The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctorate in English

Option: Civilisation

Title

The Quest for Utopia: from Samuel Butler to Bertrand Russell

Submitted by: Hacene BENMECHICHE
Supervised by: Professor Bouteldja RICHE

Panel of Examiners:

Sabrina ZERRAR, Professor, Mouloud MAMMERI University,	Chair
Bouteldja RICHE, Professor, Mouloud MAMMERI University,	Supervisor
Med Yazid BENDJEDDOU, Professor, University of Annaba,	Examiner
Hocine MAOUI, Professor, University of Annaba,	Examiner
Salah BOUREGBI, Professor, University of Annaba,	Examiner

Academic Year: 2015-2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my teacher **and supervisor professor Bouteldja Riche** whose counsels, persistent support, and encouragements have made the completion of this thesis possible. His patient readings of my work and his enlightening feedback have added to the clarity and the quality of this work.

I am equally sincerely grateful to the members of panel of examiners: **Professor ZERRAR Sabrina, Professor BENJEDDOU M^{ed} Yazid, Professor MAOUI Hocine, and Professor BOUREGBI Salah** for having deemed my thesis worthy of attention and accepted to examine it despite the weight of their other academic duties.

I also wish to address my thanks to the staff of the ―Bibliothèque du Monde Anglophone in *Sorbonne Nouvelle* University and the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* whose collections have provided me with the best part of my documents for my thesis. Special thanks are also addressed to the staff of the library of the department of English of the university of Tizi-Ouzou for their availability.

I am equally indebted to my brother Aomar, who has inspired my first readings and introduced me to the wonderful world of literature. To the members of my family whose patience and loving support have been essential to me, particularly in times of doubt, I would like to say ―thank you‖.

To my colleagues, students, kins, and friends, I address my thanks for their encouragements.

Abstract

This thesis studied the evolution and impact of utopian thought in the English-speaking world from the late nineteenth century up to the present times selecting for consideration texts produced in the late nineteenth century, which coincided with the crisis of capitalism, the first half of the twentieth century, characterised by the crisis of modernity and a general mood of pessimism with regard to the capacity of science or socialism to lead to "eutopia"‖, and texts envisioning the reconstruction of a human society, threatened by division, conflicts and ultimately possible extinction, as a global utopia. This ultimate utopia, which would represent the culmination of the Enlightenment project and the temporary materialization of the **Liberal Idea,** would, unlike the traditional static utopias, remain open to criticism and improvement.

The study, which takes its theoretical bearings from the sociology of knowledge and sociolinguistics, considers language use as a form of social action, **thinking** as tightly conditioned by **being**; action whereby social subjects / agents mediate their world. Drawing upon the critical concepts and categories elaborated by Karl Mannheim, Paul Ricoeur, Mikhail Bakhtin, Michel Foucault, and Norman Fairclough, I attempt to argue the claim that, as texts, the utopias I studied in their ongoing dialectical intercourse with other texts of the utopian tradition as well as their respective contexts performed critical function which purported to improve the texts through regular revisiting, and society through ongoing criticism, and reconstruction. Hence utopia, as a man-centered Pelagian project, has sought the progressive perfection of man and human society in the present world. In the last resort, utopianism, whether in its textual or practical version, appeared more as a critical companion, a faithful bedfellow to ideology, whose flaws it unveils and which it has helped to improve and vie.

Hence, in their quest for utopia, the Authors considered in the present thesis: Samuel Butler, Edward Bellamy, William Morris, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, H.G.Wells, and Bertrand Russell drew upon the utopian tradition, which they reworked creatively, to achieve a balance between individual freedom and happiness on the one hand, with social order and stability, on the other hand. Observed from the perspective of a member of "the backward races", which are integrated as resources and extensions in the Anglo-Saxon Enlightened utopian project, one cannot fail to suspect the difficulty these authors face, as supposed 'advocates of the interests of the whole', to overcome Mannheim's paradox and totally emancipate themselves from the outlook of a society in which they are culturally immersed. This ethnocentric attitude can be interpreted as a form of will to power‖ which has recently led to the emergence of a global hegemon. None the less, given the authors' audacious ideas on such issues as power, governance, education, demography, ethics and environment, one may say on their behalf that they have been made the reluctant accomplices of a power thirsty ideology which they will not fail to unveil and resist as such.

Résumé

A travers cette thèse nous avons étudié l'évolution ainsi que l'impact de la pensée utopique dans le monde anglophone (Angleterre et U.S.A.) depuis la fin du dix-neuvième siècle à nos jours. Les textes considérés ont été tirés de trois périodes historiques distinctes : la fin du 19ème siècle qui a coïncidé avec la « Grande Dépression », la crise du capitalisme et une explosion de la littérature utopique ; la première moitié du 20ème siècle caractérisée non seulement par la crise de la modernité qui s'est traduite par la production de textes anti-utopiques symptomatiques de la désillusion et de la perte de confiance en la capacité de la science ou du socialisme à construire l'eutopie tant promise ; mais également par des textes envisageant la reconstruction de la société humaine menacée par les divisions et un possible conflit nucléaire qui mènerait à l'extinction de la race humaine , sous la forme d'une utopie globale. Cette utopie ultime, qui constituerait l'aboutissement du « Projet des Lumières » et la réalisation temporaire de « **l'Idée Libérale »** (Mannheim ,1936) demeurera, à l'opposé des utopies traditionnelles statiques, une société dynamique, ouverte à la critique et au progrès continu.

Cette étude, qui emprunte ses outils méthodologiques à la sociologie de la connaissance, la sociolinguistique et l'analyse du discours, considère l'énonciation, « l'acte de parole » comme formes d'actions sociales par lesquelles les sujets/ agents sociaux interpettent et modifient leur monde. Utilisant les concepts et les catégories critiques élaborés par Karl Mannheim, Paul Ricoeur, Michael Bakhtin, Michel Foucault, et Norman Fairclough, nous nous sommes employés à défendre la thèse selon laquelle les utopies considérées dans leur rapport dialectiques ininterrompu, aussi bien avec les autres textes de la tradition utopique, qu' avec les différents contextes socio-historiques qui les ont produites, ont joué une fonction critique par des révision régulières de ces textes ainsi qu'une amélioration continue de leurs sociétés respectives par la critiques continue et des projets de reconstruction sans cesses renouvelés.

Ainsi, il apparait que l'utopie, en tant que projet Pélagien, a recherché la réalisation de la « Cité terrestre » par le perfectionnement progressif de l'homme. Il ressort en dernière analyse, que l'utopisme, que ce soit dans sa version textuelle ou dans sa version pratique, apparait plus comme un compagnon critique de l'idéologie libérale dominante qu'il vise à parfaire en en révélant les insuffisances que comme sa totale antithèse. Aussi, dans leur quête de l'utopie, les auteurs considérés dans ce travail, Samuel Butler, Edward Bellamy, William Morris, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, H.G.Wells, et Bertrand Russell nous ont semblés poursuivre un idéal de liberté et de bonheur individuel qui ne mettrait pas en cause l'ordre et la stabilité sociale ; idéal qui corrobore le concept « Mannheimien » d'**Idée Libérale »** .

Considéré du point de vue d'un membre appartenant aux races dites « arriérées » qui ont toujours été intégrées comme ressources et extension du projet anglo-saxon éclairé, nous ne pouvons-nous empêcher de relever la difficulté à laquelle font face ses auteurs à se défaire du « **paradoxe de Mannheim** » en s'émancipant de la vision ethnocentrique de leur société d'appartenance. Bien qu'emprunte d'humanisme, cette vision qui a donné naissance à une nouvelle forme d'hégémonie ne peut qu'être interprétée comme une énième « volonté de puissance » de « l'Europe des Lumières ». Néanmoins, considérant leurs positions avancées relatives à des questions telles que la bonne gouvernance, la paix, l'éducation, la démographie, l'environnement et les ressources, nous pouvons dire à leur décharge qu'ils se sont faits les complices involontaires d'idéologies de domination que d'autres ne manqueront pas d'identifier et de mettre à nu.

ملخص

قمنا عبر هذه الأطروحة بدراسة تطور الفكر المثالي (اليوتوبي) وتأثيراته على العالم الأنجلو_فوني [إنجلترا والولايات المتحدة الأمريكية] منذ نهاية القرن التاسع عشر والى يومنا هذا. وقد قمنا بانتقاء واختيار النصوص التي تحمل بصمة هذه الحقبة الزمنية بالعودة إلى ثلاث مراحل متمايزة: شهدت نهاية القرن التاسع عشر انتشار ما عُرف في حينه ب « الكساد الكبير » ، وأزمة الرأسمالية، وانفجار الأدب المثالي (اليوتوبي). ولم يكن التميز الذي وسم النصف الأول من القرن 20 خاصا فقط بأزمة حداثة أنتجت نصوصا أقامت نفسها منذ نشأتها بشكل متعارض كليّة مع مثالية (يوتوبيا) باعتبارها ممارسة أدبية عرضية تتميز بالتحول وفقدان الثقة في قدرة العلم والاشتراكية على بناء العالم المثالي المنشود، ولكنه أيضا زمن آخر بواسطة نصوص تهدف إلى إعادة بناء المجتمع الإنساني المهدد بالتمزق والانقسام بفعل الحروب، والمسكون بالخوف من إمكانية نشوب حرب نووية تنتهي بالقضاء على العرق البشري، في عالم مثالي حيث جميع الاحتمالات ممنكة. وتمثل هذه النزعة المثالية إشارة إلى انتهاء مشروع « عصر الأنوار ». وسيبقى الانجاز المؤقت ل« للفكر الليبرالي » (Mannheim ,1936) باعتباره الوجه الإيجابي والمتحرك والديناميكي داخل وجود إنساني منفتح على التقدم المتصل والمستمر في الطرف المضاد للمثالية التقليدية الجامدة.

تعتمد هذه الاطروحة على سلسلة من الإجراءات المنهجية المستمدة من سوسيولوجيا المعرفة ، والسيويو- لسانية وتحليل الخطاب. وضمن هذه اللاجراءات تعتبر التلفظ « فعل الكلام » أشكالا من الممارسات الاجتماعية التي بواسطتها يمكن للذات / العوامل أن تؤول العالم وتقوم بتحويله. وقد أسهم توظيف المفاهيم والمقولات النقدية التي قام ببلورتها كل من Karl Mannheim, Paul Ricoeur, Michael Bakhtin, Michel Foucault, et Norman Fairclough, في تبني فكرة الدفاع عن الأطروحة التي بواسطتها يمكن اعتبار الجدل حول المثاليات لا يزال مستمرا، سواء تعلق الأمر بالنصوص التقليدية التي تدافع عن التصورات المتعالية والمثالية، أو تعلق بمختلف السياقات السوسيو- تاريخية التي أسهمت في إنتاجها، والاضطلاع بالتالي بوظيفة نقدية عبر المراجعة المستمرة لهذه النصوص، والعمل، في الآن نفسه، في اتجاه تطوير هذا التحول داخل كل مجتمع على حدة، عبر انتقادات متتابعة تخص مشاريع إعادة البناء المتغيرة حسب الزمان والمكان.

وهكذا، فقد اتضح لنا، أن التصورات المتعالية والمثالية، كمشروع بلاجي، قد حاولت البحث عن المدينة الدنيوية / الفاضلة عبر التحسين التدريجي للإنسان. وقد تبين لنا عبر التحليل أن التصورات المثالية، نصية كانت أم تطبيقية، لم تعد تظهر كمرافقٍ نقدي إيديولوجي مهيمن، يعمل على تمجيد المثالية ذاتها عبر البحث عن النواقص بالعودة إلى الطرف المضاد في كليته. وكذلك الشأن بالنسبة لاقتفاء الكتاب أثر التصورات المثالية، أمثال Samuel Butler, Edward Bellamy, William Morris, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, H.G.Wells, et Bertrand Russell ، فقد تبين لنا خلال هذه الدراسة،أنهم يبحثون عن تصور مثالي عن الحرية وسعادة فردية لا تضع موضع السؤال الاستقرار الاجتماعي، حيث أنها في مجموعها تؤكد على مفهوم « فكرة الحرية » ، وهو مفهوم مركزي في الفكر المانهايمي Mannheimien.

وإذا أخذنا بعين الاعتبار وجهة نظر عضوٍ ينتمي إلى الفئات التي يطلق عليها اسم « المهمشون / المتخلفون » الذين عادة ما يتم إدماجهم كجماعات قابلة للاندثار والزوال في المشروع الأنجلو_ ساكسوني التنويري ، فإننا لا نملك سوى تسجيل الصعوبات التي يسببونها للكتاب الذي يحاولون حل لغز « المفارقة المانهايمية » عن طريق التحرر من الرؤية الاثنو_ مركزية في المجتمع الذي ينتمون إليه. وعلى الرغم من أن هذا التحرر ممارسة مستعارة من الاتجاه الإنساني في الفلسفة والأدب، فإنها رؤية أعلنت ميلاد شكل جديد من الهيمنة التي لا يمكن تأويلها كترجمة عن القوة التي عرفتها أوروبا في عصر الأنوار. وإذا أخذنا بعين الاعتبار المواقف المتقدمة المتعلقة بالمفاهيم الحاملة للحقوق المدنية، والتسيير العقلاني، والسلام، والتربية، فإنه يمكننا القول أن هؤلاء الكتاب قد أسهموا بطريقة غير مقصودة في تثبيت أيديولوجيا هيمنة يسهل على الآخرين تأكيد هويتها وفضحها.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ..... **i**
Abstract ..... **ii**
Table of Contents ..... **v**
General Introduction **1**
PART ONE: Historical Background: History and Utopia **17**
Introduction to Part One 18
Chapter I: History and Utopia **19**
Renaissance, Enlightenment, and Utopia 19
From Utopianism to Totalitarianism 22
Globalisation Old and New 32
Conclusion 32
Chapter II: Theoretical Grounding of the Research: Thought as social practice **33**
Definition of concepts: Utopia, Ideology, Dystopia 35
Eruption, Aspects, and function of Utopia 43
Eruption, Aspects and Function of Dystopia 46
Utopian Writers as Intellectuals 50
Conclusion 54
Conclusion to Part One **55**
References: 58
Part Two: Nineteenth Century Utopias: Depression and the Culture of Expectancy **60**
Introduction to Part Two 61
Chapter III: Politics, Ethics and Aesthetics in Erewhon: Samuel Butler's Ambiguous Utopia **62**
Introduction 62
Review of the literature, Issue and Hypothesis 63
Methodology 65
Discussion: *Erewhon* as a satire of Victorian Ethics 67
Conclusion 78
Chapter IV: Knowledge, Authority, and Heroism in Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward 2000-1888* (1887) **79**
Introduction 79
Review of the Literature 80
Issue and Hypothesis 84
Methodology: Intellectuals and Utopia 85
The New Religion and its Clergy 88

The New Nation 90
The new aristocracy of the word 93
From Nationalism to Globalism 96
Conclusion 97
CHAPTER V: Rethinking Utilitarian Ethics and the Gospel of Work in William Morris's *News from Nowhere (1892)* 100
Introduction 100
Review of the literature 105
Issue and hypothesis 106
Methodology: Mannheim's Types of the Utopian Mentality 107
The New Society 110
A Marxist View of History 111
The Politics of a Revolutionary Aesthete 116
Where does Morris stand? 119
Conclusion 125
Conclusion to Part Two 127
References 129
PART THREE: Modernity, Disillusion, and the Shift to Dystopia 132
Introduction to Part Three 133
CHAPTER VI: *BRAVE NEW WORLD (1932)*: Playing Dystopia against Technocratic Ideology 139
Introduction 139
Biography of the Author 141
Brave New World as a Utopian Satire 146
Manufacturing Social Stability through Individual Happiness 147
Language as a Vehicle of Ideology and Power. 152
The Reservation as a Natural Dystopia 157
Scientific Utopianism as Ideology 161
Characters in *Brave New World* 164
Huxley the Intellectual 166
Conclusion 173
CHAPTER VII: *Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949):* Neo-Liberalism or the Quest for "The Golden Country" 176
Introduction 176
Biographical Notes: From Sentimental Humanist to Socialist 177
From English Socialist to Anti-totalitarian Russophobe 181
Totalitarianism, Endism and the Last Man 184
Language as Power 188

Winston‘s Memory against Official Forgery 193
The Demystifying Power of “The Book” 197
Facing the “Great Inquisitor” 200
Playing the “Proles” against Leviathan 204
Dystopia as Discourse and Orwell as an Intellectual 206
Conclusion 208
Conclusion to Part Three 216
References 223
PART FOUR: Globalization: Utopia or ideology? 226
Introduction to Part Four 227
CHAPTER VIII: Socialism, Darwinism, and globalism in H.G.Wells’s: *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and Other Writings. 228
Introduction 228
Review of the literature 230
Issue and Hypothesis 233
Dialogue and Polemics in *A Modern Utopia* 235
Globalizing ―the Liberal Ideal‖ 238
Culture, Power, Economy, and Politics in *A Modern Utopia.* 239
The World State and the Reign of the Samurai 243
The Samurai as a Modern World Aristocracy 244
Evolution and the World State 246
Conclusion 248
CHAPTER IX: The Quest for Peace and the World State in B. Russell’s Political Writings (1924-1972) 249
Introduction 249
Review of the literature 250
Issue and Hypothesis 252
Peace, Stability, and New World Order 253
From Nationalism to Globalism 254
The U.S.A as a Paradigm for World Governance 256
Globalization or Americanization? 260
Attributes of The World Government. 261
Ethics in the Globalized World 262
Making the bed to the Rising Hegemon 265
From Exeptionalism to Liberal Millenarianism 266
Conclusion 267
Conclusion to Part Four 269
References 271

General Conclusion 274
Selected Bibliography..... 284

General Introduction

Discontent and its direct corollary, the quest for utopia, seem to have been the lot of Man since the dawn of history. Hesiod sought happiness and rest in ***The Isle of the Blessed*** while Plato, in ***The Republic,*** favoured a combination of order and justice in a Greece torn by The Wars of the Peloponnesus. The scriptures tell us that Adam has undergone the fall because he sought escape from his original state of innocence and happiness into knowledge. Religions, accordingly, came to reintegrate fallen man back to God's realm and his primary state of bliss only to land in the stalemate of The Dark Ages and Inquisition. In more recent times, humanists have called the lights of reason and the "miracles" wrought by modern science and technology to rescue man from the dogmas of religious faith and superstition. Scientific and technical knowledge, it was believed, when inspired by philanthropy and guided by appropriate ethics would lead to the good society. The modern societies in their capitalist and then socialist versions, which were the result of the combined effect of scientific development and the quest for a better order, have both proven unsatisfactory. It is this permanent quest for utopia that this research undertakes to explore.

The present thesis is then about "The Quest for Utopia from Samuel Butler (1871) to Bertrand Russell"(1972).Given the amount of utopian literature produced in the time span covered by this research, it has been necessary to select a number of texts which are intended to fit its limited purposes. Accordingly, the texts have been selected from **three different periods** in the evolution of utopian thinking: the late nineteenth century, the first half of the twentieth century, and the last quarter of the twentieth century. The first period was characterized by the crisis of industrialism and capitalism; and the quest for appropriate remedies through reformist schemes or revolutionary action. The second period which was marked by the emergence of totalitarian systems, ideological struggle between communism and liberalism, and the outbreak of two major conflicts, induced a general mood of

Pessimism, and loss of faith in the promises of science and socialism, all of which resulted in a shift to dystopia. The third period has to do with the process and discourse of "globalization", which in this research is tentatively considered as a modern form of utopia. Globalization as a form of New World Order, which came into frequent parlance in the last quarter of the twentieth century following the demise of communist ideology and the fall of the Berlin Wall, is read in the present thesis as the culmination of the Enlightenment project and the triumphant r e -emergence of the bourgeois liberal utopia. This last part attempts to trace the evolutions of utopia from the original local and closed *topos* assigned to it by Plato, Thomas More, and Francis Bacon in Antiquity and the Renaissance; to the form of "global village" it has been assigned by the liberal West in modern times.

Review of the Literature

Along with the numerous utopian texts published at various periods of human history, an equally huge amount of critical literature in the form of histories, anthologies, and critical analyses of the utopian texts has been produced. Next to the commonly held conviction among critics, (Jameson: 2005),(Mumford:1923),with regard to historicist function of utopia, and its capacity to infuse hope and inspire social change (Kumar:1991),(Wilde:1915) most of them (Morton:1969),(Beaumont:2005), (Kumar:1991) equally trace the eruption of utopian aspirations and practice to periods of epistemological breaks: the Renaissance, t h e Enlightenment, modernity. (Braga: 2006) established a detailed taxonomy of the utopian sub-genres while Mannheim t r a c e d the basic types of utopian mentalities and tried to present the ideological and utopian mentalities as two antagonistic worldviews. However, no study, at least to my best knowledge has followed the evolution of the utopia from the nineteenth century up to the present times trying to unveil its possible complicity with liberal or neo-conservative ideology. Further, globalisation as a world vision has never been discussed as a form of utopian/ ideological discourse albeit its presence in former utopian texts (Millennialism, the dictatorship of the Proletariat) .A ccordingly, the

global open society as envisioned in H.G.Wells ***A Modern Utopia*** (1905) and some of B. Russell's non-fiction writings, especially those published in the period of the Cold War, is studied as the realization of the liberal utopia and the temporary victory of the liberal west over "totalitarianism" and the " dictatorship of the proletariat".

Theoretical Grounding of the Research

The present research takes its basic theoretical bearings from Karl Mannheim (1936), Michael Bakhtin (1981 and1996), Michel Foucault (1997), Norman Fairclough (2001), and Hannah Arendt (1963 and 1966). Karl Mannheim's ***Ideology and Utopia: an Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*** has provided useful definitions of the key concepts used in the present thesis as well as their functions. Bakhtin's, Fairclough's, and Foucault's conceptions of language use as a form of social practice further stress the connection of language with ideological struggle. Hence, the texts studied in the present research are apprehended as "utterances or —acts" which are interpreted in their dialogic relationship to other authors' utterances, or to a given social reality. Hannah Arendt's views ***On Revolution (1963)*** and ***On the Origins of Totalitarianism*** (1966) have provided us with valuable insight into the workings of modern totalitarian systems of the kind envisioned by G. Orwell in ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1949).

This research falls within the ambit of social history and the history of ideas. The choice of the documents to explore has been dictated by a series of considerations. The first lies in the amount of information each document yields about the period in which it was produced. Along with the historicizing function of each utopian text considered, the research purports to explore its dialogic function with the socio-historical reality that triggers it, as well as with other utopian texts. Last and more importantly, it reconsiders Mannheim's dichotomy between **ideology** and **utopia** to conclude that the boundary line separating the two is often blurred. Thus, utopia appears, in the last resort, not as the antithesis of ideology but as its dialectical complement. Rather than shattering completely the ongoing

order which is considered as absolute evil, (Mannheim 1936), I suggest that it performs a critical and prophylactic function which results in its improvement and perpetuation. Considering the social origin of utopian authors as members of the ruling stratum who have temporarily and tactically cut themselves off from their original class, I suggest that utopian discourse is more reformative than revolutionary in the last resort insofar as it purports to preserve by improving the flawed order. By so doing, this unattached stratum of intellectuals, Mannheim notes, hoist themselves to positions of power as the inevitable mediators and the promoters of the interests of the whole in the conflicts opposing the different social strata. Whenever utopian ideas evolve into an oppressive ideology in power, as was the case with communism, dystopia comes to the rescue.

Utopia in the Nineteenth Century

The culture of expectancy that pervaded the late nineteenth century was conceived as an answer to the crisis of industrial capitalist societies, the loss of faith in traditional values, and the outrageously growing chasm separating a majority of labouring poor swarming the urban centres and a minority of industrialists and plutocrats holding the levers of society. Butler's ironical reflections on the flaws of Arcadianism as well as those of industrialism in ***Erewhon*** (1871) constitute an early warning about the potentially deceptive nature of utopia. In ***Looking Backward 2000-1888***(1887), Bellamy envisions a socialist utopia that reconciles the aspirations of the workers for material and spiritual comfort and the dream of the captains of industry for economic and political power combined with social prestige. Morris's socialist "ecotopia" ***News from Nowhere***, which leads through revolutionary action to the recovery of a pastoral epoch of rest, is meant by the author as a polemical response not only to E. Bellamy's reformist centralised industrial socialist utopia, but also to the Fabians' and the members of the Social Democratic Federation, who opposed revolution and whose gradualist evolution toward socialism he assimilated to complicity with capitalism. The

expectations as well as the apprehensions pervading the end of the nineteenth century were to be proved justified by the opening millennium.

The Shift to Dystopia

The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the materialisation of different forms of socialist and capitalist states, an increased impingement of mechanisation on human beings, and two major armed conflicts, the second of which involved the use of nuclear weapons. The feeling of helplessness and hopelessness induced by the growing grip of economic and ideological structures on the social subject and which were characteristic of modernity found an outlet in dystopian literature. A. Huxley's ***Brave New World*** (1932), and G. Orwell's ***Nineteen Eighty-four*** (1949) are studied as examples of the possible subversion of utopian aspirations into ideological shackles by the ruling elites. Huxley's world of spurious hedonism (a quest of pleasure) and scientifically organized and controlled human society is as appalling as Orwell's totalitarian hell in which INGSOC (English Socialism), the official ideology of the state, together with the omniscient and omnipotent Big Brother and the omnipresent secret police has resulted in a total control of the social subjects' thoughts and acts.

Globalization as Utopia

Horrified by the extent of the human losses suffered during the two World Wars as a result of economic and ideological competition between the different nation states, on the one hand, and the possible outbreak of a third major conflict that would bring human civilization to an end, on the other hand, the idea a global human society began to take shape in the minds of certain intellectuals**.** There were strong arguments in favour of an open global society, especially during the Cold War. Besides constituting an adequate answer to the millenarian aspirations of the ordinary man for equality and justice, a globalized human society would be the most adequate form of organization in a world made more organic by increased speed and technical progress. Further, a politically and economically integrated global society from which national,

geographical, racial, as well as ideological barriers have been removed, and in which access to raw materials, energy and markets is granted to all, is more likely to prevent conflict, guarantee a long lasting peace, shared prosperity, and happiness to a newly reconstructed human society.

For methodological reasons, the texts which have been singled out for consideration have been grouped thematically, which by a happy turn of chance seems to coincide with the chronological evolution of utopian thinking. A first part is devoted to the historical background and the theoretical bearings of the research. The second part deals with the late Nineteenth century utopias. The third part explores the shift to dystopia, while the fourth part tentatively analyses the quest for globalization as a form of modern utopia. The thesis as a whole is structured into four parts each of which comprises two or three chapters.

PART ONE: ***Historical Background and Theoretical Grounding of the Research***

This part is retrospective of utopian thinking from Greek times to our present age. It shows the influence of Greek thought on the Renaissance and Enlightenment utopias, which in turn, were appropriated by nineteenth century and modern thinkers as instruments whereby they could reflect critically on the means of improving the flawed orders of their time. In fact, since Thomas More wrote his travelogue about the mythical kingdom of king Utopus up to the dystopias of modern times, there seems to have been an on-going dialogue between different forms of utopia, on the one hand, and between these utopias and the socio- historical reality against which they erupted, on the other hand. It appears that next to its historicist and critical functions, utopia which constitutes a challenge to on-going social order or the prevailing ideology, partakes of the reconstruction of society on new bases and hence on the quest for power.

PART TWO: Nineteenth Century Utopias: Progress, Depression, and the Culture of Expectancy.

This part, which includes three chapters, undertakes a study of Samuel Butler's ***Erewhon*** (1872), Edward Bellamy's Looking ***Backward 2000-1888*** (1887), to be concluded by a study of William Morris's ***News from Nowhere*** (1892).In the first chapter, ***Erewhon*** (1872) is read both as a utopian satire, and a satirical utopia. It is a satirical utopia because it is used by the author to reflect on the ills of Victorian society, and unveil the ideological function of Victorian ethics and institutions in the service of industrial interests at home, and imperial interests abroad. It is a utopian satire insofar as it also questions the capacity of utopianism to lead to the perfect society. In other words, belief in utopia will only lead to other forms of subjection. The text introduces us to a pastoral society which had waged a victorious war on machines. However, just like its industrial counterpart England, this utopian society suffers from its own inconsistencies such as the criminalisation of ill health and poverty. The message implicit in Butler's satire is that every utopia is pregnant with a potential dystopia (Kumar: 1991). This chapter also discusses the difficulty for the analyst to distinguish the utopian from the ideological function of utopian discourse. Recourse to satire reveals a form of ambiguity in the attitude of the author regarding the mores and values of his society. Drawing upon Paul Ricoeur's ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*** (1975) this chapter reads Butler's recourse to Swiftian satire as a difficulty which intellectuals face to reflect objectively on a society in which they are culturally immersed; a difficulty which Ricoeur refers to as "Mannheim's paradox". This paradox leads Butler to mock without dismissing the values of Victorian society. In ***Erewhon***, ideology and utopia, as I suggest, seem to intersect. Satire, like carnival partakes of the integrative function of art for it invites critical thinking, allows outlets to social tension, and preserves by improving the social order.

In the second chapter, I read Bellamy's ***Looking Backward: 2000- 1888*** (1887) as an attempt by the author, who is apprehended as a representative of the rising reformist U.S.

intelligentsia, to cure the ills of industrialism and laissez faire capitalism by blending reformist socialism with the core American values . This peaceful and "bloodless revolution" is achieved through the gradual amalgamation of all American industries and businesses into one national trust. This utopian form of U.S socialism blended with a revived version of Christianity, "The Religion of Solidarity", is meant to gradually impregnate all the industrial then the backward nations of the world to assume a global scope. Drawing upon Mikhael Bakhtin (1996), and Karl Mannheim's ***Ideology and Utopia*** (1936), this chapter reads Bellamy's utopia as an attempts to historicise the nineteenth century American capitalist society with its polyphony of voices in a bid to renegotiate the social compact on new bases. Armed with their accumulated cultural and symbolic capital (Fairclough:2001), and the medial position they hold between the conflicting parties -capital and labour- , the rising members of the intelligentsia appointed themselves as mediators. More than this, at a time of millenarian aspirations and a growing feeling of national self-importance, Bellamy suggests globalising this national utopian model of industrial efficiency, human solidarity, and happiness. In this chapter, I also attempt to draw attention to the possible connections between the discourse of globalisation that underpins Bellamy's utopia and the present geo-strategic realignments especially following the 9:11 terrorist attacks on the U.S.A.

As for the third chapter, it deals with William Morris's ***News from Nowhere*** (1892***)***. I read this pastoral romance as an utterance meant by the author to write back to Bellamy as well as to the British reform minded socialists such as the members of the Social Democratic Federation and the members of the Fabien Society whom he suspects of complicity with capitalism.

William Guest, Morris's hero and mouthpiece whose name evokes Julian West, Bellamy's hero, falls asleep in a 19th century industrial England to awake in the same place a century later. Unlike the 19th century which was characterised by competition, strife and class war, the new century is an epoch of rest and fellowship. The utopian country which he discovers as he

is taken on a boat trip up the Thames has completely been transformed by the socialist revolution. An atmosphere of freshness, purity, and carefree indolence pervades the place and its people. The factories by the river banks have all disappeared, the river is clean, and the country has recovered its pastoral beauty of yore. In an epoch when private property and the logic of monopoly capitalism have been banned, the "Nowherians" are mostly craftsmen and farmers who are fully reconciled with their present by enjoying the pleasure provided by their work.

