to create “[de]sublimated practices of pleasures that are alarming but also imaginatively expensive”<sup>17</sup> in order to influence his readers. She asserts that his creation of “dystopian pleasures”<sup>18</sup> and his diversion from the conventional norms make the novel “provocative, playful and alarming”<sup>19</sup> at the same time.

### **Issue and Working Hypothesis:**

As highlighted above, many studies have been carried about the two works namely *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* and *Brave New World*. They have been analyzed and evaluated from different angles and perspectives. However, to our knowledge, the two works have not been compared before particularly from the angle of whether they represent an “open society” or rather a “closed society”. In other words, the fundamental issue of this research paper is to depict whether these two works meant to defend

and represent an “open society”, or are they meant to portray or construct a “closed society” instead and how *Brave New World* echoes satirically *The Open Conspiracy*.

It may not seem surprising to evoke Aldous Huxley in reference to H.G Wells and to suggest that there is a link between their texts. In fact, there are many elements which seem to set these two authors together; they lived in the same period and were even very familiar to each other. In addition, a careful analysis of the two works reveals significant commonalities between them. For example, the changes that Wells identified in his work, are those we face today largely the result of technological, scientific as well as social advances. The improved communication, for instance, had contracted the world, in the same way as the internet is doing today. Huxley’s novel, too, reflects today’s world, where science and technology have reduced the gap between human connections.

By basing our study on Karl Popper’s ideas developed in *The Open Society and its Enemies: The Spell of Plato* (1945)<sup>20</sup>, we direct our attention to highlight the writers’ perspectives in what concern the situation of the represented society in each work, that is whether the two authors advocate a “closed” or rather an “open society” instead. Significantly, the society that is depicted in Huxley’s work is, to some extent, symmetric to that of *The Open Conspiracy*; Thus, our goal is also to elucidate how the former echoes the latter. Therefore, the claim that we will study is that Wells’s ideas are based on “eugenics” and “social engineering” promoted by an “oligarchy” of elites whose aim is to control society to their own benefits, to prevent change or progress, and which in turn will lead to stability, peace, happiness and, therefore; to a “closed society”. In contrast to Wells, Huxley’s response came in the form of rejection and disapproval against this closed and narrowed society that Wells defend in his book ; he used Wells’s ideas of *The Open Conspiracy* to set up the society of *Brave New World* , with the aim of satirizing Wells’s utopian ideas. Huxley, then, defends an “open society”.

This paper is divided into two sections. The first section is devoted to the introduction as well as the methods and materials used in analyzing the two works. The second section includes the discussion which is divided into three chapters. The first deals with background information that shaped the writings and perspectives of the two authors. The second chapter examines the type of society sought for in *the Open Conspiracy: what are we to do with our lives?*. The last one discusses *Brave New World* as a satirical echo to *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?*.

### Endnotes:

<sup>1</sup>Karl Raimond Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies* 1: The Spell Of Plato (1945; repr., Abingdon, Routledge Classics, 2011).

<sup>2</sup> Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?* (Great Britain: C.A. Watt & CO. Limited, 1935; repr., San Diego CA: The Book Tree, 2006), 39

<sup>3</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* . (1932; repr., London: Vintage, Penguin London House, 1994).

<sup>4</sup>Michele Steinberg, ‘*The Open Conspiracy*’: *H.G. Wells Plots the World Empire*, Presidential Campaign Committee, February 2004. Viewed on 11-11-2017.

[https://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2006/eirv33n12-20060324/eirv33n12-20060324\\_011-the\\_open\\_conspiracy\\_hg\\_wells\\_plo.pdf](https://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2006/eirv33n12-20060324/eirv33n12-20060324_011-the_open_conspiracy_hg_wells_plo.pdf)

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>James Christie, “Love and Fine Thinking: Ethics and the State in the Writings of H.G Wells” (PhD diss., Department of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal , June 1986.). viewed on 06-10-2017.

[Love and Fine Thinking: Ethics and The World State in The Writings of ... digitool.library.mcgill.ca/thesisfile65484.pdf](http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/thesisfile65484.pdf)

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Charles Higgins and Regina Higgins, *Huxley's Brave New World* (Foster City: IDC Books Worldwide, Int, 2000). Viewed on 09-19-2017.

[file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/\(Cliffs%20Notes\)%20Charles%20Ph.D. %20Higgins,%20Regina%20Higgins-Huxley's%20Brave%20New%20World%20Cliffs%20Notes%20\(2000\)%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/(Cliffs%20Notes)%20Charles%20Ph.D.%20Higgins,%20Regina%20Higgins-Huxley's%20Brave%20New%20World%20Cliffs%20Notes%20(2000)%20(1).pdf)

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, 67.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid, 7.

<sup>13</sup>Harold Bloom, *Bloom's Guides: Aldous Huxley's Brave New World* (Broomall: Chelsea House Publisher, 2004). Viewed on 09-19-2017.

[file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/Harold%20Bloom-Aldous%20Huxley's%20Brave%20New%20World%20\(Bloom's%20Guides\)%20\(2006\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/Harold%20Bloom-Aldous%20Huxley's%20Brave%20New%20World%20(Bloom's%20Guides)%20(2006).pdf)

<sup>14</sup>Jerom Meckier, "JeromMeckier on Huxley's Ironic Utopia" in *Bloom's Guides: Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*, 72.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid*, 73.

<sup>16</sup>Jonathan Greenberg and Nathan Waddell, *Brave New World: Context and Legacy* (London: Springer Verlag, 2016). Viewed on 11-18-2017.

[file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/Jonathan%20Greenberg,%20Nathan%20Waddell%20\(eds.\)-Brave%20New%20World'%20Contexts%20and%20Legacies-Palgrave%20Macmillan%20UK%20\(2016\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/microbox/Documents/Jonathan%20Greenberg,%20Nathan%20Waddell%20(eds.)-Brave%20New%20World'%20Contexts%20and%20Legacies-Palgrave%20Macmillan%20UK%20(2016).pdf)

<sup>17</sup>Laura Frost, "The Pleasures of Dystopia" in *Brave New World: Context and Legacy*, 71.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid*.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid*, 75.

<sup>20</sup>Karl Raimond Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies* 1: The Spell Of Plato.

## **II. Methods and Materials:**

### **i. Methods:**

*The Open Society and its Enemies* is a book with two volumes by Karl Raimund Popper, written during the Second World War and published in 1945. In his book, Popper deals with the problems that arise in relation to the emergence of an “Open Society”<sup>21</sup>. He argues that some of the greatest thinkers and philosophers have opposed the rise of an “Open Society”, most notably : Plato, Hegel and Marx. Our study draws upon the first volume of the book : *The Spell Of Plato*. We shall give a brief contextualization of the concepts of ‘the open and closed society’ as explained by Popper with reference to Plato as an advocator of the Closed Society, and in the process we will explain how the “Open Society” emerged according to Popper.

The “Open Society” is a concept that depicts a society which “sets free the critical powers of man”,<sup>22</sup> where a high value is given to the ability to extend the use of critical reason. It is a democratic society that is open to criticism where each individual is given the freedom to communicate his own critical thinking toward existing conjectures, being free to refute them as well.<sup>23</sup> Hence, “the open society is a dynamic arena of conjectures and refutations built upon the critical exercise of reason and within a democratic environment”.<sup>24</sup> In addition, in an open society, many members strive to rise socially and hold important positions by willing to occupy the place of other members. This may lead to the social phenomenon of “class struggle” which is a thing, K. Popper claims, that we cannot find in an organism.<sup>25</sup> It is above all, “a society that uses piecemeal methods for increasing the possibility or reaching a reasonable compromise and therefore of achieving the improvement by democratic methods”.<sup>26</sup>

In fact, K. Popper proposed piecemeal methods for “social engineering” as opposed to “utopian social engineering”, in the sense that the open society does not necessarily strive to promote the happiness of people, that is beyond its power, but contends itself to diminish suffering whenever possible, and to protect people from violence.<sup>27</sup> In an open society, people are called to look after their responsibilities ; they are in fact responsible for their decisions. This is admittedly a heavy burden. Yet, as Popper claims, “it is the price we have to pay for being human”.<sup>28</sup> This is what is meant to be an individual and it is, as such, inevitable. This notion of responsibility requires democracy in the sense that, as responsible citizens, they are compelled to care about the affairs of the state. Democracy does not mean only the election of rulers. This is just a process or one detail to ensure that a change in rule can be effected peacefully without bloodshed or disturbing the society’s organization. The nature of democracy implies that a ruler does not need to be a good one. Institutions of a democratic society whether educational, social, or religious, should be designed to limit the damage that an incompetent ruler may cause. Plato indicated that democracy is contradictory : if democracy is the rule of people, there is nothing that prevents them to elect a tyrant, which Plato considers among the worst of political evils,<sup>29</sup> as Popper writes : “Tyranny, Plato insisted, was not the solution, nor any of the current oligarchies. Although it is imperative to keep the people in their place, their suppression is not an end in itself. The end must be the complete return to nature, a complete cleaning of the canvas”.<sup>30</sup>

However, Popper claims that a democratic society is based on reason, so intolerance should never be tolerated, at least in so far as it threatens the existence of a democratic, open state. The word ‘reason’ plays a crucial role in an open society. The power of the mind to think, understand, and form judgments by logic while designing any scheme for society, though it may create a heavy burden upon individuals, is different from aiming to design a state in

which everything is perfect, idealistic but devoid of logic i.e.reason, and thus may lead to a totalitarian rule.

The Open Society is opposed to the “Closed Society” which is recognized by “the belief in scientific taboos” in analogy with “magical taboos”.<sup>31</sup> In the Closed Society, members of the community are a part of an organism ; none of them has the ability to do something about the society, as each of them is just a simple part of the body. The closed Society is therefore not open to criticism.<sup>32</sup> It is, in fact, a tribal society, where the authoritarian values of the tribe are the most important ones. Popper asserts that :

A Closed Society resembles a tribe in being a semi-organic unit whose members are held together by semi-biological ties, kinship, living together, sharing common efforts, common dangers, common joys and common distress.<sup>33</sup>

It is a society based on taboos , tradition and authority, that opposes change, teaching that “change is evil, and that rest is divine”.<sup>34</sup>

In chapter ten of the book entitled “*The Open Society and its Enemies*”, Popper explains that Ancient Greece is the birth place of Western Civilization. According to him, the ancient Greeks were the first people to pass from tribalism into a modern society ; thus Western Civilization originated with the ancient Greeks.<sup>35</sup> The breakdown of tribalism, of the closed societies of Greece, may be traced back, according to Popper, to the time when “the ruling class of landed proprietors began to feel the population growth. This meant the end of “organic” tribalism because of the social tension that is created within the closed society of the ruling class”.<sup>36</sup>

As a result of this, a great psychological burden was imposed upon individuals due to the transition from the “Closed” to the “Open Society”. That is what K. Popper calls “the strain of civilization”.<sup>37</sup> The uncertainty and insecurity that have born with the emergence of the “Open Society” along with the painful necessity of taking personal responsibility for one’s daily life go in direct opposition with the security of the “Closed Society” that is

devoid of doubt. This transition from the ‘‘Closed’’ to the ‘‘Open Society’’ is for Popper ‘‘one of the deepest revolutions through which mankind passed’’.<sup>38</sup>

Popper holds that Plato led the revolt against the efforts of the ‘‘Great Generation’’.<sup>39</sup> The revolutionary transition from closed to open society first occurred, according to K. Popper, with the Great Generation of ancient Athens in the fifth century B.C. Those to be associated with the birth of the open society include Pericles, Herodotus, Protagoras, Democritus, Alcidas, Lycophron, Antisthenes, and Socrates above all. Plato considers Socrates to be one of the greatest defenders of the open society and that he died for its birth.<sup>40</sup>

The fact that he was condemned to death by the defenders of democracy does not demonstrate an oligarchic mentality on his part, derived from association with Critias, Alcibiades and Charmides. Socrates was not a partisan, not a politician but rather a teacher who was interested in young people, without regard for whether they came from oligarchic families.<sup>41</sup>

In his *Republic*, however, Plato becomes an unfaithful pupil of Socrates, since the greatest advocate of the open conspiracy became, in Plato’s *Republic* the representative for a return to a Closed Society.<sup>42</sup>

Plato, Popper declares, comes to the conclusion that people could not endure this ‘‘strain of civilization’’. His fellow citizens, Plato argues, would be happier if secured from the burden of individualism. So for him, there will be a need for a caste system that will integrate all people and teach them their position and its duties. Plato’s philosophy, in fact, sought to give them a theory of leadership which justifies his willingness ‘‘to close the door that has been opened’’<sup>43</sup> :

For Plato, the open society, being based on reason, left men devoid of faith in a religious system of meaning. Instead, they floundered in a sea of gray, lifeless abstractions and appeals that were merely intellectual. Human beings were above all creatures of passion ; they needed a myth and mystery, something they could believe in, a civil religion, an emotional faith .<sup>44</sup>

Instead of directing his reader's attention to questions on how to restrain the autocratic use of power by rulers who may not only be corrupt but incompetent too, Plato made a utopian plan to inspire confidence in a new class of "philosopher kings".<sup>45</sup> For him, these philosophers deserve to rule because of the wisdom they possess and their access to the idea of good. The main task of the philosophers is to produce a blueprint with the aim of obstructing political change, that is to prevent change and evolution. For Popper, Plato identified the problem correctly, but suggested a regressive solution. He "mistakenly sought to deal with the real problems brought on by the sudden transition to democracy and the open society with 'Utopian Social Engineering' ".<sup>46</sup>

In fact, "Utopianism" is deemed by Popper to be one of the enemies of the open society along with "Historicism". The historicist belief is considered the first enemy to the Open Society explained by Popper.<sup>47</sup> In chapter one entitled *Historicism and the Myth of Destiny*, Popper explains that it is "a doctrine" which establishes that "history is controlled by specific historical or evolutionary laws whose discovery would enable us to prophesy the destiny of man".<sup>48</sup> Here, this orientation is contradicted by confirmation of, as Popper puts it, its neglect and misunderstanding between "scientific prediction" and "historical prophesy".<sup>49</sup> The Utopian approach, in its turn, is based on a higher ideal that aims to remould the whole society, leaving by this no stone unturned. "Utopianism attempts the impossible quest to restrain change and return back to the lost innocence of the closed society, to the seizure of critical thought, the return to the beasts",<sup>50</sup> and eventually leading the way to an authoritarian rule.