In the third chapter**,** I read ***News from Nowhere*** as a reflection by William Morris on the utilitarian concept of the *summum bonum* and the best way to achieve it. Unlike Bellamy‘s over centralised utopia, where an "Industrial Army" committed to the welfare and happiness of the social subjects assumes national then global economic and political control, Morris seems to favour individually chosen enjoyable crafts oriented to meet the needs of local communities. Happiness for Morris does not depend on the rigid division of labour imposed by economic efficiency and the amount of goods produced or possessed but rather on the nature of the relationship that human beings have with their work and with their fellow human beings. Alienating labour in Bellamy‘s over organised industrial system is replaced by enjoyable "work play" in Morris‘s decentralised society. In Morris‘s utopia, the good society has been achieved through revolutionary action rather than bourgeois reformism. Besides questioning the utilitarian liberal ethics underlying the Victorian and the American societies, Morris alludes to the dangers of excessive industrialism characteristic of the budding modernity. Central among these dangers are alienation, subjection, pollution and the rapid depletion of resources induced by the quest for maximum profits and larger markets. Worse than these, competition for the control of resources and markets has resulted in imperial expansion and military conflicts that threaten human existence. Morris's apprehensions proved justified although his aspirations for an epoch of fellowship and rest resulting from a socialist revolution have failed to

materialise. The utopia promised by modernity both in its socialist and liberal versions proved equally flawed and unsatisfactory.

PART THREE: Modernity, Disillusion, and the Shift to Dystopia.

In "Icarus and the Future of Science" (1924) Bertrand Russell expressed his concern about the capacity of Man to make a beneficial use of technical progress. He feared that, like Icarus, modern man would use science to satisfy his natural drive to domination rather than to promote the welfare and happiness of his fellow men. Signs of the misuses of scientific knowledge and technical progress for purposes of subjection and domination were already apparent in liberal as well as socialist societies. The subversion of the human aspirations into systems of domination and subjection resulted in disillusion which took the form of dystopia.

The second part of this study explores the shift to dystopia that reflected the mood of disillusion characteristic of modern societies. The horrors of the First World War combined to the effects of the Great Depression and the persistence of social inequalities shattered the faith placed in progress. The feelings of powerlessness and alienation experienced by social subjects are brightly pictured by Aldous Huxley in his utopian satire ***Brave New World*** (1932); and George Orwell's ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1948). Both novels depict societies in which the new ruling elites have used utopian discourse to achieve power and control society. In each society, the utopian discourse, which has been used to transform the flawed society into a totalitarian system (Mannheim: 1936) assumes an ideological function whose purpose is to prevent any further transformation. Tellingly, in both systems scientific and technical knowledge is made into an instrument of social control used to perpetuate the power and privileges of the ruling oligarchies rather than to promote human comfort, freedom, and happiness.

In ***Brave New World*** (1932), Aldous Huxley reflects on the capacity of scientific and technical progress to achieve a combination of individual happiness and social stability in a

spiritually bankrupt world. Huxley's dystopia is a benevolent totalitarian system. It is a static, global welfare state supervised by ten World Controllers. Through an expert combination of eugenics and Pavlovian methods, scientists have succeeded to produce the number of social subjects with the desired intellectual quotient, values, and skills. The citizens of Huxley's dystopia are mass- produced from "human hatcheries" and so conditioned as to insure a control of population growth, social stability, and human happiness. The babies who are 'decanted' in these hatcheries are taken to nurseries where they are submitted to 'sleep teaching and neo-Pavlovian conditioning' to learn the values and prejudices of their respective castes.

In this rigid hierarchical welfare world society, in which science is the new religion, Ford has overthrown the traditional lord. The ruling aristocracies of Alphas hold legislative and executive positions; Betas and Gammas are in charge of technical jobs, while the Epsilons who are at the bottom of the pyramid perform menial jobs. As a collectively organised producing and consuming unit, this society seems to have reconciled social stability with individual happiness and the quest for power of the managing elites. Being globally organised and controlled, the spectre of competition and of a destructive war have been swept away. However, the author doubts the capacity of a society that relies exclusively on consumption, the gratification of sexual pleasure, organised leisure, and evasion through drugs to insure genuine happiness. In this artificial paradise made of superficial pleasures, Huxley makes the absence of a spiritual dimension strongly felt. Equally worthy of notice is his integration of the "uncivilized parts" of the world as mere savage reservations used as holiday resorts for the civilized people in quest for evasion or exoticism.

Brave New Word (1932) appears as a satirical attack on the world of "our Ford", over-organisation, and the Humanists' promises that science would free man from superstition, need, bondage, and fear through a gradual control of natural phenomena the human genes.

In Huxley‘s dystopia, the absolutism of science has replaced the absolutism of religion. The globalist liberal discourse which glorifies science and technical progress as means to more economic efficiency and social order is unveiled as a strategy that legitimises subjection of the lower strata at home, and the domination of ―the backward populations‖ whose territories are annexed to the world state as reservations and holiday resorts for civilized men in quest for exoticism. Coercion and forced subjection have been supplanted by genetic manipulation, and psychological conditioning, which insure subjection.

In ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1949), G. Orwell, an English socialist and member of the Labour Party, portrays a dystopian state in which England has been turned into a part of a totalitarian super state "Oceania" under the absolute rule of Big Brother, who is assisted by an oligarchy of devoted Inner Party members. Written in the first wave of the "cold war" in which socialist ideology was gaining ground in Europe and especially in the "backward areas" of the globe, Orwell felt it vital to warn people in the West against the perversions a socialist revolution may lead to. Like Brave New World which warns against the uncritical devotion to science as "the new religion of humanity", and the use of technical progress to produce a modern breed of industrial slaves who are conditioned to swap their freedom for happiness, ***Nineteen Eighty Four*** depicts a totalitarian world in which " INGSOC"(English Socialism), the official ideology of Oceania, is turned into a new religion by a " clergy" of power thirsty inner party members whose dogmatic truths admit no contention.

Written at 'the height of the first wave of Cold War hysteria', as Krishan Kumar notes, '[c]conservatives and liberals on both sides of the Atlantic, but especially in the United States, gratefully seized on it as a stick with which to beat the Soviet Union' (Kumar, 1991:289). It is therefore as an anti-Communist, anti-Stalinist pamphlet in favour of the British brand of "democratic socialism" that Orwell's novel is read in the present research. His insistent siding with socialism and the British labour Party notwithstanding, ***Nineteen Eighty-***

Four sounds like a call to arms addressed to "the English-speaking races" (sic) [to resist] totalitarianism, [which] ***if not fought against***, could triumph anywhere (Orwell's emphasis)' (Orwell, 1970:564). At other occasions, he outrightly urges his audiences inside the English speaking world but also those behind the "Iron Curtain" who were crushed by totalitarian ideology to act. 'The morale to be drawn from [Nineteen Eighty-Four]' he insists in his press release of 15th June 1949, 'is a simple one: ***Don't let it happen. It depends on you (***Orwell's emphases, quoted in Kumar, 1991:291)'. The author's intent, which he also stated in his essay "Writers and Leviathan" in reference to Thomas Hobbes, is for intellectuals to 'push the world in a certain direction'. Given the appeal implicit throughout the novel 'to resist, and then to overthrow Big Brother and the system', I read ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** as a 'utopian dystopia' to borrow one of Tom Moylan's categories. An opposition to the ideology of "INGSOC" has risen in the form of a secret organisation called "the brotherhood" under the leadership of Emanuel Goldstein (a direct reference to Trotsky's opposition to Stalin's dictatorship) who deconstructs the totalitarian ideology and practices of the system as "oligarchical collectivism". Thus, Orwell's assimilation of Soviet communism to German fascist ideology is here interpreted as a return to British liberal Idea. The prophetic influence of Orwell's dystopia in the 1980s, the growing opposition to communist ideology in the West as well as in the East which led to the gradual demise of Soviet communism before the disintegration of the USSR, is evidence of the transformative influence of Orwell's anti totalitarian ideas.

PART FOUR: Globalisation: Utopia or Ideology?

The fourth part explores the theme of globalization as a form of utopia. Although the idea of a globalisation was already present in millenarian aspirations: in revolutionary as well as evolutionary reformist socialist discourse, the idea of a globally organised human society, which had reached an advanced level of economic integration, was first envisioned and clearly articulated in H.G. Wells' ***A Modern Utopia*** (1905), before it was strongly advocated

by Bertrand Russell in the form of a World Government (1920-1972) as an instrument for the preservation of peace, universal justice, progress, and human happiness.

Both H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell were proclaimed socialists who were concerned by inequality and injustice. They knew that competition over the accumulation of wealth and power nationally and worldwide, caused social disorder and international unrest. They were also concerned that the quest for socialism through revolutionary action could only lead to other forms of despotism and anarchy or that international competition would lead to the extermination of the race.

The twentieth century as the new millennium was perceived as an age of improvement and hope. Like many of their liberal contemporaries, both authors believed that scientific knowledge and technical progress, these dynamos of society, could gradually refine human character and better human society. Eugenics, an appropriate use of psychology in education, and sociology for social reconstruction could lead to through gradual steps to utopia. However, unlike Wells, who was the last writer to produce a positive utopia, Bertrand Russell did not write a utopia in the conventional sense. It is rather his strong commitment to peace and his belief in the possibility and inevitability of a global system of governance, a World State to achieve it, which is tentatively taken as utopian.

A Modern Utopia (1905) is read as a bourgeois liberal utopia which reflects its author's belief in progress, his Darwinian convictions, his distrust of revolution, and his ambition as a member of the new rising class to order and control society. Unlike former closed utopias which were conceived as perfect and static, his modern utopia, which is a compendium of past experiences, is open and kinetic. This planetary utopia is conceived and ruled by an aristocracy of legislators and executives belonging to the ―Samurai order‖. Wells's utopia is a form of federal World State, which is the sole owner of all the land and resources and from which frontiers are banned. The exploitation of the resources is devolved to the local

governments which take in charge public services and contribute taxes to the World State. In a modern world of immediacy made possible by the speed of technical progress, ***AMU*** expresses the ambiguous position of the rising class of intellectuals. While they wanted to correct the flaws of the capitalist system, they feared that a socialist revolution would only lead to a totalitarian dictatorship or anarchy, hence their conception of a system of which they will be the creators and sole masters.

Bertrand Russell's belief in progress, his consistent and unflinching commitment to globalisation in its most positive sense, and his **idea** of "World Government" as an instrument of universal peace and cooperation toward human progress and happiness are taken as utopian given their inspiring and potentially transformative power. As an intellectual in a modern world made strongly organic by technical progress, he remained all his life a critical advocate of a global human society, with a stationary demography, an educated and healthy population, rid of all forms of prejudice, "sharing" the resources of the planet, and enjoying the boons brought about by progress. The World Government will insure peace through control of mass destruction arms, the main sources of energy, and the prevention of conflicts.

The positions he held in his various writings prove his commitment to a New World Order that would grant, peace, prosperity and happiness to the human kind. The occasional shifts in his ideological sympathies are not read as Julian Benda's "betrayal of the clerk" in this research but rather as a form of intellectual independence and moral loftiness whereby he refuses to bargain his principles. As a socialist, he criticised Bolshevism which he assimilated to a form of dogmatic creed close to religion that would lead to totalitarianism and political inquisition (Russell, 1920:8-16). In "Icarus or the Future of Science" (1924), and "The Taming of Power" (1938) Russell seemed to favour the U.S. type of democratic federal governance which he suggests should be disseminated to the rest of the world. However, in 1966, as reported by De-Weerd, Russell set up a "War Crimes Tribunal" to try the American President Lyndon Johnson for war crimes in Vietnam.

His actions in favour of peace and the self-determination of former colonies which brought him prison sentences and the label of "anti-American" are taken as evidence of his independence. Russell's positions in favour of a global society open to criticism and improvement seems to conform to Karl Mannheim's type of liberal utopia. The question whether he or Wells can be held responsible for the subversions of the idea of world governance into a form of neo-liberal empire deserves to be debated.

Throughout the different analyses, special attention has been paid not only to the historicist and dialogic function of utopian thinking, but also its influence on the geostrategic rearrangements that have affected our world. This attention stems from the suspicion that today's balance of power in favour of the liberal West is partly the result of the transformative power of utopian/ dystopian thinking as theorised by Karl Mannheim (1936).

PART ONE:

Historical Background:

History and Utopia

Introduction to Part One

'The dream of a just society', George Orwell once wrote, 'seems to haunt the human imagination ineradicably in all ages, whether it is called the kingdom of heaven or the classless society, or whether it is thought of as Golden Age which existed in the past and from which we have degenerated' (Orwell, 1970:274). It is this constancy and consistency of utopian aspirations as a structure of imagination which has characterized human thought throughout ages, together with the derisive and skeptical responses it has triggered in the form of lampoons, satires, cacotopias, or dystopias; which has constituted a tradition of thought since the Renaissance.

The discovery of Greek classical Antiquity, Kumar notes, has led to the creation of 'the modern western utopia invented in the Europe of the Renaissance' (Kumar, 1991:3). The Renaissance and Enlightenment utopias, although infused with Christian elements, relied principally on man to found the ideal society. Appropriating the triumvirate of "king philosophers", "guardians", and "Slaves" of Plato's ***Republic*** as the basic classes of the modern western utopia, Western intellectuals dreamed of a society ruled in turn by Bellamy's "Patricians", Wells's "Samurai or the mind of the race", Huxley's "Controllers", or Orwell's "Inner Party".

Blind faith in utopia brought about critical responses in the form of satire, cacotopia, and dystopia. Outstanding figures among these skeptics are Jonathan Swift, Samuel Butler, Aldous Huxley, and George Orwell, all of whom unveiled the possible subversion of utopian thought into a new instrument of social control and subjection; a renewed version of the Platonic "golden lie" that would insure order and submission.

Along with this ongoing dialogue among the texts of the utopian tradition on the one hand, and between the texts and their respective contexts, on the other hand, a bulk of critical literature and anthologies related to this tradition has been produced trying to supply analytical tools whereby the various texts can be situated and approached.

It is the evolution of the **ongoing dialogue within the Western utopian tradition, and with society** which began with the demise of the religious world view around the sixteenth century and which later gave birth to the intellectual and social upheavals of the nineteenth century and modern times, that this first part of my research is concerned with.

Chapter One: History and Utopia

Before dealing with the texts proper, I shall devote this first chapter to utopian writing which has continually marked western thought. This historical overview has imposed itself because the regular resurgence of utopian thought under various forms at different stages of human history seems to suggest its close connection to human life. I shall attempt to follow its evolution from classical times to modern human societies. However, particular attention will be paid to certain utopias which emerged from the Renaissance to the second half of the twentieth century. My aim is to investigate the dialectical relationship between utopian ideas and socio historical orders. Many theorists and historians of thought including Karl Mannheim, Mikhael Bakhtin, Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough have noted and analysed this connection.

Indeed, at the dawn of history Freud writes, the primal horde, weary of fratricide conflicts, resuscitated the spirit of the father in the form of a totem to restore the disrupted order in the clan(Freud :1967). In the antiquity, Plato suggested to entrust the government of "The Republic" to philosophers to lead the Athenians out of the darkness of the cave[3] into the light of truth, justice and order (Plato :1950). Later, prophets came to bring justice and lead fallen Man back to the "Elysian fields", the Promised Land, which he was to reach through observance of God's word or *logos*. Indeed, the ancient Greeks considered that the *bios* should be governed by the *logos* or reason.

Renaissance, Enlightenment, and Utopia

However, thwarted by a long and vain quest for "The City of God" as envisioned by Saint Augustine, and the promised land, religion having been subverted into an instrument of subjection by an alliance of the monarchies of divine rights with the Catholic "prelates", man undertook through his own effort and genius to found on earth the ideal city. According to Mannheim, The Middle Ages witnessed the emergence of Chiliastic and Millenarian

movements under the leadership of Thomas Muntzer and Joachim of Fiore. Under the leadership of these monks, hungry peasants, weary of waiting for the advent of the reign of equals, acted on their own to hasten the coming of the promised eschatological end (Mannheim, 1936: 211-219). The revolts of the Diggers and the Levellers during the English Civil War are good example of these movements. In the mean time, monarchs and princes in the north of Europe, encouraged the Reformation movement under Martin Luther and John Calvin who were challenging the world view and authority of Rome (***Encyclopedia Britannica***: 2006). For these reformers, _the Bible not the Pope was the source of religious authority‘.

A new era in which Man was becoming a sovereign subject was dawning upon part of Europe. As a result of this evolution, this new subject didn’t need intermediaries to decide of notions of right and wrong. He strove to emancipate himself from the tutelage of the church and make use of his reason and free will to act. Religion as a world view and a powerful instrument of legitimacy and political power was no longer the exclusive monopoly of Rome and the catholic clergy. Together with this trend, the landed aristocracy and the rising merchant bourgeoisie, imbued with the spirit of the Enlightenment, were questioning the absolute character of the monarchy and claiming participation in decision making.

Thenceforth, the enlightened subject, according to John Calvin could, - by means of reason, hard work and an appropriate interpretation of the notions of “right” and “good” achieve success and happiness and deserve salvation and even election ***(Encyclopedia Britannica:***2006). This implied that the ablest and most successful members deserved to be entrusted with the organisation and leadership of society. This aspiration to emancipation was met by the combined attacks –in the form of inquisition- of the vested interests to protect the shaking feudal traditional order from disruption. Deviant subjects who were perceived not only as the victims of the fiendish influence of Satan or witches but also as their potential agents were

purified with the fires of hell on the scaffold. Although critical of the absolutism of the Catholic Church, Martin Luther denounced the excesses of the peasant revolts (Ibid). Between the absolutism of the monarchies of divine rights and the bloody revolutionary anarchism of millenarian and chiliastic peasant revolts, a moderate bourgeois trend appalled by the absolutism of the monarchs but also apprehensive of the violence of the peasant revolts, suggested striking a compromise by resorting to utopia, the concept which has inspired the present research.

I do not pretend, within the modest limits of this chapter, to give a detailed account of utopian thought. I shall limit my study to particular utopias that emerged at particular periods. This choice is dictated by practical considerations. I shall focus my attention on the evolution of utopian thought mainly from renaissance times and the publication of Sir Thomas More's insular ***Utopia*** (1506) to the second half of the twentieth century. Particular attention is paid to the late nineteenth century, the first half of the twentieth century following the two World Wars, and the late twentieth century onward.

Further, I shall dwell particularly on utopian writings which have a direct relationship with my research theme. Accordingly, I have singled out the utopias which express the bourgeois liberal outlook on the one hand, and the communitarian collectivist utopias which express the aspirations of the poor and the labouring classes, the socialist utopias, on the other hand. My aim is to analyse the effects of these two conflicting world views on the evolution of British political thought and institutions.

I hope that the study of utopian thought , as an ideal substitute to social reality, which erupted at specific periods of history will yield useful information not only about the society under study but also about the forces that struggled to shape it. My ambition to understand society through this approach comes from the seemingly intricate dialectical relationship between social reality and utopianism. There seems to be such an intimate inter-

determination between social reality in a given society at a given period of its history and the utopian thought that one feels justified in claiming that the history of Man is closely linked to the history of utopian thought and utterances, and vice-versa. According to Michel Foucault,

> all of us are living and thinking subjects . . . . Social historians are supposed to describe how people act without thinking, and historians of ideas are supposed to describe how people think without acting. Everybody both acts and thinks. The way people act or react is linked to a way of thinking (Foucault, 1982).

This claim, I hope, will justify the choice of my research theme as a means to understand the evolution of utopian ideas in the English speaking world, England and the USA, since the late nineteenth century up to the present time. This study is expected to yield useful information about British and US societies as an outcome of the dialectical interplay of social practice and utopian thought. Additionally, I hope to be able, in the light of recent theories of discourse, to account for the shift from insularism to nationalism, and then globalism, and the evolution in the position of the utopian writer whose thought is determined by his social stratum and therefore used as a tool in the defence of the world view and interests of his group. It is important to note that in the present research, the concepts of stratum or society taken to mean the group- social, local, corporal, or national, to which the author of the text represents himself to be culturally and ideologically bound.

From Utopianism to Totalitarianism

I shall borrow Jean Servier's (1967) view that two basically antagonistic utopian trends have shaped modern European social and political institutions: monkish Millennialism and bourgeois utopianism when he notes that:

> . . . le millénarisme est resté l'espoir des pauvres en ce monde, ... Plus qu'un acte de foi, les mouvements millénaristes ont exprimé la volonté des hommes de réaliser sur terre l'ordre nouveau que Dieu tardait à établir. . . .
> Devenu révolution, le millénarisme a réaffirmé la conviction profonde des pauvres en ce monde qu'à eux seuls appartenait le royaume de la terre. . . . [Toutefois], le millénarisme s'est heurté, au fils des siècles, à l'inquiétude des possédants. . . . les humaniste de la renaissance, les philosophes du Siècle des Lumières ont rêvé d'une cité juste dont ils

> seraient les guides éclairés parce qu‘ils refusaient la dure cité des égaux que le peuple attendait(Servier ,1967: 22-23).

With the developments of science and technology in the 18th and 19th centuries, man placed his faith in a new creed .Science, the direct outcome of empiricism, and technology as its application to meet practical ends expressed man‘s belief in his mission and capacity as a vicar of God. Auguste Comte is convinced that this “Religion of Humanity” (***Encyclopedia Britannica***: 2005) was the solution that would insure order to the social body and happiness to the social subject. This dogmatic belief which took the name of scientism or positivism assumed the function of a new religion that would lead to the perfection of the social body by the gradual perfection of its component “organs and cells”. This enthusiasm in the “miraculous” powers of science was epitomised by Servier (1967) as follows:

> La nature est domptée, entièrement soumise à l‘homme, et l‘énigme douloureuse de la mort
> . . . est purement et simplement niée en tant qu‘énigme. . . .
> La religion n‘a plus besoin de corriger les imperfections de la culture . . . . La culture n‘a plus d‘imperfections ; bien au contraire, par la science, son expression directe, elle assure la perfection de l‘homme, son bonheur terrestre, la mise en ordre d‘un bonheur nettoyé de toute angoisse.
> Les prémices matérialistes de la science ont été posées une bonne fois pour toutes, excluant dieu de l‘univers, l‘âme immortelle du corps de l‘homme afin que l‘aventure humaine puisse se dérouler sas angoisse. La vie doit naître de la matière, ce qui écarte toute nécessité d‘un geste créateur ; l‘homme est issu d‘un long transformisme de la vie, d‘une évolution depuis l‘amibe jusqu'à l‘homme blanc adulte et civilisé : l‘occidental qui se voit ainsi délivré de toute angoisse et récompensé d‘avoir abandonné son âme. (Servier;1967: 365- 369)

Parallel to the belief in science to subject nature and order society, ran the conviction that the enlightened European is the agent naturally fitted and entitled to propagate this new faith to the ―darker‖ areas of the globe. To the technocratic drive of the capitalist bourgeoisies to order society following the pattern of a body or after the mechanical laws that govern the universe to prevent tension and insure efficiency, social harmony and happiness, other social reformers such as P.J. Proudhon , shocked by the social inequalities of the bourgeois system, replied that the betterment of the social body could be achieved through the education,

polishing and voluntary cooperation of society‘s individual members towards a shared ideal commonwealth (Quoted in Servier, 1967: 371).

On the one hand, through millenarianism and chiliasm, the poor dreamed to abolish property, lay down fences and enclosures which were perceived as the main source of their plight, and strove to defend their natural rights to equality and happiness. Equality, among other things, meant equal access for labourers and peasants to the land during the feudal and renaissance agrarian economy. Later, egalitarianism expressed the aspirations of the workers during the industrial revolution to the abolition of property and the institution of the collective ownership of the means of production which, being concentrated in the hands of a minority of financiers and industrial tycoons, had kept the majority of workers in an unnatural state of misery and dependence.

On the other hand, the humanists of the renaissance and the philosophers of the Enlightenment, who expressed the interests of a rising bourgeois class, displayed an ambiguous position. They condemned both the millenarian aspirations of the peasants and the workers to a classless society through Revolution and the absolute reign of the traditional institutions of authority as equally incongruent with reason. Resorting to utopia, they projected the foundation of a social order that would, under the leadership of enlightened elite, insure harmony to the social body and happiness to its individual members. They dreamed of a city where order, justice and happiness would prevail because government would be based on reason as it will be entrusted to philosophers or scientists.

The advances achieved in the fields of astronomy and physics in the 16th and the 17th centuries brought science and with it scientists to the fore. Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was the first to put forward a scientific method for the discovery of truth. In his “ *Novium Organum”* he argued the claim that truth could be reached through the observation of phenomena, classification and experimentation to retrieve the laws of nature. The discovery

of the theory of gravitation by Isaac Newton(1642- 1727) (***Encyclopeadia Britannica***:2006) convinced man that the natural world being ordered by mathematical laws, the best way to establish order in society was to entrust its government to scientists. According to these scientists, truth is not to be sought beyond the physical world. It could only be reached by observation of the phenomena and by retrieving the laws that organise them. The empirical method used in physics and natural sciences helped man to understand and subdue nature to his benefit. The triumphant achievements of the various sciences and their uses to meet practical ends through the exploitation of nature increased man‘s belief in the capacity of science to understand the laws governing society and thus improve the social order which was but an element in the natural order.

With the scientific and technical developments of modern times these two utopian trends have materialised into two different political systems in the late 19th century and the first half of the twentieth century. The industrial revolution which started in Great Britain in the late 18th century was the result of the empirical method. Progress achieved in experimental sciences found applications in industry and turned England between 1780 and 1850 into the workshop of the world. The term revolution finds its justification in the important transformations induced in all aspects of British society. However at the social level it produced a deep feeling of frustration. The hopes placed in science to improve man‘s condition soon turned to disillusion before the increasing wealth of a minority and the misery of the majority.

Voices began to rise to unveil the subversion of scientific utopianism into an ideology in power. Just like religion which sanctified the absolute monarchies of divine rights, blind faith in science could serve to legitimise the rule of the industrial elites and conceal from view the pauperisation of the labouring masses. These elements which were formerly used as a weapon to undermine former absolute orders may evolve into ideologies whose function is to

strengthen the grip of the new economic and political elites on society. As Charles Fourier (1772-1837) writes:

> L'industrialisme est la plus récente de nos chimères scientifiques ; c'est la manie de produire confusément sans aucune méthode en rétribution proportionnelle, sans aucune garantie pour le producteur ou le salarié de participer à l'accroissement de richesse ; aussi voyons nous que les régions industrialistes sont autant et peut être plus jonchées de mendiants que les contrées indifférentes sur ce genre de progrès.(Quoted in Denis Fernandez Recatala ,1991 : 161)

In a direct hint to Adam Smith, Fourier takes England as an illustration of the misery that the exaggerated optimism in science had engendered:

> Voila le vol sublime de l'industrie vers la perfectibilité . . . et cependant, chaque année voit éclore une douzaine de philosophies nouvelles sur « la richesse des nations » : que de richesse dans les livres, que de misère dans les chaumières !
> A ces illusions, opposons les réalités : est-ce un vol sublime que la situation de Londres, qui, [tout en étant] le grand foyer de l'industrie [totalise] 332000 pauvres(Ibid., p.165).

These voices grew louder, mainly in France and England formed a chorus which increased workers' consciousness in their power as a class and their capacity to alter the existing unfair order. Instead of improving the workers' conditions industry and machines led to the devaluation of the worker and his marginalisation. There was a growing conviction that the revolution that had occurred in the physical and the natural order should penetrate and transform the social order.

Incarnated by such social reformers as Richard Owen in England, Charles Fourier and Etienne Cabet in France and thinkers, like Pierre Joseph Proudhon , Carl Marx and Friedrich Engels, a new trend of thought representing the workers' aspirations projected to alter the capitalist order based on the private ownership by a minority industrialists and plutocrats for means of production and capital. In his ***Critique of Political Economy*** (1859), Karl Marx unveiled the mechanisms whereby the ruling minority uses the political institutions to perpetuate its domination on society. In 1848, he issued , with F. Engels, ***The manifesto of the Communist Party*** (1848) denouncing the alienating influence of industry on the workers who were robbed of their work, made financially dependent on the bourgeois

capitalists, and turned into reified extensions of the machines. The manifesto called the proletarians of the world to unite and realise the dictatorship the proletariat; the logical and final outcome of the process of historical materialism. Workers' class-consciousness grew in proportion with the development of industry from the late 19th century until the unexpected Bolshevik revolution which overthrew the reign of the Tsars in Russia.

However, the materialization of these two antagonistic utopian trends into political system underpinned by official ideologies proved both unsatisfactory. Neither capitalism, as an outcome of liberal thought and the theory of "The invisible hand" which had triumphed in England, the United States and Germany from the middle of the nineteenth century up to great slump, nor the success of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 which evolved into a communist state whose strategic aim was to turn the world into a ―classless society free of exploitation‖ under the dictatorship of the proletariat seems to have kept its utopian promises.

The moment of their realisation, both systems evolved into ideologies resorting to different strategies but having as a unique motive force the rulers' indomitable "will to power‖, and as an ultimate objective total domination and control of society. It is at precisely that moment that thinkers, realising the possible subversion of utopian thought into a totalitarian system, appeal once again to dystopian thought as a means to unveil utopianism in power as ideology and create appropriate conditions for its transformation or its prevention.

The texts we have selected for consideration constitute interesting case studies for various reasons. If the utopias of the late nineteenth century are often described as 'escape from history' Keith Booker notes, the dystopian impulse that informed the literature of the twentieth century is to be interpreted as 'a return into history' (Booker: 2005). The alienating influence of modernity and Taylorism, the horrors of Nazism and the excesses of Soviet Stalinism have imposed on writers and social thinkers a toning down of the exaggerated faith in progress. In face of the growing grip of the modern structures of power on the social

subject and a gradual evolution of modern societies into carceral systems, to borrow a Foucauldian metaphor, writers such as Aldous Huxley and George Orwell have expressed legitimate suspicion as to the ends progress was being put to. Dystopian literature calls for a lucid re-examination of the promises and perversions of progress as it affects the liberal consumerist society of Huxley's ***Brave New World*** (1932), or the egalitarian‖ communist society which assumes the nightmarish totalitarian state so artfully pictured by Orwell in ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1949).

While legitimately doubtful about the promises of progress, the fact that technological progress has reduced distances and made our modern world more organic is admitted by all. Economic globalisation has been made inevitable by industrial development, faster and more reliable communications, and commercial expansion. However, competition over resources and markets has engendered imperial expansion and continuous wars, which- given the destructive potential of the latest weapons used during the two World Wars- could result in the annihilation of the human race. For the whole of humanity to enjoy the boon of progress, the modern utopia should not only be socialist in outlook but global in scope as well. This was the solution advocated by H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell who call for the institution of a sovereign World State that would grant peace and shared prosperity for the human race. Only, in the projected global system, utopia gives way to pragmatism and real politic. This new system is to be ruled by an aristocracy of disinterested executives and theorists who have imposed themselves as the fittest to rule.