Interestingly, Popper writes that Plato's description of the perfect or best state is usually interpreted as the utopian program of a progressivist.<sup>51</sup> It is a slave state, and accordingly Plato's best state is based on the most rigid class distinctions. By training and other psychological influences, and mainly by the elimination of economic interests which may lead

to disunion, the state preservation problem is reduced to preserving the internal unity of the ruling class. All property becomes common property by the introduction of communism, that is by the abolition of private property.<sup>52</sup> Thus, family is destroyed ; otherwise it may become a possible source of disunion. One other fundamental principle is that there must be no mingling between the classes.<sup>53</sup>

In chapter six entitled *Totalitarian Justice*, Popper accuses Plato to redefine the word ‘justice’ to mean something different from what it means for everyone, in reality, and different from what the Greeks and his own teacher, Socrates, understood by it. Plato meant by justice “that which is in the interest of the best state”,<sup>54</sup> that is “to arrest all change, by the maintenance of a rigid class division and class rule”.<sup>55</sup> Plato’s demand for justice, according to Popper, “leaves his political programme at the level of totalitarianism”.<sup>56</sup> From the basic of Plato’s conclusion that everyone in the city should mind his own business, it follows, according to Popper that the state is just when the ruler rules, the worker works, and the slave slaves.<sup>57</sup>

To conclude, Popper distinguished between an Open and Closed Society in his book. For him, while the Open Society is the one that favors change, and is based on reason and criticism and thus calls for democracy, the Closed Society is closed to criticism, whose laws and customs are felt to be unchanging, static and inevitable. This distinction between an open and closed society will help us to depict the type of society in Wells’s and Huxley’s works. By applying Popper’s definitions and characteristics on the societies of *Brave New World* and *The Open Conspiracy*.

## **ii. Materials:**

### **Summary of the books:**

#### **a. *Brave New World* (1932):**

In *Brave New World* (1932), Huxley depicts a united World State where war, conflict and poverty are abolished. There are five castes: Alphas, Betas, Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons. The life of the different castes is under strict control. Personal emotions are not allowed; art and beauty are considered as disturbing, and family is a taboo word. Babies are not born but artificially created using an assembly line. They mature rapidly and stay the same until they die. The World State tends to enhance consumption according to principles based around those of Henry Ford who becomes the new deity. There is no religion, love or creativity. Even books are banned, and free thinking is not allowed. Indeed, people in this World State live in a closed society that doesn't give them a chance to be real individuals. The various Savage Reservations are the other setting presented in *Brave New World*. Beyond the realm of the World State, the Savages still marry, give birth and age. Into the world of the civilized state comes John the Savage who was abandoned with his mother in one of the savage reservations. The novel ends with John's committing suicide as a result of his disillusionment with the supposedly civilized world.

**b. *The Open Conspiracy* (1931) :**

H.G Wells advocates in his *The Open Conspiracy* (1928) the society's need for social, economic and political reconstruction. Throughout his book, he insists on the open conspirator's need for the collective sense of duty toward the other. He argues that the citizens of the new world have to get rid of the selfish thoughts by working collectively in order to reach a more global and developed world. He argues that the human race has to overthrow its individualist and nationalist ideas in order to reach its success. According to him, this progress requires a social revolution that would clean up these restrictive values which hinder the spirit of collectivism. In fact, the latter is highlighted in the different chapters of the book, giving importance to its influence on the advancement of a given society. Wells maintains that this collectivization can only be reached through the reformation of the different social

systems. Divided into nineteen sections, the book underlines the importance of the social systems, including the educational and religious ones, in understanding the advancement of the humankind. Wells considers these systems as double-edged swords which influence society positively and negatively. However if they are well used, they will be the stepping stone by which the open conspirators can build a new world. In its final chapters, the book advocates the need of social reform to achieve the humankind's progress. The latter, according to Wells, is linked to the scientific criticism that introduces society to the world of globalization.

### **Endnotes:**

<sup>21</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies 1: The Spell of Plato*, 5.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, 33.

<sup>23</sup> Catarina Leão, *Into The Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering: Challenges and Sollutions.*( MA in Governance, Leadership and Democracy Studies,2015), 9.  
<https://repositorio.ucp.pt/bitstream/10400.14/18815/1/Catarina%20leao.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemis*, 199.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 184.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 202.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 222.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Catarina Leão, *Into the Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering*, 9.

<sup>32</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 199.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Catarina Leão, *Into the Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering*, quoted in Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, vol1(2005) (Oxfordshire: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd), 37.

<sup>35</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 197.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, 201.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid, 202.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid, 201.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid, 209.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Dante Germino , *The Open Society in Theory and Practice*. (University of Virginia, Martinus Nuhoff The Hague ,1974), 18.

<sup>42</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 204.

<sup>43</sup>Dante Germino , *The Open Society in Theory and Practice* , 18.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>In *The Open Society and its Enemies* (1945) and more explicitly in *The Poverty of Historicism*.

<sup>48</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 42.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid, 35.

<sup>50</sup>Catarina Leão, *Into The Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering*, 61.

<sup>51</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 78.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid,80.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid, 81.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid, 119.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid, 120.

## Results and Discussion:

This paper constitutes reading Wells's *The Open Conspiracy* (1928) and Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) in terms of the type of society described in the two books. *The Open Conspiracy* has as its objective the reformation of old moral values, systems and laws and their replacement with a new world order under the supervision of a global government. For Wells attaining a high level of social stability is of capital importance in the ideal state he outlines. This stability requires as its basics a strong collective control of society. Yet, to maintain this stability, the World State is required to control its population ideologically, psychologically, and biologically. In fact, H.G Wells's globalist agenda is based on a massive recourse to propaganda and eugenics in order to arrange the population so that it can match his utopian world. In fact he advocates the reconstitution of the class system and the establishment of a directed breeding to attain an efficient and a functional society.

Thus, to achieve this globalist revolution of the old world order, Wells urges secret societies and the people of influence, who until then, conspire to manipulate the affairs of the world from the shadows, to come out and conspire overtly to create a World Government. These individuals are the ones whom Wells refers to as "Open Conspirators", rich men of power and influence; an intelligentsia that will form the elite who will lead the world into a new order and govern it. Thus, Wells aims at holding authority by abolishing the Nation-State sovereignty to impose a totalitarian agenda.

Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, is a satirical novel written as a response to and is based on Wells's ideas of a World State. In the novel humans are constrained with a constant trivial routine that reminds them of their role and the supposed good system in which they live ; this triviality have a similarity to what H.G Wells advocates in his *Open Conspiracy*, that all must work only for the benefit of society and that the individual cannot exist without purpose for that society. Early in chapter one and two, the way of conducting psychological

conditioning is explained. It is based on reinforcement with the aim of preventing any change in the social order. So, *Brave New World* is a satirical attack against conditioning individuals to accept their state of subjection.i.e to avoid change which is perceived as disruptive of order, with people never questioning the roles assigned to them. In addition, in the name of and for the sake of their happiness, people in the World State are just like slaves. In fact, this happiness that the world controller Mustapha Mond advocates is an utilitarian one which aims only at providing pleasure and happiness to avoid change in the social order.

Hence, we have come to the conclusion that Huxley unveils the ideological workings of the World State to enslave humans and to preserve the caste of rulers . We have come to the inference that by directing people's attention to these dangerous ideological practices, Huxley described a Closed Society because *Brave New World* satirises the World Government and the stratification of society as a form of totalitarian rule by means of science and eugenics. The novelist is making people aware of what he saw as threats to his society. So, Huxley's implicit purpose when he satirizes a closed society is to defend the right for critical thought and a society that is conducive to progress and change.

## **CHAPTER I :*The Open Conspiracy* (1928) and *Brave New World*(1932)as Reflections of Their Socio-Historical Context :**

The improvements of the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe and America were awaited to continue further in the turn of the 20th century. Yet, the atrocities engendered by WW1 and the desperate World Economic Depression of the 1930s ruined those previous aspirations. From this, we intend to demonstrate how the troubled times of the inter-war period led H.G Wells to write *The Open Conspiracy :What Are We To Do With Our Lives ?* (1928), where he proposes a World-State as the ultimate solution to end the economic, social and political antagonisms of the world, and how Aldous Huxley reacted satirically to this World-State in his *Brave New World* (1932).

Those who write are the witnesses of today and the architects of tomorrow. They are the echo of their time. Their era shapes their vision of tomorrow. Thus, we may say that the events and the turmoils of their time serve as the primary materials of their everlasting attempts to the imaginary building of the better future. Herbert George Wells (1866 – 1946) was a witness of an era when the world was undergoing tremendous changes and upheavals both politically and ideologically.

In fact, the upsetting period of late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century propelled him into the first lodges to witness the spread of Socialism, Nationalism and the breakthrough of the totalitarian regimes under the ideological chaperoning of Bolshevism, Nazism and fascism. These ideologies led the world straight to two great wars. Indeed, to say that Wells lived in a troubled period is an euphemism, to say that his era greatly influenced his political thoughts is just as obvious. It is this experience as a witness of this sick world that led him to redirect his art towards international politics.<sup>58</sup> As attested by the writing of *The Open Conspiracy* (1928) where he calls to the unification of this fractured world under a single World-State.

The Independent Labour Party's failure in the general elections of 1895<sup>59</sup> ended up by convincing the left wing movements and unions that to be represented in the parliament, it was necessary to unite under a single party. This union ends up being concretized and politicized under the name of the Labour Party. The party had its first political success in the general elections of 1906. The enthusiastic atmosphere that emerged from this measured success appealed to Wells and oriented him towards Socialism. Indeed, due to his belonging to the lower class combined with this striking upsurge of Socialism, made his involvement and adherence to the Socialist doctrine, a natural evolution.

Wells's involvement with the Labour Party came from his membership in the Fabian Society, a political club of middle class intellectuals engaged in social reforms. H.G Wells became a Fabian in 1903 and broke with them in 1908. This short relationship is a result of an ideological antagonism between H.G Wells and the other Fabians on the socio-political agenda of the Fabian Society. In fact, despite the fact that the Fabian Society is infused with reforms and a socialist doctrine, Wells wanted to convert the Fabians into a greater propagandist movement. He proposed to enlarge the little dribble of Fabian activities into a large movement and make more "Wellsian" socialists.<sup>60</sup> The rejection of this larger ideal signed his break-up with the Fabians as he considered that they cannot permeate the existing order with their minimalist ideals.<sup>61</sup> From this stance, we deduce that the Fabian and the Labour Party's Socialism differs from that of Wells'. In fact, while the Socialism of the former is local and regional, that of the latter is global. He refuses the narrowed and local ideal which he criticizes strongly in *The Open Conspiracy* (1935), he declares:

The various Socialist movements again are partial projects professing at present to be self-sufficient schemes. Most of them involve a pretence that national and political forces are intangible phantoms, and that the primary issue of population pressure can be ignored. They produce one woolly scheme after another for transferring the property in this, that, or the other economic plant and interest from bodies of shareholders and company promoters to gangs of politicians or syndicates of workers—to be steered to efficiency, it would seem, by pillars of cloud by day and pillars of fire by night.<sup>62</sup>

The above quote demonstrates Wells's repudiation of that form of simplistic and minimalist Socialism which is static and invariable as it came with minimum revolution. According to him, Socialists and Communists will not be ripe and won't fit for his ampler concepts of the modern outlook of the World-State, unless they come to realize that their stereotyped repudiation of private monopolization is not a complete programme, but just a preliminary principle.<sup>63</sup>

For instance, the Socialism Wells despised the most was that of Stalin which he called and identified as "an autocratic state capitalism".<sup>64</sup> He probably refers to Stalin's pursuit of Socialism in one country which is the opposite of his Trotskyist Internationalism. Despite the fact that he was against the then prevailing trends of Socialism, H.G.Wells's political stance is essentially socialist. He states that "The Open Conspiracy is the natural inheritor of socialist and communist enthusiasm; it may be in control of Moscow before it is in control of New York".<sup>65</sup> No wonder that his World-State sketched in *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* advocates the establishment of Socialism as the State Policy.

In spite of being a fervent socialist, as testified by the writing of numerous pieces on social treatise, Herbert George Wells remains a proven antagonist of the classes in general and of the labour class (which has emerged and spread in early 20<sup>th</sup> century and became a real Socio-political force in many European countries such as Russia) in particular. In fact, Wells opposes Karl Marx's historicist view that "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles".<sup>66</sup> According to Wells, these class struggles are of a negative impact on society, since clash between factions always leads to a social disaster as it favors the split and disunion of the society. He defines the "class war" concept of the Marxists as an invention of the classes. Thus, it is a poor snobbish imitation and a natural tradition of the old older.<sup>67</sup> He declares overtly that *The Open Conspiracy* is not to exalt the labour class but to abolish it,<sup>68</sup> since it is naturally inept to his new world order.

However, H.G Wells supports one specific faction that he welcomes in his modern world that is the intellectual or scientific class. In fact, Wells “clears the way for the recognition of an elite of intelligent, creative minded people scattered through the whole community”.<sup>69</sup> His social selectiveness, can be explained by his academic past as a student of biology in the Normal School of Science in London (1884-1887). Wells was under the chaperoning of T.H. Huxely who influenced his thoughts and transformed his social approach into an eugenicist one. He also influenced him to embrace Darwinisim, as John.S.Partington declares:

As well as introducing Wells to Darwinian evolution, T.H Huxley infused Darwin’s theory with an ethical code that convinced Wells not only that humankind was able to influence the course of its own evolution, but that humanity had a duty to see that its own evolution was progressive and for the species as a whole.<sup>70</sup>

As asserted in the above quote, Wells’s education as a biologist influenced his thinking and vision on the Socio-political matter, and turned him from a static socialist into a eugenicist reformer as it is proven in *The Open Conspiracy* (1928), where social selectivism is central in the World-State outlined in it. To this extent, Wells declares,

Intelligent control of population is a possibility which puts man outside the competitive processes that have hitherto ruled the modification of species, and he can be released from these processes in no other way. There is a clear hope that, later, directed breeding will come within his scope.<sup>71</sup>

Furthermore, the rejection of the classes in his new world order is not just the fruit of his social Eugenism, but it is also largely due to his belief that the divided classes, and the disputes it generates are at the origin of the rise of another spectrum which led the nations to armed conflicts. Actually, Nationalism that seized the European and Atlantic nations (United States of America, Canada among others) at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is one of the main triggers of the two World Wars. According to Wells, this exaggerated legitimization and exaltation of belonging to a state finds its sources in the feeling of belonging to this or that class, he states:

You cannot expect a world union of soldiers and diplomats. Their existence and nature depend upon the idea that national separation is real and incurable, and that war, in the long run, is unavoidable. Their conceptions of loyalty involves an antagonism to all foreigners, even to foreigners of exactly the same types as themselves, and make for a continual campaign of annoyances, suspicions, and precautions—together with a general propaganda, affecting all other classes, of the necessity of an international antagonism—that creeps persistently towards war.<sup>72</sup>

Wells argues that it is this patriotism of the classes that is behind the rise of Nationalism, because for him it is this same class antagonism that extends to the international arena and is, therefore, the cause of conflicts between nations. Indeed, the zealous nationalism of Hitler from 1933 to 1945 (which advocated a nationalist socialism that opposes the international socialism put forward by Wells) had a devastating effect on Europe which, by its very elitist and racist nature, put forward the superiority of the Germans that served as an ideological foundation and justification for conquering and subjugating other races and nations, said historically and biologically inferior to the Aryan race. This doctrine led the world on the paths of World War II. Actually, in the vision of Wells, nations are seen as the reproduction of the classes on the international scale. He demonstrates this stance in his *What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* (1935):

This exacerbates patriotism in which we have all been trained and with which we are all, with scarcely an exception, saturated. And meanwhile war, which was once a comparative slow bickering upon a front, has become war in three dimensions; it gets at the 'non-combatant' almost as searchingly as at the combatant, and has acquired weapons of a stupendous cruelty and destructiveness.<sup>73</sup>

It is his identification of the concept of Nation-State as being the primary source of international armed conflict which led him to call for the end of nation's sovereignty. In other words, Wells's plan is to get rid of the contemporary states whose fundamental organization is plainly military<sup>74</sup>. This came with a favor of a single World-State, as the only solution to end war needs the world's politics to be cosmopolitan.

Therefore, for his World-State, Wells forecast a universal government that is totally in opposition to the governments of today's nations, which grip and divide mankind.<sup>75</sup> To end the fragmentary competitive confusion of the politicians and the diplomats, he proposes a government that is characterized by its renunciation of the traditional liberal thinking of democracy and parliamentarism. The Wellsian government will invoke the collectivization of the social affairs, where private property and individualism are nowhere to find. It is intriguing how this vision is analogous to the Fascist authoritarian ideals that oppose any democratic parliament or individual rights, all in the name of a supreme collective ideal.

This Totalitarian ideology that took full scale in Mussolini's Italy in the 1920s is strikingly similar to Wells's World-Government. In fact, the influence that Mussolini's regime had on his political thoughts is made concrete, when in august 1932 he declared to his Oxford audience that Liberalism need a Phoenix Rebirth, and a competent receiver that is flatly opposed to Parliamentary democracy. These competent rulers should be a special class of people like the Guardians of Plato's *Republic*, which its contemporary models are to be found in the Fascisti in Italy.<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, he argues that "to evolve into this prosperous and progressive utopia, liberalists should transform themselves into a Liberal Fascisti and become an organization that will replace the dilatory indecisiveness of parliamentary politics, the same way that the Fascist Party, to the best of its ability, is Italy now".<sup>77</sup>

To Sum-up, with all the turmoil that took place in his time, the world appeared to Wells as a sick patient that pushed him to endorse the same arrogance as that of Plato's, as the healer of his gangrenous world. This is why his Blueprint *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* can be seen as his medical prescription, where he prescribes a single world political control that will dominate the earth, and generate a New World Order that will, according to him, end the traditional conflicts of the Old Order.

. The interwar period, represents an age of transition, as Wells's utopian ideas became wrecked and not recognized by people as before. Interwar dystopian fiction, such as *Brave New World*, represent a road for the study of chief social and cultural conditions of the time. It both reflects the emerging modern literature and displays the impacts of the historical and social conditions of the period upon the individual as a result of the First World War, the machine age, and urbanization<sup>78</sup>.

In fact, Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World*, as Charles and Regina Higgins explain, incorporates themes that fit with the social Sciences of the era. During the 1920's, the British Empire was highly influenced by the changes brought by the First World War. The social attitudes of the era marked a turning point as the expansion of the technological means paved the way for an economic and prosperous growth. Following this process of industrialization, questions started to be raised about the high levels of consumption and production. While some view this change as the beginning of new personal independence, others expressed their worries about its negative consequences<sup>79</sup>.

Huxley, in his turn, expresses, in his satirical novel, his concern about this transformation in the familiar way of life. Although set in the future, *Brave New World* reflects a world full of corrupt behaviors and morals. Huxley draws back the attention to the dangers of governmental control of the technological means that can create a totalitarian state. In his novel, Huxley predicts the different events of the future in ironical ways by portraying the immoral practices of the 1920-30's<sup>80</sup>.

Yet, the most modern trait of dystopian fiction is its disillusionment with modern life. The dichotomous concepts of Utopia and Dystopia explain this notion of modernity<sup>81</sup>. Early Science Fiction is characterized by its incorporation of utopian ideas which are manifested in the works of H.G Wells such as *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and particularly in *Anticipations* (1901). It is recognized by Wells's own involvement to late Edwardian and Victorian concepts

of science, technology and progress as well as to utopian socialism. However, these ideas continued even in his non fiction works set after WW1<sup>82</sup>, such as *The Open Conspiracy*. In this sense, Krishan Kumar writes :

After the first World War, utopias were everywhere in retreat. The 1920s, 1930s and 1940s were the classic era of the 'utopia in the negative', the anti-utopia or dystopia. These were the 'devil's decades', the years of mass unemployment, mass persecution, brutal dictatorships and world war. H.G.Wells continued to practise and preach his utopianism throughout this period, but he had largely lost his audience. He had in particular little influence-except as a target- with the new generation of thinkers who had been fashioned by the disillusioning experience of the world war. For them, it was grotesque to see reason and science as the great deliverers of humanity. If reason and science provided any guide to the future, it was in the nightmare form of their perverted use. The urge to look into the future remained. That was the compliment that anti-utopia paid to utopia. But it was now a future to be feared. In a number of books of striking imagery and power- Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, Arthur Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*, George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* - the future was portrayed as a totalitarian hell in which all hope was extinguished and all exits closed<sup>83</sup>.

The above lines explain how Huxley's novel, among others, act as a satire on Wells's thoughts. It is true that Wells aided to elevate the shape of Science Fiction and not only Science Fiction for even though his non fiction works were not recognized by people and critics, and although he sought utopian ideals in *The Open Conspiracy*, more specifically ; to our knowledge his ideas are what we see happening in today's society. Yet his works including *The Open Conspiracy* were mocked and satirized by dystopian writers amongst whom Aldous Huxley. In the works of such dystopian writers, the aim for structuring a utopia is reversed into a frightening and unpleasant dream in which technology in the future revealed utopia as an optical illusion. Aldous Huxley described by Anthony Burgess as "the greatest anti-Wellsian of them all"<sup>84</sup>. By the inversion of the ideas of Wells, Huxley underscored or stressed the conditions of the interwar period we referred to above. Yet, it is worth noting, as Margaret Atwood explains in her introduction to *Brave New World*, that while *Brave New*

*World* portrays the horrors of Wells's dreams of utopia, it also carries utopian thoughts because *Brave New World* may represent a perfect society for many of its inhabitants. Its inhabitants are beautiful, secure, and free from diseases and worries.<sup>85</sup>

However, on another hand this question of utopia is examined within *Brave New World* with regard to the freedom of people. Bernard Marx, for example, is rejected from the society of the World State because of his physical appearance as he was born short, however unnaturally.<sup>86</sup> In fact, utopia described by Krishan Kumar as that which “provides the positive content to which anti-utopia makes the negative response. Anti-utopia draws its materials from utopia and resembles it in a manner that denies the affirmation of utopia. It is the mirror-image of utopia- but a distorted image, seen in a cracked mirror”.<sup>87</sup>

Chief among the causes of the shift from utopia to dystopia is the first World War.<sup>88</sup> Huxley described himself as a “member of what i may call the war generation for others of his kind”.<sup>89</sup> For him, the war represented “the violent disruption of almost all the standards, conventions, and values in the previous epoch”.<sup>90</sup> In this sense, in Huxley's novel we find associations with the theme of WW1. The crises of “Nine Years”, “The Great Economic collapse”<sup>91</sup>, as well as “the conspiracy of elites”, for example, is what constitutes *Brave New World*.

To conclude, H.G Wells provided clues for achieving a beneficial human unity through an “open conspiracy”, as he puts it, an intellectual and political transformation along with a reform and revolution in education. Wells's *Open Conspiracy* is reactive in its call for social reform. Such reform is in large part a reaction to the problematic period that included WW1, the promising 1920's, in addition to Wells's own socialistic views. Huxley creates a sense of control in a united brave new world, where war, conflict, and poverty are abolished, to reflect social, economic and cultural changes in the early 20th century. It is noticeable, from our

reading of the two works, that *Brave New World* echoes *The Open Conspiracy*. In some ways, we may say that Huxley used Wells's blueprint of *The Open Conspiracy* to set up the society of *Brave New World*., with the aim of satirizing Wells's ideas.

#### Endnotes:

<sup>58</sup> Edward Mead Earle, *H.G. Wells, British Patriot in Search Of a World State*, Cambridge University Press, 1950 (World Politics, Vol.2, No.2), 181-208. Viewed on 08-12-2017 03:11.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009188>

<sup>59</sup> Readman, Paul A. "The 1895 General Election and Political Change in Late Victorian Britain." *The Historical Journal* 42, no. 2 (1999): 467-93. Viewed on 12-14-2017.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020996>.