In the late nineteenth century, as Kumar put it, ―tales of advanced mechanical civilizations jostled those of simple back-to-nature utopias‖ (Kumar, 1991: 65). ***Erewhon*** (1871), Samuel Butler's utopia, draws upon two founding texts of the utopian tradition: Sir Thomas More's ***Utopia*** (1506), and Jonathan Swift's ***Gulliver's Travels*** (1726). Samuel Butler resorts to satire to reflect critically upon Victorians' institutions, their Darwinian ideas,

their mores and values in an age of transition from agrarianism to industrialism, an age of vain opposition to the triumphant advance of mechanisation, and imperial expansion.

Edward Bellamy‘s ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** (1887), was published in the period of the Great Depression and labour unrest. Bellamy‘s response to the seemingly irreconcilable demands of the workers and those of the captains of industry took the form of a gradual peaceful evolution into a utopian form of state socialism in which the ―national trust‖ was the sole owner of all the natural resources, industries, and stores of the nation. The economy of this centralised state is run by an ―Industrial Army‖ committed to the service and happiness of the nation; an army whose officers hold managerial positions. This system has the merit to reconcile the aspirations of the working classes for increased comfort and happiness, and the dreams of the industrial elites for increased economic efficiency and positions of leadership both nationally and globally. The success and popularity of Bellamy‘s reformist utopia was immediate and widespread not only in the USA but throughout the industrialised west.

The success of Bellamy‘s over centralised industrial system worried William Morris who deprecates it as a bourgeois strategy to prevent a proletarian revolution from happening. He suspects Bellamy‘s reformism of complicity with capitalism when he postpones the advent of the socialist state to a remote point in the future. Morris‘s News from Nowhere (1890) is a rejoinder from a guild socialist who did not share Bellamy‘s vision on the nature of the future socialist state, the way to achieve it, and the kind of ethics that would inform it. For Morris, the future socialist state which will be achieved through revolutionary action is a decentralised pastoral state from which the alienating and dehumanising influence of industrial organisation are banned.

Like their predecessors, nineteenth-century utopias albeit seemingly not concerned with the here and now, drew most of their substance and form from the historical reality which represented their object of critical analysis. By reflecting back to their societies the improved

version of their flawed state, utopias hint at the inconsistencies of the on-going orders and suggest appropriate remedies to them. Thus, Samuel Butler‘s ***Erewhon*** is deeply concerned by the Victorian mores, values and practices which he unveils as ideological artefacts that sustain the order. Edward Bellamy‘s ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** reflected America‘s aspirations to reconcile industrial efficiency with social justice, which constitutes a precondition for social stability. The political democracy that had for the first time been successfully instituted in the New World could not vie unless it was sustained by an economic democracy that would grant its citizens, thanks to ―The Religion of Solidarity‖, equal access to the fruit of the new Eden. In a period of growing awareness of the national self as a vanguard of humanity, Bellamy suggests to disseminate the U.S. model of economic and political organisation to the old corrupt world and its backward parts to insure its economic and moral regeneration. Interestingly, the seed of globalisation sown by Bellamy in the late nineteenth century seems to have taken root. Hegemonic aspirations were not absent from this vision and the discourse that sustains it. Later utopian or dystopian texts have integrated this dimension into their narratives, and our modern world is largely mapped and represented from a globalist perspective.

It is no surprise, then, that the two dystopias included in this thesis are global in scope. ***Brave New World*** (1932) represents the outcome of the bourgeois liberal thought which culminated into a technocratic global world state under the rule of a board of scientists called "World Controllers***". Nineteen Eighty-four (***1949) represents the accomplishment of the socialist state:―the classless society‖, in which Big Brother the mythical leader of the revolution and the Party control everyone and everything.

Both ―systems‖ depicted in the novels take root in the utopian literature and the philosophical constructs of the Enlightenment period. Huxley‘s world appears to echo the hopes and the dreams of the humanists and the bourgeois as expressed in Shakespeare‘s ***The Tempest*** (1994),

Francis Bacon‘s ***New Atlantis*** *(1626),* Auguste Comte‘s ***Le Systéme de Politique Positive*** (1858) and H.G. Wells’s ***A Modern Utopia*** (1905). Huxley‘s satirical attacks on the sacralisation of science and Western utilitarianism express the scepticism and disillusion of the author and that of his contemporaries as to the ends to which scientific and technical progress were being put to in the modern world. Jonathan Swift‘s art of satire as expressed in ***Gulliver’s Travels*** is probably not foreign to Huxley’s work.

Orwell‘s imaginary world, on the other hand, represents the realisation of the socialist aspirations and the proletarian revolution predicted by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their ―Manifesto of the Communist Party‖ (1848).Orwell‘s dystopia may also have been inspired by James Harrigton‘s ***Oceana*** (1656) as a means to remind the readers of the betrayal‖ of the ideals of the Civil War by Cromwell. Orwell examines how the utopian socialist premises envisioned by the socialist thinkers of the late 18th and early 19th centuries have shaped Oceania, Orwell‘s ―ideal‖ state projected in ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1949). Disillusion and a feeling of betrayal are also present in Orwell‘s fiction in which socialism assumes the nature of an unquestionable dogma, Big Brother the status of an infallible deity. As outcomes of utopian trends, the two novels question the blind belief in continuous progress which underlies the Enlightenment project. Writing in periods of growing ideological fanaticism, the 1930s and the period of the Cold War, the authors wanted to warn against the exploitation of human natural gullibility and the subversion of his aspirations into instruments of control and subjection. What the two authors were concerned by is the total grip of the systems on the social subject in the modern world. Manipulation in the consumerist liberal world and coercion in the totalitarian state have alienated modern man and turned him into the subject of power structures beyond his control.

Globalisation Old and New.

Religious millenarianism of the Middle Ages evolved into a call for the workers of the world to unite and found the dictatorship of the proletariat to oppose the forces of global capitalism made inevitable by the development of communication, the steady increase of industrial output, and concomitantly the quest for larger amounts of raw materials, sources of power, labour and larger markets. International competition over the control of markets had already resulted in two World Wars. The institution of instruments of regulation and governance was vital in a world where a nuclear conflict threatened to annihilate human civilisation.

Conclusion

Time and the latest evolution of events seem to have confirmed the globalist vision of such thinkers as E. Bellamy, H.G.Wells, and Bertrand Russell. Today‘s world, which has been made strongly organic by the revolution in communication technology, is controlled by the technologically and economically fittest nations. The Darwinian aspirations expressed ***in A Modern Utopia*** (1905) under an aristocracy of the Samurai and Bertrand Russell‘s call for the institution of a World Government are present in today‘s geostrategic trends. Humanity seems about to land at the global utopia again.

Chapter Two: Theoretical Grounding of the Research: Thought as Social Practice

The study of the different texts may inform us about the influence of utopian thinking on the evolution of social theory and politics in England and the U.S.A. The impact of social as well as physical sciences on society brought about increased aspirations for welfare, happiness, justice, and order, which often failed to materialise. This culture of expectancy, which reflected the different aspirations and apprehensions of conflicting strata, informed the utopian texts of the late nineteenth century and those of the twentieth that we have selected for consideration. In fact, as outcomes of the dialectical interplay of social practice and utopian thought, England and the USA, whether in the late 19th century, or during the Cold War period, probably bore the traces of utopian thought both in their institutions and practices. Moreover, I hope to shed some light on the contribution of the intelligentsia in the struggle for power between the different social classes within society and towards issues outside their country. My interest in utopian thought as a key to analysing society comes from my belief, a belief I share tentatively with Karl Mannheim (1936) that 'thought is socially determined' and with Norman Fairclough's that 'linguistic phenomena are social phenomena of a special kind' (Fairclough, 2001: 21).

My concern to pay special attention to the conditions that give rise to utopian thought comes from the belief that, like any other action in society, utopian thought which represents the ideal counterpart to reality is a reaction to certain specific conditions of being. As such, it is conceived in Mannheim's theory either as a purposeful act directed towards the improvement of the conditions that have produced it, or as a means of temporary escape from the contingencies of history. Thus, once I have identified the aspects of utopian societies as ideal counterparts of the on-going ones it may be possible to infer the aspects of the on-going society against which the utopia was constructed. Further, I analyse and discuss the nature and function of utopian writing in the light of recent studies defining knowledge as socially

determined cultural resource or social capital, and speech or writing as social practice oriented towards the pursuit of ends common to a given social group. Indeed, for Marxist thinkers such as J.P. Sartre, the social subject uses thought as a tool to mediate his social environment in much the same way as he uses a tool to mediate and transform the natural world (Sartre,1948: 105). The same procedure will be followed in our attempt to grasp and analyse the eruption and function of dystopian thought.

Furthermore, I attempt in all situations to analyse the position of the authors as social subjects taking into account the various forces that shape their outlook and the use they make of their act of writing as social practice. The term "subject" is used in the present research as defined by Norman Fairclough , as a term having a 'felicitous ambiguity' meaning both one under the jurisdiction of a higher authority and an agent performing an action. As this theorist explains: 'In one sense of *subject*, one is referring to someone who is under the jurisdiction of a political authority, and hence passive and shaped; but the *subject* of a sentence, for instance, is usually the active one, the ―doer‖, the one causally implicated in action (Fairclough:2001,p.32).Indeed, an agent cannot act meaningfully and efficiently unless there are conventions, here the world view, the code and the shared aspirations of his group, within which to act.

I make mine the function attributed by Norman Fairclough, Mikhael Bakhtin, and Karl Mannheim to language use as social practice, and undertake to argue the claim that utopian and dystopian writing, like any other use of language in society, may function as discourse. As such, both of them vehicle a series of commonsensical assumptions and manifest an interpretation of the world congruent with the interests of its respective group which purports to silence another or other possible interpretations (Fairclough 2001:p. 64).This act of writing informs about the subject position or the author as, a recipient of the values and interests of his group through his cultural capital, and as an agent, through his social practice-

his act of writing- of a function in the service of the maintenance of the existing social order or its transformation (Ibid: 52-53).

Definition of concepts: Utopia, Ideology, Dystopia.

We shall now proceed to define the concepts of utopia and dystopia and attempt to identify their relationship to each other and to the social reality that provokes them. Only once these concepts have been made clear shall we give an overview of utopian thought and discuss its relation to reality.

We share Keith Booker‘s belief that utopian and dystopian thoughts entertain a dialectical relationship and constitute, in the last resort, two faces of the same coin whose critical function aims at the improvement of the social order and the achievement of commonwealth. In his book ***Dystopian literature: A theory and Research Guide,*** he defines

> . . . dystopian literature[as] specifically that literature which situates itself in direct opposition to utopian thought, warning against the potential negative consequences of arrant utopianism. At the same time, dystopian literature generally also constitutes a critique of the existing social conditions or political systems, either through critical examination of the utopian premises upon which those conditions and systems are based or through the imaginative extensions of those conditions and systems into different contexts that more clearly reveal their flaws and contradictions (Booker, 2005:187).

Next to Keith Booker, we shall borrow Carl Mannheim‘s definitions of ideology, utopia and counter utopia, a term which he uses to refer to dystopia. Mannheim‘s definitions (1936) are useful for they define ideology, utopia and dystopia as world views used by different social groups as strategies in their struggle for social control.

The Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary theory defines ―utopia‖ as an imaginary place or state of things in which everything is perfect. Etymologically, the word takes its origin from the Greek ‘*ou”* meaning (not) or good, and ‘*topos’* meaning place (ibid).Thomas More (1516) was the first to coin this word which came to mean: ―a place where all is well but that exists nowhere‖ Historically, it refers to an ideal republic, an earthly paradise close Homer‘s description of the ―Elysian Fields‖ or another version of Esiod‘s ***―The Isle of the***

Blessed" (ibid) Christianity reinforced the myth that ***The City of God*** (ibid)couldbe reached by man through observance of God's word. We will use the term ―utopian‖ in the present dissertation as defined by Karl Mannheim (1936) as: ‗those orientations transcending reality . . . which, when they pass over into conduct tend to shatter either partially or wholly the order of things prevailing at the time'(p.192).

As mentioned in the introduction, utopian thinking seems to have developed alongside human existence from the dawn of history till modern times. It has constituted an ideal counterpart of that which is by imagining how it should be, and thus contribute to improve existence by bringing reality close to the ideal. When action, based on thought or idea as a counterpart to an oppressive reality transforms existence, there arises a fresh desire to transcend the new order, the ―topia‖ and so on indefinitely. In his **Outlines of the Principles** of History, Droysen J. G., sums up this dialectical relationship between existence and thought as follows: '. . . that out of the already given conditions, new thoughts arise and out of the thoughts new conditions- this is the work of me' (cited in Mannheim, 1936: 199).

The study of the different texts is based on the view; a view held by many linguists and social theorists, that there is a tight, dialectical relationship between society and the thoughts of its social subjects. This intricate relationship between being and thinking, existence and ideas, has inspired historians to study man's ideas as a means to learn about his life in society. Indeed, there has developed a growing awareness among historians of thought and sociologists that the study of social history is inseparable from the study of the history of ideas (Foucault: 1982). The study of how man thinks, which is usually conditioned by his existence, can inform about his life as a member of a social group with whom he shares a certain number of values, interests and an attitude and interpretation of life.

It is this view which Mannheim(1936) developed in his book ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge .***He posits the existence of a tight

relationship between thought and interest groups in society. As a result of this claim, ideas can best be understood when they are analysed in the historical -social context in which they are produced. Accordingly, the thinking subject is to be regarded as a social agent and, therefore, his thought as a social action which is usually determined by the position he holds in one of the social strata. In this respect, ―individual‖ thought as social action is to be interpreted in relation to the outlook, thinking categories and interests of his group. The approach developed by Karl Mannheim, "The Sociology of Knowledge", seeks to analyse how theories produced in society express the interests of specific social strata(Mannheim,1936: 267).

The sociology of knowledge is of particular interest to our research because it helps to understand how on-going social orders give rise to certain thoughts, and how these thoughts in turn contribute to shaping the social orders in the sense of maintaining or transforming them. In this respect, conflicting thoughts which characterise a given historical-social situation can be explained as a struggle between different social strata for social control (ibid).

The intellectual crises which manifest themselves in the form of a confrontation between different interpretations of the world each of which attempts to impose itself as the most natural, is to be interpreted as a conflict between social groups with conflicting interests. The social group whose interpretation of the world pervades society is the one which achieves social predominance. Mannheim (1936) claims that

> [. . .] the struggle for power takes place not only in the economic or political fields but also. . . in the diverse interpretations of the world which,[. . .] when their social background is uncovered reveal themselves as intellectual expressions of conflicting groups struggling for power'(ibid: 269).

It is through the analysis of these conflicting ideas that historians of thought hope to reach an objective understanding of historical-social processes as temporary outcomes of never ending social conflicts.

The strategy of the different antagonists in their quest for social predominance consists in "unmasking" the opponent's interpretation of the world as being socially rooted, and consequently subservient to the interests of the group that bears it. This struggle for power which took the form of an intellectual crisis in modern times is reduced by Karl Mannheim (1936), for the sake of clarity, to 'two slogan like concepts: ideology and utopia' (ibid: p.39). According to him, ideology and utopia are two complementary faces of the same coin whose interaction is at the origin of the historical process of evolution.

For him, "ideology" refers to the tendency among the ruling group 'to obscure the real condition of society both to itself and to others and thereby stabilize it (ibid: p.40)'. "Utopia" on the other hand, constitutes the opposite tendency to the ideological outlook. It stands as the counterpart to ideology since it is borne by the rising strata of society or those who act on their behalf, and are not satisfied by the on-going order of things. The bearers of this outlook are'intellectually so interested in the destruction and transformation of a given condition that they unwittingly see only the elements in society that tend to negate it' (ibid).

Clearly, "ideology" and "utopia" are discourse instruments deployed by competing social groups to maintain or change unequal relations of power. Members of the ruling class attempt in their thinking to conceal the unequal relations of power by presenting the on-going order as the only valid and natural one so as to strengthen and maintain it, and by so doing preserve their dominant position(ibid). Conversely, members of the rising strata who aspire to challenge the predominance of the ruling group are not interested in things as they are but rather in things as they ought to be , hide or ignore in the real situation any positive element that may weaken their determination to transform the existing order which is thus considered as absolutely evil. Clearly "ideology" represents the outlook of the ruling elite while "utopia" represents the world view of the class or group which aspires to control society.

These two positions seem irreconcilable as any element that may shake the confidence of their promoters in the validity of their interpretation is swept aside. The ideological mentality strives to present the here and now, "*the topia,*" as the ideal while the utopian mentality rejects reality as absolute evil and strives to construct and ideal order, a utopia, as a substitute to the unfair prevalent order elsewhere or in the future. In this relentless struggle, power and social control are achieved by the group which succeeds to impose its interpretation of the world, its conventions, as the only ones compatible with reason and common sense. Norman Fairclough (2001) explains "conventions" and "common sense" as ideological instruments resulting from struggle for power. They are used by the dominant strata to naturalise and perpetuate their dominant status. Thus, they are ideological instruments since their function is precisely to sustain relations of domination and subjection through hegemony Fairclough, 2001: 87-89). Hence, to undermine the adversary's position and limit his drive to total domination usually depends on the ability to unmask his interpretation of the world as being socially determined and interest-bound.

Originally developed by Marxist thinkers, this technique of unmasking became a weapon used by intellectuals linked to the different social strata in their struggle for power and political control in the modern age (Mannheim 1936). Indeed, each of the conflicting groups attempts to shake its opponent's confidence in its thinking and thereby reduce its influence and capacity to shape and control society. Utopian thought suggests that the prevailing order is unfair and therefore stirs aspiration to change it. In their turn, the classes in power feeling their position jeopardised by the transforming power of the utopian thought depreciate this latter as a mere opinion, a vaporous dream that is unlikely to be achieved ; or they rely on some myth or orthodoxy that idealises the on-going order to hide its flaws and prevent its transformation.

As a result of the systematic use of this technique of unmasking of the adversary‘s thinking as an instrument in the service of power, there grew among the intellectuals of different social origins and allegiances an attitude of scepticism towards thinking which came to be perceived as an instrument of deception. Thenceforth, statements pronounced by a thinker as a social subject are not taken at their face value but are analysed as functions or actions of this subject which are determined by the historical- social position and so oriented towards the realisation of certain ends congruent with the interest of the subject and his group (ibid).

This sceptical view oriented historians of thought, social theorists and certain linguists to look for the social determinants of ―individual‖ thought and its use as function in the service of collective purposes. Accordingly, a subject‘s utterance or statement is tainted with ideology when he is no longer considered as an independent individual but rather as a member of a group whose mental structure and outlook are bound by the conservative outlook of his group. Further, the statement of the subject is to be analysed not only in its social context as a weapon used by the member of a social group in its struggle against another over social predominance but also in its relation to other statements in the social field of discourse. Foucault argues that ‘the manifest discourse is [. . .] no more than the repressive presence of what it does not say’ (Foucault, 1997: p. 241). It remains for the analyst to discover the voice that has been silenced.

In this respect, the statement thus produced can constitute a **rejection**, **transformation** or **reactivation** (emphasis added) of another statement pronounced under different historical-social conditions or from a different social perspective. Consequently, utopian thought, when it results in the transformation of the on-going order, is to be interpreted as ―a counter-ideology‖; for unlike the ideological drive which is interested in the preservation of reality as it is, the utopian statement strives to transform reality and alter the existing relations of power.

The modern times, a period characterised by rapid changes, social ascension of certain strata and tension at various levels, a tension that often took the form of struggle between ideology and utopia, normalisation and transformation, no one could foretell with a fair amount of certainty which of the two outlooks would come out victorious.

The historical process is the result of the continuous shift in power between competing groups with these two basically opposing outlooks: the ideological and the utopian. The moment the rising social group that bears the utopian outlook succeeds to alter the relations of power and impregnate most of the society, especially the institutions and values, with its interpretation of the world, the utopian outlook evolves into an ideology and presents itself as the only valid and natural order and so, strives to maintain the prevalent state of things indefinitely (Mannheim: 1936). At that moment, the stratum which has newly reached social predominance attempts to freeze historical evolution by turning some of its utopian thoughts into ideological instruments in the service of preserving the newly constituted order. Once again, other social strata which have lost their dominant social status or which feel oppressed or marginalised by the newly constituted order develop a dystopian outlook and strive through a counter utopia, or dystopia, to alter the new ideological order based on utopian premises. Dystopia may also be used to counter the transforming influence of utopian trends by projecting in the future the appalling consequences of their materialisation.

An example of utopian thought which had been perverted into an ideology is the attempt by the bourgeois liberals to present freedom, reason, and science as an infallible substitute to the religious world view of the Church and the monarchies of divine rights. Once in power, the bourgeoisie placed such faith in reason and science that they evolved into an orthodoxy that admitted no contending view. Similarly, socialism which was originally a thought of utopian nature which aimed at overthrowing the capitalist order to institute the dictatorship of

the proletariat, was subverted into a totalitarian ideology in the service of a bureaucratic oligarchy once it had reached power.

Once the liberals had reached power, the situationally transcendent ideas of brotherhood, freedom, equality and happiness flourished alongside social and economic inequalities, exploitation and even slavery (Mannheim, 1936). They functioned as ideologies for they concealed the iniquities of liberalism in power. Later socialism which was originally a utopian idea was mystified into an ―ideal system‖ and used such concepts as revolution, brotherhood and equality as deluding ideological artifacts to shield from view the subjection of society by a ruling oligarchy of bureaucrats and party members. Thus, language as a vehicle of thought which serves the stratum in power to naturalise its interpretation of the world and preserve its dominant status is also used by the rising stratum to unmask the rulers' interpretation of the world as an ideology in the service of maintaining unequal relations of power.

When the social stratum bearing the utopian outlook controls society and imposes its world view, and the utopian outlook evolves into a totalitarian ideology that tends to freeze history, there arises a fresh desire from emerging social strata to alter it. This trend which strives to prevent the evolution of utopia into an ideology takes the form of a dystopia or counter utopia.

Dystopia is an imaginary society that is the total antithesis of utopia. Certain academic circles (Mannheim)find the term anti-utopia more appropriate for the function it is assigned is precisely to counter the transforming or rather 'the freezing' influence of utopian thought on society and history. It usually refers to an imaginary society that was originally meant to improve man's being in the world. However, some fatal flaw or miscarriage in the execution of its plans or the strategy of its realisation produced the exact opposite of the effect it was expected to produce. Etymologically, the term ―dystopia‖ is a Greek word made up of the prefix *"dys"* meaning ill or bad, and *"topos"* meaning place. It was first mentioned by John

Stuart Mill in a parliamentary speech (***Encyclopedia Britannica***:2006] in 1868. However, the dystopian genre had been used in 1726 by Jonathan Swift in his famous satirical novel ***Gulliver's travels***. This form of writing was used as early as the Greek times under the form of lampoons. Indeed, Michel Foucault informs us that a lampoon was a text written by a Greek aristocrat praising as virtues the most manifest flaws of democracy. It was, for the Greek aristocrats, a satirical way of unmasking rule by the *"demos"* as the cause of anarchy and chaos. This form of criticism was to be reactivated by many other writers among whom we can mention Samuel Butler, Yevgueni Zamyatin, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell to name but a few.

Eruption, Aspects, and functions of Utopia.

One immediately notices that both the technocrats of the capitalist system and those of the socialist system appeal to science and education to rationalise a certain social organisation projected as the only valid way to achieve social stability and subjects' well-being and happiness. In both social systems, the social subject is conditioned to behave in such a way as to meet the expectations of the institutions, social orders, as well as those the group of which he is a member. He is assigned a role and acts as an element within a system. As such he loses initiative and free will. In a technocratic state, whether capitalist or communist, social subjects' thoughts and actions are constrained by reason rather than superstition or coercion. Pour les technocrates', Jurgen Habermas observes,

> le contrôle de la société faisant suite au contrôle de la nature est devenu un problème d'ordre technique. . . .
> Ils veulent contrôler la société de la même manière que la nature en la reconstruisant selon le modèle des systèmes autorégulés de l'activité rationnelle par rapport à une fin et du comportement adaptatif. Cette orientation n'est pas le fait des seuls technocrates de la planification capitaliste ; il en est de même pour les technocrates du socialisme bureaucratique (Habermas ,1973 :65).

The utopias of the enlightenment expressed an equal rejection of the monarchies of divine rights and the radicalism of the peasants. Faith was placed in the growing capacity of man to retrieve the laws of nature and exploit it. Science came gradually to assume the function of a

new religion which was to perfect the social body by improving its individual components or systems. In modern societies which are essentially modern technological societies, religion and metaphysics are cast out. Society is organised as a system whose inner logic is to achieve a predetermined end; the *sumum bonum* or the maximum happiness of the social subjects and the harmony of the social body by relying on science and technology rather than on religion or metaphysics.

Appropriate organisation, techniques and processes are mobilised to reach the end. Human welfare being a technical problem taken in charge by scientists, there is no need to appeal to something called God, morals or religion**.** However, as explained in ***Utopia*** and ***The New Atlantis*** time is frozen in an eternal repetition of the same present**.** Nothing new happens and even if there are no written laws, the ideology of the ruling elite pervades society in such a way that the actions of the social subjects are totally conditioned. This is achieved technically either through genetic manipulation or education which takes the form of conditioning.

In fact the social subject experiences alienation as his thoughts and actions are determined by the rulers. As a result reality is no more than an endless repetition of the present. In short, historical evolution is brought to an end. Another important aspect is the ideal on which traditional utopias are built is the quest for perfection. Because of this quest for perfection, deviance from the utopian norms is perceived as a natural or technical defect which is simply corrected or eliminated. Perfection requires strict normalisation of social subjects, values and institutions to prevent disorder. Deviant subjects are marginalised, exiled, or eliminated. This explains the attitude of the enlightened white man towards the non Europeans. These are integrated in the European self through civilisation or simply ―exploited‖ in the form of labouring force like the rest of the natural resources that happen to exist on his land. The other is considered as a ―living tool‖, an attitude already

present among the Greeks towards the "barbarians (***Encyclopedia Britannica***:2006)

The modern utopia, Philip Novak notes, is a totally cultural product where, modern Man accedes to power. Commenting on Nietzsche, Novack goes on to explain that through science and technology, the most positive manifestations of culture, the enlightened subject, rid of the burden of moral considerations of good and evil, moved by his indomitable will to power, accedes to the status of over man, the modern Prometheus, the creator and master of his world (Novak: 1996, pp.132-137).The triumph of intellectual and technical power made possible by the Enlightenment project confirmed this Darwinian vision. The fittest were to create and to shape the modern world. The "perfect" citizen in capitalist societies, like most of the commodities or resources on the market, says Norman Fairclough, is ―produced‖ out of need, conditioned to hold a position and to perform obediently the function assigned to him in the social system, by a hierarchically superior, usually benevolent power which delivers him from the anguishing questions of existence and even from his free will. According to Jean Servier(1967), this quest for order in which the social subject is reduced to the proportions and functions of a cell in the body has been expressed by philosophers like Plato, Saint Simon, and Auguste Comte.

This is the deal proposed to man in modern times: total submission to the will of the new lords a submission which acquired the status of a religion in return for the achievement of happiness. These were the main ideological elements of the rising bourgeoisies that had aspired to achieve power and order society. According to Saint Simon, government should be entrusted to successful industrialists and scientist whose task will consist of carrying out God's will to achieve man's welfare and happiness. Saint Simon claims that

> [. . .] dans la société qui vient, les comtes et les barons de l'industrie, organisés hiérarchiquement d'après les mérites, seront les juges naturels des intérêts matériels de cette société, comme les seigneurs du Moyen Age étaient les juges naturels des intérêts matériels de la société militaire (cited in Servier,1967 :24).

According to him, ‘the absolutism of religion’, should make room to, ‘the absolutism of reason and science’ (ibid).

The utopian socialist thought which in its turn aimed at countering and correcting the iniquities of the liberal bourgeois system did no better than produce another totalitarian ideology. All those ideal theories which placed man as their end threatened to lead to the end of man. The moment of its realization, the dream turned out to be a nightmare it threatened to bring the historical process and, with it man, to an end. Hence the need for a counter-utopia was felt to protect society from a new form of totalitarian ideology. Krishan Kumar has rightly noted that ‘anti-utopia is the shadow of utopia’.

Eruption, Aspects and Functions of Dystopia

A dystopian society is usually characterised by an oppressive social control under a totalitarian system. It is often stratified into a rigid caste system that allows no social mobility. Individual uniqueness or originality is often inexistent. Instead of individual identities, the rulers who are usually hidden from sight and whose will pervades society through institutions and various myths, values and practices, fashion social members who, like parts of a complex machinery or the organs of a body, are ‘conditioned’ to perform the specific functions and display the desired social behaviour that would insure the undisturbed continuity of the system (Huxley: 1977).

In such a system where the family as the basic social cell is suppressed, Richard Coyne observes, emotions of love and loyalty which ought naturally to be directed towards the family are usually diverted towards professional corporations, the system, or some mythical leader. Besides, social members are under the complete control of the rulers who withdraw behind some anthropomorphised machinery, principle or idea in a dystopian state, intimacy is inexistent as members‘ movements are constantly scrutinised by hidden cameras or their punctuality and other actions controlled by machines or constrained by any other

principle such as “public utility” or “economic efficiency”. In short, subjection and conformism are the most highly praised virtues while free will and originality are perceived as folly (Coyne: 1983, p.21).

In such a system, historical process which is the result of social contradictions, struggle over privileged positions and change in power relations is brought to an end as there is complete submission from members whose consciences are stuffed with the ideas, cultural patterns and the will of the power holders. Man also seems to be brought to an end and made into a mere recipient programmed by the power holders to reproduce the same beliefs, the same assumptions and thus the same power relations over and over again.

In a dystopian society, Hannah Arendt explains, a revolution is under way but it is only a delusion meant to give social subject an illusion of change while it is actually a revolution similar to the movement of celestial orbs; a perpetual repetition and reproduction of the structure the dynamics of which are determined by the rulers‘ will that permeates the social body and regulates, with an absolute precision, the movements as well as the relationships of the different parts to the whole (Arendt,1969: 83). There is no need for external coercion since the rulers’ will is integrated in the psyche of social subjects as the only natural and valid vision of the world.

The dystopian statement is manifested by a speaking subject through a protagonist who realises that there is something terribly wrong with his society. He is usually aware of the flaws of his society which he undertakes to unmask. For example, he realises that some founding myth, ideal or principle is used by the ruling elites as an ideological instrument to perpetuate its domination. Unfortunately, his attempts to communicate his rejection of or resistance to the oppressive order through a dialogic relation with other social subjects usually prove fruitless (Paulo Freire, 1996). As a result, opponents to a dystopian order are usually

misunderstood, isolated and helpless. In the end, they are often discovered and either crushed or converted into supporters of the dystopian system.

Hence, the dystopian order as an antithesis of utopia may express the disillusion of an intellectual elite towards the subversion of sincere aspirations of the people towards freedom or well-being into an ideology or the fear from ruling elite that a coming order based on utopian ideas would undermine their dominant status and turn into a total ideology from which any hope of salvation would be impossible. It may also express the dilemma of intellectuals to continue backing utopianism in power and run the risk of betraying their mission at the service of justice and freedom or oppose once again the utopian order which they helped to bring about and again run the risk of becoming renegades and cast out of society.