<sup>60</sup> Edward R. Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society* (London, 1925), 178.

<sup>61</sup> H. G. Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography*, quoted in William J. Hyde, *The Socialism of H.G Wells in the Early Twentieth*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (April, 1956), 198.

Viewed on 12-14-2017 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2707743>

<sup>62</sup> Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?*, 129-130.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>66</sup> Karl Max and Frederick Engels, *Communist Manifesto*. (United States of America: World's Classics, 1992), 17.

<sup>67</sup> Herbert George Wells, *the open conspiracy :What Are We To Do With Our Lives?*, 85.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

<sup>70</sup> John S. Parkington, *H.G. Wells's Eugenic Thinking of the 1930s and 1940s*, Penn State University Press, 2003 (Pennsylvania: Utopian Studies, Vol. 14, No. 1), 74-81. Viewed on 12-12-2017 10:18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20718547>

<sup>71</sup> H.G.Wells, *The Open Conspiracy*, 47.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, 76-77.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 07.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>76</sup>H.G. Wells, *'Project of a World Society'*, The New Statesman and Nation, 20 August 1932; H.G. Wells, *After Democracy: Addresses and Papers on the Present World Situation* (London 1932), 2-3.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 17-18.

<sup>78</sup>“*Only The Great WE ‘: Interwar Dystopian Fiction and the individual*”, 1.  
<http://www.undergraduatelibrary.org/system/files/Only%20the%20Great%20WE%20-%20Interwar%20Dystopian%20Fiction%20and%20the%20Individual.pdf>

<sup>79</sup>Charles Higgins and Regina Higgins, *Huxley’s Brave New World*, 7.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>“*Only The Great WE ‘: Interwar Dystopian Fiction and the individual*”, 3.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid.

<sup>83</sup>Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (Great Britain : Basil Blackwell Ltd ,1987), 224.

<sup>84</sup>“*Only The Great WE ‘: Interwar Dystopian Fiction and the Individual*”, 3 , quoted in David Bradshaw, Biography in Aldous Huxley , *Brave New World*( London, 2007), xx.

<sup>85</sup>Margaret Atwood, ‘Introduction’ in Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* ( London : Vintage, Penguin London House, 2007), ix, x.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*, 100.

<sup>88</sup>“*Only The Great WE ‘: Interwar Dystopian Fiction and the Individual*”, 4.

<sup>89</sup>David Bradshaw , ‘biography’ in Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* ( Worcester College, Oxford, 1993), xxxi.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 41.

## **Chapter Two : The Nature Of Society Of The World-State Proposed By H.G.Wells In *The Open Conspiracy* (1935):**

This chapter highlights the nature and the image of society in the World-State as put forward by H.G Wells in *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* In an attempt to fulfill this aim, we will make appeal to K. Popper's social theory: *The Open Society And Its Enemies I: The Spell Of Plato* (1945) to provide us with the necessary criteria to determine whether the imagined World-State society presented in *The Open Conspiracy*, by H.G Wells, is an open or a closed one.

Accordingly, before the writing of his manifesto *The Open Conspiracy* (1935), Herbert George Wells was already a fervent advocate of a World-State. From the publication of *Anticipations* (1901) to his death in 1946 he never ceased to encourage the establishment of a "New World Order" which would be based on a World-state. Indeed, through a large series of writings he gave support to a world governance, a support which is noticeable in various works such as *War Of The Worlds* (1889), *A Modern Utopia* published in (1906), *The World Set Free* (1914) and Many others. Yet, it is in his work *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* (1935) in which he really exposes and presents the definitive details, his vision of a global state.<sup>92</sup>

Indeed, in this work later subtitled '*What Are We To Do With Our Lives?*', Wells synthesizes all his socio-political views in a single body. A Blueprint in which he outlines his fresh and invigorating cosmopolitan idea of global governance. A plan that refers to a clear desire to end the nation-state as a framework of political administration and identity reference and therefore, advocates a World-State as a more elaborate form of human organization, following his Darwinian evolutionary logic.

As mentioned earlier in this analysis, the idea of a unified world into a single community is systematic and a focal point in Wells' Political thoughts. It is his quality as a

witness and a contemporary writer of the troubles of his time, precisely the inter-war period (1918-1939), which led him to write *The Open Conspiracy* (1935) as a reaction, a solution to world chaos. *The Open Conspiracy* sharpens the cosmopolitan shape of the new world as it maps out steps and methods to the achievement of a sovereign World-Government.

## **I. The Authoritarian Nature of The World Government:**

The idea of a World Government is central in Wells' *Open Conspiracy* (1935). According to Wells, a World-State is possible only if the governing bodies are superseded and unified to become one, and thus, form a Global government. As he clearly states, "The new world as a going concern must arise out of the old as a going concern. Now the most comprehensive conception of this world is of one politically, socially, and economically unified".<sup>93</sup> In other words, the ruling and leading force of the World-state is a single and a centralized organization. More clearly, a collective body rid of any competing institutions. Actually, Wells via this discourse expresses his cosmopolitan stance of global politics through an optimistic and a utopian vision of his ideal world. In this regard, Karl Popper (1945) claims, "The Utopian attempt to realize an ideal state, using a blueprint of society as a whole, is one which demands a strong centralized rule of a few, and which therefore, is likely to lead to a dictatorship".<sup>94</sup>

As a matter of fact, a concentrated power in the hands of the few, and in the absence of institutional opposition, will probably lead to Authoritarian governance. Moreover, this reflection of K. Popper pushes us to ask fundamental questions: what if the rulers of this world government turn out to be tyrannical? If so, who would prevent a despotic government? The answers to these questions are nowhere to be found in *The Open Conspiracy* (1935). There is no indication that it is a democratic elected government, or whether it is open and responsive to the people. Indeed, there is a vague portrayal of the governing body, as there will be no need for president or a parliament or any sort of council that meet and debate political,

economic or social agendas.<sup>95</sup> The old governing institutions will be replaced by a directory of a “suitably equipped groups of the most interested, intelligent, and devoted people,... powerful enough to supersede without haste or delay whatever is awakening or unsatisfactory in the general direction.”<sup>96</sup> These passages picture the absence of Parliamentary system and local authorities. This stance can be considered as an analogy to the political and the Positive view of another secularist of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In fact, the French philosopher August Comte (1798-1857), in his final essay of *Cours De Philosophie Positive* (1865) entitled *The Religion Of Humanity*, advocates a certain spiritual and central power.

Comte considers that the people’s preference of local authorities is an historical anomaly. According to him, the central power has precedence over the local, because it’s more practical, more directly responsible, and less likely to set up any claims or spiritual influence. Whereas the local or legislative power, which, by nature, not having its functions clearly defined, is apt to interfere in theoretical questions without being in any sense qualified for doing so, then, it is injurious to intellectual freedom.<sup>97</sup> In other words, being a secularist and a supporter of a global power led by the scientific and intellectual elite,<sup>98</sup> there can be no specific political or legislative representation for any minority or locality. In fact, being populated by the lower class (which is mainly constituted of peasants and laboureurs) that is quite often characterized by a noticeable deficit of political awareness and low level of intellectualism. Thus, according to Comte, they can only interfere and disrupt negatively on the broad lines of the global authority since they are in no case qualified for doing and assuming political representation. Consequently, according to Comtean standards, these localities and social categories should be reduced to the role of “Fetishists” and therefore, cannot be part of what Comte calls “The Great Being”.

Just like Auguste Comte, Wells advocates centrality of power, to avoid all interferences of localities, which are for both of them, of a negative influence and thus, a source of

instability to the state. However, this stance is clearly undemocratic, since we notice the absence of a parliamentary system and local representatives. Actually, the latter are at the base of a democratic government that stands for political pluralism and allows oppositional debates between different political programs. The latter allows the voice of each social representative to be taken into consideration before the instauration of any law or directive, as the parliamentarians and local representatives are the people's voice which permits the balance of powers and thus, guard the guardians. On the contrary, this process of choosing the rulers is selective but not elective. In this respect, John S. Partington (2000) points out that with the World government-by-jury, Wells's hope is to end electoral politics,<sup>99</sup> this structure highlights the democratic deficit from which this government suffers as there are no independent organizations to supervise and protect the civil liberties. To this extent, K. Popper states:

For we may distinguish two main types of government. The first type consists of governments of which we can get rid without bloodshed—for example, by way of general elections; that is to say, the social institutions, provide means by which the rulers may be dismissed by the ruled, and the social traditions ensure that these institutions will not easily be destroyed by those who are in power. The second type consists of governments which the ruled cannot get rid of except by way of a successful revolution—that is to say, in most cases, not at all. I suggest the term 'democracy' as a shorthand label for a government of the first type, and the term 'tyranny' or 'dictatorship' for the second.<sup>100</sup>

According to the above quote, the World-Government is of the second type. In fact, in so far as it is not based on the diversity of opinions, it ceases to be responsive to the governed people and the general interest. Consequently, it creates a split between the rulers and the ruled, a divorce that will impose an atmosphere of a total disenchantment that will likely lead the now servile and alienated people, to revolt against the state. In this regard, Popper (1945) states “[i]n a non-democratic state the only way to achieve reasonable reforms is by the violent overthrow of the government and, the introduction of democratic framework”.<sup>101</sup>

Clearly, the World-State as presented in Wells's *What Are We To Do With Our Lives?* (1935) is devoid of Parliamentarism and political Pluralism. Popper argues further that the deprivation of people from such democratic tools which are the bearer of the ruled, will likely lead to a revolution. Thus, according to Karl Popper's standards, we can say that the World-Government sketched in Wells' *The Open Conspiracy* (1935) may evolve into tyrannical one, and therefore, should be categorized as an Authoritarian government and likely to lead to a closed society.

## **II.The Ruling Elites :**

As we have mentioned previously in this chapter, the World-Government does not emerge from an electoral system as the representatives or constituents are not chosen by the people through a majority of votes. To this extent, Roslynn D.Haynes (1980) states that the Wellsian World-State government “is characteristically a technocracy, socialist in economy and politically authoritarian, ruled by an elite of 'functional men', mostly scientists, who would seize power during a crisis and retain it through their efficiency and general ability’”.<sup>102</sup>

Indeed, Wells's blueprint does not contain elements indicating a democratic system where the voice of the people is taken into consideration, and from which future leaders emanate. However, we are provided with a clear identification of these leaders as being the most interested, intelligent and devoted ones,<sup>103</sup> having the quality of science.<sup>104</sup> In fact, the above Wellsian identification of the government representatives, as little informative as it might be, still important, since it resembles the portrayal of Plato's rulers of his ideal state “Kallipolis” in the *Republic* (380 B.C) the “Guardians”<sup>105</sup> the educated ones. In fact, for Plato the ones who rule his best city are chosen from the physical, moral and intellectual elites. He argues:

Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils—nor the

human race, as I believe—and then only will this our State have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.<sup>106</sup>

The word “Philosophers” reflects the intellectual elites of Plato’s era and parallels the Wellsian intelligent rulers who have the quality of science. According to Plato, the Philosopher is the best ruler because he masters naturally the art of ruling since he has the prerogatives to acquire the wisdom and political knowledge that are necessary to be the best ruler.

More clearly, in a cast state like that of Plato’s Kallipolis every citizen has a “specific craft for which he has natural aptitude”.<sup>107</sup> The philosophers are destined to rule, according to Plato, it is fair and a matter of justice if they are rulers by nature as he argues that the common men have “no true knowledge of reality, and no clear standard of perfection in their mind to which they can turn”.<sup>108</sup> August Comte in his *Religion of Humanity* embraces the same reasoning since he not only pleads for them to be the priests of humanity who represent spiritual authority, but he advances also the purity of philosophers as he argues;

Philosophers whom no one can accuse of reactionist or servile views, who have given up all political prospects, and who are devoting themselves wholly to the work of spiritual reorganization, need not be afraid to take this course; and they ought to exert themselves vigorously in making the central power preponderant, limiting the functions of the local power to what is strictly indispensable.<sup>109</sup>

From the above statements, we deduce how the Plato Comtean visions serve as a prequel to the Wellsian stance and his reflection that man as being an imperfect animal is condemned to be intellectually and morally untrustworthy. Therefore, man should have his activities checked and guarded<sup>110</sup> by those intelligent rulers, just as the common men devoid of knowledge should be ruled by the wise philosophers.

Relying on these statements, it is clear that both Wells’s and Plato’s claim that the philosophers and men of science should reign is elitist. In fact, it is not representative of the people, as it excludes them from participating in electing the ones who normally will guide

and protect them, even though these elites can master science, logics, mathematics or politics, if they are not from the other classes, they will not serve the interest of the people. In this regard, Karl Popper (1945) states that in the process of choosing the rulers, the people should not rely on their wisdom or goodness because if we do so, then we should prepare ourselves from the beginning to have bad governments and the worst leaders.<sup>111</sup> This claim rejects clearly the one of Plato and Wells that the wisest or the scientists are ideal rulers. These assumptions are formulated in order to allow the elites to retain power and serve, according to Popper (1945) “the cause of the totalitarian class rule of a naturally superior race”.<sup>112</sup> Thus, the identification of this ruling class as totalitarian one is logical according to Karl Popper’s standards.

These authoritarian rulers are perfectly satirized in Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* where the authoritarian World-State is ruled by ten “World Controllers”, a group of scientists who represents the elites of the World-State’s cast system having at their head Mustapha Mond, a typical personification of Plato’s Philosopher King. Thus, we may say that in an open democratic state, the best rulers are the ones who form a homogeneous government that represents every faction of the ruled, which cannot be the case of both Plato’s Philosophers and Wells’ Men of science, since they emerge of one faction, that of the elites.

### **III. Totalitarianism in a Static World-State :**

As we have seen so far in this chapter, Wells’s World Government is subject to extreme collectivization, without political diversity but characterized by political Centralism having the unification of the world population into a single community as a fundamental directive. In fact, Wells advocates a “World Civilization”,<sup>113</sup> which implies the standardization of the human populations, ethnicities and races, which hitherto are multiple and as diverse as divergent, into a single community with a single direction. Thus, to attain

this unanimity, Wells finds it fundamental to control population economically, socially and biologically.

Actually, for Wells, the path to social unification requires a profound social remodeling will imply the modification or the suppression of the existing social classes that are defined as the main actors of a perpetual antagonism. This chauvinistic sentiment of belonging to a defined social branch extends internationally. It nourishes the competitive and nationalistic atmosphere that generates destructive wars. We have pointed out in the first chapter that Wells insists on the necessity to end wars and to achieve peace. People must be cosmopolitan in the politics by allowing a common political control that will dominate the earth and suppress the conflicting standards of the traditional life.<sup>114</sup> One of these conflicts is none other than the existing and the very varied class system.

Indeed, the World-State he sketches is bound to be governed by one government and therefore, will have a unanimous policy. This undemocratic stance is openly endorsed as he states: “our hope for the human future does not lie in crowd psychology and the indiscriminating rule of universal democracy”.<sup>115</sup> In other words, this unanimity will not materialize unless the governed populations conform to the same directive as the said government. Thus, it will likely impose on them by the eradication of any form of divergences and refutations that naturally emanate from the homogeneous class system. This authoritative imposition is contradictory to the principles of an open society and is refuted by K. Popper as he claims that an open society is the one that sets free the critical powers of man.<sup>116</sup> In fact, Catarina Leao defines the open society as,

A society where the ability to exert the use of critical reason is most highly valued. It is a society open to criticism, where within a democratic atmosphere each individual is free to express his own critical views towards the existing conjectures, being also free to proceed to their refutation. Hence, the Open Society is a dynamic arena of conjectures and refutations built upon the critical exercise of reason and within a democratic environment.<sup>117</sup>

In addition, for the achievement of this purpose, it is essential to proceed to the suppression of the social diversity which is precisely generated by the multitude of the working classes, as it represents the perpetuation of class-struggles. In his book, Wells made clear his vision since he declares that “The Open Conspiracy can have nothing to do with the heresy that the path of human progress lies through an extensive class war”<sup>118</sup> which according to him, is responsible for the socio-political decay and degeneration of the human race. Instead, as John S. Partington advances, Wells wanted the creation of an alternative greater middle class that would absorb the working classes through increased mechanization and control.<sup>119</sup> More clearly, “the World-State aimed to reconstitute the class system so that, rather than being divided economically and socially, the labour was divided according to each individual’s function in global production, distribution and administration”.<sup>120</sup> From this stance on the socio-economic level, we notice a consequent democratic deficit as Wells’s World-State projects to categorize individuals according to a deterministic method where their wishes and dreams are neglected in favor of their natural abilities when it comes to their insertion in the economic life. It’s worth noting that it is going to the exact opposite of Karl Popper’s reflections, as for him, the class-struggle is an essential composure of an open society that allows individuals to strive and thus, to rise socially and take the places of the others fellow citizens.<sup>121</sup>

In other words, and whatever its unflattering name may suggest, the phenomenon of class-struggle symbolizes an open society. An environnement where individuals have the liberty to choose their functions and their place in the society. They enjoy a freedom to improve their social rank since their will is respected and surpasses any social determinism no matter what their natural capacities or innate abilities are. Therefore, their social rank is not static but dynamic and able for improvement and does not obey the rigidity of the social life proposed by Wells in *The Open Conspiracy*. In Wells’s blueprint, *The Open Conspiracy*,

social stability is critical and fundamental in the ideal state outlined in it. As mentioned previously, this requires a rigorous ideological and collective control of the society. Nonetheless, ideological manipulation will not be effective alone, but it requires also the World-State to control its population psychologically, biologically, with recourse to Eugenics in order to attain the desired level of social conformity and stability.

H.G Wells declares that the World-State will come with a specific conception of modification and development for each class and that “its sustaining purpose is to throw drudges out of employment and eliminate the inept”.<sup>122</sup> This extract demonstrates the eugenicist scope that Wells advocates in his World-State. Its society will be made in the image of his ideal state: it will be ideally remodeled, selective and elitist in order to achieve a prefect society that will be rid of unwanted elements such as burglars, thugs and the inept who are harmful to society.<sup>123</sup> By “the inept” he arguably refers to “the people of the abyss” previously mentioned in his books *The Time Machine* (1895) and *Anticipation* (1901).

According to John S.Partington,, “people of the abyss” is the expression which Wells uses to refer to the diseased, criminals and the non-adaptable residue of society.<sup>124</sup> J.Partington goes on to claim that:

Wells expressed concern that the “people of the abyss”, and especially persons afflicted with transmissible diseases, were not, as a group, dying out as would have been the case in less prosperous times. Instead, improved hygiene and health services, combined with the philanthropic impulse of certain sections of the wealthy, were assisting such persons to remain alive and to propagate their type. In the New Republic ( the ideal world state which Wells believed to be emerging out of his contemporary time), a new leadership would emerge made up of scientifically trained engineers and technicians who would deal with the problem of the abyss in a dispassionate, rational manner.<sup>125</sup>

More clearly, Wells urges the use of biological science to eliminate those he considers to be inept and socially unfit to his World-State, an idea he reiterates in *The Open Conspiracy*, namely, a government that will deal with this category, in a lucid and dispassionate manner. This practice echoes the infanticide practiced in the totalitarian and closed society of Sparta as

it is reported by K.Popper “Infanticide was not an Athenian institution; Plato, seeing that it was practiced at Sparta for eugenic reasons.”<sup>126</sup> the method involves the killing of children with apparent physical disabilities, as it was reported in the tyrannical Sparta.

As a final step to his quest toward his ideal society, Wells insists that man, just like the animal world from which he evolved, is a creature that struggle perpetually for his sustenance. Indeed, man is characterized by the struggle of survival which drives him to be conditioned by his survival instinct and make him subjugated to his primitive drives. These characteristics, according the Wellsian logic, are not the ones which represent the functional and adapted individual that is wanted in the collectivist and conformist society that Wells projects; As long as the current nature of man varies according to his instincts, it renders him an indomitable creature, consquently, unsuitable for this ideal society. As a result, Wells insists on the necessity for the World-State to release the animal from this competitive struggle.<sup>127</sup>

To attain this aim, it is necessary for the World-State to supply man’s needs before he can have free will.<sup>128</sup> By proceeding that way, Wells expects that man, once granted fundamental needs will be satisfied and tranquilized.<sup>129</sup> This method which consists in over-assisting man, even if it gets rid of the eternal stress that results from his struggle for survival, dehumanizes and deprives him of his liberties and natural responsibilities. According to Karl Popper, this uneasiness is a collateral damage resulting in shifting from the closed to open society, where people are appealed to accept responsibilities, and they should consider this life struggles and uneasiness as “the price to be paid for every increase in knowledge, in reasonableness, in co-operation and in mutual help, and consequently in our chances of survival and the size of the population. It is the price man have to pay for being human.”<sup>130</sup> Responsibilities, in K.Popper’s words, are a characteristic of an open and free society in the sense that, the greater the responsibilities of the individuals, the more democratic a society is.

Given that, it typifies a balanced society where the state does not control overwhelmingly the life of its citizen, and where individuals have free will.

Moreover, Wells, in order to make the World-State last and to maintain the stability of his ideal society, advocates the total control of human breeding. In fact, he hopes that later, directed breeding will come within his scope.<sup>131</sup> The aim is to affect the general birth rate or the birth rate of specific types as the directive sense of the community may consider desirable”.<sup>132</sup> In other words, Wells advocates to control biologically the reproduction of the human race so as to obtain functional individuals with specific abilities in accordance with the needs of the society.

This plan to control human breeding was advocated and desired by Plato in his totalitarian ideal society. In fact, K;Popper reports that Plato developed his eugenicist argument defending the infanticide. The latter argues that we should breed humans with great care. According to Plato, humans are just like animals; if we do not control the human reproduction then the race will degenerate.<sup>133</sup> Just as Plato, Wells sees the control of the human breeding as a necessity to maintain order and the stability of the community, and above all, to create a functional society where individuals are raised to complete a specific task or a role in an effective way. These eugenicist practices are well satirized in Huxley's *Brave New World*, where, in the name of social stability, the World-State uses scientific processes in breeding humans, namely: Ectogenesis, Neo Pavlovian Conditioning and Hypnopadia. The use of these methods depends on the cast of the unborn/ born child is predetermined to.<sup>134</sup>

Furthermore the utopian World-State and its ideal society will build a world in which all the populations will be unified into one, a world that will allow every individual to find his happiness and his place. A possibility of a world without war where peace reigns will be concretized, if we follow the precepts of Wells's ideas in *The Open Conspiracy*, to the

detriment of all the freedoms that man currently enjoys in the present world, even though the latter is imperfect and uneasy. However, it is precisely these imperfections that give humans the possibility of evolving and becoming better. On the contrary, the Wellsian world proposes a static society where citizens's fate is predetermined, as man is dehumanized by the excessive control of his biological life. This will be further discussed in the following chapter, where our analysis of Aldous Huxely's world state outlined in his *Brave New World* (1932), gives us a clear vision of the Wellsian ideal society, given that the characteristics of the World-State of the latter in terms of control of the population. Indeed, massive recourse to science, the pursuit of standardization and supreme ideal common, and alteration of human nature, are ironically adapted and discussed in Huxely's *Brave New World*. In fact, the latter shows how individuals cease to be human owing to a nightmarish predestination, as a definite life in a static and closed society, engendered by the totalitarian agenda of the World-State.

#### **Endnotes :**

<sup>92</sup>Harold Bloom, *H.G Wells: Bloom's Modern Critical Views* (Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers,2005).173

<sup>93</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 39.

<sup>94</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies* (Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1945; repr., Abingdon: Routledge Classics, 2011), 185.

<sup>95</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 40.

<sup>96</sup>*Ibid*, 4.

<sup>97</sup>Auguste Comte, *A General View of Positivism* ( New York, United States of America, Cambridge University Press, 2009). 131.

<sup>98</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*,41.

<sup>99</sup>John Patington, *Building Cosmopolis: The Political Thoughts of H.G Wells*, University of Reading December, 2000 (Great Britain), 244.

<sup>100</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 152.

<sup>101</sup>*Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>102</sup>Roslynn D. Hanes, *H.G Wells Discoverer of the Future- The Influence of Science on his Thoughts* (London and Basingstoke: THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD, 1980), 88.

<sup>103</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 41.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., 44.

<sup>105</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 79.

<sup>106</sup>Allan Bloom: *The Republic of Plato*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (United States of America: Library of Congress Catalog, 1991), 177.

<sup>107</sup>Giulia Matassa, "Plato's Argument For Rule By Philosopher Kings," University of York, April 17, 2013. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/04/17/should-philosophers-rule/> Viewed on 12-17-2017.

<sup>108</sup>Ibid.,

<sup>109</sup>Auguste Comte, *A General View of Positivism*, 131.

<sup>110</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 46.

<sup>111</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 149.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid., 146.

<sup>113</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 11.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., 36-37.

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., 86.

<sup>116</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 33.

<sup>117</sup>Catarina Leão, "Into the Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering: Challenges and Solutions," Instituto de Estudos Políticos Universidade Católica Portuguesa, January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015. <http://www.iep.lisboa.icp.pt>

<sup>118</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 66.

<sup>119</sup>John S. Partington, *The Pen as Sword: George Orwell, H.G. Wells and Journalistic Parricide*, Sage Publications, Ltd: Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Jan., 2004), 45-56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3180669>. Viewed on 11-30-2017

<sup>120</sup>Ibid.,

<sup>121</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 199.