Like utopian discourse to which it stands as the binary counterpart (Derrida: 2000) the dystopian statement appears to function as discourse. According to Jacque Derrida, for concepts to acquire meaning, they should be related to their opposites or binary counter parts. For example the concept "freedom" acquires meaning only as the binary counterpart to slavery; but if the two words are equated as is the case in Orwell's dystopia 1984. Meaning becomes problematic and without meaning it becomes impossible to interpret or alter the world. By unveiling the possible outcomes of on-going utopian trends, their possible subversion in the future by power thirsty members into ideological instruments of hegemony, the speaking subject uses his knowledge to arouse a critical attitude towards the utopian discourse or societal trends and convert the aversion thus aroused into acts of resistance that would oppose, hinder and prevent the realisation of the ―ideal‖.

Furthermore, some landmarks with an important symbolic value are included in the dystopian society to render its similarity with the present society easily identifiable in the minds of the audience who establish a parallel with their society. By scratching the surface of

the dystopian society, a task which is usually undertaken by the protagonist, one easily discovers "traces' of the original society ―the lost Eden‖ in the form of familiar places, faces or practices which the new order resulting from utopian practices has concealed or destroyed

The aim of the speaking subject is manifestly to shake the consciences, point at the perverse outcomes of utopianism as totalitarianism and stir action that would prevent the materialisation of the utopian order. Social action thus stirred is directed towards maintenance and 'conservation' of the prevailing orders in their present state and the 'silencing' and prevention of aspiration to social transformation. It appears clear that dystopian writing or counter-utopia is meant as an emancipating tool against the transforming, then the freezing effect of utopian thought on the historical process once it gets hold of the levers of power in much the same way as utopian thought is expected to emancipate the social subject from the grip of ideology.

The intermittent eruption of utopian discourse seems to be linked to periods of uncertainty and social tension during which the discordant voice of a repressed or marginalised group rises to challenge the prevailing worldview and aspires to construct a new order where the causes of the tension are suppressed; an order that would grant them participation. To which representatives of the on-going order feeling their dominant position threatened by the utopians' aspiration to transform society respond through dystopian discourse unveiling utopianism as a strategy used to _naturalise' or render acceptable the pretensions of an emerging group to social predominance. In the light of the function attributed by Fairclough to language as social action ,and by Mannheim K., to thought as being socially rooted, dystopian thought appears to be used as a pre-emptive weapon against the potentially reifying power of utopian thought when it evolves into an ideology .

Clearly, both utopia and dystopia have an emancipating function. The former attempts to project, in space or in time, an ideal order as a substitute to an oppressive or an unpleasant

reality; and by so doing stirs action that will in the long run transform of the on-going "imperfect" order. The latter, on the other hand, realising the evolution of utopian thought into an ideology in the service of ruling elite unmasks the ideological function of utopia. By unveiling the ideological nature of utopia it protects social subjects from the grip of ideology and thus serves freedom.

Utopian Writers as Intellectuals

Intellectuals, Mannheim observes, are those individuals who can be found in all classes and who concern themselves with ideas and the realm of the spirit. He takes care to note that intellectuals are not '[. . .]those who bear the outward insignia of education, but those few among them who , consciously or unconsciously, are interested in something more than success in the competitive scheme that displaces the present one(Mannheim ,1936:258)'. Through their actions, these social subjects of a special kind, since they are not linked indefinitely with any given class, are interested in an ideal of truth and justice that the on-going order, in as far as it is realised, does not offer. This explains why intellectuals have often joined their action and given their voice to the social class bearing the utopian outlook and striving to transform the historical-social reality (ibid.. p259).However, as soon as the rising stratum reaches power so that reality gets closer and closer to the utopian ideal, the intellectuals who never feel content with things as they are, free themselves from the stratum in power and once again attempt to improve the existing order by resorting to a counter-utopia or a dystopia.

Freedom on the part of intellectuals from allegiance to the new ruling elite, their suspicion towards reality and the quest of the absolute takes the form of three possible alternative attitudes towards the new reality .They may become sceptical and attempt in the name of intellectual integrity to destroy, by unmasking them, the ideological elements of the new social order .They may adopt a romantic attitude and try to correct the flaws of the

present order by seeking, in the past, values and reality transcendent ideas that the on-going order has concealed. These may be religion, family allegiance, symbols and myths. Finally, the intellectuals may withdraw completely from society and take refuge in individual mystical experience. To escape the alienating influence of reality, they seek personal ecstatic experience and renounce participation in social struggle.

These three attitudes, Mannheim explains, are the basic forms of the disillusion expressed by intellectuals against the subversion of utopian ideas into ideologies. However, we should not forget that intellectuals, in spite of their quest of absolute truth and justice, remain social subjects whose thoughts and actions are constrained by such factors as their social positions, the historical period and the various struggles using thought as a weapon in struggle over social predominance (ibid.,p.259).

The function assigned to the utopian or dystopian thinker in our modern society by Karl Mannheim seems to have inspired other intellectuals like Edward Said (2001). According to Said, the true intellectual should resist the effects of ethnocentric attitudes. His task is to evaluate according to certain universal standards of, ethics , truth and justice ; a position which he can‘t achieve unless he rises above the influence of religion, race, nationality or class .The intellectual, owing to his cultural capital and his position in society, unveils what he perceives as truth by deconstructing theories , discourses and practices used by power holders to legitimise their power over and control of others, in the name of some grand ideal, a certain idea of good or justice. Edward Saïd (2001) says that ‘L‘intellectuel est donc un homme dont l’affiliation politique, l’appartenance nationale et les premières fidélités ne doivent à aucun moment, prendre le pas sur les critères de vérités attachés au malheur et à la vérité (Saïd, 2001 :9)’.

However, Julien Benda had warned us before E. Said that it is not easy to be that kind of intellectual. He explained that there are very few intellectuals in our world as most of the so-

called intellectuals are gifted people who sell out their skills to corporations or interest groups to which they are 'organically' linked. He claimed that appearances notwithstanding, _there are few king philosophers, morally straight, whose consciences and speech are not corrupted by the pursuit of practical ends (Benda, cited in Said: 2001, p.19)'. For Benda (1927), intellectuals are those who say: 'My realm is not of this world'. The remnant majority have betrayed their mission by allowing their moral authority to be used, often in return for material or symbolic compensation, in 'defense and promotion of the organisation of collective passions such as class interest, mass interest or aggressive nationalism (ibid)'.It is precisely this ideological or cultural bias, which prevents intellectuals to reach absolute objectivity that Paul Ricoeur refers to as **Mannheim's Paradox.** To reduce the effect of this bias, Mannheim, like Norman Fairclough advise analysts and critics to take into account the perspective from which they discuss the issues they raise to avoid this pitfall.

In modern times, with the spreading influence of modern mass media and their encroachment on people's representations and consciences, there is a growing tendency among power holders to allure intellectuals into granting their support to the ruling elites by disguising abuse of power under respectable forms .The rare intellectuals who refuse to barter their authority for a higher social or academic status are usually marginalised or condemned to symbolic death. This may explain the dilemma of many intellectuals towards issues of justice and truth. Either they join the cultural establishment and observe the rules of the politically correct conventions–in Fairclough's words observe the ―ideological common sense‖ of the ruling stratum-to integrate the mainstream society and see their ideas echoed and amplified, or be critical beyond the accepted limits and run the risk of losing their voice or their authority.

Because they challenged authority utopian writers have often suffered marginalisation, persecution and sometimes death. Would European present institutions be what they are had it not been for the disturbing voices of those daring dreamers and lovers of a certain idea of

man , a certain idea of truth a certain idea of justice. Does this quote by Jean Ziegler (1997) apply exclusively to utopian writers?

> Difficile de ranger parmi les héros triomphants les porteurs d'utopie. Ils sont plus familiers de la guillotine ; du bûcher ou de l'échafaud que des meetings victorieux et des lendemains qui chantent. Et pourtant !sans eux, toute l'humanité, toute espérance auraient depuis longtemps disparus de notre planète (Ziegler ,2005 :31-32).

Or, may it be applied to dystopian writers as well?

In contrast to utopian writers, dystopian ones perceiving the possible exploitation of people's legitimate aspiration to a better life may foresee the possible perverse outcomes of utopianism and warn against it. The exploitation of utopian discourse and the construction of the utopian order are usually achieved at the expense of man by power thirsty elites which exploit man's aspiration for well-being, usually with the support of the intellectual elites, which hire their voices to the rulers to legitimise the new order. Dystopia, therefore, undertakes to unveil the ideological function of utopian thought. Jonathan Swift, and after him Yevgueni Zamyatin, Aldous Huxley and George Orwell were sceptical towards the realisations of utopian societies.

The function of dystopian discourse, although it appears to be the exact opposite of utopian discourse, seems to be closely linked to the struggle for power. The difference between the two lies in the fact that utopian discourse suggests the transformation an unpleasant socio-historical reality through the pursuit of a common ideal while dystopian discourse warns against the subversion of the ideal into an instrument of hegemony and subjection and thus, emphasizes the need to conserve the present order as a better option.

Mannheim suggests that the function of the dystopian writer is similar to that of the utopian writer for it aims at protecting history and man from the deadly grip or utopia turned into a total ideology. One is tempted to espouse Fairclough's claim that in utopian discourse the speaking subject positions himself is in 'a creative position' since he attempts through his statement to alter existing relations of power while in dystopian discourse, he is in a _normative

position,(Fairclough,2001:87-89)‘ for, by projecting the nightmarish outcomes of utopian trends, the speaking subject does no more than suggest their prevention and insist on the maintenance of the on-going system and its conventions; the normalisation and perpetuation of prevailing relations of power. In spite of their apparently contradictory function, utopian and dystopian thoughts seem to pursue a common objective; an ideal of Man, freedom and social justice.

Conclusion

Clearly, the two genres may be ranked as the two sides of the same coin; discourse instruments whose aim is to emancipate the social subject from the grip of ideology. As to the occasional shifts from utopia to dystopia, I suggest that it reflects the proximity or the inclination of the speaking subject for change or conservation as a means to spare society evolution towards the fatal end of history and Man.

Before the hopes and the fears expressed both by the utopian writers in their respective novels, as to the fate of historical process and Man, we wonder whether as, intellectuals they were concerned about the fate of humanity at large, or whether, influenced by the outlook of their social or national group, they were concerned only by the fate and interests of their group to the exclusion of the rest.

Conclusion to Part One

In this first part, I have attempted to highlight the regular eruption, reactivation, discussion and rejection of utopian thought throughout history. The continuous resurgence of this genre has seemed to be linked to man‘s quest of an ideal state of being as a reaction to an unfair social order.

My purpose has been to find out whether the eruption of utopian writing was linked to specific socio-historical conditions, and then, to check whether it could be used as a ‗tool‘ or a strategy to counter the ideology of a ruling elite. The historical periods with which utopian thought coincided seem to confirm its function as a strategy used by a rising social stratum to transform relations of power by naturalising their participation in power.

The bourgeois utopianism which appealed to free will, reason and science informed society and challenged the religious world view by organising society following the laws of the physical and the natural Word. Capitalism which relied on science to legitimise its organisation of and hegemony over society was in its turn the object of Marxist attacks which unveiled it as an ideology which is based on unequal relations of power.

Socialism, on the other hand, erupted as a reaction to bourgeois capitalism. It bore the peasants‘ and workers‘ aspirations projected to correct the iniquities of capitalism through a socialist revolution that would lead through class struggle to a classless society where workers own collectively the means of production. Once in power, communism which was based on utopian premises evolved into a totalitarian ideology.

My research theme "**The Quest for Utopia from Samuel Butler to Bertrand Russell"** is approached by drawing upon Michel Foucault, Norman Fairclough and Karl Mannheim to argue and support the claim that utopian and dystopian genres are discourses. These theorists ascribe language and thought a central part in social phenomena for they consider that language use, as a product of historical-social processes and an instrument in the struggle for

power, not only reflects relations of power but contributes, as a tool whereby the world is mediated, to preserve an economic political and social status-quo or produce change. In this respect, the study of utopia and dystopia two conflicting discourses may provide valuable information about the different social groups struggling for social predominance.

After defining utopia and briefly exposing its aspects, we attempt to argue that the utopian genre seems to possess the characteristics of discourse .It is an aspiration to life in an envisioned ideal world instead of a real oppressive world which the manifested statement silences. In fact, aspects of utopia may vary from one historical period to another for they constitute the idealised counterpart of an on-going historical social reality.

I define dystopia as an antithesis of utopia and argue that in a dystopian statement the speaking subject uses his statement to construct, somewhere in the future, a society which is the outcome of utopian discourse but which, once realised, comes out to be a nightmare instead of a dream. The aspects of utopian thought which were meant to improve man‘s existence turn into ideological instruments of subjection and oppression. The subversion of legitimate aspirations to well-being into an instrument of hegemony in dystopian discourse aims at silencing the utopian aspirations for change.

In utopian discourse the speaking subject is in ‘a creative position’ and aspires to alter existing conventions and relations of power while through dystopian discourse the speaking subject is in ‘a normative position’ and attempts to deter change and maintain existing relations of power as the only normal and possible ones. It appears that both utopia and dystopia function as counter-ideologies; instruments of emancipation of the individual from the alienating influence of systems.

Finally, it is hoped that the theoretical findings of the present chapter will help to identify the utopian or dystopian aspects in the documents objects of the present research and the function they are assigned by their authors. Besides, keeping in mind the function of thought

as socially rooted and socially oriented practice, it is hoped that the study of the documents will yield some useful information about the issues at stake and the struggles over them both inside England and internationally in the period stretching from 1930 to 1950.

In the end, I discuss the function of the speaking subjects and attempt to find out whether as Edward Said's intellectual they base their action, the act of writing, on universal standards of truth and justice, or whether in Fairclough's and Ricoeur's words they are so 'constrained by the outlook of the stratum' to which organically linked that one can't fail to be sceptical about the infallibility of their sense of truth and justice as well as their concern about Man at large.

References:

- Arendt, Hannah. ***On Revolution.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

- Booker, M. Keith. ***The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature***: ***Fiction as Social Criticism.*** Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994

- Candlin, Christopher N. Et al. ***Sociolinguistics and Social Theory***. Harlow: Edited by Nicolas Coupland, Srikant Saranji, and Christopher N. Candlin, Longman, England ,2001.

- « Comte, Auguste : Système de politique positive ». Available at « *http://www.lycos.fr*, accessed: in June 2008.

- Coyne, Richard. ***Designing Information Technology in the Post-Modern Age***. Massachussetts: M.I.T. Press, 1983.

- Cuddon, J.A. ***A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory.*** London: Penguin Books, Penguin Books Ltd.,England 2001.

- Duranti Alessandro. ***Linguistic Anthropology.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Fairclough Norman. ***Language and Power.*** Essex: Pearson Education Ltd., Longman, 2001.

- Foucault, Michel. ***The Archaeology of Knowledge***. London: Routledge, 1997.

- ..... —Discourse and Truth: The Problematisation of *Parreisia".* Berkley: Berkley University Press, 1983.

- Freire, Paulo. ***Pedagogy of the Oppressed.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1996.

- Habermas, Jürgen. ***La technique et la science comme idéologie.*** Paris :Editions Gallimard, 1973.

- Huxley, Aldous. ***Brave New World.London:*** Granada Publishing Ltd.,Triad Panther Books, 1977.

- Kumar Krishan. ***Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times.*** Cambridge, Massachusetts***:*** Basil Blackwell, 1991.

- Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.*** Trans Louis Wirth and Mark Shills, New York: A Harvest book, Harcourt Brace and Company, 1936.

- Nelson, Francis. ***Shakespeare and "The Tempest".*** New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith Publisher Inc.,nd.

- Novack, Philip. ***The Vision of Nietzsche.*** Rockport: Jacob Niedelmen Editor, Massachussetts, 1996.

- Omesco, Ion. ***Shakespeare: son art et sa tempête***. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1993.

- Plant, David. « The Diggers, British Civil War and Commonwealth‖. Available at http://www.british-civil-wars.co.uk. Accessed on june 20th 2008.

- ***Platon, Oeuvres Completes.*** Paris : Gallimard, Col. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1950.

- Recatala, Denis Fernandez. ***Mémoires du futur : une anthologie de l"utopie.*** Paris: Messidor Editions Sociales, 1991.

- Ricoeur, Paul. ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia***. Chicago: Chicago university Press, 2005.

- Said, Edward. ***Des Intellectuel set du Pouvoir.*** Alger : Editions Marinoor, 2001.

- Servier Jean. ***Histoire de l"utopie.*** Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1967.

- Stafford, D. Clerc. ***Ce que Freud a vraiment dit.*** Paris :Marabout Université, Editions Stock, 1967.

- Swift, Jonathan. Gulliver‘s Travells.Middlesex, Peter Dixon and John Chalker Eds., Penguin Books, England, 1967.

- Wells, Herbert G. ***A Modern Utopia*** .London: Chapman and Hall, 1905.

- **Encyclopaedia and Internet Ressources :**

- « Auguste Comte: Système de Politique Positive ». Available at : http://www.lycos.fr. Accessed on june 20th 2008

- Braga, di Corin. « Utopie, Eutopie, Dystopie et Anti-utopie ». rivista di filosofia on-lie, http://www.metabasis.it, Septembre 2006, an I numero 2. accessed on june 10th 2008.

- ***Encyclopedia Britannica.*** Edited by Robert C. Preble, compiled under the editing staff of Encyclopedia Britannica and Louis R. Rossi; Harry Edward Hauser, London:2005

Part Two

Nineteenth-Century Utopias: Depression and the Culture of Expectancy

Introduction to Part Two

The late nineteenth- century in England and the New World was an age of progress, industry, urbanisation, and imperial expansion. It was infused with the feeling that the Baconian dynamic utopia was a realisable project. The Scientific revolution, which had boosted agricultural production and turned urban centres into workshops, fed the hope that society, under the reign of scientists, the heirs of the elders of Solomon‘s Houses, would gradually improve to provide enough for all. Meanwhile, the common ownership of goods, collective education, and welfare for all as envisioned by Plato, and later Thomas More (1516) didn‘t materialise. Worse, mechanisation and industry caused the ruin and misery of peasants and craftsmen who left the country and swarmed into the industrial centres to swell the population of paupers haunting the streets and the nights of the haves. Social protest movements such as “Luddism” and “Chartism”, and the threat of a proletarian revolution echoed the bourgeois Darwinian belief in progress and evolution towards the good society under the reign of the fittest.

Representative texts of these conflicting utopian visions to remedy the flaws of nineteenth century industrial societies are Samuel Butler‘s ***Erewhon (***1871), Edward Bellamy‘s ***Looking Backward*** (1887), and William Morris‘s ***News from Nowhere*** (1892). These utopias, besides constituting appropriate responses to the ills of their respective societies, present the merit of anticipating the challenges that modern societies would have to face. Next to the possible conflation of ideology with utopia as theorised by K. Mannheim and P. Ricoeur, these texts prefigured the issues of alienation and subjection, the depletion of power resources, environmental issues, hegemony and Imperial expansion to name only these.

The hopes placed in scientific progress by the elites were met with the frustration and disillusion of the representatives of the peasants and the workers who advocated revolution as the soundest way to the good society. This _ideological drama‘ Mathew Beaumont notes, _was played out most markedly in the political and intellectual impact of socialism on middle-class consciousness‘ (Beaumont, 2005, p.6).

The present part explores the contributions of certain representative middle class intellectuals who drew upon the utopian tradition to take part in the debate of their time with regard to the ideal schemes whereby to construct / reconstruct the modern industrial society, and the architects best fitted to supply the blue prints and undertake the reconstruction.

Chapter I: Politics, Ethics and Aesthetics in Erewhon: Samuel Butler's Ambiguous Utopia

Introduction

This chapter purports to analyse Samuel Butler's satirical treatment of Victorian institutions and values in ***Erewhon*** (1872). It focuses on the function of the utopian genre to account for the ideological struggles that inform society and its capacity to suggest cures to its ills. It draws upon Paul Ricoeur's ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*** (1975) to account for Butler's difficulty to reflect objectively on a society in which he was culturally immersed; a difficulty which Ricoeur refers to as ―Mannheim's paradox‖ and which partly explains his ambiguous attitude. A symptom of this ambivalence is the writer's recourse to satire which mocks without dismissing the values of Victorian society. Satire like carnival partakes of the integrative function of art for it allows outlets to social tension, invites critical thought and preserves social order.

Century ends are known to be periods of great expectations, and the end of the nineteenth century which had begun to reap the fruit of Enlightenment was no exception to the rule. Indeed, the triumph of empirical knowledge and reason over ignorance and superstition had produced scientific and theoretical breakthroughs, technological innovations and social progress, all of which had turned Great Britain into an orderly body politic, a busy workshop and a powerful, self-confident economic and military world power under the rule of enlightened elites. The gradual discovery of natural laws increased man's control of natural forces, opened unlimited horizons before him and strengthened his belief that ―laissez faire‖ and Free Trade were the best way to ideal state.

The fin de siècle was a period during which the hopes of the rising working classes for an improved future were echoed by the apprehensions of the middle classes that rule by the many may lead society back to anarchy. These conflicting feelings of aspiration and apprehension pervaded British society and produced a culture of expectancy that found

expression in utopian writing. As the growing economic and political influence of the workers was not translated into political terms, a feeling that something ought to be done to meet the workers pressing demands for recognition pervaded British society. However, this feeling of empathy which stirred some middle class intellectuals to act as the voice of the workers through utopias hardly concealed their fear of a proletarian revolution as the inevitable outcome of historical evolution.

For Mathew Beaumont (2005), the utopias produced at that period were meant by their authors as imagined virtual answers to the concrete demands expressed by certain social strata which if fulfilled here and now might cause the disruption of the ongoing order. They represented an external view-point from which their authors tried to understand the contradictions of their society and hint at possible schemes whereby the tensions threatening their society could be relieved. However, holding an intermediate position between the working classes and the middle classes, the utopian writers displayed an ambivalent attitude which seemed to reflect their difficulty to situate themselves socially and culturally. It is the purpose of the present article to look into the origin and the function of this ambivalence as expressed in Samuel Butler's (***Erewhon****: 1872).*

Review of the literature, Issue and Hypothesis

Published anonymously by Trubner in 1872, ***Erewhon*** has been the object of numerous critical studies. Indeed critics could be anything but indifferent to a daring work of art that undertook to strip naked the inconsistencies of Victorian society. However, while purportedly meant to 'hold a mirror up to Victorian society' (Kumar, 1991: 106) to reveal its incongruities, critics and readers alike have been baffled by the intended function of the satire. Butler's vagueness in purpose may explain the consensus reached by critics that —for all its qualities, [Butler's novel] might have been written by the Erewhonian professor of

inconsistency and evasion‖, to quote Darco Suvin who best epitomises this view (quoted in Parrinder, 2005:353).

Although meant by its author to function as a utopia, considering the anagrammatic relationship of his romance to Sir Thomas More's "Nowhere", the supposedly ideal society portrayed by Butler is deficient in the traits of a conventional utopia. In his discussion of the novel, T.J. Remington concludes that it is closer to a Swiftian satire than to 'a conventional utopian or dystopian fiction, or with modern science fiction for that matter. Set neither in an ideal future nor in an ideal past, ***Erewhon***'s imaginary society falls short of utopian fiction or dystopian satire',(Remington,1983:37). Unlike most of Butler's critics, Remington refuses to read the views expressed by the writer in the chapter entitled ―The Book of the Machines‖ as the precursor of science fiction, anticipating the horrific developments of science, but rather as a deliberate exaggeration of both the Darwinians who hold positivist views, and of the way evolutionary ideas could be distorted by conservatives in order to counter progress.

Much the same ambiguity in Butler's attitude is noted by Krishan Kumar. According to this critic, this ambiguity manifests itself through the writer's use of 'utopian form to satirise Darwinian ideas, but also to portray an alternative that [he] equally mocks and praises' (Kumar, 1996:65). Butler's possible intended aim was to warn against the quest for utopia, for any utopia is pregnant with a potential dystopia. Kumar notes '[a parallel between] the literary form of satire [. . . and] the social form of the Saturnalia, an annual festival of mockery and destruction that was also a positive re-enactment of the pleasures of the Golden Age' (ibid: 104).

Like the Saturnalia, satire might be assigned a "carnivalesque" function insofar as it provides an imaginary dimension in which the conventions, the values and the taboos that bind the social subject can be safely violated. Only, these transgressions, B a k h t i n remarks, function as a sort of safety valve playing a cathartic function (Bakhtin, 1996: 73).

While it allows the participants to indulge in all sorts of excesses and transgressions within the limits of the carnival, it actually prevents creative praxis for it helps the order to regenerate and perpetuate itself, once the tensions threatening to shatter it had been released. This form of criticism is ideological in nature for rather than transforming the on-going order, it tends to strengthen it. Although Kumar hints at the uneasy position and vague aim of the satirist, he does not, discuss the causes of this ambivalence.

The critic who probably best accounts for Butler's ambiguity is A.L. Morton who describes ***Erewhon***

> [as] the prospect of a utopia from the study window of a country rectory through the eyes of the rector's brilliant, eccentric son. And it is one of the characteristics of the rector's clever son that he is able to feel extremely detached while in fact remaining very much a part of his environment. [adding to describe the paradox in which Butler is caught: to be at the same time in an out of the system whose mores he scrutinises that] . . . he is like a weak swimmer, forever striking out from the shore and as often heading back in panic the moment he finds he is out of his depth. (Morton**,** 1969: 185-193).

Morton realises the difficulty Butler felt as a middle class intellectual, who is too content in the enjoyment of the material comforts of his position, to emancipate himself from the outlook of his group. It is, in part, this ambivalence of the utopian writer towards the "inconsistencies" of his society which this article aims to account for. More specifically, this article is premised on the assumption that Samuel Butler who set out to satirise Victorian mores was so constrained by the outlook of his class that he rather seems to condone that precisely which he "purported" to attack.

Methodology

Butler's ambivalent attitude towards the values of his society is discussed within the Marxist theoretical framework. As a onlooker, trying to observe his society from an external, ideologically neutral point of view, Butler seems to be caught in a paradox; a paradox expounded by Karl Mannheim in ***Ideology and Utopia: A Sociology of Knowledge (1932)*** and Paul Ricoeur's ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia (2005).*** Additionally, this article draws

upon Butler‘s two essays: “Life and Habit” and “Unconscious Memory” which I suggest contribute to a better understanding of Butler’s reading of Victorian institutions. However, before I embark in the discussion of the novel shall briefly present Mannheim‘s paradox.

Contention usually arises in times of economic and social change in which rising economic and social strata contest or challenge the legitimacy of the exiting order, its ideas and practices. The contending stratum, to whom the on-going order represents ‘the absolute evil’ (Mannheim, 1932), suggests an alternative system in which the flaws of the former are corrected. By superimposing the image of the ideal utopia over that of the flawed on-going order, it becomes easy for observers to identify the defects of the system object of contention. Utopia is therefore a scheme for the improvement of society**.** Like ideology, utopia resorts to ‘situationally transcendent ideas’ in its project of reordering society on ―more convenient‖ bases. However, unlike ideology which tends to naturalise the present system, the function of utopia is to shatter it. However, the same theorist takes care to precise that certain situationally transcendent ideas do not transform the existing order but aim only through wish fulfilling images at providing a temporary escape from reality. These are ideological in nature (ibid).

Starting from the hypothesis that ideas produced in society reflect the interests of the social stratum that produces them, Mannheim sets himself the task to trace the social origin of different ideas by referring them to the respective groups whose interests they vehicle. And since different thoughts or interpretations of the world are used as weapons in the defence of the interests of the social group which produces them, Mannheim attempts through a ‘non-evaluative’ approach referred to as The Sociology of Knowledge to map the social forces that inform society at a given moment of its history. However, since the sociologist himself is part of the very society he undertakes to study, and since he uses conceptual instruments bearing the cultural and ideological bias of the group that has devised them, he can‘t escape

ideological influence in his analyses, views and conclusions. This was the paradox in which Mannheim was caught, and which I tentatively suggest Butler the satirist could not emancipate himself from.

Discussion: *Erewhon* as a satire of Victorian Ethics

Erewhon is the story of a young Anglican who leaves his native home to go to some 'new colony', buy crown land, and use it for sheep breeding. He reports to have reached the new land during 'the last months of 1868' (Butler, 1872). The country having already been peopled by Europeans, the narrator is hired as a shepherd. He dreams of exploring a stretch of land that lies beyond a range of mountains hoping to find fertile land or some precious mineral ore such as gold, diamond or silver that will make his fortune. To achieve his aim, the narrator allures a native, "chowbok", with Brandy to help him cross the range. However, the latter runs away leaving the narrator alone as they are nearing a pass that was to lead him to Erewhon.

Although abandoned by his guide, the narrator resolves to cross the range whatever the dangers that might befall him. His dreams of fame and fortune were typical of the Victorian spirit of the time. The narrator who was no other man than Butler knew that

> [The risks involved in going further into the unknown] were serious considerations, but the hope of finding an immense track of available sheep country which I was determined to monopolise as far as I possibly could suffice to outweigh them; and in a few minutes, I felt resolved [. . .] that I would follow it and ascertain its value even though I should pay the penalty of failure with death. (Butler, 1872: 18)

In the meantime, the narrator regrets his failure to convert "Chowbok" to the Christian religion, not out of a disinterested charity act to save a fellow creature from damnation, but out of sheer egotistic, motives. In an ironical hint at the proselytizing mission of the Evangelists the narrator explains his efforts at converting the native by the spiritual and material benefits he would reap both in this world and in the afterlife.

> I had set my heart upon making "Chowbok"a real convert to Christian religion.
> [. . .] I was all the more inclined to save the unhappy creature from an eternity of torture by recalling the promise of St James, that if anyone converted a sinner (which Chowbok surely was) he should hid a multitude of sins. (ibid)

This passage is an ironical hint at the evangelists‘ conception of their mission and their relationship to the natives. Religion was a form of trade. Conversion was a dually profitable deal through which the missionary not only has his sins absolved but secures the natives’ submission and bodily strength in the real world as well. In return the convert receives hypothetical promises of salvation in the other world. This deal implicit in the missionaries’ efforts to convert the natives is instantiated by this lament expressing the narrator’s frustration that Chowbok ‘was stony ground, [. . .] and I could neither be of spiritual assistance to him, nor he of bodily profit to myself’ (ibid: 22).

At the summit of the pass, the hero had to summon all his strength and courage on finding himself face to face with ugly looking enormous statues, constituting the threshold to Erewhon. It was not long before he met with the inhabitants of Erewhon who were akin to Europeans apart from the fact that they were strikingly healthy and good looking. The country itself, though lagging about six hundred years behind England in terms technical progress, had much in common with the narrator‘s homeland. Technological backwardness, as the hero was soon to discover, was the result of a deliberate choice to wreck and then impose a ban on every sort machine. His being found in possession of a watch while being submitted to medical examination brought the narrator a prison sentence; for the possession of mechanical devices just like ill health and misfortune are criminalised by Erewhonian law. Fortunately, the narrator’s ‘fair hair and good health’ drew him the magnanimity of the magistrates, and the sympathy of the king and the queen (ibid: 28-30).

The narrator gradually discovers a country apparently different from his, but whose institutions, values and practices, when examined closely, reproduce and reflect, albeit in a distorted way, Victorian ones. Butler‘s Erewhon is described by Morton as

> [. . .] *a Mundus Alter et Idem*, an antipodean country like and unlike [England], in its own wisdom and its own folly, different from [it] but subtly complementary, so that it satirises and criticises on three different planes simultaneously. Its hero is at one and the

> same time Butler who satirises and a priggish young Anglican who is the object of the satire (Morton, 1969:186).