<sup>122</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 68.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., 65.

<sup>124</sup>John S. Partington, *H. G. Wells and Population Control: From a Eugenic Public Policy to the Eugenics of Personal Choice : Population Control as Public Policy: Sterilisation*. <http://www.academia.edu/400264/>. Viewed on 11-15-2017

<sup>125</sup>Ibid.,

<sup>126</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 84.

<sup>127</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 47.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., 46.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid., 48.

<sup>130</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 202.

<sup>131</sup>Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 47.

<sup>132</sup>*Ibid*, 48.

<sup>133</sup>Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 84.

<sup>134</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, (London, Vintage Penguin Random House, 1994), 43.

### **Chapter Three: *Brave New World* (1932) as a Satirical Echo to *The Open Conspiracy*:**

*Brave New World* (1932) describes the life of a number of characters who live in a global, united World State. In the second chapter we have come to the inference that according to Wells's description of his World State, there is no individual freedom because most people will be just like puppets having the task of fulfilling the purpose of the ruling class and which they do not understand, yet which they obey, being unable to refute them or do otherwise. The present chapter is intended to analyze the kind of society that *Brave New World* advances in the light of the "open" and "closed society" criteria of Karl Popper's theory, and how *Brave New World* echoes *The Open Conspiracy*.

#### **I. Authoritarianism in *Brave New World*'s society :**

Huxley depicts a society, which, in its attempt to achieve a perfectly engineered life, has created an authoritarian World State based on a hierarchical caste system and controlled by an elite of alpha plus. The World State controllers in *Brave New World* aims at making the life of its citizens stable as there is "no civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability".<sup>135</sup> Yet, this individual stability is maintained by the suppression of the principles of individuality. The regime that *Brave New World* represents must ensure that the stability of the social fabric is under control by dominating and controlling the behaviour of each individual. Even before giving birth to them, different harsh and inhuman methods of breeding and conditioning are used to ensure that the process of stabilizing society is from the beginning under supervision. For the ones who see this society from the surface only, it may seem to them that everything is adequate and satisfactory, mainly that there are

no diseases or poverty, but for those who contemplate the consequences, they may deduce that the value of humans is lost and stolen in the process. People in the World State have no opinions, no free will and no right to intervene in the World State's affairs, so they live under control, and this is what Karl Popper deemed to be characteristics of a "closed society".

Importantly, Wells's utopian ideas in *The Open Conspiracy* describe a world that is greatly shaped by control : a control of human development, and he even advocates a control of human environment through means of genetic transformation. Wells considers this to be an appropriate solution to establish a new world order. He claims :

To avoid the positive evils of war and to attain the new levels of prosperity and power that now come into view, an effective world control, not merely of armed force, but of the production and main movements of staple commodities and the drift and expansion of population is required. It is absurd to dream of peace and world-wide progress without that much control.<sup>136</sup>

This means that Wells advocates a universal fascist system, and holding authority over everything and everywhere, and this is exactly what Huxley describes and satirizes in *Brave New World*. Furthermore, the ideas of Wells expresses the belief that leadership should be given to those 'philosopher kings' who have the best education and skills as being the necessary weapons to fulfill their ruling tasks. His politics calls for the creation of a World State that will unite the world and hold control on most aspects of human life. He tries, in fact, to persuade people with the idea that human beings have the ability to control their environment and their own natural flaws while being also free from any outside involvement. The story of *Brave New World* is very much shaped by these ideas with Huxley's aim clearly being to criticise Wells. The way Huxley constructs the society of *Brave New World* is what leads us to say that his aim beyond this exaggerated description is to mock and satirise Wells . Huxley stirs a kind of disgust and fear in the readers of his novel .For example, he not only creates a caste system by dividing people into Alphas, Betas and Epsilons but tends to

redive them into “morons” and “semi-morons” too. Huxley’s criticism stems from his contemplation of the dangers that may ensue from using technology without control and restriction. He seems to see the dangerous side of Wells’s thoughts, and this is what we are going to prove in what follows.

The society of *Brave New World* is much like an organ or a tribe where individuals live together under strict conditions and obey the laws assigned to them by controllers. Hence, the citizens are human-machines, and not individuals, in fact. In the words of Popper, “if the individual is nothing but a cog, then ethics is nothing but the study of how to fit him into the whole”.<sup>137</sup> The director of conditioning centers tells his students that :

Conditioning is crude and wholesale; cannot bring home the finer distinctions, cannot inculcate the more complex courses of behaviour. For that there must be words, but words without reason. In brief, hypnopaedia[...]. ‘Till at last the child’s mind is these suggestions, and the sum of the suggestions is the child’s mind. And not the child’s mind only. The adult’s mind too-all his life long. The mind that judges and desires and decides-made up of these suggestions. But all these suggestions are our suggestions!’.<sup>138</sup>

These lines suggest that citizens are the possession or property of the World State, and as such they are just like automata or slaves who are conditioned to love their state of slavery . According to James E-Coté and Anton L. Allahar, Huxley in *Brave New World* affirmed that “in order for the status quo to be maintained and the established system to run smoothly, the disfranchised must be made to love their servitude or at least not to recognize it as servitude”.<sup>139</sup> As everyone in the World State is conditioned to accept as true what the world controllers chose and desire them to believe, the citizens do not express dissatisfaction with their position in the society or the tasks they accomplish. Thus, it appears that the problem of hating their state of slavery is solved because people are conditioned to love their servitude.

According to Popper’s description of Plato’s political wisdom, we may deduce that this political wisdom is prevalent in *Brave New World* in several key ways. Our aim is not to

conduct a comparison between them, but since Plato represents the first and most important advocate of a closed society as Popper intends to demonstrate, it is of capital importance to read some aspects of *Brave New World* in terms of Plato's utopia, to further understand the type of society sought for in the novel. The fact that individuals in *Brave New World* are programmed from their birth to hate reading and reject any kind of emotional influence is so similar to Plato's belief that moulding the minds of people through training and other psychological influences to protect the interests of the state. In fact, the *Brave New World* society is the modern ideal society, but reason was restricted and specified to science and technology. Furthermore, the two are based on a utopian blueprint which is based on the idea of a hierarchical caste system and a society that is run by an elite. Socrates's city in Plato's *The Republic* has the same kind of perplexities as Huxley's *Brave New World*. Just as life demands shelter, clothing in Socrates's city, also in Huxley's World State :

The machine turns, turns and keeps on turning-for ever. It is death if it stands still...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.<sup>140</sup>

Therefore, as we hinted for it above, there must be someone who must put things in norms to ensure all this happens without inconveniences : a world controller. The job that he is compelled to perform is to ensure that those "wheels" keep going and not disturbed by outsiders or those who do show disagreement with the new system and as Popper claims "the first and most important function of the philosopher king is that of the city's founder and lawgiver".<sup>141</sup> This idea of a controller is one important thing that Huxley criticizes in Wells's World State. Wells claims in his *Open Conspiracy* that : "...the reasonable desire of all of us is that we should have the collective affairs of the world managed by suitably equipped groups of the most interested, intelligent, and devoted people".<sup>142</sup> So, Wells clearly advocates an authoritarian World State that is ruled by an oligarchy of elitist described by Plato as "Philosopher kings". Yet, Popper writes that "I think we must face the fact that behind the

sovereignty of the philosopher king stands the quest for power. The beautiful portrait of the sovereign is a self-portrait”.<sup>143</sup> To say it differently, the supreme power or authority of the philosopher king calls for the possession of power that serves the interests of the ruler and the state only. Therefore, it is not wrong to say that the rulers ought to care more about the state than they care about individuals that live in this state, even those citizens who are supposed to be the most full and intelligent in comparison to other castes. The controllers see that it is more important to construct a system that tends to make perfect citizens, but where the word perfect means what leads to the continued strength of the World State, than a system that takes accountability and worries about the personal well being of its citizens.

But, even with these concerns, one may think that Mustapha Mond is, in fact, right in declaring that if the “wheels stop turning”, all people die, and so, this may lead us to think on the importance of producing people prepared to be strong and wise enough to keep these wheels turning. Yet, can this be done without sacrificing human values and deprive people from their qualities. Indeed, in its attempt to create a perfect society and keep its principles run smoothly, the World State in *Brave New World* deprived its citizens of their individuality and humanity. In the name of stability, the World State turns its citizens to become slaves by “methods of ectogenesis, neo pavlovian conditioning and hypnopaedia”<sup>144</sup> as Huxley explains in the early chapters of the novel :

In chapters one and two of *Brave New World*, the way conducting breeding is explained. Natural childbirth is replaced with artificial breeding. Depending on the caste the unborn individual is going to belong to, different methods of breeding and conditioning are used. A very cruel method of altering the future of the unborn is explained by Mr. Henry Foster :

Reducing the number of revolutions per minute, Mr Foster explained. The surrogate goes round slower, therefore passes through the lung at longer

intervals ; therefore gives the embryo less oxygen and nothing like oxygene shortage for keeping an embryo below par. <sup>145</sup>

In this method, Huxley explains how the embryo receives different levels of Oxygen ; this depends on the caste the person is going to belong to. This implies that, the Alpha caste, which is the elite caste that is destined for important and influential roles in society, receives high levels of oxygen during infancy, while the Epsilon caste, which is one of the lower castes that is shaped for labor tasks, receives low levels of oxygen.<sup>146</sup> It is noticeable that the Epsilons are genetically developed to be inferior individuals in intelligence and health while the Alphas, have more enhanced mental abilities.

This is not the only method used to shape the different castes according to the World State's interests. The experiments conducted after childbirth also play an important part in the process. In the second chapter of the novel, the director exposes one of these experiments to his students called Neo-Palvolvin Conditioning. A group of infants belonging to one of the lower castes, the Delta caste, are submitted to a very radical method of conditioning, where the babies get electric shocks when they touch books or flowers. Thus, the Delta caste, being a labor caste, is raised to feel a distinct "fear towards literature and botany", because there is "the risk of their reading something which might undesirably decondition one of their reflexes".<sup>147</sup> To explain why the Deltas are conditioned to fear flowers and botany, the director Helmholtz Watson says that "a love of nature keeps no factories busy".<sup>148</sup>

The children are also submitted to a form of conditioning from a speaker while they sleep, with the aim of creating not only a love for one's own caste but also learning to dislike the other castes. The feeling of belonging to one's group and being conditioned to believe one individual is better than another eliminates the possibility of striving to hold the position of others, which is a normal idea in an open society. Popper claims that members of an "open society" may strive to rise socially and hold important positions in society by willing to take

the place of others. This may lead to the so called phenomenon of “social struggle” which is a thing we can not find in a closed society.<sup>149</sup>

Alpha children wear grey, they work much harder than we do, because they are so frightfully clever. I'm really awfully glad I'm Beta, because I don't work so hard. And then we are much better than Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse.<sup>150</sup>

The passage depicts a room where sleeping children belonging to the Beta caste, listen to a voice repeating the message. The director calls this method i.e. hypnopaedia “the greatest moralizing and socializing force of all time”.<sup>151</sup> The three methods we tend to explain so far are the foundation upon which the World State bases itself in order for people not to question their place in society or the job they are compelled to fulfill, with a complete satisfaction with their present situation. The idea of being able to manipulate human actions and thoughts seems to be absurd. So, People are like slaves and their lives are not worthy. In fact, Wells's advocacy of utopian social engineering in *The Open Conspiracy* is clear. He claims :

...Nature ensures a pressure of population through passions and instincts that, given sufficient knowledge on the part of women, can be satisfactorily gratified and tranquilized, if need be, without the production of numerous children. Very slight adjustments in social and economic arrangements will, in a world of clear available knowledge and straightforward practice in these matters, supply sufficient inducement or discouragement to effect the general birth rate of specific types as the directive sense of the community may consider desirable.<sup>152</sup>

These lines reveal the eugenics thinking of H.G Wells ; his appeal to “social engineering” and which Huxley tends to criticize as demonstrated above by showing how absurd and humiliating to engineer people's life and make them satisfied with their ignorant lives, in order to achieve the World State's success. In *Brave New World*, humans are actually not only satisfied with their ignorant lives but conditioned to be happy all the time.

## **II. Utilitarian Happiness in *Brave New World* :**

The society of *Brave New World* is a utilitarian one which aims to sustain the greatest amount of people with a sense of pleasure and delight. In fact, “Utilitarianism” is an essay written by John Stuart Mill to give “Utilitarianism” a value as a moral theory, and to respond to misconceptions about it.<sup>153</sup>

Mill defines utilitarianism as a theory based on the principle that "actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness." Mill defines happiness as pleasure and the absence of pain. He argues that pleasure can differ in quality and quantity, and that pleasures that are rooted in one's higher faculties should be weighted more heavily than baser pleasures.<sup>154</sup>

The lifestyle in *Brave New World* is built upon the idea that happiness is the only requisite in one's life. Yet, this happiness is not natural but artificial. Reading chapters ten to thirteen of *Brave New World*, one may notice that the society of this world relies on unethical practices such as using drugs and on machines in order to fill the lives of its citizens with happiness. However, citizens must struggle to realize happiness by their own. Finding obstacles is inevitable, for it is there where the significance of life lies. Popper writes :

Our fellow men have a claim to our help, no generation must be sacrificed for the sake of future generations, for the sake of an ideal of happiness that may never be realized. In brief, it is my thesis that human misery is the most urgent problem of a rational public policy and that happiness is not such a problem. The attainment of happiness should be left to our private endeavors.<sup>155</sup>

To our knowledge, Linina Crown is , perhaps, the character who lives in a constantly false happiness, and seems to enjoy it to the full. It appears that the methods of conditioning are well applied upon her to the point that she is convinced that the civilized society where she lives is a perfect one, where happiness means consuming soma and the belief in the motto “everyone belongs to everyone else”.<sup>156</sup> She does not show any expressions of disapproval on the perceived faults of happiness. In other words, there is no criticism.

However, Popper in *The Open Society and its Enemies* outlined another approach to social engineering that is what he calls “Piecemeal Social Engineering”<sup>157</sup> with the principle of minimizing avoidable suffering. Popper does not claim the “Open society” as an ideal or utopian goal that aims only to achieve happiness. He holds that a politician may or may not hope for the realization of an ideal state and achieve false happiness and perfection on earth,<sup>158</sup> instead :

He will be aware that perfection, if at all attainable is far distant, and that every generation of men, and therefore also the living, have a claim ; perhaps not so much a claim to be happy, for there is no institutional means of making a man happy, but a claim not to be made unhappy, where it can be avoided. They have a claim to be given all possible help, if they suffer.<sup>159</sup>

Thus, the mission of the piecemeal engineer will be to search for methods to fight the most urgent evils of society, rather than searching for its “greatest ultimate good”. Popper’s support of piecemeal methods stems from his conviction that they are the gateway for social reform since they are based on reason and criticism. It is, in fact, a reasonable method of improving the life of the greatest number of people at any moment.

In *Brave New World*, the stability of society is considered as the first priority for world controllers. If there is unhappiness, then the entire system will sink into the bottom. It is, in fact, just like the World State of Wells that is based on utopian social engineering. Coleman (1967) claims that “Huxley’s *Brave New World* is a satirical attack on the utopia of social reformers in which misery and instability have been abolished by a supreme, benevolent state, at the expense of individual freedom of action and thought”.<sup>160</sup> Hence, our analyses bring us to one conclusion, namely, Huxley satirizes the World State which aims at the complete destruction of human principles and individuality.

Furthermore, in Huxley's *Brave New World* family, monogamy, romance and chastity, too, are matters of shame, while promiscuity and sexual experiences produce no blushes.<sup>161</sup> Accordingly, as Matter.W claims :

The society of A.F 632 is perfectly terrifying to to the creative individual who wishes to test the gates of heaven and hell, and who seeks to find doors of perceptions not conveniently open for perverse purposes by the state. When pleasure and escape become unavoidable goals, Huxley reasons, the individual lives in a nightmarish ideal society that cannot allow him the right to be unhappy.<sup>162</sup>

Thus, the inhabitants of the World state are just like puppets who do not possess the ability and the right to distinguish between a false and true happiness ; they only have “the opportunity to be another happy cog in a vast machine designed and run by the government”,<sup>163</sup> as Bob Barr writes.

In the setting of *Brave New World*, no one has a choice to be happy or not. Any person who exhibits a feeling of discontent or emotions is either given a dose of soma or they are sent to a remote place. The World State conditions its citizens to use soma which is a drug that the population of *Brave New World* take to avoid pain and negative emotions. As Mustapha Mond puts it : “the world is stable now. People are happy ; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get...and if anything should go wrong, there's soma”,<sup>164</sup> Mustapha Mond demonstrates that life in the World State is an ideal one since unlike the previous life before the Ford era, when people could not avoid pain, people now can easily escape all sorts of pain and sufferings. “No wonder those poor pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable. Their world didn't allow them to take things easily, didn't allow them to be sane, virtuous, happy...They were forced to feel strongly”.<sup>165</sup>

In his blueprints, Wells declares that “the Open Conspiracy will also be dissolving and repudiating many existing restrictions upon conduct and many social prejudices”.<sup>166</sup> So,

Wells clearly legalizes drugs, promiscuity, and other social prejudices as he writes it. Huxley proceeds to attack the World State which further reveals his satirical stance. Instead of encouraging people to read books and enhance their self awareness, it motivates them to swallow drugs. Daily obstacles are absent, but at the same time happiness comes only in the form of gratification. People rely on drugs to reject emotions such as anger and fear. This seems good as long as they do not have any moral or intellectual doubt or discomfort about that, but those who do may find it heavy to be accepted. Anyone who uses his mind to think correctly is therefore obliged to go into exile.

Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson are two characters who are exiled to an island because they do seek truth and ideals of individuality. In chapter eleven, Bernard Marx seems to show hatred towards his society and explores the meaning of human emotions and individuality as a result of his feeling to be an inferior person. Similarly, in chapter ten, the director goes on to attack Bernard Marx . He says :

This man , he pointed accusingly to Bernard, this man who stands before you here, this Alpha-plus to whom so much has been given, and from whom, in consequence, so much must be expected, this colleague of yours-or should i anticipate and say this ex-colleague ?- has grossly betrayed the trust imposed in him. By his heretical views on sport and soma, by the scandalous unorthodoxy of his sex-life, by his refusal to obey the teachings of Our Ford and behave out of office hours “like a baby in a bottle”..., he has proved himself an enemy of society, a subverter, ladies and gentlemen, of all order and stability, a conspirator against civilization itself.<sup>167</sup>

As a matter of fact, as J.R.Ward states that “Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* is impressive in its bold insights into a regimented world” ; “man is no longer free, but manipulated according to society’s master plan”.<sup>168</sup> This is one of the backdrops of Utopianism Karl Popper tends to criticize, for although the goal beyond the utopian blueprint may be to accomplish high ideals of happiness for all, the “benevolent dictator”, in this case Mutapha Mond, will face problems as far as his intentions may be challenged by the criticism

that some individuals may dispose due to the fact that “a certain blueprint may not represent- and it most probably does not- the same standard of ideal society for everyone”.<sup>169</sup> Hence, the benevolent dictator will find himself obliged to suppress opposed opinions and criticism so that the ‘perfect plan’ can yield effects. The problem resides in the fact that not only “unreasonable” oppositions will be neglected but “reasonable criticism” as well, driving by this the dictator to a situation where “without some such check, he can hardly find out whether his measures achieve the desired benevolent aim”.<sup>170</sup> Now, one may say that in this new world people live in a constantly ‘closed society’ that seems to be shining in the surface, yet corrupt underneath. In the novel *Mustapha Mond* exemplifies this corruption. In a discussion with John, Mond says that “universal happiness keeps the wheels steadily turning ; truth and beauty can not”.<sup>171</sup>

### **III. The Totalitarian Character of the New Social Order :**

Huxley explains more clearly the ideas of *Brave New World* in chapters sixteen and seventeen. Through a dialogue between Mustapha Mond and John the Savage, the author highlights the totalitarian world view which the World State promotes regarding art , science, and religion, three important facets that constitute societies. The dialogue between John and Mond explains the satirical nature of Huxley’s book . Mond explains how people live in a happy , stable world, even though this happiness comes at the expense of their individual principles. In John’s perspective, it is an absurd existence which Mond tends to defend, even by sacrificing a free life.

When John asks Mond why he prohibits all what is old like Shakespeare, Mustapha replies that society no longer needs them . People would not understand old things because they are happy with this limitation now. He says :

The world is stable now, people are happy ; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get.They are well off ; they're safe, they're never ill, they're not afraid of death ; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age.<sup>172</sup>

As a matter of fact, in *Brave New World* “there is no need for spiritual activity, scientific curiosity, artistic creativity, or exploration of cultural heritage.These are replaced by the consumption of soma pills, sex hormone chewing gum, and escapist, sensuous feelies’’.<sup>173</sup>

John the Savage claims that “Othello’s good, Othello’s better than those feelies’’.<sup>174</sup> “Of course it is’’,<sup>175</sup> the controller agreed “but that’s the price we have to pay for stability.You’ve got to chose between happiness and what people used to call high art, we’ve sacrificed the high art.We have the feelies and the scent organ instead’’. <sup>176</sup> This means that people in the World State had to pay in return for their happiness, and the price is to sacrifice art and beauty.The controllers do not allow people to receive the education that does not help to maintain the stability within society. Beneficial knowledge is not allowed because it may alter the system, so people are not allowed to read books since reading old things may supress the conditioning system they received since their birth.

When John and others protest that science is everything, the World Controller admits that science has led to great achievements in their society such as happiness. Nevertheless, he assumes that if scientific progress occurs without restriction, it may not achieve happiness. According to him, the publication of new theories should be banned because they may bring about change.He says :

We have our stability to think of.We don’t want to change.Every change is a menace to stability.That’s another reason why we’re so chary of applying new inventions.Every discovery in pure science is potentially subversive ; even science must sometimes be treated as a possible enemy.Yes, even science.<sup>177</sup>

Here Huxley shows how the people of this state become satisfied with full government control of their daily lives.Science is only used in a way that undermines people’s daily life

through moulding their minds for bad habits such as consuming drugs .When it comes to using science in a way that benefits society , the World State controller cut any road leading to a properous use of it. In this sense, Bertrand Russel writes : “Science enables the holders of power to realize their purposes more fully than they could otherwise do.If their purposes are good , this is a gain, if they are evil, it is a loss”.<sup>178</sup> The satirical nature of Huxley’s sentences is frightening ; the idea that man should be strict with the use of science in order for people to live always in happiness seems to have no sense.

“Art, science you seem to have paid a fairly high price for your happiness”<sup>179</sup> says the Savage, asking him, if there is more than this. “Well religion of course”,<sup>180</sup> replies the controller. Religion is another sacrifice made to ensure happiness ; in fact, Mond considers religion to be the most powerful force that destablizes society. In this way, Mond claims the irrelevance of God in the modern society. He confesses to John that God really exists and that he does not deny the role that religion plays as far as the ancient world is concerned, but since God is incompatible with machinery, they decided to exterminate his existence. Mond argues : “Call it the fault of civilization.God isn’t compatible with machinery and scientific medicine and universal happiness.You must make your choice.Our civilization has chosen machinery and medicine and happiness”.<sup>181</sup> John attempts to counter this argument by using the reservation from which he comes as an example. Religion, John the Savage argues, comes naturally to men, and its whole disapperance is not likely.The religion of the reservation from which John comes acts as a force that gives the Savages the ability to endure not only happiness but turmoil as well .Religion, in fact, gives great meaning to their lives.<sup>182</sup> Hence, in Huley’s World State, “there is no social, political, or religious questions, because they have all been solved by the government”.<sup>183</sup> The idea that not only there is no religion in Huxley’s modern society, but that it seems to be stable without religion is absurd and terrifying.

In fact, in this modern society that is informed by science and technology even the Cross which is a symbol of Christianity is replaced by the “T” which symbolizes the model T car of Henry Ford who becomes the new deity for the modern society. Unlike the Alpha plus Mustapha Mond, the Savage shows his willingness for human values and individualism. He rebels against the tyranny of Mond, stating that “I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin”.<sup>184</sup>

To conclude, the psychological conditioning depicted early in the novel which is based on reinforcement aims at perpetuating the prevailing social order and preventing change since people will never question their role in society. In addition, the citizens of the World State are enslaved for the sake of their happiness. Mond explains that happiness is the sovereign good which dictates all society's policies. In essence, this happiness is a utilitarian one which aims at maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. This is depicted in the novel through the use of soma, enhancing consumerism, and even abolishing family ties. The conversation between Mustapha Mond and John the Savage in the final chapters, is a long discussion, where the Savage, to some extent, acts as the voice of reason, while Mond as a speaker for the World State's philosophy. Karl Popper claims the “open society” as the one that uses piecemeal methods for increasing the possibility, or reaching a reasonable compromise and therefore of achieving the improvement by democratic methods. Yet, the World State of *Brave New World* adopts utopian methods that in the process of applying them, it leads to the creation of a closed society. Huxley shows that if people's feelings and way of thinking are what make them human, then turning them off make them something like machines and, hence, will become more unhappy. The more people distance themselves from what they feel, the more unhappy they truly become and lose their humanity in the process.

## Endnotes :

<sup>135</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 36.

<sup>136</sup> Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 37.

<sup>137</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies I : The Spell of Plato*, 136.