The two places, England and Erewhon, are presented as two sides of the same coin, each of which is meant to reveal and suggest cures to the ills and inconsistencies of the other. These ills, the author interestingly seems to suggest, arise from man's quest and imposition of absolute truths or radical positions whether in science, religion or morals, without submitting their validity to regular empirical examination. The imposition of these absolutes is often dictated by man's natural drive to preserve power positions rather than by a quest for truth or justice *per se*.

This propensity to satirise his contemporaries' beliefs, conventions and practices arises from the author's abhorrence of received dogmas which, he suspects, partake of intellectual, moral and social stagnation and so lead to a general entropy, deadly to creative thought and practice. In his introduction to H.F. Jones's ***The Notebooks of Samuel Butler Author of Erewhon,*** Francis Byrne Hacket describes Butler as ―a pragmatist, rebellious to intellectual conventions, habits of thought and claim for undeserved authority‖, all of which he perceives as mechanisms of ideological power. He was referred to as ― a conscientious objector‖ because he was one of the first to realise with thinkers like Nietzsche that the perpetuation of views and practices whose validity is not regularly submitted to scrutiny, perpetuates the status-quo in the interpretation of the world, and so in the relations of domination and subjection. Butler who believes that the function of an intellectual is to constantly question institutionalised truths and naturalised practices, notes that:

> The world is full of [. . .] moss grown writers who once were advanced and revolutionary. If a writer has to be paraded as heterodox, it has to be shown that he has a manner, a method of dealing with things that really deserves to be considered advanced. (Butler: Qtd in Hacket, 1910: iii)

It was probably this conviction that prevented him from siding with any of the views held regarding machinery, religion, ethics or justice, contenting himself to unveil their

absurdity when they are erected as absolutes and integrated into the ideological arsenal of power. It is equally this depiction of falsehood and hypocrisy that makes ***Erewhon*** a modern novel and Butler a vanguard social critic despite his ideological bias which I shall discuss later.

Erewhon is an Arcadian society free from the problems of industrialism. Erewhonians are healthy comely and happy. Their religion is a mixture of Greek polytheism and idolatry, and Christian monotheism. The number of church goers is steadily declining though outgrown by the adepts of "Ygdrun" the goddess of worldly pleasures. Their colleges teach conformity in thought and fight creative thinking and originality and so keep society in a state of permanent subjection to the official ideology.

The prohibition of machinery in Erewhon, despite this country's potential to become a technological power long before England, may be read as a satirical backward glance at luddites and Communists who had attacked the alienating effects of machines. It may also be interpreted as an attack on the Darwinians who hold positivist views on creation since they consider all forms of life as having gradually evolved from an original state of materiality. Appropriating the views of the evolutionists who advocate a mechanistic view of the universe, Butler lends his voice to one of the professors whose book he pretends to quote and claims that man is no more than a highly advanced machine. He then goes on to argue that since man is a highly refined machine, machines in their turn might in the course of their "evolution" become human and even surpass and overthrow him from the status of master to that of slave, considering the speed of "mechanical evolution". Anticipating on the arguments of his opponents who contend that machines cannot develop a consciousness or a free will of their own, that 'though [they] should never hear so well and speak never so wisely, they will always do the one or the other for our advantage, not their own, that man will always be the ruling spirit and the machine the servant', the professor argues further that

> […]the servant glides by imperceptible approaches into the master; and we have come to such a pass that, even now, man must suffer terribly on ceasing to benefit the machines. [. . .]How many men at this hour are living in a state of bondage to the machines? How many spend their whole lives, from the cradle to the grave, in tending them by night and day? Is it not plain that machines are gaining ground upon us, when we reflect on the increasing number of those who are bound down to them as slaves, and of those who devote their whole souls to the advancement of the mechanical kingdom?[. . .] Are there not probably more men engaged in tending machinery than in tending men? [. . .] Are we not ourselves creating our own successors in the supremacy of the earth? Daily adding to the beauty and delicacy of their organisation, daily giving them greater skill and supplying more and more of that self-regulating, self-acting power which will be better than any intellect? (Butler, 1872: 85-86)

The principle of "warfare and struggle"- that all forms of life have used with varying degrees of success; leading the stronger to outgrow, subject or prey upon the weaker that lose the struggle and give in or disappear – has been supplied to machines by man whose fitness, and very existence has come to depend on the continuous development and perfection of machinery. So now, the relation has been reversed; turning man, whose survival depends on machinery, into an 'appendage of the machine' bound to a strict observance of his duties towards his master lest he stake his existence the moment he neglects them. Although today's machines do not have senses or a reproductive system, 'if this be taken that they cannot marry, and that we are never likely to see a fertile union between two vapour-engines with the young ones playing about the door shed . . .' (ibid:87), it is because they are still in a rudimentary stage of their development and so have to perform these functions through the agency of man. However, considering the speed of their evolution, it won't be long before they become autonomous. The fact that there are machine-making machines is forerunning evidence that in the remote future they may become able to "give birth" to machines without man's intervention, or even against his desire.

There was only one attempt to counter this "thechnocide". It came from another professor who claimed that man being a 'machinate mammal' whose different organs and limbs are no more than integrated parts of the complex being; parts which have evolved to meet the contingencies imposed by his environment. It follows from this that machines and

tools can be considered as external organs and limbs of the same being to which they are subservient. The only risk involved in allowing an unrestricted development of external organs is a 'degeneracy of the human race [. . . with] the man himself being nothing but soul and mechanism, an intelligent but passionless principle of mechanical action' (ibid: 93). The point developed by the second professor is that machines which are an inevitable by-product of human civilisation have greatly added to men's and nations' power and sense of comfort. It is the possession of these extracorporeal means that make a difference between the mighty and the weak, the rich and the poor, a civilised race and a race of savages. It may even be to the advantage of man to be ruled by machines for these latter are less inclined to emotional disturbance or prejudice and usually grant due reward to their servants. Still, in spite of the validity of these arguments, it was said that the first contender had the best of it and so a ban was imposed on machines and their possession outlawed.

Here a certain number of things have to be noted. The first and foremost is the author's attempt at keeping aloof with respect to the debates and struggles that informed British society; regularly resorting to satire or irony where he feels that ideas and conventions are used to secure or maintain positions of power. He takes care, as an author, never to claim a definite truth, but uses various characters such as Higgs, the hero of ***Erewhon,*** and the professors he meets there to express the conflicting views about ethics, religion, money, social conventions, and progress that informed British society in his time. Butler seems particularly interested in the relationship of social institutions to the happiness of the social subjects; and any time a practice or an institution diverts from its purpose which is to serve man, he unveils it as a mechanism of control and power. Erewhon, with all its pastoral beauty, may be read as a hint at the fate England might have faced at the turn of the century had the ideas of the "Luddites" triumphed and been carried to their logical conclusions**.** Without its gunboats, telegraph, railways and banking system, England would have been a mere backward country

at the mercy of technologically more advanced nations. The ironic tone in "The Book of the Machines" can be taken as reflection on the theses of the Darwinian zealots who claim that the possession of 'these extra-corporeal limbs' by an individual or a nation earned them the respect of technologically less fitted peers. Here, the writer wonders whether a world based on competition and selection in which the reign of the fittest is taken as part of the natural order of things was morally acceptable. The issue is worth raising in a society where such leading social thinkers as Thomas Carlyle and Mathew Arnold shared these views according to Josephine M.Guy (Guy, 1998:24).

Equally important is the author's scepticism that a blind belief in the power of reason, science and technology to achieve the *summum bonum* as promised by utilitarianism. Through the hero Higgs, whom he sometimes uses as his mouthpiece, the author wonders whether a society impregnated by Darwinism could be trusted to relieve the poor from the burden of want, cure the sick and improve people's morality. On the contrary, the criminalisation of sickness, insanity and poverty in Erewhon and the complacency with which theft, swindling, and even crime are dealt with are ironical attacks on British judicial system which condemns the vagrants, the sick and the disabled to workhouses, the lunatics to asylums; failing to notice that the wealth of the rich had been accumulated through swindling and the sweated labour of the working classes. Rather than dealing with the symptoms of the social ills, the author ironically suggests, the Victorians would be better inspired to look for their root causes as the Erewhonians do with their deviant subjects whom they entrust to "straighteners"However, in Erewhon as in England, current beliefs, values and conventions are those most likely to strengthen and perpetuate the existing social order.

In this respect, one strange custom observed by the narrator is the attitude of Erewhonians toward ill health, poverty, and misfortune. These are considered as different forms of crime and punished accordingly. By contrast, forgery, swindling and robbery, which

in England are considered as crimes, are treated in Erewhon as misdemeanour with the subject 'taken to hospital and carefully tended at public expense' (Butler, 1872). The narrator attends the trial of a man in the last stages of tuberculosis being sentenced to a life imprisonment for 'persisting in his criminal conduct' (ibid). To avoid trial the Erewhonians make it a paramount duty to feel well and often resort to all sorts of artifacts and falsehood to conceal their ill health in much the same way as Victorians will conceal their immoral conduct whatever the cost. The laws of the land, Butler wants to suggest, find their explanation in the constitution of the country. Erewhon, which is founded on eugenic bases, criminalises ill health and deformity. Likewise, England which conditions respectability with material comfort creates laws that would reinforce divine protection and favour of the fortunate in their accumulation of wealth at the expense of the have-nots. In other words, the mighty that monopolise economic and so political power make laws that would praise them for their success while the same laws would lay blame on the poor for their improvidence.

Reluctance from the "Erewhonians" to admit their ill health, like the reluctance of the Victorians to confess their sins or immoral conduct may find explanation in the reactions of indignation which these forms of misconduct arouse and the disgrace incurred by their authors afterwards. If ill health in Erewhon were understood to be caused by objective biological or social causes such as germs, malnutrition or lack of hygiene and entrusted to doctors as was the case in England; and if, correspondingly, poverty, theft, and fraud in England were taken to have objective social and economic conditions, and treated as a form of sickness as was done in Erewhon; both societies would find remedies to their inconsistencies.

What the author suggests is a scientific approach to criminality in England. The best way to prevent crime was to look for its deep economic, cultural or political causes and suppress this evil by suppressing the conditions that have created it. The Erewhonian judge who had inflicted a life sentence to hard labour to the man suffering from tuberculosis is again

a sideward glance at those English judges who blindly enforce the New Poor Law regulations in the vain hope of preventing disability or poverty. Indeed, in 1870, the Local Government Board returned to the spirit of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, with a tightening of outdoor relief and a return to the workhouse system. This resulted in an official fall in the rate of paupers to 2% but actual figures gave the rate of 30%(Farraut: 1995,Quoted in Beaumont, 2005).

The judge who pronounced the sentence against the patient suffering from tuberculosis was fully convinced of the fairness of the verdict so immersed was he in the values and prejudices of the society 'in which he had been born and bred' (Butler, 1872: 47) Again the author satirises the English judicial system as an ideological apparatus set by the powers that be to insure the preservation and perpetuation of the social body and their privileges. The judge who leads the trial is not interested in the deep causes of the disease.

> I am not here to enter upon serious metaphysical questions as to the origin of this or that [he declares . . .]; which would result in throwing guilt on the tissues of the primordial cell, or on the elementary gases. There is no question of how you came to be wicked, but only this—namely, are you wicked or not? This has been decided in the affirmative…. (ibid: 44)

He looks for facts that lay blame on the criminal regardless of the deep causes which have prompted his action. Justice, conventions and other institutions, the author suggests, are mechanisms developed by the social body in its quest for self-preservation; just like living organisms are prompted by their self-preserving instincts to evolve according to the contingencies of their environment. When he comments on the Erewhonian law, the narrator concludes that the social order and the commonwealth transcend individual welfare and happiness. Reflecting on the concepts of right and duty, the author wonders: 'Who shall limit the right of society except society itself? And what consideration for the individual is tolerable unless society be gainer thereby?[. . .] Property, marriage, the law; as the bed to the river, so [are] rule and convention to the instinct (Ibid,:46).The writer tells us that rule and

convention are useful for the preservation of society. Here the writer hints at the arguments of organicism to support the claim that the social body has the natural right to rid itself of "a bad organ" through cure or amputation. For Butler, the ethical value of institutions, conventions and practices is measured by the extent to which these contribute to the sustenance of the existing political order. The moment the political order becomes oppressive beyond endurable limits, turning man into a mere element in a political system, it becomes the duty of the writer as an artist to come to the rescue by unveiling the excesses of the system.

This is what Butler attempted to do through his attacks on Darwinism, the judicial systems, certain academic practices through his satire about the professors of inconsistency and evasion'. This is what he also did through his satirical depiction of the Erewhonian religious institutions: "the Musical Banks". Officially and openly, Erewhonians profess adherence to the official religion through their frequent visits to the Musical Banks the currency of which they pretend to value better than they do the other money. However, and in practice all of them know that in their daily dealings the other currency is essential. Higgs who acts as Butler's mouthpiece admires the pragmatism of the Erewhonians who 'pay lip service' to their religion and conventions while in practice they pursue worldly ends.

Erewhonians are admirable because they are practical people, respectful of their religion without disregarding the pursuit of happiness and the pleasures of life. They are vigorous, healthy, good-looking and unconscious of self. These qualities reach their perfection in the character of the "high Ygdrunite"; those people who 'in the matters of human conduct and the affairs of life have got about as far as it is in the nature of man to go. [. . .] They are gentlemen in the full sense of the word (Butler, 1872: 176-177)'. In his portrayal of the "High Ygdrunites", Sharma notes that

> Butler presents the results of his most careful and mature thinking on moral and religious matters. The more he thought, the more he became convinced of the unnatural and unhealthy character of the Puritan ethic which had acquired such a strong hold

> over the English mind in the wake of the Evangelical movement. It produced an obsession with the ideas of sin and sacrifice that poisoned the lives of people by cheapening the present life (Sharma, 1963:103-104)

For butler, religion should be made for man; not man for religion. As such, its first task is to make man happy and healthy. While the author admits the function of religion as a factor of social cohesion and individual integration, he warns against its use as an ideological instrument of conformity and subjection. Hence, Butler admires the High Ygdrunites because they are true to life. They give life supporting instincts their due share; being guided as they are by the quest of pleasure and the avoidance of pain.

In contradistinction to the "High Ygdrunites", to whom they constitute the negative counterpart, stand the "Cashiers of the Musical Banks" who represent the clergy. These have 'a cramped expression upon their faces, the result of something in their lives that had stunted their natural development.[. . .]They lacked, with a few exceptions the true Erewhonian frankness; and an equal number from any other class would have looked happier and better men (Butler: 1872:57). Butler ironically wonders whether Erewhon would be a better place were their expression to be transferred to the rest of the people promptly responding by an emphatic 'no'.

Here again, Butler satirises the ideological function of religion without denying its social importance. What he questions is the deadly grip it may exert on the minds and vitality of the social subjects. Butler's depiction of the Musical Banks is a satirical attack on Victorians' self-deception. Most of them possess 'a skin deep religiosity' while in practice they behave as inveterate philistines. Nonetheless, the author explains his contemporaries' hypocrisy by their effort to reconcile a strict morality imposed by social conventions with individual sanity and balance. Through Higgs, who had noted the prevailing indifference of the Erewhonians to the precepts of the Musical Banks in their everyday dealings, the author

concludes that the Erewhonians were on the eve of a revolution that would bring about ‘a new order more in harmony with the minds and the hearts of the people’ (Ibid:59).

Conclusion

Butler is a philosophical writer coupled with an original artist. He makes use of irony and satire to stir debate about the flaws of his society. His originality as a writer comes from the fact that he uses various *personae* to express conflicting views about such issues as mechanism and humanism, religion and science, education, and the relationship of laws and ethics to society to name only these; never arrogating himself the final word. The author, who abhors dogmatic positions whether in science, religion, or morals, refuses to take clear-cut positions regarding the issues he raises. Butler’s use of irony often unsettles the reader who is at pains to decide when the author is satirising and when he is making objective observations of facts. This makes ***Erewhon***_a polyphonic novel open to various interpretations. As an artist and critic, Butler points out the flaws of his society and the follies of his contemporaries which he interprets as mechanisms of adaptation, survival and self-perpetuation. Although critical of his society he believes in the soundness of its institutions and its capacity to construct consensus through gradual improvement instead of radical change the author‘s motto being: ‘surtout point de zèle’.

Chapter II: Knowledge, Authority, and Heroism in Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward 2000-1888* (1887)

Introduction

This Chapter revisits Bellamy's Utopian novel ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** **(**1887) with reference to its socialist and globalist themes in the light of the recent developments that have led to the triumph of liberal ideology over communism. Combining elements of Mikhael Bakhtin's theory of the novel as expounded in Simon Dentith's ***Bakhtinian Thought*** (1996), and Karl Mannheim's ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge***(1936), it reads the novel as an attempt by the rising intelligentsia to use its privileged trans-class position to historicize the 19th century capitalist society and renegotiate the social contract on new bases. Their symbolic and cultural capital, and the medial position they hold between the conflicting parties, capital and labor, places intellectuals in an ideal position as mediators. Their influence on politics and their participation as experts or members of think tanks seems to have made of them objective allies of today's liberal globalizing trends.

The moment one begins to reflect on utopian thought in the U.S.A., especially such socialist writings as Bellamy's ***Looking Backward 2000-1888***, one is overcome by a feeling of the vanity of such an undertaking. Indeed, what interest could the study of a socialist utopia raise after the demise of communism, the felling of the Berlin Wall; symptomatic of the victory of liberal ideology over communism, and the subsequent economic and ideological realignments not only east of ―The Iron Curtain‖ but also in former areas of influence of the ex-Soviet bloc in the Third World? What could one say about Bellamy's Utopia that has not already been said considering the bulk of critical appraisals it triggered both at home and abroad for over a century now? Would a revisiting of Bellamy's utopia provide some cues to help understand the shock wave that has recently been sweeping through the Great Middle

East, and which is strangely affecting mostly nation states that constituted ideological satellites of the deceased communist U.S.S.R?

Review of the Literature

On its publication, the novel, despite its author‘s proclaimed escapist function, constituted both a literary and political event. ‘From an anonymous journalist’, John L. Thomas writes, ‘ Bellamy was suddenly propelled to the literary and political stage to find himself something of a national hero’ (Thomas, 1967:1). ‘Within a year of its publication in 1888’, adds Krishan Kumar, ‘***Looking Backward*** sold a quarter of a million copies in the United States alone;[. . . and] in 1897, it had sold half a million copies in America and hundreds of thousands throughout the world’ (Kumar, 1987:133).

Outside the English speaking countries, the novel‘s popularity was confirmed by its translation into most of the major languages in the world. According to Sylvia Bowman, Bellamy was read not only in England, France, Germany, Russia and Italy, but also in Australia, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Africa, and many other countries (Bowman :1962). In an article entitled ―A Great American Prophet‖ published in ***Common Sense*** in 1934, John Dewey, the great American philosopher wrote: _ What ***Uncle" Tom"s Cabin*** was to the anti-slavery movement Bellamy‘s book may well be to shaping popular opinion for a new social order‘(quoted in: Kumar, 1987:134). Dewey‘s prediction proved right as Bellamy exerted a direct influence, according to Kumar, on many of the American socialists as Daniel de Leon, Eugene V. Debbs, and such influential social critics as Thorstein Veblen, and Upton Sinclair.

Abroad, Leo Tolstoi, who realized the first translation of the novel into Russian, praised it as ‘an exceedingly interesting book’, according to Krishan Kumar, who further remarks that ‘So alarmed were the Tsarist authorities by[its] success [. . .] that in 1889 they banned it from public libraries and reading rooms‘ (Kumar, 1987: 135).

However, it would be wrong to suppose that the novel‘s reception was a general fit of applause. Although it drew heavily on socialist ideas taking care not to dismiss capitalist values altogether, it received equally violent attacks from conservatives as well as socialists. In 1893, J.W. Foot, a conservative, described ***„Looking Backward"***

> [. . . as] the ban of this nation. It breeds a notion in the minds of thousands that somehow the government will be compelled by agitation to do for them what God, nature, and society demand they shall do for themselves. Its utopian notions have taken root in many minds. Multitudes who never saw the book have received its teachings secondhand and have been poisoned by them (P.62: Qtd.in Parrington, 1964: p.78).

Indeed, many Americans influenced by nativism eyed with suspicion the kind of socialist ideas that were at the basis of Bellamy‘s utopia and which were introduced by the waves of immigrants that flooded the country following the potato failure crop in Ireland, and the failed 1848 socialist revolutions in Europe.

From a socialist perspective, William Morris unveils ***Looking Backward*** as the manifestation of its author‘s character; ‘a bourgeois Whig frame of mind that is quite content with modern civilization once it has been rid of a few ridiculous survivals of the barbarous ages’ (Morris, 1993:381). Morris argues that certain bourgeois utopias are no more than an appropriation by bourgeois intellectuals of the suffering of the poor, and their subversion into remote paper paradises where fanciful solutions are applied to real problems. In a lecture given before members of The Socialist League in 1885, Morris declares that the hopes conveyed by utopian writing

> are but a reflection in those who live happily and comfortably of the vain longings of those others who suffer with little power of expressing their suffering in an audible voice: when all goes well, the happy world forgets these people and their desires, sure as it is that their woes are not dangerous to them the wealthy: whereas when the woes and grief of the poor begin to rise to a point beyond the endurance of men, fear conscious or unconscious falls upon the rich, and they begin to look about them to see what there may be among the elements of their society which may be used as palliatives for the misery which, long existing and ever growing greater among the slaves of that society, is now at last forcing itself on the attention of the master (Morris,1993:309).

William Morris warns against two dangers involved in Bellamy‘s utopia. The first danger is that it might convince socialist enthusiasts that the advent of socialism is an inevitable outcome of a progressive historical process; a conviction that might function as an opiate which would lead to contemplative quietism and thus preclude or at least delay transformative action that would bring about the desired society. The second danger lies in the hyper-centralized mechanistic logic of ***Looking Backward***; a coldly utilitarian society, geared to the satisfaction of the needs of a consumerist society by making workers into disciplined conscripts of an industrial army. This system, Morris warns, will deter many socialists from pursuing it**.**

It would be equally wrong to consider Bellamy‘s utopia as having sprung up miraculously out of a cultural or ideological vacuum. Utopian ideas and schemes were an important part of American history and culture. Indeed, the quest for and discovery of the New World itself, and the series of ordeals accomplished by ―the pilgrims‖ through their successive triumphs: over the natural elements- The Atlantic and the hostile natural environment of the continent-first, their victorious Revolution against the representative of the old corrupt order, the king of England, next, and finally their triumph over ―the heathens and the Spaniards‖, had strengthened Americans‘ confidence that they were the missionaries chosen by providence to lead humanity toward moral regeneration.

Although American utopianism was largely inspired by Jedeo- Christian traditions, it began to assume secular aspects with the spread of Enlightenment ideas and the development of technology. The gradual weakening of the religious sentiment led to a reinterpretation of the American Dream. The traditional religious interpretation gave way to an economic interpretation claiming equal access to the luxuries and material comfort of the New World. The 1880s were years of transition from a rural agrarian economy, to an urban industrial one. The development of modern land and water communication networks connected the Eastern

coast to the Western one, the North to the South, which strengthened Americans‘ national feelings, and their faith that technical progress was another heavenly sign; and, like Aaron‘s rod, an instrument in the service of the nation‘s destiny as the vanguard of humanity.

However, rapid transformations induced by progress created mitigated feelings of hope and apprehension as it led to the constitution of gigantic trusts in industries, banking, and services, depriving many Americans of the fruit of the new Eden. Industrialism and monopoly capitalism had made victims especially among little farmers, small businesses, and wage earners. As Krishan Kumar notes, if the Civil War had united the American nation in its enterprise of enforcement of the basic human birthrights of ―equality and freedom‖ by imposing the abolition of institutionalized slavery to the Southern States, uneven distribution of wealth threatened to undermine the economic foundations that were a necessary prerequisite to political equality and human happiness (Kumar, 1987: pp., 138-139). Discontent among the victims took a variety of forms. Farmers‘ revolts, labor unrest, and different forms of violence were symptoms of this discontent. The frequent press campaigns, civil crusade against corrupt politics and the power of the trusts; and the emergence of realism, naturalism, and utopianism in literature were equally symptomatic of the crisis.

The utopian novels written in that period, of which ***Looking Backward*** constitutes a popular example, partook of the same need to construct the good society by unveiling and correcting the flaws of the present one. None the less, unlike realism and naturalism which highlight the corrupting influence of a basely material world on the individual, utopian literature champions progress as the utilitarian panacea that would produce social harmony and individual happiness. Said otherwise, against the pessimistic mood of naturalism which presents the social subject as the reluctant victim of powers beyond his control, utopian writing invites voluntary, enthusiastic participation of the social agent to the construction of the new society. Hope is used as the motive power for social change.

What is the secret of the novel‘s fame? What is there in ***Looking Backward*** that propelled its author from the status of journalist to that of ‗social engineer and prophet of a new morality‘? What is there in the novel that has helped it impregnate culturally diverse societies and reach universality? More importantly, what relevance could a revisiting of Bellamy‘s romance have to our time?

Issue and Hypothesis

The fact that it is often likened to Karl Marx‘s ***Das Kapital*** is evidence of its tremendous transformative potential. What critics have not sufficiently underscored is the capacity of utopian writers to capture the conflicting emotions of hope and fear that inform their society, turn them into utterances that represent the contending voices, before they deftly construct a consensual order that temporarily contents the conflicting parties. This is what Bellamy succeeded to do insofar as his ―gospel‖ The Religion of Solidarity and his scheme for an Industrial Army made ―converts‖ and volunteer ―conscripts‖ throughout the United States and even abroad. Like many intellectuals of the Progressive Era, he felt that a redefinition of the American Dream as a democracy of goods was a necessary precondition for the recovery of the original political democracy.

The present chapter explores the impact of the rising intelligentsia, whose emergence coincided with the rapid diffusion of knowledge and the contraction of space and time induced by technological development, not only on a national scale but globally as well. In other words it discusses the socialists‘ charge of ‗ideological complicity of the intelligentsia with the prevailing capitalist model of history‘ (Beaumont: 2005, 10).It goes further, for besides assigning intellectuals a central role in organizing and leading the new state, Bellamy‘s system in no way threatens the basic pillars of capitalism, but it moderates the excesses of the plutocracy. More than this, Bellamy‘s nationalist utopia is constructed as a model to disseminate to the other parts of the world; a global blueprint, conceived, and to be

supervised by an army of disinterested patricians committed to the happiness and the well-being of the people. Plato‘s philosopher kings who ruled over a closed city state are now to spread their wisdom to the whole global village. What is worth noting is that the role of historical agents is withdrawn from the workers as agents of historical change, and assigned to the intelligentsia as the architects of the new social compact. If any viable change is to occur, it has to be achieved not by revolutionary action of the proletariat, but through peaceful evolution under the wise tutelage of knowledgeable cultured elites.

Methodology: Intellectuals and Utopia

This chapter integrates elements of Bakhtin’s theory on the novel (1996) with Karl Mannheim‘s treatment of intellectuals(1936) to read Bellamy‘s novel. Indeed, in his definition of language, Bakhtin goes beyond Saussure’s definition of language as a binary sign system which people draw upon to name and organize the world. For Bakhtin, to speak is to change the world through an infinite number of speech acts. To speak is to enter into a creative dialogue with an already committed act, be it a speech or social act, which bears value. Value which denotes an attitude is ideological in nature; so, one speaks to foster, maintain and reproduce an already present act, or to challenge it with a view to its transformation. The ideological function of language use informs aesthetics of which the novel is an important form. This seems to be the case with the way utopian writers use this particular form of literary discourse in their attempt to deal with the tensions that inform their society. Hence, through this dynamic, dialectical interplay, authors as social agents permanently construct themselves new identities through their participation to the construction of the good society: the eutopia.

As an aesthetic form, the novel is the locus where the conflicting interests and the actions of the different social groups are represented. Also, as an utterance and social action, it provides valuable insight into the perspective, interests and social position of its author. With

respect to the perspective and role of the author, Bakhtin distinguishes two sorts of novels: the polyphonic novel and the monologic novel. 'The polyphonic novel', Bakhtin argues, 'grants the voices of the main characters as much authority as the narrator's voice which indeed engages in an active dialogue with the characters' voices'(Bakhtin,1996:41). In the polyphonic novel, the narrator is placed on an equal footing with the other characters with respect to authority. Polyphony, for Bakhtin, should not be understood as an abdication by the author of his responsibility, but as recognition of the other with whom he engages in a dialogue; not another whose voice he appropriates and fashions in such a way that it fits his ideological expediencies. Polyphony, like genuine democracy, has important ethical and political implications. The monologic novel, on the other hand, represents a world in which the different parts are integrated by the writer's consciousness and the contending voices are synthesized in the writer's authoritative voice. The monologic novel, accordingly, depicts a world in which harmony and consensus prevail; a world where conflict is resolved. Central to this feat, is the heroic influence of the narrator who usually acts as the mouthpiece of the author.

It is here that Mannheim's views on the novelist coincide with Bakhtin's treatment of the author. Bellamy the author, the speaking subject, and the social agent is apprehended as a member of the rising intelligentsia. The special position of the Intelligentsia comes from the fact that their outlook, unlike owners of capital or members of the working class, is not determined by a rigid position in the production process. Mannheim writes that members of the intelligentsia come from various social strata; and so may keep a certain ideological affinity with their original class but he insists on this important fact that

> There is, however, one unifying bond between all groups of intellectuals, namely education, which binds them together in a striking way. Participation in a common educational heritage progressively tends to suppress differences of birth, status, profession and wealth, and unite the individual educated people on the basis of the education they have received. [. . .] This modern education has created a homogenous medium [knowledge] within which the conflicting parties can measure their strength. [. . .

>] Modern education, from its inception, is a living struggle, a replica on a small scale of the conflicting processes and tendencies which rage in society at large (Mannheim: 1936, 154-156).

This acquired cultural capital gives intellectuals a mixed temperament and subjects them to the influences of opposing tendencies in the social reality. It is this relatively unattached or trans-class status that places them in a privileged position by making them 'attuned' to the different interests and points of view that inform their society. It is this lofty "hill-top position" that enables them to develop an all-inclusive synthetic perspective that would reconcile the interests of the various social organs and thus preserve the harmony of the social body.

Unlike the members of the traditional classes, whose thought is determined by their class position, intellectuals 'penetrate into the ranks of the conflicting parties in order to compel them to transform conflicts of interests into conflicts of ideas' by rationalizing the demands of the contending parties and attempting to reconcile them through a renegotiated social compact which would be acceptable to all. To achieve this end, intellectuals draw upon the resources available in the situation- the cultural matrix of their society- dismissing practices that are no longer acceptable, and cancelling those that are not yet realizable. By doing so, Mannheim observes, 'they use their privileged social moorings [in] their quest for [and] fulfillment of their mission as the predestined advocate[s] of the intellectual interests of the whole (ibid, 158)'.

In the looming modern society of the 1880s ushered by the new millennium, where the spread of knowledge and science had led to a sharpening of class consciousness, intellectuals may be led to a form of self-perception and self-construction as the **inevitable mediators** (emphasis added) of the diverging and often conflicting interests that threatened social stability. The utopian novel written by Bellamy sounds quite in line with this spirit and with the spirit of the age. It denotes a shared exasperation with the excesses of the Gilded Age, and

a new faith in progress that would lead gradually to the improvement of society and the human condition.

It was to this emerging stratum of intellectuals and experts that Bellamy belonged. Their sense of justice and consciences demanded that they act to relieve the plight of the working classes, while fear of radical anarchy dictated caution in the schemes they drafted to that end. It was to the members of that 'cultured class' that he appealed to steer society to safer grounds. The secret of Bellamy's success may be explained by his ability to feel the pulse of the American society during the Reconstruction period, grasp the contradictions that threatened the country's cohesion, and draw upon core elements of the U.S. cultural matrix to envision an order in which the contradictions are magically solved. Bellamy's futuristic society, presented the narrator with a ―hill-top perspective‖ wherefrom he could historicize his society and which could serve according to John L. Thomas 'as a blueprint for the reconstruction of the American society plagued by the materialistic excesses of the Gilded Age' (Thomas, 1967:16).

The New Religion and its Clergy

By the time he set out to write his utopia, Bellamy, through his work as a journalist, had accumulated enough knowledge about the ills of industrial societies and the remedies likely to cure them. His knowledge of the social inequalities that characterized the American society inspired Bellamy with the parable of the coach. 'I cannot do better' , he writes about nineteenth century U.S.A,

> . . . than compare society as it then was to a prodigious coach which the masses of humanity were harnessed to and dragged toilsomely along a very hilly and sandy road. The driver was hunger, and permitted no lagging, though the pace was necessarily very slow. [. . .] The top was covered by passengers, who never got down, even at the steepest ascent, [and . . . who] could enjoy the scenery at their leisure, or critically discuss the merits of the straining team. Naturally, such places were in great demand, and the competition for them was keen, everyone seeking as the first end in life to secure a seat on the coach for himself and leave it to his child after him (Bellamy, 1887: 97).

Those on top of the coach, the writer goes on to explain, do feel compassion for their brethren; and at such times express their empathy noisily and exhort the toilers to patience, for their efforts will be duly rewarded in the other world. For Bellamy, traditional religion has been turned into an ideological opiate that binds the workers to their condition and gives the ruling class an easy conscience. Indeed, for members of the ruling class, exploiting the workers and being served by them was part of the natural order of things; a feeling that resulted from their religious and class perspective. Inequality and injustice were given metaphysical rather than human interpretation, which of course spared the haves of their responsibility toward the deprived. What was needed was a renewed form of faith: "The Religion of Solidarity".

The period in which the writer produced his story is characterized by competition among the haves on the one hand, and labour unrest on the other as 'The working classes had quite suddenly and very generally become infected with a profound discontent with their condition (ibid, 100)'. The workers knew what they wanted; but as they did not possess enough light and wisdom to choose the means most appropriate to achieve their end, they may cause havoc in society as signs of 'an impending social cataclysm' were hanging over society (ibid).The fears felt by sensible men as regards the future of the American society were exacerbated, in Bellamy's words, by 'the talk of a small band of men who called themselves anarchists, and who proposed to terrify the American people into adopting their ideas by threats of violence', adding as an afterthought that, 'a mighty nation which had just put down a rebellion of half its own members in order to maintain its political system [was unlikely] to adopt a new social system out of fear' (ibid: 102). The future society, from which Julian West looks backward, and which he intends to use as an argument to overcome resistance to change, is a technocratic utopia in which the contradictions and the tensions plaguing nineteenth century U.S.A have miraculously vanished.

The New Nation

The new society which Bellamy‘s hero discovers spells order, discipline, plenty and bliss. It is one which has been constructed by an Industrial Army whose officers, and ranks and files were devotees to the Religion of Solidarity. The basic outline of the story is that of a sleeper who awakes in the utopian society one hundred and thirteen years later. Julian West, Bellamy‘s hero, is an insomniac who sleeps in an underground vault known only to his manservant, and the professional hypnotist, Dr Pillsburry, who regularly puts him into a trance at night. Julian‘s chronic insomnia was the result of the climate of anguish and unrest created by the frequent labour conflicts stirred by the then strong workers unions (A.F.L ,C.I.O. and the Knights of Labour). By virtue of his class affiliations Julian resents the labour activists. Besides, he has personal reasons to hate them for strikes in the building industry were delaying the completion of his house and his marriage to the wealthy and beautiful Edith Bartlett. One night, Julian‘s house burns down, and his servant with it. Julian, who is presumed dead, remains in trance, and goes on sleeping to awake in the year 2000, in the house of a certain Dr Leete, his wife, and their daughter Edith. It is therefore through death in the old corrupt self and rebirth in the new society that Julian undergoes a process of regeneration, by initiation to life, and integration of the new society.

The new society which Julian discovers has, as though miraculously, progressively rid itself of all the problems of the late 19th century America. Dr Leete, a high ranking official of the ruling elite, welcomes him and introduces him to the Boston of the year 2000, its institutions and culture. Interestingly enough, it is from Dr Leete’s ‘house top’ that the visitor had an overview of the utopian city that ‘lay at[his] feet’ (Bellamy,1967: 115) .Interestingly, the visitor to utopia and his mentor choose a lofty perspective to overlook the new society and get as clear a view of it as possible. However, the true beauty and harmony of the new society, which the new visitor has yet to discover, lies in its economic, political, and

social organization of which the architecture and the urban landscape are eloquent reflections.

Economically, the new society was a centralized system in which the state had the complete monopoly of industries, banks, and public facilities. State control over public facilities was actually a demand formulated by most reformers of the late 19th century in the U.S.A. This has taken place naturally and peacefully Julian‘s host explains. As the trend toward larger and larger monopolies continued, small businesses and trusts disappeared swallowed by larger ones, until there remained only one trust; the trust. As Dr Leete explains to his visitor:

> Early in the last century the evolution was completed by the final consolidation of the entire capital of the nation. The industry and commerce of the country, ceasing to be conducted by a set of irresponsible corporations and syndicates of private persons at their caprice and their profit, were entrusted to a single syndicate representing the people, to be conducted in the common interest for the common profit .The nation, that is to say, organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed, it became the one capitalist in the place of all other capitalists, the sole employer, the final monopoly in which all previous and lesser monopolies were swallowed up, a monopoly in the profits and economies of which all citizens shared (Bellamy,1888: 126).

Following the Darwinian evolutionary process of natural selection, the American economy has progressively and peacefully developed into a system of state capitalism in which the state, which is the economic and political emanation of the nation, is the unique trust, ―The Trust‖, of which all the citizens are shareholders; a sort of ‘utopia Ltd’ in Mattew Baumont’s words. What surprises Julian West further is the fact that no revolution or bloodshed were needed for the change to occur. As Dr Leete explains, through a series of objective lessons, the people realized that the larger the trusts the easier and the more efficient their management; so that when the nation came to integrate all the trusts, public opinion had grown favourable to it.

Bellamy‘s aversion to socialist doctrine and class war which he assimilates to ‘anarchy and bomb laying’ has been underscored by more than one critic. He insists on the fact that the

New Society was inspired rather by the millennial dreams of equality and the Christian teachings of self-sacrifice and martyrdom which ensure their followers rebirth and eternal life in the universal being which are society or humanity at large. These are, for J.L. Thomas, the main factors which cement the organic unity of the new society. As an American writing in the Cold War period, this scholar was probably reluctant to admit any influence of socialist ideas on Bellamy. He explains that Bellamy drew upon the American tradition and used the Religion of Solidarity, the National Party, and the Industrial Army as the ideological instruments 'that checked the destructive forces of capitalist greed and proletarian envy' (Thomas, 1967: 55-56). Krishan Kumar, by contrast, writing after the demise of Communism, says that Bellamy who had travelled through Germany in 1869, and who had edited Charles Nordhoff's The ***Communistic Societies of the United States,*** and John Noyes' ***History of American Socialism,*** had been influenced by socialist ideas, but remarks that the author could not openly advocate socialist ideas in a society where anybody suspected of socialist sympathies _could be taken into a corner and clubbed' (Kumar, 1991: 141).

The Industrial Army is the basic economic and political structure of Bellamy's utopia, of which the Religion of Solidarity is the dominant ideology and the instrument of organic cohesion. As its name suggests, this army is a strict military organization applied to economic and social ends. Its purposes are obviously utilitarian since it aims at the construction of the welfare state in which highly efficient industrial organization based on strict discipline and patriotic devotion to work in the service of the nation grant regular supply of commodities and services to the utopians. Promotion in the ranks of the army is merit based; and the incentive that puts the utopians to diligent work is the quest of their peers' respect and the nations' gratitude to those who serve it. Bellamy, as Krishan Kumar notes, has created the moral equivalent of war. Warring energies and Christian feelings of compassion are deflected into working energies in the service of equality and welfare. Like wartime heroes, volunteers

in the Industrial Army are promoted to positions of responsibility and decorated with medals of honours**.** Although apparently egalitarian, since it is based on equality of income, the new society is a Darwinian, meritocratic society in which the fittest still hold positions of power added to the gratitude and admiration of the nation which they serve so disinterestedly.

The Religion of Solidarity provides the necessary emotional atmosphere for the social subject to serve the system. Its basic premise, which is inspired by the Christian tradition of martyrdom, is that human beings are instinctively driven to seek communion with the infinite, but are often prevented from doing so by the egotistic side of self which clings to the quest for immediate temporary pleasures. The Religion of Solidarity is then an appeal to its followers to abandon the temporary, egotistic and mortal self, to seek regeneration and eternal life through communion and merging with the universal self. How is this ideal of fusion with the greater being, be it society or humanity, to be achieved? Solidarity, equality, and dedication to the service of the nation could be spread through culture and education on which Bellamy and most reformers insist to make change desirable, therefore possible.

The Religion of Solidarity stood in opposition to the materialistic and individualistic ethos of the Gilded Age. It drew upon the sense of sacrifice that stirred the humanitarian and patriotic feelings of soldiers of The Union during the Civil War; feelings that were deflected into work energies in the service of industry. It also appealed to the Christian feelings of charity, brotherhood and sense of sacrifice to cure the ills of capitalism and Laissez Faire rather than socialist doctrine which Bellamy well knew would arouse reactions of aversion from the majority of Americans who associate it with immigrants, anarchy and violence. Appearances notwithstanding, it was another form of oligarchy in disguise**.**

The new aristocracy of the word

Bellamy belongs to that tradition of thought which sought to construct the good place: an elsewhere that would constitute the ideal counterpart of the flawed on-going society. He is

heir to the tradition established by Plato, Thomas More, Francis Bacon, Henry de Saint Simon, J.S.Mill, Robert Owen, Karl Marx, and the Fabians, to name only these. If the early utopias were conceived as closed places, cut off from a corrupt and potentially corrupting outward world which was characterized by greed and ruled by sheer power, the spread of reason and science with the Enlightenment emboldened the bearers of knowledge that reason and science alone deserved to rule and order society. Scientific and technical progress increased intellectuals' confidence that science should be the Religion of Humanity, and its bearers the natural architects of a regenerated world, and therefore its legitimate rulers. In the nineteenth century, scientific and technical resources had been made available, and the utopia long sought for seemed attainable. This may explain why that period, which constituted a watershed between a declining traditional agrarian society rebellious to change and a modern industrial one not yet fully born, was rife with utopian aspirations.

Although the discovery of America was given religious interpretations, the constitution of the newly born nation drew heavily on the secular ideas of the Enlightenment. The basic principles of equality, freedom, and happiness underlying such founding events as Thomas Paine's "Common Sense", The Declaration of Independence, and The Emancipation Proclamation, belong to that tradition which had sought to institute social order and human happiness as ultimate ends through the technical and ethical means of science and justice. In the late nineteenth century U.S.A., as was the case in Europe both of which seemed caught between the hammer of a ruthless plutocracy and the anvil of a revolutionary proletariat, the rising _unattached class', conscious of its growing power to generate consent or to stir revolution, suggested to re-negotiate the social compact on renewed terms. Alvin Gouldner (1979) grasped the rising power of the intelligentsia when he declared that _intellectuals have, for many years now formed a new class which has developed a monopoly over a

culture of critical discourse, and whose power has superseded the power of the traditional wealthy families and the landed aristocracy‘(Trans. Mine, quoted in Said, 2001: p. 22) .

Looking Backward 2000-1888, partakes of the intellectuals' desire to enter politics in quest for the good society. Like the Fabians in England, especially the Webbs, they attempted to use their cultural and symbolic capital, in Bourdieu's terms, to construct an order halfway 'between the morally bankrupt Charybdis of laissez faire, and the potentially destructive Schyla of a proletarian revolution, (Baumont 2005)'.The publication of the novel was immediately received as the bible of the reformers and Bellamy found himself involved in politics. Demands for the constitution of a Nationalist Organization emanated mostly from intellectuals and retired officers of the Army of the Union. Bellamy in his answers insisted on the leading role for the learned classes. In a letter to Thomas Wentworth Higginson, dated December 28, 1889, he insists that

> [. . .] the change [should be] led and guided by the natural leaders of the community, [not] left to the demagogues [adding that] it was the peculiar felicity if our countrymen in their revolt of 1776, that their natural leaders, the men of education and position, led it.[. . .] As for our politicians they of course will only follow not lead public opinion. It belongs to the literary class to create, arouse, and direct that opinion. (Unpublished Papers, 76)

The medial position they hold between the conflicting forces of labour and capital gave intellectuals a favourable position as intermediaries who could convince the conflicting parties of the need to strike a deal.

The deal which mirrored the threat of an impending revolution that might sweep away the owning classes if they did not give in to the aspirations of working classes, and which promised the masses a peaceful progressive evolution towards the commonwealth as an inevitable historical process, presented a threefold merit. First, to the owning classes, the new society promised positions of leadership since the utopia is a meritocratic but philanthropic society in which the managing staff of the industrial army holds executive positions in an industrial society where disciplined, dedicated soldiers now enthusiastically perform the tasks

which were formerly only reluctantly performed by rebellious working class members. Next, to the members of the working classes whatever their functions, the new society provides 'each according to his needs', which means that any worker, just like any high ranking officer, receives enough to grant him access to the luxuries of the affluent society. Last and most importantly, to the architects of the new system, it grants the honours due to heroes for they will have succeeded to build the consensus by combining modern elements of socialist thought with the traditional American evangelicalism to produce a highly efficient industrial society; affluent, egalitarian, communitarian and stable, and above all, a society that would serve as ―the vanguard to the nations of the world‖.

From Nationalism to Globalism

Further evidence of the growing influence of the intelligentsia is the commitment of Bellamy and his Nationalist Clubs to function _as the ideological spearheads of the Populist Party' in its campaign against the two traditional parties, and the inclusion by the Democratic Party of planks contained in the Populist platform in its programs for the 1896 presidential elections. Bellamy goes further in tickling American national pride and its burgeoning globalist ambitions by presenting his utopian model of society as one that has already impregnated the world. To a question by Julian west about the state of the Old World, Dr Leete informs him that

> the great nations of Europe, as well as Australia, Mexico, and parts of South America, are now organized industrially, like The United States which was the pioneer of the evolution. The peaceful relations of these nations are assured by a loose form of federal union of worldwide extent. An international council regulates the mutual intercourse and commerce of the members of the union and their joint policy toward the more backward races, which are gradually educated up to civilized institutions (Bellamy, 1888: 184).

This international council is set mostly to facilitate free access to all sorts of resources and markets worldwide, and insure fair commercial practices; already hinting at the defunct League of Nations instituted after WWI, and the United Nations with its satellite

organizations set up after the Second World War such as the GATT, WTO, IMF, as instruments of international economic and financial intercourse and ―world governance‖. However, this global federal system should in the future evolve into a single global body in much the same way as progress had made tribes and small kingdoms into nations. ‗You must understand', Dr Leete argues, 'that we all look forward to an eventual unification of the world as one nation. That, no doubt, will be the ultimate form of society, and will realize certain economic advantages over the present federal system of autonomous nations'(ibid: 186).

David Ross's claim, that 'Society is after all a cultural construct', is probably close to the truth. In his introduction to Thomas Peyser's ***Utopia and Metropolis***, Ross uses the metaphor of society as '. . . a text, a historical human construct that can therefore be deciphered and help to penetrate the nature of that society in terms of the relationship between its culture and its power structures' (Peyser, 1998: iii). He goes on to explain that as a cultural construct, society is made up of 'fictive foundations [an ideology] that sustain an order' (ibid). Accordingly societies being thus constructed and ideologically sustained, would it not then be possible to alter the structure of the existing system, and establish new relations between its component parts by setting new fictional foundations? This has been proven possible throughout history and this was what Bellamy with other reformers attempted to do. By drawing upon the most salient elements of late Nineteenth century U.S. culture that Bellamy succeeded to give shape to a society millions of workers and most reform minded intellectuals in the industrial world dreamed of but could not as clearly articulate.

Conclusion

Despite the numerous critiques which targeted it, especially from the advocates of Marxist doctrine probably frustrated at having been denied their proletarian revolution, Bellamy's novel had the merit not only to stir debate about the numerous flaws of industrialism and laissez faire capitalism, but also suggest political and social action towards change. The

welfare and social measures underlying Roosevelt‘s New Deal three decades later when the Great Depression had reached its apex owed an undeniable debt to Bellamy‘s ideas. What is debatable is the artificial, mechanical aspect of life in his utopia, in which the industrial and commercial systems function with the precision of a machine, and which prefigure modern man‘s subjection to the productive and consumerist logic of the new society. Equally questionable was the militaristic logic of the new society which, as later developments would show, contained the seeds of fascism and totalitarianism.

Looking Backward is a monologic novel in which the divergent voices of the trusts and the representatives of the labouring classes are synthesized in the writer‘s authoritative voice allowing no contending voices to be heard. It claims a position of centrality to the learned elites whose voices were to become, nationally as well as globally, increasingly influential considering the central function that communications and information were to acquire in the modern age. Like Plato’s Republic, its welfare and order depend on the knowledge, wisdom and ascetic discipline of a ruling caste committed to industrial efficiency, social order and peace, and the happiness of the social subjects. However, unlike their Greek precursors, the modern rulers do not depend on the labour of a slave caste. This appropriation by the intelligentsia of workers’ suffering and the rulers’ fears to construct a new order in which they hold a central position may betray a quest for social prestige and lust for power. It seems close to the platonic republican ideal in which philanthropic benevolent king philosophers assume ruling functions.

As recent developments have shown, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent process of “creative chaos” launched with the U.S. “Wars on Terror”, and the transformations affecting the Middle East and North-Africa region, pompously referred to as the “Arab Spring”, the new society, but also the new empire can be culturally constructed. Jacques Attali, the French philosopher and champion of globalization, wrote recently that the

advent of internet and social networking was speeding up the standardization of identities and aspirations, which makes it possible for people to enter communities of their choice. This process of cultural globalization, which leads to a weakening of national identities and allegiances, is simultaneously creating a global society in which individuals are immediately subjected to international law (Attali, 2011: 24). This explains the use made by the Americans and some of its allies in the "free world" of The United Nations and the rhetoric of "democracy and human rights" as a modern Trojan horse wherever their strategic interests are threatened. This rhetoric is often echoed by certain intellectuals, who have now become organically linked to transnational trusts. According to Tom Moylan,

> the very little bourgeois class that used utopian thought to transform society in the previous centuries, More, Bacon, and socialists, turned to dystopia once having naturalized the reign of the intellectually fittest';[. . . adding that] within the new hard times of the 1980s aggravated by the demise and fall of the communist model, the left suffered major setbacks. Systemic challenges were replaced by the local and situated. Assertive as those movements were, the dispersed force of their multiple actions was never enough to stop the new leviathan (Moylan, 2000: xv)

The use made of Islam in Indonesia, Tchetchenia, and Afghanistan, to name only these, to weaken and then shatter the soviet bloc; and the use that is now being made of human rights ideology through virtual networking to stir revolt, partake of the strategy to recover lost ground and areas of influence suffered by the liberal west following the wave of independence revolutions which broke out in Africa and Asia after the Second World War. Independence for "The wretched of the Earth" was made possible not only by the anti- imperialist rhetoric of the Cold War period, but also by the balance of power established by the presence of a powerful communist bloc. Communism as the advocate for the rights of the workers having been defeated and Islamic fundamentalism having been adumbrated to the ideological arsenal of the "Free World", let's beware, sovereignty for the wretched of the earth is over; the empire is striking back.

CHAPTER V: Rethinking Utilitarian Ethics and the Gospel of Work in William Morris's *News from Nowhere (1892)*

Introduction

The end of the nineteenth century was characterized by the consolidation of the Industrial Revolution in England. The term "Revolution" finds its justification in the deep transformations that technology and machinery have wrought in the physical, social, economic, as well as the political spheres. Parallel to the industrialization process, this country, with a traditionally rural agrarian economy, witnessed a rapid urbanization caused by the massive shift of country people, forced to idleness by enclosures and the mechanization of farming, and who flowed to the urban industrial centres in quest for jobs. Next to the anarchical growth of cities, the development of mining in the country, and the concomitant need to connect the mines to the industrial centres; and the factories and workshops to different markets, resulted in the construction of a dense network of roads, railways, and canals which profoundly altered the natural environment. The rapid increase in mass produced wares for an expanding world market, which was made possible by the use of machinery and the division of labour, gave economic power and political control to the rising capitalist class. By the time the Great Exhibition was held in London in 1850, England was referred to as "The Workshop of the World"; and Sir Francis Bacon's technological utopia, prophesized in ***The New Atlantis*** (1626), was beginning to materialize.

However, progress, was a Janus faced process. The combined influence of the Enlightenment and empirical thought, on the one hand, and the puritan ethics, which praised work and success as signs of election, and condemned poverty as evidence of idleness and divine curse, on the other, produced mitigated results. The growth of the factory system did not lead to the land of plenty and rest promised by Bacon. The increased use of machines caused the decline of craftsmanship; and with it the economic importance and social pre-eminence of craftsmen and their traditional organizations: the guilds. The ―fortunate,

provident‖ few, who had invested their money and energy in industry and trade, accumulated wealth which in turn gave them control over political institutions. Thus, exploitation of the labouring poor by the new middle classes was backed up by social legislation such as The New Poor Laws of 1834. The puritans' conception of work and Herbert Malthus's theory on population growth as it relates to resources gave it "moral and scientific" sanction. Strange as that seems, pauperization and the plight of the labouring poor increased in proportion to industrial growth; and the poor were looking forward to the reign of equality, peace and rest that the new millennium was expected to herald. The precarious situation of the working man described by Friedrich Engels in ***The Condition of the Working Classes in England*** (1886), was exacerbated, Mathew Beaumont writes, 'by the effects of the "Great Depression" from the mid- 1870s to the mid-1890s [which exposed] the decline of Britain's industrial supremacy, [and] fissured the middle classes' confidence in the capitalist system' (Beaumont, 2005: 6)

There had been growing among the workers and members of the middle classes who had developed a social conscience the conviction that 'the system was as bad as it can be' and that in consequence 'many schemes more or less philanthropic or revolutionary are proposed for its regeneration' (carpenter, 1885: 3). Actions toward regeneration had taken a variety of forms. The most worthy of mention among these were the desperate attempts of the machine wreckers to 'stop mechanical progress', Robert Owens's experiment with cooperative work at New Lanark, agitation by the Chartists for the repeal of the Corn Laws and enfranchisement for the workers, and the 1848 revolutions in the early decades of the century. Equally worthy of note is the initial union of the liberals with the working classes, especially in their agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws and the extension of the franchise which was to give the liberals comfortable legislative majority for the adoption of Free Trade measures. Bellamy's version of "national socialism" mobilizing an "industrial army" whose new creed is

"the Religion of Solidarity", which has been discussed in the previous chapter, represents the culmination and one of the most popular remedies to the excesses of capitalism. However, once the captains of industry had achieved political supremacy over the Tories, there followed a period of economic prosperity during which the liberals, who assumed political power, concerned themselves more with trade and imperial expansion than with the claims of the working classes. Reasons for this divorce of Liberals with the workers will be discussed later. This may, in part, explain the radical claims of the New Unionism and syndicalism of the 1880s.

To the financial and political power accumulated by the representatives of industry and finance, the workers retaliated by combining their powers through trade unions. Two factors helped in the development of workers' combination in the 1880s, Henry Pelling notes: 'the effects of "the Great Depression", with its apparent threat to Britain's industrial supremacy, and the emergence of Marxian socialism' (Pelling, 1993: 83). Signs of a pervasive crisis, and imminent confrontation pervaded the social body. One sign of the malaise, probably due to the spread of Marxist discourse, was a sharpening of the workers' class consciousness which took the form of massive integration by workers of trade unions. Another sign was the formation of the Social Democratic Federation under A.H. Hyndman which, Pelling writes, 'took the lead in the great unemployed demonstrations of 1886-1887 [. . . and] was advocating a law to establish the eight-hour day (ibid)'. A last but no less important sign was the election as union leaders of young men imbued with socialist ideas such as Tom Mann, and James Keir Hardie who were critical toward their elderly union leaders' leniency, and less prone than them to compromise. The fighting spirit insufflated by the new leaders resulted in the frequent conflicts in labour such as strikes, picketing, and demonstrations in the late 1880s.

The English state representing the moneyed and industrial interests refused to yield to workers claims. On the contrary, employers resorted to pressures and blackmailing against

unionized workers. The most common practices were recourse to blackleg labour to break the strikes, and repression of workers demonstrations by police or military forces. Indeed, against a background dominated by scenes of mob violence of the storming of the Bastille, violence inflated by such writings as Edmund Burke's ***Reflections on the Revolution in France,*** and the Cacotopian novels, an extreme form of dystopia, published in the 1880s to demonize popular democracy, the ruling classes met workers' pleas with suspicion mixed with fear. Henry Pelling remarks in this respect that

> [. . .]ministers of the crown in most cases knew very little about the lives or the feelings of the manual worker; and any signs of organization among them were frequently regarded with alarm, as being potentially criminal and even seditious (Pelling,1993: 3)

This led to the split of the social scene into two antagonistic factions, the well-off and the poor, separated by an abyss of mutual ignorance, class prejudice, contempt and hatred. Time seemed ripe for action. And in face of the ruling classes' negative responsiveness to their demands, workers and their representatives grew more and more convinced that only collective revolutionary action and the socialization of the means of production was likely to put an end to their slavery.

The sense of crisis, combined with the advent of the millennium created an atmosphere of expectation. Hope for a better future had taken the form of communitarian experiments which have known varying degrees of success. Various manifestoes such as the Manifesto of The Communist Party (1848) announced the advent of an egalitarian society. The success of the Paris Commune in 1871, and the experiment by their French neighbours with proletarian democracy sharpened British workers' hope in the near advent of socialism. Emboldened by the success of the popular revolution in France, English workers, who did not have their own political representation in parliament in the 1890s, had no other choice, Henry Pelling writes, than _put their claims before parliament and the government [. . .] by petitioning or lobbying, by public demonstrations and pamphleteering, or more crudely by disturbance of the peace'

(ibid). Agitation was conducted by workers' unions to claim an eight- hour work day and to limit wage cuts claimed by the capitalists who argued that they were necessary for English products to stand competition against U.S. and German ones. It was during one of these demonstrations against the Irish Coercion Act on 13 November 1887, that the police and army ruthlessly charged the peaceful demonstrators killing five protesters and making a large number of victims among whom were women and children(Baumont:2005,28). These events referred to as "Bloody Sunday" were to have immediate and lasting effects.

The immediate effect was the split of the socialist movement into two factions which, though in accord on the end, disagreed on the means to achieve it. In a country where people had still vivid in their minds the excesses of the French Revolution, 'It precipitated', in *E.P.* Thomson's words, 'the turn towards Fabianism and gradualism, and the spread of disillusionment in revolutionary organization and tactics'(Thomson,1977: 502). Playing on the fears of the English people and their traditional animosity toward the French, the reformist trend within the socialist movement reinforced themselves on the political scene. Marxist socialists and anarchists became more than ever before convinced that the lukewarm attitude of reform minded socialists such as the Fabians and the moderate members of the S.D.F. turned them into objective allies of the capitalists. By advocating gradualism, they delayed the advent of the socialist society to an indefinite point in the remote future. Socialists believed that only a large scale alliance of all the workers determined to sweep away the capitalist system, based on property and exploitation, could bring about the socialist state. It was in this period of disillusion mingled with hope and aspirations that William Morris, an accomplished artist and militant socialist, wrote ***News from Nowhere*** (1892).

Any discussion of Morris's utopia that does not take into account the immediate events that triggered its writing and the author's personality will prove an arduous task that will do justice neither to the author's contribution to the utopian tradition and the social debate, nor to

his earnest quest for a genuine socialist order that would draw upon the English cultural tradition, and reconcile social harmony with individual happiness. One important way to read Morris‘s utopia is to set it against the background in which it was produced; a task which I hope the introduction has partly provided for. Accordingly, Morris‘s utopia is to be interpreted in its dialogic relation to the state of near insurrection that prevailed in the 1890s, and in the polyphony of reformist and revolutionary voices contending to shape the future of the English capitalist society at the “fin de siècle”. If the majority of critics agree on the richness and originality of Morris‘s romance as a direct answer to the calls of the workers and to Edward Bellamy‘s ***Looking Backward*** (1888), there is no consensus on what makes the strength and originality of the novel.

Review of the literature

Most critics considered two facets of Morris‘s personality in discussing ***News from Nowhere***: its author’s varied artistic inclinations, and his commitment to Marxist ideas. To art and the triumph of socialism, he devoted his time, money, and intellectual genius. These two passions, Clive Wilmer affirms in his introduction , have finally used up his energies, for he reports that the doctor who examined him after his death at the age of sixty two declared that his ‘disease is simply being William Morris, and having done more work than most ten men’(Wilmer:1993,ix). Jean Paul Revauger (2004) considers William Morris together with his master John Ruskin as the spiritual guides of the Guild Socialists; while George Claeys in “Socialized individuality: A Re-assessment of the Sources and Classification of Morris’s Socialism” notes the difficulty to categorize Morris as a socialist, but underscores the authors’ merit in transcending ‘the artificial dualism of the utopian/ scientific distinction’ (Claeys: 2004, 164). The same critic highlights further Morris’s insistence on the individual and the local over the systemic standardizing trends of the traditional utopias, which places him close to anarchism. Mathew Beaumont, an expert on utopian thought in the Victorian era, reads

News from Nowhere as a form of political discourse with a dual function. On the one hand, it engages in a dialogue with the conservative cacotopian discourse and the Liberals' gradualist "idea", which attempted to dramatize the effects of "mob rule" in France to arouse aversion to and scare English public opinion away from communism and popular democracy, or at least leave the advent of socialism to peaceful historical evolution. On the other hand, 'it presents an ideal socialist society that negates the empty present of capitalism [. . .] and depicts a present [in a future socialist "epoch of rest"] characterized by plenitude and transparency' (Beaumont: 2005: 172).