<sup>138</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 23.

<sup>139</sup> James E. Coté and Anton L. Allahar, *Generation On Hold : Coming of Age in the Late Twentieth Century* (New York : New York University Press, 1996), 109. Viewed on 27-12-2017.

<https://books.google.dz/books?isbn=0814715311>.

<sup>140</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 36.

<sup>141</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 171.

<sup>142</sup> Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 41.

<sup>143</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 181.

<sup>144</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 43.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid, 10.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 199.

<sup>150</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 22.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid, 23.

<sup>152</sup> Herbert George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*, 48.

<sup>153</sup> SparkNotes Editors. "SparkNote on Utilitarianism." SparkNotes LLC. n.d.. <http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/utilitarianism/> (accessed March 12, 2018).

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Karl Raimond Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations : The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (Basic Books, Publishers New York London, 1962), 361. Viewed 12-12-2017.

[www.rosenfels.org/Popper.pdf](http://www.rosenfels.org/Popper.pdf)

<sup>156</sup> Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*.

<sup>157</sup> Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, 184.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup>D.C.Coleman, *Bernard Shaw and "Brave New World"*, Penn State University Press ( The Shaw Review, Vol.10, No.1),6-8. Viewed on 02-07-2017 11 :15.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40029835>

<sup>161</sup>Gary Westfahl, *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Science Fiction and Fantasy : Themes, works and Wonders*, Vol 3, (New York : Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2005), 944. Viewed on 22-11-2017.

<https://books.google.dz/books?isbn=0313329532>

<sup>162</sup>William Ward Matter, *Aldous Huxley and the Utopian Tradition*, Science.fiction studies.2(2), 147. Viewed on 23-12-2017.

<https://ttu-ir.tdl.org/ttu-ir/bitstream/handle/2346/11691/31295001279446.pdf?sequence=1>

<sup>163</sup>Bobb Bar,"Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*-Still a Chilling Vision After All These Days"(Michigan Law Rev ,2010), 856. Viewed on 14-12-2017.

[http://www.academia.edu/7577636/ALDOUS\\_HUXLEYS\\_BRAVE\\_NEW\\_WORLD\\_STILL\\_A\\_CHILLING\\_VISION\\_AFTER\\_ALL\\_THESE\\_YEARS](http://www.academia.edu/7577636/ALDOUS_HUXLEYS_BRAVE_NEW_WORLD_STILL_A_CHILLING_VISION_AFTER_ALL_THESE_YEARS)

<sup>164</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 193-194.

<sup>165</sup>Ibid.

<sup>166</sup>Herbet George Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*,143.

<sup>167</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 129-130.

<sup>168</sup>J.R.Ward, "*The Tired, Timid World of Aldous Huxley*",178, quoted in Ahmed Ahmed Abdelaziz Farag, *Enslavement and Freedom in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World* (Department of Languages and Translation, Umluj University College, Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia 2016), 60. Viewed on 16-12-2017.

<http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text-pdf/F4D8E6B57947>.

<sup>169</sup>Catarina Leão, *Into the Practical Application of Piecemeal Social Engineering*, 13-14.

<sup>170</sup>Ibid.

<sup>171</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 201.

<sup>172</sup>Ibid, 193-194.

<sup>173</sup>L. Hadomi , '*From Technological Dystopia to Utopia: Brave New World and HomoFaber*', 113, quoted in Ahmed Ahmed Abdelaziz Farag, *Enslavement and Freedom in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World* (Department of Languages and Translation, Umluj University College, Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia), 61.

<sup>174</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 194.

<sup>175</sup>Ibid.

<sup>176</sup>Ibid.

<sup>177</sup>Ibid, 198.

<sup>178</sup>Cosma Rohilla Shalizi, *Icarus, or, the Future of Science by Bertrand Russell* (1924). (Berkeley, California, 11 June 1994). Viewed on 15-12-2017.  
<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/en/russell2.htm>.

<sup>179</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 203.

<sup>180</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>181</sup>*Ibid*, 207.

<sup>182</sup>*Ibid*, 208.

<sup>183</sup>D.C.Coleman, *Bernard Shaw and ‘Brave New World’*, 8.

<sup>184</sup>Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World*, 211.

## **General Conclusion :**

The present paper has studied H.G Wells's *The Open Conspiracy : What Are We To Do With Our Lives ?* (1928) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) in terms of the society described in the two books. Throughout the analysis of the works, it is clear that there is a dialogue between them. Indeed, the two books portray a united World State which control the whole world under a totalitarian rule. By criticising the World State's authoritative practices, Huxley aims to warn against the misuse of science and knowledge. The utopian society of the World State is to be perceived as a satire of Herbert George Wells's utopian thoughts .

In this paper we have tried to establish a link between the two writers in terms of the type of the society they describe in their works. In *The Open Conspiracy : What Are We To Do With Our Lives ?*, Wells holds optimistic expectations with science and technology, in the sense that he advocates a total and unchecked recourse for technology and scientific process. In fact, to achieve a world peace and attain an everlasting happiness, he reinforces his advocacy with a disguised discourse on the benefits that science could have for achieving stability and efficiency in society. By contrast to Wells's utopian ideas, Huxley mocks by describing how people become subservient to the World State, and the way in which the exaggerated planning of society had solved all problems and anxieties of people, at the expense of their freedom and above all their individuality.

Huxley truly describes a closed society in the novel, but in reality he aims to advocate a society that is open to change and progress by refuting the utopian and the ideal state that Wells sketches in *The Open Conspiracy*, by explaining the way people who live in a closed, static society lose their individuality and identity, and how it is important to strive for advancement and improvement. We may say that the novel is a device to help future society in evading the negative effects of the society described in the novel ; it reflects the fears of Huxley about

future societies like the society Wells preconizes in his Blueprint where the pursuit of happiness and supreme ideal will probably lead to the dehumanization of the population. The novel, effectively, represents the similarity of its society to today's globalized world in terms of the cultural, economic, political, and social context. The modern society is still not reaching the elevated level of Huxley's society nor that of Wells, nonetheless, the similarity between the contemporary society and the novel's society is perceptible.

#### **IV. Bibliography :**

##### **1. Primary Sources :**

- ✓ Huxley, Aldous . *Brave New World* .1932 . Reprint, London: Vintage, Penguin London House, 1935.
- ✓ Wells, Herbert George . *The Open Conspiracy: What Are We to Do With Our Lives?*. Great Britain: C.A. Watt & CO. Limited, 1935; repr., San Diego CA: The Book Tree, 1928.

##### **2. Secondary Sources:**

- ✓ Atwood, Margaret .‘Introduction’ in Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* . London : Vintage, Penguin London House, 2007.
- ✓ Bloom, Allan: *The Republic of Plato*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. United States of America: Library of Congress Catalog, 1991.
- ✓ Bar, Bobb’’Aldous *Huxley’s Brave New World-Still a Chilling Vision After All These Days* ’’.Michigan Law Rev ,2010.

[http://www.academia.edu/7577636/ALDOUS\\_HUXLEYS\\_BRAVE\\_NEW\\_WORLD\\_STILL\\_A\\_CHILLING\\_VISION\\_AFTER\\_ALL\\_THESE\\_YEARS.](http://www.academia.edu/7577636/ALDOUS_HUXLEYS_BRAVE_NEW_WORLD_STILL_A_CHILLING_VISION_AFTER_ALL_THESE_YEARS.)

- ✓ Bradshaw, David. ‘Biography’ in Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* .Worcester College, Oxford, 1993.
- ✓ Bloom, Harold. *Bloom’s Guides: Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World* .Broomall: Chelsea House Publisher, 2004.
- ✓ Bloom, Harold. *H.G Wells: Bloom’s Modern Critical Views*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers,2005.

- ✓ Christie, James. *Love and Fine Thinking: Ethics and the State in the Writings of H.G Wells*. PhD diss., Department of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal , June 1986.
- ✓ Coté, James E and Allahar, Anton L .*Generation On Hold : Coming of Age in the Late Twentieth Century* .New York : New York University Press, 1996.  
<https://books.google.dz/books?isbn=0814715311>
- ✓ Comte, Auguste . *A General View of Positivism*. United States of America, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- ✓ Coleman, D.C . *Bernard Shaw and ‘Brave New World’* , The Shaw Review, Vol.10, No.1, Penn State University Press.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40029835>
- ✓ D. Hanes, Roslym. *H.G Wells Discoverer of the Future- The Influence of Science on his Thoughts* . London and Basingstoke: THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD, 1980.
- ✓ Farag, Ahmed Ahmed Abdelaziz. *Enslavement and Freedom in Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World*. Department of Languages and Translation, Umluj University College, Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia.  
<http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text-pdf/F4D8E6B57947>.
- ✓ Frost, Laura “The Pleasures of Dystopia” in *Brave New World: Context and Legacy*, 71.
- ✓ Germino, Dante. *The Open Society in Theory and Practice*. University of Virginia: Martinus Nuhoff The Hague ,1974.
- ✓ Greenberg, Jonathan and Waddell, Nathan. *Brave New World: Context and Legacy*. London: Springer Verlag, 2016.
- ✓

- ✓ Huxley, Aldous. *Preface to Brave New World*, by Huxley Aldous .New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2010.
- ✓ Higgins, Charles and Higgins, Regina. *Huxley's Brave New World* .Foster City: IDC Books Worldwide, Int, 2000.
- ✓ Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* .Great Britain : Basil Blackwell Ltd ,1987.
- ✓ Mead Earle, Edward ,*H.G. Wells, British Patriot in Search Of a World State*, Cambridge University Press,1950. World Politics, Vol.2, No.2. Viewed on 08-12-2017 03:11.
- ✓ Meckier, Jerom. "Jerom Meckier on Huxley's Ironic Utopia" in *Bloom's Guides: Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*,72.
- ✓ Matassa, Giulia. *Plato's Argument For Rule By Philosopher Kings*.University of York, April 17, 2013. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/04/17/should-philosophers-rule/>
- ✓ Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick .*Communist Manifesto*. United States of America: World's Classics, 1992.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009188>.
- ✓ "Only The Great WE ": Interwar Dystopian Fiction and the individual".  
<http://www.undergraduatelibrary.org/system/files/Only%20the%20Great%20WE%20-%20Interwar%20Dystopian%20Fiction%20and%20the%20Individual.pdf>
- ✓ Paul A. Readman. "*The 1895 General Election and Political Change in Late Victorian Britain*." The Historical Journal 42, no. 2 .1999.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020996>.
- ✓ Patington, John.S. *Building Cosmopolis: The Political Thoughts of H.G Wells*. Great Britain: University of Reading. December, 2000.

- ✓ Partington, John.S. *The Pen as Sword: George Orwell, H.G. Wells and Journalistic Parricide*, Sage Publications, Ltd: Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Jan., 2004). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3180669>.
- ✓ Partington, John.S. *H. G. Wells and Population Control: From a Eugenic Public Policy to the Eugenics of Personal Choice : Population Control as Public Policy: Sterilisation*. <http://www.academia.edu/400264/>.
- ✓ Popper, Raimond Karl. *Conjenctures and Refutations : The Growth of Scientific Knowlege*. New York ,London :Basic Books Publishers ,1962.  
[www.rosenfels.org/Popper.pdf](http://www.rosenfels.org/Popper.pdf)
- ✓ Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, vol1.2005 .Oxfordshire: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- ✓ Popper, Raimond Karl. *The Open Society and its Enemies* .Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1945; repr., Abingdon: Routledge Classics, 2011.
- ✓ R. Pease, Edward. *The History of the Fabian Society* .London, 1925.
- ✓ Rohilla Shalizi, Cosma. *Icarus, or, the Future of Science by Bertrand Russell* (1924). Berkeley, California, 11 June 1994.  
<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/en/russell2.htm>.
- ✓ Steinberg, Michele .*‘The Open Conspiracy’: H.G. Wells Plots the World Empire*. Presidential Campaign Committee, February 2004.
- ✓ SparkNotes Editors. “SparkNote on Utilitarianism.” SparkNotes LLC. n.d..  
<http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/utilitarianism/> (accessed June 01, 2018).
- ✓ Ward Matter, William. *Aldous Huxley and the Utopian Tradition*, Science fiction studies.2(2), 147.  
<https://ttuir.tdl.org/ttuir/bitstream/handle/2346/11691/31295001279446.pdf?sequence1>

- Westfahl, Gary. *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Science Fiction and Fantasy : Themes, works and Wonders*, Vol 3, New York : Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data, 2005. <https://books.google.dz/books?isbn=0313329532>
- Wells, H.G .'*Project of a World Society*', The New Statesman and Nation, 20 August 1932; H.G. Wells, *After Democracy: Addresses and Papers on the Present World Situation* . London 1932.
- Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography*. Quoted in William J. Hyde, *The Socialism of H.G Wells in the Early Twentieth*, Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. 17, No. 2 April, 1956. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2707743>