Issue and hypothesis

Although critics have discussed at length Morris's conception of happiness at work, the author's attitude to Victorian utilitarianism and the ―Gospel of Work‖, together with his relationship to nature and the Arcadian drive that inform his work have not been given fair attention. Besides, apart from presenting him as a romantic opponent of modern civilization, critics have not sufficiently investigated the long run ecological effects of his pastoral utopia and the focus it lays on the particular, the individual, and the local over the systemic, the typical and the global. The present research purports, accordingly, to situate the complex personality of the author as a speaking subject, but more importantly as a social agent involved in a struggle to renegotiate the social, economic and political order of his society. With hindsight and reflection on the practices, the impact, and the fate of communism in Asia and Eastern Europe, we can better appreciate Morris's "Kropotkinesque" form of decentralized socialism, and his distrust of the totalitarian ideologies of our time, be they liberal or communist. Later dystopias such as Aldous Huxley's Brave ***New World*** (1932), and George Orwell's ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1948), were to prove him right; "ideal" systems may lead to totalitarianism which is deadly to genuine happiness and individual freedom.

Politically, Morris is a difficult person to situate. With a comfortable annual income of £ 900 at the age of 21, he was a well-to- do liberal who became the treasurer of the largely working class National Liberal League. In 1883, he left the Liberal party, which he suspected was leading the same imperialist policies as the conservatives, for the Social Democratic Federation under Hyndman before his disagreement with its strategy of permeation convinced him to found, with Eleanor Marx and others, the Socialist League. Morris himself writes that

'the only safe way of reading a utopia is to consider it as the expression of the temperament of its author' (Morris, 1994: 420). We shall trust Morris's soundness of judgment and appeal to Karl Mannheim (1936) to read the writer's utopian mentality.

Methodology: Mannheim's Types of the Utopian Mentality

Karl Mannheim defines

> [. . .] a state of mind [as] utopian when it is incongruous with the state of reality within which it occurs[taking care to precise that] only those orientations transcending reality will be regarded as utopian which when they pass over into conduct tend to shatter, either partially or wholly, the order of thing prevailing at the time (Mannheim,1936: 192).

He explains further that certain "situationally transcendent ideas' such as fairy tales, dreams, escapist thought, myths, romances, and humanistic fantasies, have always informed men's lives but these cannot be labeled as utopian for they do not alter the existing social order. On the contrary, they rather tend to maintain it by veiling its flaws from view, or providing a temporary escape from the incongruities of the present instead of altering it. As such, they perform an ideological function since they are interested in things as they are, not as they should be.

Before it performs its transformative function, Mannheim writes, a utopia goes through a series of stages. At its initial stage, the utopia germinates as a wish fantasy in the mind of a single charismatic individual. Later, it is incorporated in a social group which can be sociologically determined. This individual, who is gifted with particular creative genius,

pioneers a vision which is determined by the social position of the group he belongs to, reflects the world view of its members, who are usually dissatisfied with things as they are, and so undertakes to break the bonds of the existing order. Mannheim warns us against the risk of overestimating the influence of the individual over his group however gifted he may be. Unless the individual utopia conforms to emotions and ideas of the group, it will fail to mobilize its adhesion and therefore lack the human resources necessary to produce the desired change.(ibid, 207-208)

Mannheim has identified four types of utopian mentality. In his categorization of these utopian structures of mind, this sociologist considers the way the members of each group relate their thoughts and actions to time: past, present and future. Accordingly, he labels them as: ‗the orgiastic chiliasm, the liberal humanitarian idea, the conservative idea, and the socialist-communist idea'. Mannheim considers that politics in the modern sense began with the peasant revolts of the Middle- Ages under the leadership of monks like Joachim of Flores, and later Thomas Muntzer. Orgiastic energies and ecstatic tensions, formerly of religious nature and oriented toward a realm beyond the present, assumed secular forms and were reoriented towards the satisfaction of worldly ends. The pleasures of heaven were given gratification, through violent action, in the here and now. This outlook has taken the form of anarchism in modern times.

The liberal idea, the second form of utopian mentality, is ―the child of the Enlightenment‖. It represents the utopia of the rising bourgeoisie and the Whigs which questioned the traditional world view of the Catholic clergy and the landed aristocracy. The liberal idea is oriented towards the future. It follows the dictates of reason and the teachings of experience to correct the flaws of the present which itself has evolved from the original flawed state of nature. For the liberals then, history is a linear process of progressive

improvement that will irretrievably culminate in the realization of the perfect state; the utopia somewhere in the remote future.

Unlike liberals, conservatives do not theorize. They trust in the soundness of the traditions, institutions, and practices which constrain social subjects' thoughts and actions. The conservatives' idea is the 'living reality'. They often dismiss their opponents' utopias as unrealizable chimera, or 'a mere opinion, vaporous and lacking concreteness'. The conservatives' idea is the "topia"; their ideal is the here and now. Conservatives may return to the past, but they do so only to show the present as an unchanging continuity of long living ideas and practices. Their perpetuation is proof enough of their validity and legitimacy. To the conservatives then, any change of the present ideal order can lead but to chaos and anarchy; and is therefore strongly opposed.

The last form, the socialist- communist utopia, can best be analyzed in its relation to the other utopias. Like the liberals, socialists believe in history as a process of improvement that will lead gradually to the socialist state. However, unlike the liberals, socialists set the realization of their utopia at a definite time in the future which coincides with the collapse of the capitalist mode of production and culture. For socialists, ideas are not dreams or mere wishes. They are rational, realistic aspirations based on the observation of the historical process, and as such, they turn into motive power for transformative social action under clearly identified circumstances. The road which had led from the past to the unsatisfactory present, and which will lead to the projected socialist state of the future is scientifically investigated so that adequate means are mobilized, and appropriate strategies traced to achieve the projected ideal.(ibid, 211-245)

These different forms of utopia often coexist, albeit conflictingly, in modern society. The culture of society is, thus, a conglomerate of these different worldviews; with varying degrees of dominance, and in perpetual dynamic interaction. _Any epoch, Beaumont writes, is

therefore a dialectical cultural process shaped by the complex interrelations between movements and tendencies both within and beyond a specific and effective dominance‘ (Baumont: 2005, 21). It follows that Morris is apprehended as a member of a social stratum whose fears and apprehensions are reflected in the aspirations he gives voice to. It also follows that his utopia should be read as an utterance by means of which he enters into a dialogue with the other utopian mentalities about the future of the English society. It is no surprise, then, that Morris‘s romance starts with the account given by a friend about a meeting of the Socialist League in which there was ‗a brisk conversational discussion, as to what would happen on the morrow of the revolution. . . ‘(Morris: 1993, 43). During the meeting, the narrator points out that there were as many diverging points of view as there were factions, insisting on the majority of delegates having ‗strong but divergent anarchist opinions‘ (ibid).

It was these divergences among the English socialists which irritated Morris and which made one of the delegates, apparently Morris himself, lose his temper at the ‗foolish‘ schemes they drafted. At the end of the meeting, he caught the train back home on the bank of the Thames musing on the state of the new society repeating to himself, ‗If I could see a day of it! [. . .] If I could but see it!‘(Ibid: 44). It was with the same yearning that he went to bed in his house in Hammersmith on a winter night, to awake in the new society on a bright summer morning in the same place, but in the year 2103.

The New Society

The story of William guest‘s visit to the new society unfolds in the form of two journeys into the centre of London. Entry into the utopia takes the form of a purifying and rejuvenating bath; ‗a baptismal submersion in the now clean waters of the Thames‘ (Latham: 2004, 55). A boatman by the name of Dick offers to drive him on a round trip by coach from ―Guests‘ House‖ in Hammersmith, past the Houses of Parliament, to the British Museum, and back.

The second journey is a boat-trip offered the visitor by Dick and his wife Clara, from Kelmscott House to Kelmscott Manor, two places familiar and dear to William Morris. Their object is to join in the year‘s haymaking festival in Oxfordshire on the upper parts of the Thames. On their way upstream, they meet Helen, a lively charming young woman with whom Guest falls in love.

In utopian writing, journeys and visits involve discovery, initiation and learning, and finally the return of the visitor to his society as a changed man, a missionary. His task now is to share his vision and enthusiasm to make ‘others [. . .] see it as [he has] seen it’ (Morris, 1993: 228) to arouse enthusiasm and stir transformative action. This, however, will require ‘strife, pain and labour to build up little by little the new day of fellowship, and rest and happiness’ (ibid).Guest’s experience then is not a mere fantasy, an escapist dream, but a realistic workable scheme on condition that others see it from the hero‘s perspective; in other words not from the philistine materialistic perspective of the Victorian society, or the materialistic martial logic of Edward Bellamy. Guest‘s visit to the new society has a dual impact. The first, Clive Wilmer writes, ‘is a Marxist inquiry into the historical process’ which brought about the new society. The second involves an emotional, existential quest for rest and happiness. This form of happiness, Morris suggests, can be achieved only through the abolition of commercialism and utilitarianism which largely informed Victorian ethics, and through a redefinition of work and social organization.

A Marxist View of History

Through his first trip, Guest learns from old Hammond, a 105 year old man interested in the history of Nineteenth century England that change came through a workers’ revolution. When Guest inquires whether the change was peaceful, the old historian replied that ‘it was bitter war till hope and pleasure put an end to it’ (Morris, 1993: 133). The revolution started with the demonstrations of Trafalgar Square which were repressed by the army in 1952. They

were followed by a General strike of all the productive forces and the dissolution of parliament which was replaced by a Committee of Public Safety. The Committee was represented locally by workers' committees whose task was to give relief to people by producing and distributing food. As old Hammond explains, the union of all the productive forces under the leadership of the Committee for Public Safety made the forces of reaction powerless. Besides, members of the Committee for public Safety, whose leadership and administrative skills had been sharpened by the civil war, took care to drop the word "revolution" and replace it by the more neutral name of " Board of Conciliation and its Local Offices" to avoid scaring public opinion. Unlike the liberals and the Fabians who believe in a gradual peaceful evolution towards socialism, Morris advocates revolution. He is not politically naïve and is quite aware, as old Hammond explains, that the forces of reaction had more than once launched counter offensives by fomenting "a coup d'état" and later through an armed militia named "the friends of order" composed mostly of members of the upper middle classes who collected arms and tried to defend the great industrial centres against the revolutionaries in vain (Ibid: 147-155).

By engaging in a sort of Socratic dialogue with old Hammond, William Guest learns that the new society had evolved laboriously. It assumed its present shape as a result of the abolition of property which was perceived as the source of all forms of evil plaguing society. With the abolition of capitalism based on the quest for profit, England had gradually recovered its pastoral aspects. People naturally returned to country villages, occupied the freed lands, and the villages became populous and alive again. Like old Hammond whom he makes his spokesman, Morris is horrified by the effects of capitalism on the country, its people and their values. 'This is how we stand', the old man declares,

> England was once a country of clearings amongst the woods and wastes, with a few towns interspersed, which were fortresses for the feudal army, markets for folks, gathering places for craftsmen. It then became a country of huge and foul workshops, and

> fouler gambling dens, surrounded by ill kept, poverty stricken farms, pillaged by the masters of the workshops. It is now ***a garden***(emphasis mine), where nothing is wasted and nothing is spoilt, with the necessary dwellings, sheds, and workshops, scattered up and down the country, all trim and neat and pretty (Morris, 1993: 105)

The factories by the Thames have gone, and the river which has recovered its purity abounds in perch and salmon. The abolition of private property and profit based activities has rendered obsolete the traditional institutions linked to capitalism. In much the same way as knowledge had caused the fall of Adam and Eve, industrialism, which was the result of scientific inquiry and technical development to control and appropriate natural resources to the benefit of man, had killed the pastoral beauty and care free society of late medieval England. The recovery of previous innocence and happiness requires, for Morris, the destruction of industrialism, together with its economic and political expressions private property, ―Laissez Faire‖ capitalism, and power lust. This was precisely what the revolution had done in his utopia, and this was the way to the good society, Morris argued, in the nineteenth century England.

In the new socialist society that unfolds before the narrator, one old institution after the other has withered away. The Houses of Parliament which were at first intended to be pulled down have finally been preserved and turned 'into a storage place for manure' owing to the intervention of 'a queer antiquarian society' opposed to the destruction of ancient buildings (Ibid, 69). Morris hints at his Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings founded in 1877, and uses irony to suggest that dung, in the new, mostly agrarian society, is more useful than the corrupt politicians committed to the protection of private property in the old order. Courthouses, just like the august legislative institution, have also become useless. There being no private property that would stir envy, greed, or the quest for wealth which gives access to social prestige, most crimes such as theft, robbery, or swindling, have naturally died out. As old Hammond explains, 'it is easy for us to live without robbing each other [because] this has become a tradition, a habit of life. [. . .] That is in short the

foundation of our life and our happiness' (Ibid: 112). Transgressions of this tradition do occur occasionally, but then, they are taken as mere errors to which the transgressor soon makes amend. Here again, Morris seems to suggest that the most stringent criminal laws would not prevent crime in a society where a good portion of the population is denied access to the basic necessities of life, whereas a more equitable distribution of wealth would be the best way to its prevention. Old Hammond further explains that the punishment inflicted by courts upon "criminals" used to express 'the fears of the rulers of society [who] were dwelling like an armed band in a hostile country; but we who live among our friends need neither fear nor punish' (Ibid:114).

Equally important is the change that has occurred in people's constitutions, their social organization, and lives. All the denizens Guest meets in the new society are strikingly healthy, good looking, and merry. The men are strongly built and handsomely groomed in what looked like fourteenth century costumes. The young women, equally healthy and fair looking, free from the artificial coquettish inhibitions of Victorian women, were naturally sociable and graceful. Guest who was asked his age shocked his hosts when he replied that he was hard on fifty-six 'because as one of the young women waiting on them at "the Guests House" explained, 'you look rather old for your age' (57). Morris uses the young woman as his mouthpiece to account for Guest's precocious ageing compared to the inhabitants of his utopia by remarking that 'one ages very quickly if one lives amongst unhappy people' (ibid). Even the centenary old Hammond doesn't seem to have been affected by age considering his sharp wits and excellent memory. The good constitution of the "Nowherians" seems to be the result of the healthful influence of the Earthly Paradise in which they live. They live in small communities in close contact with nature; in little villages and mansions beautifully decorated and scattered in the midst of fields, woods and forests. The ecology of the surrounding environment is reflected in the inner balance of the "Nowherians", whose self-ecologies

irradiate outward through their kindness, human warmth, and happiness, all of which exert a healing influence on Guest. This quality of life is the result of the revolution which has led to the destruction of the ancient order, with society regressing 'to a state as rude as barbarism', until it led to the rebirth of a new world with a new spirit.

> The spirit of the new days, of our days, [old Hammond explains] was to be delight in the life of the world; intense and overwhelming love of the very skin and surface of the earth on which man dwells, such as a lover has in the fair flesh of the woman he loves; this, I say, was to be the new spirit of the time (158).

What makes the happiness of the "Nowherians" is their absorption in the enjoyment of the present experience. They neither look with nostalgia toward a lost bright past nor dream of a promising future. They are not alienated from the present, the here and now, of which they intensely appreciate every moment, every detail.

Another important factor of good health, happiness, and rest, is the relationship of the Nowherians to work. Morris was horrified by the alienating effects of the factory system and the modern organization of labour. In a lecture given to The Hampstead Liberal club in 1884, entitled 'Useful Work versus Useless toil', he argues that the Victorian society is divided into two distinct classes; the upper parasitical classes made up of aristocrats and middle class financiers and factory owners, who hardly ever do any work, and the working classes who spend all their life at work with little hope for rest or pleasure at work (Morris: 1993, 287-306). In this society, workers are robbed of the fruit of their labour because what Engels call "surplus value" benefits to the masters and factory owners. Workers lead a life of slaves forced to toil according to a tempo imposed by the machine to ensure the bare necessities of life. To this 'useless toil', Morris opposes 'pleasurable useful work' such as the work done by the craftsmen and the yeoman farmer in the middle Ages. Work of this kind provides pleasure to the artisan who can contemplate the finished object of his creative genius and labour. It gives

him an identity, satisfaction, and hope of rest. In Morris's utopia, freely chosen pleasurable work has replaced alienating useless labour. This has been achieved through abolition of property, the modern division of labour, and the disappearance of the unproductive classes. One can say with Herbert Marcuse (1957) that Morris's ***"Nowhere"*** is a society governed by the _Pleasure principle' instead of the _Reality Principle'.

The Politics of a Revolutionary Aesthete

It is only when one attempts to seize Morris's 'temperament' that one fully grasps George Clay's claim that the writer 'defies easy categorization as a socialist, and in particular, the crucial divide between "utopian" and "scientific" socialism. . .'(Clays: 2004, 163-164). The complexity of his personality and views may be attributed to his variegated artistic and intellectual pursuits ranging from architecture, restoration, decoration, tapestry, wallpaper, poetry, translation, prose and essay writing(Wilmer:1993). ***News from Nowhere*** reveals influences of the main texts of the utopian tradition such as Hesiod's ***The Isle of the Blessed, The Land of Cokaygne,*** Sir Thomas More's ***Utopia*** (1516) which he published with a foreword in his Kelmscott Press in 1893, and where he praises More's system as the precursor of modern socialism (Morris: 1993, p.373- 375). It also reveals the influence of socialist writings such as ***The Communist Manifesto*** (1848), Karl Marx's ***Das Kapital,*** which he reads in French translation in 1883, and Particularly Bellamy's ***Looking Backward: 2000-1887*** (1888), to which Morris's romance was meant as a direct answer. What is worthy of notice is that Morris's "***Epoch of Rest"*** draws more heavily on the libertarian pastoral utopias than on the more ―serious‖ texts of the tradition such as Plato's ***Republic,*** or Francis Bacons ***New Atlantis*** and particularly Bellamy's ***Looking Backward*** to which it constituted a polemical rejoinder**.** One reason for this choice is that the triumph of commercialism and industrialism which were the materialization of the Enlightenment utopia in its liberal form had brought increased deprivation, dependence on new and more ruthless masters, and

unhappiness for the working man. Another reason lies in his fears that philanthropy in the form of readymade ideal commonwealths benevolently handed down by elites to passive, submissive and grateful subjects such as the one envisioned by Bellamy, may prove deadly to the individual‘s creative potential, his freedom, and his happiness at work.

Morris’s readings of the above mentioned communist literature and his frequent discussions with Eleanor Marx have introduced him to the process of historical materialism. This may explain his departure from the Liberal Party for the Social Democratic Federation; which he soon left because he was dissatisfied with its gradualist strategies. This may also explain his attack on Bellamy whose ‘Whig frame of mind’ and whose gradualist peaceful utopia he finds complicit with capitalist order. By contrast to the Liberals, the socialists, and the Fabians, Morris was convinced that the in 1890s, capitalism had reached its point of crisis, and that the social historical context was propitious for a proletarian revolution. Obvious signs of the crisis were the frequent strikes on the docks, in the mines, and the gas works, under the leadership of men imbued with socialist ideas. In “The Hopes of Civilization”, a lecture that William Morris gave before the Hammersmith Branch of The Socialist League in 1885, he explains at length the historical evolution of human societies from the slave revolts of the Antiquity, through the peasant revolts of the Middle-Ages, to the formation of the class conscious proletariat of modern capitalist societies. Morris, now a convinced Marxist, insists that ideas and political organization reflect the material conditions of each epoch which they tend to foster and perpetuate. It follows that members of the politically dominant strata cannot be trusted in their promises to improve the condition of their ‘slaves’. And Morris to conclude logically that

> [. . .] to a reasonable man, it seems unlikely to the last degree, or we will say impossible that a moral sentiment will induce the proprietary classes[. . . that live by the labour of others] to yield up this privilege uncompelled; all one can hope is that they will see the implicit threat of compulsion in the event of the day, and so yield with good grace to the terrible necessity of forming part of a world in which all, including themselves, will work honestly and live easily (Morris, 1993: 309-328).

It should also be noted that the revolution for Morris will not be necessarily violent if the holders of the ancient order do not oppose change which has become a historical necessity.

As a Marxist, Morris's analysis of class relations in the nineteenth century English society bears striking similarities to the analysis developed by Friedrich Engels in ***The Condition of the Working Classes in England*** (1845). Both thinkers agree that the mechanization of farming and industry, and the reorientation of production to meet the needs of a growing world market and stand competition against the newly emerging powers, led to the destruction of the medieval economic and social structures, and caused the ruin of numerous craftsmen, journeymen, and farmers who were forced to join the largely unemployed or under-employed urban proletariat. In 1845, Engels, who was writing about the situation of the workers before the Industrial Revolution, observes that

> [t]hey did not need to overwork; they did no more than they chose to do, and yet earned what they needed. They had leisure for healthful work in field or garden, work which in itself, was recreation for them, and they could take part besides in the recreation and games of their neighbours, and all these games- bowling, football, cricket, etc- contributed to their physical health and vigour. They were for the most part strong [. . . and] well-built people. Their children grew up in the fresh country air, and if they could help their parents at work, it was only occasionally; while of eight or twelve hours for them there was no question (Engels, 1987: 51).

The modern division of labour was to change this state of affairs. These free, healthy, lively, and dignified human beings had been turned by the greed of the newly formed commercial and capitalist classes, in a matter of a few decades, into armies of half-starving urban paupers, totally dependent on the good will of their masters. It is no surprise that Engels, who lived in close contact with the workers for about two years, assimilates the Industrial Revolution and the legislation that was passed to promote it, especially The New Poor Laws (1834), to ‗premeditated crime' considering their effects on the condition of the

workers. Engels illustrates his claim by referring to the working people one meets in the industrial towns as

> [. . .] pale, lank, narrow-chested, hollow eyed ghosts, whom one passes at every step, these languid flabby faces, incapable of the slightest energetic expression, I have seen in startling numbers only in London, though consumption carries off a horde of victims in the factory towns of the north. In competition with consumption stand the Typhus, to say nothing of Scarlet Fever, a disease which brings most frightful devastation in the ranks of the working class (ibid: 130).

These are the effects, which Engels and Morris, attribute to the capitalist division of labour with its sacrosanct maxim of ―maximum profit at the lowest possible cost‖, and which had forced the workers into insanitary dwellings, overwork and poor diets. One positive thing of the industrial system, for Engels, is that it sharpened workers class consciousness and increased their hatred toward their masters; two important preconditions for a proletarian revolution to start.

Where does Morris stand?

If one considers "How the Change Came" as described in Chapter xvii, Morris's romance reads like a blueprint tracing the steps of a revolutionary strategy that would lead to Communist society. He warns workers against the reformist temptations of bourgeois intellectuals who 'called themselves socialists', and who attempted to allure them into believing in a peaceful and gradual improvement of their 'state of slavery by forcing the rich to pay much' until a state of 'practical equality was achieved' (Morris, 1993: 134).For the communist society to come to life, Morris insists, three conditions must be fulfilled. First, total divorce should occur between the proletariat, which should constitute a class conscious monolithic block, and the capitalist class or their representatives. Secondly, the change can occur only through revolutionary action which will result not only in a radical transformation of the economic structure, but also of the ideology, or "superstructure", which sustains it. Finally, the revolution must be spearheaded by a vanguard of particularly gifted workers'

representatives organized as "The Committee for Public Safety". In this case, Morris's utopia seems to fit in Mannheim's "communist –socialist" category.

Yet, some of its other aspects show the new society to be closer to the other categories of utopian mentality identified by Karl Mannheim. It is a future society which goes back to the Middle-Ages, and even further back to recover a quality of life, values, and a social organization that industrialism has destroyed. Morris resuscitates the pastoral, largely rural England of the late Middle-Ages; then freezes history into an eternal present which gives the "Nowherians", who rejoice in the immediate pleasures of the here and now, entire satisfaction. As such, one is at loss whether to consider William Morris as a romantic conservative clinging to an order of things that the triumphant advance of industrialism was threatening with extinction; or as an anarchist averse to any form of order, who does as he pleases, and whose energies are oriented toward the immediate gratification of pleasures in the present. One aspect of Morris's personality is his declared ' desire to produce beautiful things [. . . combined with an intense] hatred of modern civilization'(Morris,1993: 381), and his commitment, together with medievalist figures like Dante Gabriel Rosetti, John Ruskin, and Thomas Carlyle to the revival and preservation of the simple pleasures of medieval lifestyles with its Gothic architecture, and handicrafts. Medievalists' aesthetics; their interest in handicrafts and Gothic architecture, Clive Wilmer explains, reveals both ethical and political pursuits. Aesthetically it denotes the quest for a higher order pleasure that only the production and contemplation of art can provide. It shows the craftsman's quest for freedom at work and his joy in the creative process which is perceived as a process of self-fulfilment and self-construction. Politically it seeks freedom from the slavish imitation of classical art, and emancipation of the workers from the alienating effects that the division of labour and the mass produced wares which the factory system forces upon them. It appears, then, that Morris's aesthetic choices reveal his political commitment.

His political commitment and ethical choices acquire meaning when they are read against the philistine utilitarianism of the "nouveaux riches" of his time. Utilitarianism is roughly defined as 'the quest for pleasure and the avoidance of pain'. Utilitarian philosophers measured the value of actions by the amount of pleasure they could generate, or the intensity of the pain they could spare. Thinkers like Jeremy Bentham, for example, went so far as to devise a method whereby to calculate the amount of pleasure which an action is expected to generate. Pleasure, however, was often associated with the material condition achieved by an individual or a social body through their actions. It follows that actions that would increase an individual's or a nation's material wealth are said to comply with the principle of utility; for material comfort, it is believed, reduces pain and increases happiness.

Utilitarianism served as the ideological basis to a rising class of capitalists and their little bourgeois allies. It was this philosophy that glorified the achievements of technology and the advance of industrialism as the best way to individuals' moral salvation, the nation's wealth and the happiness of its members. It follows that the workers' suffering is perceived as the direct result of their idleness and improvidence. It was again this philosophy that inspired such legislation as The New Poor Laws 1834, Free trade, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws. These laws were deemed necessary because they turned "idle, improvident workers" into 'useful members of society and maintained the fragile balance between scarce resources and population‖, ―they introduced light through trade into backward communities', and provided cheap bread to the workers. What actually happened, E.P.Thomson writes, is that this philosophy multiplied the wealth of the rich fivefold and so increased their political power at the expense of the workers' health, dignity, and happiness. The same philosophy inspired and legitimised colonial enterprise, imperial domination and the subjection of so called "prolific, and improvident backward populations"(Thomson:1977, pp.45-46).

Morris's conception of happiness rests on totally different bases. In his ideal society, the abolition of property has created an equality of condition that has broken the vicious circle of perpetual strife and competition for the accumulation of wealth. Men's material possessions are no longer the measure of their happiness as property has been reduced to the basic necessities: a beautiful stone cottage in the midst of a wood or surrounded by a garden, good food, and colourful clothes, all of which are obtained through a freely chosen agreeable work. The choice and the nature of work are paramount in achieving happiness. Craftsmanship demands a personal emotional, mental, and physical investment for the creation of an object and the construction of a personal identity. A craftsman is also the product of his work since his reputation rests to a large extent on the quality of his wares. His relation to his work is economical, but also social and existential. He acquires a social status and an identity by virtue of the art he produces. A.L. Morton writes in this respect that _[Morris] had learned from Ruskin to see art not as a special activity producing a special kind of luxury goods but as an essential part of the whole life of man' (Morton: 1969, 209). Morris's conception of work as it is performed in his future communist society stands in contradistinction with the compulsory, mechanical, alienating labour resulting from modern industrial organization. 'Art or Work Pleasure', as old Hammond calls it (Morris: 1993, 160), is the source of people's happiness.

Morris's utopia may also be read as the quest for an original state of 'happiness in innocence' proper only to young age. With growth and ageing come knowledge and the development of a moral sense, both of which constitute, according to Eric Rabkin,the consequences of the first act of transgression of God's command, and which subsequently resulted in Man's feeling of guilt with its corollary human incapacity for real pleasure (Rabkin: 1983, 3-4). This is true for individuals as well as societies. Guest's journey into the future socialist society of his dreams takes the form of a return to the rejuvenated England of his childhood; a society which

communism had rid of the shabbiness, pollution and human misery introduced by capitalism. To Guest who remarked on the 'childishness' of the "Nowherians'" art as expressed in their love of legends and fairy tales, Dick, his guide, explains that 'it is natural to like these things strange; just as when we were children. . .' and old Hammond to add that

> It is the child-like part of us that produces work of imagination. When we are children time passes so slow with us that we seem to have time for everything.[. . .] At least, lets rejoice that we have got back our childhood again. I drink to the days that are. [. . .] We are too happy, both individually and collectively, to trouble ourselves about what is to come hereafter. (Morris, 199:132).

The inhabitants of Morris's eutopia, like children, are fully reconciled with their present. They are neither romantics who mourn the loss of a golden age nor utopians who look forward to a time of rest and happiness to come. Their happy and carefree life comes from the recovery of their original state of innocence in close touch with nature; a state enjoyed by Adam and Eve before the Fall, or by primitive peoples whose minds have not been spoilt by the pursuit and accumulation of property. The term "garden", evocative of Eden, is often used to refer to the new society. To Ellen's father who seemed to favour the competitive life of the nineteenth century on the ground that competition made people 'freer, more energetic, healthier and happier', Guest replies: 'To me, you seem here as if you were living in *a heaven* compared with us of the country from which I came' (Morris: 1993, 176).It is this heaven that Morris challenges his readers to envision.

What makes ***News from Nowhere*** such a rich and appealing romance? It is because _into [it], as into no other book, A. L. Morton writes, Morris packed his hopes and his knowledge, all that he had accomplished and become in a life of struggle' (Morton: 1969, 209). What he had become, in the main, was a mature, humane social thinker doubled with an accomplished artist. His knowledge of history, and his readings into Marxist literature had taught him to apprehend ideas, morals, and art as ideological expressions of the material conditions of society. Hence, his vision of creative, pleasurable work and utilitarian ethics in a communist

society constitutes a direct critique of the Victorian alienating useless toil. Morris considers that the logic of the capitalist system enslaves both masters and workers. The former are bound all their life to stand competition against rivals on the national and world markets. They do so by tending their machinery, raising the cadence of work, increasing automation and specialisation. In short, they gradually turn into the servants of the machines, which were originally meant to serve them. In the same process, the worker becomes part of the complex machinery of the factory system; a mere commodity whose price is subject to the law of supply and demand. This alienating effect of the capitalist system on the owning and the working classes alike is clearly evoked by Guest‘s interpretation of

> Ellen‘s mournful look [which] seemed to say, [. . . .] _Go back again, then, and while you live, you will see all around you people engaged in making others live lives which are not their own, while themselves care nothing for their own real lives – men who hate life though they fear death‘(Morris: 1993, 228).

Only in a classless society in which ‘mastery has changed into fellowship’ could this state of alienation be superseded and an epoch ‘of rest and happiness’ be built up (ibid).

Morris uses his artistic sensitivity to construct the new society that stands as the antithesis of the Victorian one. It is mostly a rural, agro-pastoral society in which small town communities live close to the land and where individuals practise freely chosen activities in the service of their ―neighbours‖. Decisions are made through direct participation of all the members in meetings held in the local church. This form of decentralized democracy seems to run counter to the totalitarian tendencies of utopian societies in which king philosophers, scientists, or aristocrats devise a system that reconciles social harmony with individual happiness. Morris shows his suspicion of the Platonic and Baconian utopian systems. In his attempt to provide an alternative to Bellamy‘s centralised system, he insists on the importance of the individual and the local against the collective and the global.

Conclusion

To conclude, we can say with Clive Wilmer that ‘It is the central paradox of Morris‘s paradoxical character that in [his] hatred of modernity he is himself most modern, for it leads him to desire alternatives and to believe that he is able to construct them’ (Wilmer:2004, 30). His democratic pastoral utopia, in which individuals and small communities are given centrality over systems, prefigured the dystopian themes of alienation, cultural standardization, and corporate identities associated with modernity. In short, the discourse of the Enlightenment, which purported to emancipate man from ignorance, superstition, fear and want, by means of knowledge, reason and science, gradually led to the construction of modern man as the subject of a cluster of power structures in the modern bourgeois communist and liberal states.

Morris’s prediction that the good society could be achieved by means of a proletarian revolution proved wrong, but his skepticism in the capacity of centralized state socialism to ensure the happiness of the workers proved justified. His insistence on individuals over systems, on the local over the global, on the capacity for human beings to achieve happiness by other means than the accumulation of material wealth denotes the author‘s apprehension that bourgeois values will eventually triumph. Although an admirer of the French revolution and an advocate of revolutionary action, he took care never to make mention of executions or purges in the chapter “How the Change Came”. The realisation of the Communist utopia led to bureaucratic centralization, thought control, a police state, and purges; while liberalism led through gradual welfare measures to the consumerist affluent society, in which individuals are conditioned to swap their freedom and originality for access to the fruit of ―the new Eden‖. These flaws are admirably revealed in modern dystopian novels like ***Brave New World*** (1932) by A. Huxley, and ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1948) by George Orwell.

Interestingly, escape from the dystopian world in both novels is sought through a return to nature and individuality. In Orwell‘s dystopia, Utopia takes the form of “the golden country” in Winston Smith‘s dreams; a country where he enjoys moments of rest, freedom and bliss at the side of Julia, another dissident like himself, away from the deadening grip of the party ideology and Big Brother‘s scrutinizing panoptical look. In Huxley‘s technological dystopia, John “the savage” who has spent his life dreaming to join the “good place”, the modern world, flees the spurious pleasures of a spiritually barren modern life, which he is finally brought to, and takes refuge in the simple life of a farmer in quest of the simple pleasures of a pastoral life. John‘s nurture on the traditional values of honour, manliness, and moral probity lead him to flee the ‘sterilising effects of civilization’ and seek the epic ordeals, strong emotions of a classical age before, he experiences the tragic ending of a Shakespearean hero. Both Winston Smith and John “The savage” represent resistance to the enslaving potential of the Enlightenment utopia in its liberal and socialist versions. Morris‘s message, that rest and happiness can be reached through other paths than material wealth, is still valid in a world dominated by the globalising trend of bourgeois consumerist model. Art, individuality, cultural diversity, spirituality, or symbiosis with an unspoilt natural environment, may represent substitutes to the discourse of globalisation that the new empire is spreading to impose its hegemony on the world.

Conclusion to Part Four

The end of the nineteenth-century in England and the U.S.A. coincided with the crisis of industrialism and monopoly capitalism. Symptoms of the crisis were the Luddites' opposition to machines, the Chartists militancy for political representation, the failed 1848 revolutions in Europe, but mainly the Parisian Communards experiment with proletarian democracy in 1871 which threatened to create converts to proletarian revolutionary action among the unionised labour movement.

On the cultural level, this period was characterised by a 'veritable discursive explosion' (Beaumont, 2005:3) in the form of novels and short stories imagining various forms of remote societies from which the flaws of the nineteenth century society were removed. The utopias we considered in the present research drew creatively upon the tradition to embark in a critical dialogue with certain founding texts of the utopian tradition on the one hand, and with the ideas and practices informing their respective societies, on the other hand.

Samuel Butler's ***Erewhon*** is an inverted image of Victorian England. Erewhon is represented as a pastoral society which has imposed a ban on machines and industrialism. However, just like industrial England, this Arcadian society has its ideology, its flaws and weaknesses. Samuel Butler, who defines himself as a conscientious objector, resorts to utopian satire to warn his readers against the naive belief in ideal states. However, while he doubts in the capacity of man to achieve the closed ideal state, he unveils the ideological function of certain Victorian institutions such as religion, education, the judicial system in the service of the powers that be. Butler believes in criticism to correct the flaws of society but he warns against excessive zeal and readymade solutions.

Edward Bellamy relied on a gradual evolution of U.S. society toward socialism rather than on a proletarian revolution to solve the problems of capitalism. ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** **is** a liberal utopia in which Bellamy reconciled the aspirations of the working

classes to comfort and happiness with the ambitions of the U.S. industrial and political elites for power and prestige. The Religion of Solidarity which replaced the ―laissez faire‖ policy of the ―gilded age‖, and the Industrial Army committed to the service of the nation gradually led to the ideal socialist state in which everyone was provided according to his needs. This ideal system of organisation was to inspire and impregnate the rest world.

The success of Bellamy‘s utopia triggered William Morris‘s polemical rejoinder ***News from Nowhere*** (1892). Morris feared that socialists' belief in Bellamy‘s gradualist schemes might preclude the realisation of the socialist revolution or delay it to a remote point in the future. To the logic of industrial gigantism and administrative globalism that inform Bellamy‘s future society, and which hardly conceal the author‘s hegemonic liberal ambitions, William Morris imagines a socialist state brought about by revolution. Instead of a rigidly stratified industrial consumerist society, Morris envisions local pastoral societies where enjoyable 'work play' has replaced alienating industrial labour and in which strict military hierarchy and discipline have given way to fellowship.

The debates over the best way to reconcile progress with human happiness and the issues raised by the utopian authors continued to haunt human imagination at the eve of the new millennium. Conservatism, revolutionary socialism, liberal gradualism continued to grapple with the problems induced by progress. As to the "subject populations", they are either ignored and totally silenced, or made the reluctant participants of a play that was being written and directed by the Enlightened European.

References :

- Abiteboul, Maurice. « Faiblesses, lacunes et limites de l'utopie dans ***News from Nowhere*** », in ***William Morris News from Nowhere.***Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Attali, Jaques***. Demain, qui gouvernera le monde ?***Alger :Editions Hibr, 2011.

- Beaumont, Mathew. ***Utopia Ltd., Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England 1870-1900.*** Boston: Brill Leiden, 2005.

- Bakhtin, Michael. ***The Dialogic Imagination.*** Edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1981

- Bellamy, Edward. ***Looking Backward 2000-1888.*** Edited with an introduction by John L. Thomas, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.

- Berthet, Dominique. « L'utopie d'un esthète », in ***William Morris News from Nowhere.*** Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Bowman,S. et AL. ***Edward Bellamy Abroad: An American Prophets" Influence***. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1962.

- Butler, Samuel***. Erewhon***. London: Trubner and co., 1872.

- Boos, Florence S. ―Personal and Political Lieux d'anticipation in ***News from Nowhere***‖. Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Carpenter, Edward. ***England"s Ideal: A Tract***. Manchester: Heywood, 1885.

- Claeys, Gregory. ―Socialised Individuality? A re-assessment of the sources and classification of Morris's socialism‖. Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Dentith, Simon. ***Bakhtinian Thought.*** London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

- -Engels, Friedrich. ***The Condition of the Working Classes in England.***

- Falzon, Frédéric. « Entre rupture et fidélité, un _communisme de nulle part' ». Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes : Editions du Temps, 2004

- Guy, Josephine M. ***The Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and documents***. London and New York: 2002.

- Himmerfeld, Gertrude. ―The Intellectual in Politics: The Case of the Webbs‖: ***Journal of Contemporary History,*** 6:3 (1972: July) p.3.

- Kumar, Krishan. ***Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times.*** Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1991.

- Laski, Harold J. ―The Fabian Way‖: ***Current History*** (New York), 41:1 (1934:Oct).

- Latham, David. ―Living in Heaven: Morris's ***News from Nowhere",*** in ***William*** *Morris News from Nowhere.* Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- -Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.*** San Diego, New York and London: Harcourt Brace and Company,1936.

- Marcuse, Herbert. ***Eros and Civilisation***. New York: Vintage Books, 1957.

- Morton ,A.L. ***The English Utopia***.(first published in Londo by Lawrence and Wishart, 1952), Berlin: Seven Sea Books, 1969.

- Moylan, Tom. ***Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science fiction, Utopia, Dystopia***. Oxford and Colorado: West View Press, 2000.

- Morris, W. ***Political Writings: Contributions to Justice and Commonweal 1883-1890***. Edited by Nicholas Salmon, Bristol: Thoemes, 1994.

- Morris, William. ***News from Nowhere and Other Writings.*** Edited with an Introduction by Clive Wilmer, London: Penguin Books, 1993.

- ***No Place Else: Explorations in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction.*** Edited by Eric S. Rabkin, Martin H. Greenberg, Joseph D. Olander, Illinois/ Carbondale University Press, 1983.

- Parrinder, Patrick. ―Entering Dystopia, Entering Erewhon‖. ***Critical Survey,***Vol.17. Issue :1., 2005.

- Porter, Roy. ―Matrix of Modernity‖. In: ***History Today,*** Vol.51. Issue: 4, April 2004.

- Peyser,Thomas. ***Utopia and Cosmopolis: Globalization in the Era of American Literary Realism***. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.

- Remington, Thomas J. ― The Mirror up to Nature‖: Reflections on Victorianism in Samuel Butler's ***Erewhon***. In: ***No Place Else: Explorations in***

Utopian and Dystopian Fiction.(pp 33-56), Edited by Eric S. Rabkin, Martin H. Greenberg, D. Olander, Illinois: Carbondale University Press, 1983.

- Ricoeur, Paul. ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia.*** Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005.

- Rothstein, Edward. ―Utopia and Its Discontents‖: in ***Visions of Utopia***. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.

- Saïd, W. Edward. ***Des Intellectuels et du Pouvoir***. Alger : Editions Marinoor, 2001.

- Sharma, Govin Narain. ***Samuel Butler as a Literary Artist.*** Ph.d.Thesis. Toronto, 1965

- Thomson, E.P. ***William Morris: From Romantic to Revolutionary***. London: Merlin, 1977.

- ***Unpublished Papers of Edward Bellamy***. Houghton Library, Harvard University, n.d.

- ***William Morris: News from Nowhere and other Writings.*** Edited with an introduction by Clive Wilmer, London: Penguin Books, 1993

PART THREE:

Modernity, Disillusion, and the Shift to Dystopia

> Les utopies apparaissent comme bien plus réalisables qu‘on le croyait autrefois. Et nous nous trouvons maintenant devant une question bien autrement angoissante : Comment éviter leur réalisation définitive ?
>
> Les utopies sont réalisables. La vie marche vers les utopies. Et peut être un siècle nouveau commence-t-il, un siècle où les intellectuels et la classe cultivée rêveront aux moyens d‘éviter les utopies, de retourner à une société non utopique, moins parfaite, plus libre.
>
> Nicolas Berdfiaeff.

Introduction

The present part explores the dystopian impulse that informs Aldous Huxley‘s ***Brave New World*** (1932) and George Orwell‘s ***Nineteen Eighty-four*** (1948). The choice of these novels as documents to explore has been dictated by two factors. The first lies in the importance of the period in which they were produced and which stretches between 1930 and 1950;a period characterised by social tension, struggles and changes both within British society and at world level. The second lies in the apparent relationship between these struggles and their socio-political outcomes, on the one the hand, and the ideas conveyed by utopian writing which we suggest had constituted, together with other factors, an important motive force behind social and historical change on the other hand.

Considering the regular eruption of utopian or dystopian statements, their frequent reactivation and propagation, we undertake to look for the conditions that provoke them and their possible use as social action to alter- through the projection in the future or in space of an ideal society- an unfair social order; or to preserve an existent social order by projecting in the future a dystopian society. In both cases, the study of the statement as an interpretation of the world (Foucault, 1997: Archaeology), therefore as a form of social action, may reveal interesting facts not only about the interplay of the various forces shaping society but also about the writer as a speaking subject (Fairclough:2001, p.32). By ―statement‖, we take Michel Foucault‘s (1997) and Bakhtin‘s (1981) definition of an utterance, for example the

writing of a book, as determined by the social subject‘s position in society and his reaction to the situation that caused its eruption and also as an answer to other statements.

We will appeal for our analysis to Michel Foucault (1997), ***The Archaeology of Knowledge*** (ibid) Norman Fairclough (2001), ***Language and Power***, but mainly to Karl Mannheim (1936), ***Ideology and Utopia***, all of whom assign language use a central place in social phenomena. The choice of this approach is motivated in the first place by the fact that these theoreticians have stressed the relationship between thought and social reality. This makes their views appropriate to our research for two reasons. First it will help us to analyse the emergence of utopian thought at various moments of human history as a repetition, transformation and reactivation of former ideas and thus help us to grasp the historical conditions that give rise to this particular thought. Secondly, it will enable us to support our claim that utopian and dystopian writing bear a dialectical relationship to social reality.

This, we hope, will help us in the analysis and discussion of the respective dystopias projected by Aldous Huxley and Georges Orwell. Our analysis will attempt to determine their relationship with former utopias, the function they are expected to fill as regards the historical and social background against which they erupted. Further, our choice to pay special attention to language comes from the fact that both Huxley and Orwell highlight the function of language as an important determinant of social subjects‘ thoughts, representations and behaviour. In ***Brave New World***, social subjects are _conditioned through sleep teaching‘ to accept as ―natural‖ the values and organisation of their society and thus contribute to maintain the existing order. In ***Nineteen Eighty-four,*** the philologists of The Party have developed a new language, ―Newspeak,‖ which prevents social subjects from developing other thoughts than those allowed by ―Ingsoc‖ which stands for English socialism and which reflects the ideology of The Party.

Additionally, recent trends in social studies, such as those conducted by A. Duranti(1997) and C.N. Candlin (2001) tend increasingly to focus on language use in the interpretation of society. The importance attached to language by social theorists seems to confirm the close links between social phenomena and linguistic phenomena. Indeed, Mannheim, Fairclough, and Bakhtin define language use as a form of social practice. In fact, this approach, which considers language as discourse, seems appropriate to the analysis of the documents explored as traces in the archaeological field of discourses in which they erupted. They are studied not only in their relation to other interpretations of the world but also as reflections of social reality. Accordingly, they are analysed as a resource and a function of the speaking subject - an interpretation of the world against another- and a defence of a given order. They may also inform about the perspective and aspirations of the social strata on whose behalf the two authors produced their statements.

This part is intended to show the shift of interest that occurred between the period of the Great Depression and the period following the two World Wars within English speaking world and among its elites. Further, it highlights some salient similarities such as the way socialisation and language constrain social subjects, discusses the function of utopian and dystopian thought on society, and the use made by the two authors of anti-utopian or dystopian writing as discourse. In this respect, our aim is to identify the function of the dystopian texts as utterances and their dialogic relationship with the social reality and with other utterances. Next to this we shall try to discuss the point of view of the writer as an intellectual and how as a social subject he bears the outlook of his group.

This part is divided into two important chapters. The first chapter entitled: ***—Brave New world***: Playing Dystopia against technocratic ideology‖ analyses the use made by Aldous Huxley of anti-utopian writing to depict a world in which science, rather than being used in the service of man, is diverted to enslave man and turn him into an object shaped to fit in the

economic and social pattern conceived by the rulers' ‗will to order', as he writes in his introduction to the 1984 edition to ***Brave New World***. Huxley's novel, besides criticising the use of science to achieve spurious ends and the writer's disillusion with the intellectuals' complacency before the dehumanising effects of knowledge, reveals important facts about the capitalist and consumerist discourse pervading British society amidst growing social inequalities in the 1930s. Fairclough (2001) explains at length how the discourse of consumerism colonises people's lives in modern capitalist societies (Fairclough: 2001, pp.163-179)

Brave New World (1932) depicts a technocratic society based on the Darwinian principle of selection and merit. Difference and inequality are institutionalised and naturalised through eugenics and Pavlovian conditioning. The dominant ethical principle that acts as the motive factor is hedonism. Social subjects being biologically controlled, predestined in a hatchery, and conditioned to accept their social destiny fit like cells in the social body.

In this "ideal society" in which "Ford" has been substituted to Lord, and science has become the "Religion of Humanity" as prophesised by Auguste Comte, Man and society have been reduced to the proportions of technical questions that could be studied, classified, perfected, organised and controlled by applying the laws governing living organisms and systemic organisations discovered in nature.

In the second chapter entitled ***Nineteen Eighty-four***, Neo-millenarianism or the Quest for 'The Golden Country', we undertake to analyse the historical conditions that gave rise to Orwell's dystopia and the use made by the writer as a speaking subject and of his novel as a statement to counter utopian discourse. Indeed, the belief expressed by Orwell that language exerts a strong influence on people's thoughts and actions is drawn upon by the writer and used as a weapon to preserve British society from the fatal grip of utopian socialist thought turned into an ideology in power. The quest of ―The Golden Country‖ by Winston, Orwell's

hero, a country that had been concealed by the totalitarian ideology of Oceanian society suggests a shift in the writer‘s attitude from the anarchist idealism of his early years to the harsh realism of the fifties which imposed resistance, through a return to traditional English values, to the growing influence of communism.

In both chapters, we discuss how the authors‘ perspectives as speaking subjects are constrained by their social group and cultural capital on the one hand and reality on the other. They become in Fairclough‘s words social subjects who use their social capital to achieve a dual end. At the local level they contribute to unmask[17] the utopian outlook of a rising class, for example the aspirations of the working classes, as a potential threat to the ongoing liberal order and use it to conceal the flaws of the existent order. On the international level they use their act of writing to fight Soviet Communist ideology which was threatening the western values, and naturalise British exploitation to _the savages‘ and _the slave populations of the colonised territories‘: terms used by Orwell to refer to the African and Asian population .

Being based on “Critical Discourse Analysis” (Fairclough 2001) and The Sociology of Knowledge (Mannheim, 1936) this part aims to discuss how the statements of the two writers as ‘interpretations of the world‘ are constrained by the authors’ “member‘s resources”; and the outlook of their group, or how their cultural capital which is fashioned by their life in society determines their outlook and actions. In this respect and following both Mannheim‘s and Fairclough‘s advice we are aware that the present thesis which is an interpretation of interpretations of the world is necessarily influenced by our position as a social subject and our cultural capital. Accordingly, it is as a student belonging to a country of the third world; a country whose people suffered exploitation, political and economic subjection and exclusion from European history in which we, the peoples of the south, were considered as mere resources and extensions to the European self that we analyse and discuss the novels. We

discuss the authors‘ point of view of the other, keeping in mind J.C. Young Robert‘s claim that

> . . . in western philosophy, when knowledge or theory comprehends the other, then the alterity of the latter vanishes as it becomes part of the same. . . . In all cases, the other is neutralised as a means of encompassing it. Ontology amounts to a philosophy of power, an egotism in which the relation with the other is accomplished through its assimilation into self (Young, 2004:45).

It is, therefore, as a speaking subject who considers that human dignity and value do not result from skin colour, language or religion but rather arise from the very condition of being human, and therefore aware that language use goes beyond the mere task of using words to designate things, and that our task as a research student is to unveil what lies beyond or under the words.

We will focus in our discussion on the factors within British society and at world level which brought about the shift in emphasis from resistance to Technocratic utopianism to resistance to socialist utopianism. Next to this we will attempt to argue the claim that dystopian writing, like utopianism is discourse, therefore influenced by the historical-social situation in which it is produced and used as a weapon against another interpretation of the world.

Finally, we analyse the function of the writers and try to find out whether they acted as intellectuals concerned by truth and justice or whether as social or national subjects their action was constrained by their class or nation and thus bore the point of view and interest of their stratum.

In the end, we discuss the relevance of the study of utopianism as discourse and the importance of the approach which considers language use as social practice in the analysis and discussion of historical social phenomena. Indeed, it is hoped that increased awareness of the influence of language in shaping social relations may help to understand present struggles for power within society and at the international level and constitute the first step towards emancipation.

CHAPTER VI: *BRAVE NEW WORLD (1932)*:Playing Dystopia against Technocratic Ideology

Introduction

The second quarter of the 20th century was a period of disillusion and doubt for the English intellectuals. The period of optimism that had characterised the 19th and the early20th centuries was drawing to a close. In his History ***of Civilisation: The Age of Capital*** E.J. Hobsbawn notes that the prevailing belief that ‗the twentieth century would be a more glorious; more successful version of the nineteenth', was being seriously shaken (Hobsbawn: nd, p.308).

‗The religion of Humanity' ‗The new Christianity', ‗the Religion of Solidarity' which relied on the combined efforts of scientists and the barons of industry to build the commonwealth of the nation and insure happiness for all had reached a point of crisis. Social thinkers such as Henry de Saint Simon, Auguste Comte and Edward Bellamy, and H.G. Wells, albeit proclaimed socialists, believed that the government of society should be entrusted to the fittest among its members such as scientists and the captains of industry. They believed that a form of ―innate altruism‖ prompted men in their actions thus ensuring the welfare of the social body. However, not only had the utopian technocratic ideals at the basis of this Darwinian system failed to improve man's condition but they had contributed to exacerbate tensions between social classes at home and nations at world level. Capitalism had increased the wealth and the power of the rich at the expense of the labouring classes. Disillusioned and feeling betrayed, workers' claims which were originally directed at improving the workers' social conditions began to evolve into political aspirations of the labouring classes for a socialist state. The Russian revolution was met with great enthusiasm, Henry Pelling writes, as '. . . the leaders of the I.L.P., and the British Socialist Party summoned a special convention at Leeds to greet the event' (Pelling, 1982: p.146).

Sacrifices and austerity measures following the First World War, made worse by the great slump of the thirties, were strongly felt by the British elites. There was a loss of faith in the old values and a deep scepticism in the soundness of the new ones .These feelings were characteristic of many works of fiction which were published in that period.

The central concern raised by English writers was the outcome of the social struggle raging between the representatives of workers and the powers of business. The issue of the struggle was made all the more uncertain by the crises that occurred abroad and their repercussions at home. Public opinion inside England was particularly sensitive to the political transformations affecting not only Russia but also Germany and Italy. Each of these experiments found supporters eager to apply it on both sides of the radical wings of the political spectrum. According to Peter Davidson, There were Marxist militants in England but there were also fascists who were tempted by the Nazi ideology of racial Darwinism. Sir Oswald Mosley (1896-1980) was successively conservative, independent, and Labour MP. In 1931, he broke away from the Labour Party to form The New Party. He became a fanatical supporter of Hitler, and his party became ―The Union of Fascists‖ the uniformed members of which were known as Black Shirts. He was interned during the war (Davidson: 2001, p. 135). Having kept vivid in their mind the horrors of the Great War, the prevailing mood among the majority of people was towards preserving peace, at home and at world level at all costs. It was in that period of tension, uncertainty and secret prayers for peace that Aldous Huxley produced ***Brave New World*** (1932).

We said in the first chapter that Huxley‘s novel was a reactivation and an echo of former utopian writings. It seems to constitute an ironical reply to H.G. Wells ***A Modern Utopia*** (1905) and Bertrand Russell's "Icarus or the Future of Science" (1924) for both are written from a global perspective. It may also be apprehended as a critical analysis of Auguste Comte's ***Système de Politique Positive***, but also the ethics of utilitarianism of Jeremy

Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873).Central to their ethical doctrine is the belief that the quest for pleasure and the avoidance of pain is the motive force of individuals and society. As a result of this belief, the social system should aim at the realisation of happiness as its end. However, before embarking in a detailed study of the novel, we shall give a brief account of the writer‘s life bearing in mind Mannheim and Fairclough‘s views of the writer as a social subject and of the act of writing as social action.

Biography of the Author

Aldous Huxley was born on July 26, 1894 in the county of surrey, England, into a family of scholars and intellectuals. His father was Leonard Huxley, a prominent literary man and his grandfather was T. H. Huxley who worked on the Darwinian evolutionary theory. His mother was the daughter of sir Mathew Arnold, the English poet, essayist and critic (Aldous Huxley Biography: “The Author and his Time” His family background had made him into a polymath with a wide range of intellectual pursuits: from anthropology to zoology, from poetry to mysticism. His brother Julian Huxley was a renowned biologist who collaborated to the foundation of the UNESCO and became its first president.

Aldous Huxley intended to become a doctor, but a state of near blindness resulting from an eye sickness prevented him from studying medicine. None the less, ‘this only and most important event in [his] life’(ibid) had a stimulating effect on him. At first he learnt Braille and then, having partly recovered his sight, he used a magnifying glass to read. Surprisingly, his ―handicap‖ had a stimulating effect on him and helped him have another ―vision‖ of the changes occurring in his world and a deeper understanding of the realities of his time and their possible future implications. As a writer, he was conscious of his position and the weight of his social responsibilities. Moreover, having reached intellectual maturity in a period of doubt and disillusion, caused by the growing encroachment of the trusts’ accumulated wealth

and power on individuals‘ lives with the indolent complacency and benevolent contribution of scientists and social theorists, and the loss of human values induced by the rapid changes in people‘s lives, he, in contrast to the optimistic enterprising elites , was critical of the modern world and deeply concerned by the changes looming ahead. Although he was not an activist, he believed that intellect was as important as physical power and said about, his vocation: _my ambition and pleasure are to understand not to act’ (ibid).

As a member of the ruling class, he had an ambivalent attitude towards the way his society was organised and the means it used to insure the welfare of its members. Improvements brought about in the human life thanks to scientific progress induced a mood of widespread optimism that science, that “New Religion” of modern times, was to enable man to found on earth the lost Eden .The mysteries of natural phenomena which used to be attributed to magic o r to divine power were being explained by science. Superstition and metaphysics were receding before the triumphant achievements of reason and science .All sorts of scientific theories were developed to subject nature on the one hand, and social and human sciences to prepare man for organised life in the city on the other hand . Accordingly, the world was organised into a variety of fields and structures each of which was apprehended, explained and controlled by theories of which they became the objects. As a result of these developments, sciences were developed having as their unique pursuit the best possible exploitation of man- that extraordinary resource -and its use and perfection for the benefit of the social body.

Huxley‘s world in the 1930‘s bore the traces of the various theories that had been shaping it; theories such as utilitarianism, Darwinism, eugenics, psychoanalysis and behaviourist psychology, the combined influence of which was expected to reconcile social harmony and efficiency with individual contentment. Instructed, by the uses to which philosophical theories, religious ideals and scientific findings had been put to in former

periods; Huxley was sceptical as to the ends to which the discoveries of these sciences were to be used. For example, he was sceptical that theories like eugenics, and social Darwinism or the generalisation of the principles of behaviourist psychology in education, which he prefers to refer to as "conditioning" would be used to achieve the officially manifested end -the betterment of the citizen and the social body – but had as their hidden agenda the exploitation of the human resource, to use the discourse conventions of capitalism, which was rather a threat to individual freedom and happiness.

Huxley believed that heredity made each individual unique; and this uniqueness was essential to freedom. Furthermore, he believed that happiness could not be experienced through the manufacture and marketing of shallow pleasures, standardised leisure like cinema, sport and holidays or the licentiousness granted to sexual promiscuity and the use of drugs. Like most of his contemporaries, Huxley was shocked by the horrors of World War I and the exacerbation of social iniquities science has brought about for he was convinced that its use was not totally incompatible with peace, social stability and genuine individual happiness. Yet, he felt that something was wrong with the way science and knowledge were being used, and felt it his duty to act. As Gerald Heard a long time friend of Huxley described him, 'Huxley's ancestry brought down on him a weight of intellectual authority and moral obligation which are reflected by the themes he developed in ***Brave New World*** as well as his other writings (Huxley Biography).

Indeed, it would be wrong to think that Huxley's blindness turned him into mere meditating hermit cut off from the world. With his wife (Maria Nys), he travelled a lot and entertained many friends. He spent several years in Italy and France, visited India and Central America before he settled in California the climate of which he expected to have a healing effect on his sight. Meanwhile, he met many writers like Lytton Strackney, H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, and D. H. Lawrence with whom he seemed to share concern regarding the

end to which science was put, the lack of spirituality, and superficial pleasures of modern life. He often met with Russell and Wells in the ―Coefficient Club‖ of which they were members to discuss issues of interest such as science, religion and society, peace, and politics. His familiarity with intellectual circles and his work as a literary reviewer kept him informed about the main events of his time.

As pointed out earlier, Huxley realised that the domination and subjection of the masses and individuals appeared to be more durable when achieved through pernicious conditioning and manipulation, especially when these were draped in the utopian discourses of scientific and technological precision and efficiency, and the ideals of common good, social stability and happiness. He believed that man had the 'means to save himself from himself, but he lacked the will to do so' (ibid). The writing of ***Brave New World*** in 1932 may be interpreted both as a loss of faith in man and as a warning that 'the will to order' through science and engineered standardization, just like 'the will to truth' of the Greek philosophers are masks worn by Man's innate 'will to power'(Novack:1996) .

Aldous Huxley was a prolific writer. Between 1916 and 1920, he published several volumes of poetry together with a collection of stories: ***Limbo***. His first novel, ***Chrome Yellow***, which established his reputation as a novelist was published in 1921. Meanwhile, Huxley was writing essays, articles and reviews for different periodicals .His writings which were a combination of fact and fiction expressed the fear that the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning victorious claim : 'what science does man can't put asunder (Huxley,1932: 29),' may come true , unless witty satire , intelligent unmasking of mind speaking to mind undertakes to undermine and prevent it. As a pacifist member of "the Peace Pledge Union" , he acted through his writings which he used as a launching pad for his ideas and convictions in defence of the individual human freedom from the alienating influence of the rising powers. In an essay titled "Music at Night" Huxley expresses the urge that the different forms of

knowledge should contribute to a better understanding of man and be subservient to the improvement of his being on earth when he declares: 'Literature is also philosophy is also science.[. . .] I think it not only permissible, but necessary, that literature should take cognizance of physiology and should investigate the still obscure relations between the mind and its body' (Huxley, (1931).

Aldous Huxley believes that in addition to being a work of art, literature, like philosophy and science appeals also to mind. Because of the dialogic relation of his novels with scientific, ethical, and political issues, many critics agree that 'he was a greater essayist than he was a novelist' (Huxley Biography). Furthermore, he believed that men in his time were being alienated and subjected through manipulative ways by exploiting their natural drives towards the pursuit of pleasure and contentment. This manipulation was made all the more efficient since it was underpinned by "error proof" theories which aimed to produce in the minds of the people 'the real revolutionary revolution' (Huxley:1932, p.10). Huxley develops this idea further by explaining that 'Government by clubs and firing squads, by artificial famine, mass imprisonment and mass deportation, is not merely inhuman . . . it is demonstrably inefficient-and in an age of advanced technology, inefficiency is a sin against the Holy Ghost'(ibid:12).

Convinced that social subjects' loss of freedom and their dependence on new masters called the state, the nation, happiness or common good were first wrought in people's minds through discourse and ideology, Huxley concluded that it was only through discourse that the intellectual elites could help people undo the chains that bind them. In one of his essays ―Ends and Means‖, (1937) ,Huxley made clearer his worries concerning the pre-eminence of systems over individuals when he declared that _the universe as a whole still remained meaningless, but certain of its parts, such as the nation, the state the class, the party were endowed with significance as its highest value'. In a later collection of essays**, *The Perennial***

Philosophy, (Harper 1945), he emphasised his original conviction that without a spiritual dimension, life becomes meaningless.

Albeit he was a productive writer, Aldous Huxley was not ranked among the outstanding literary figures of his time. This may be explained by the fact that his primary concern was more to reach and inform the largest possible audience. The writer‘s concern in his ideas over art explains why although his novels were often witty and satirical they were flawed in terms of characterisation and plot. During the thirties, while he was writing ***Brave New World,*** he was deeply concerned with peace as he was a member of ―The Peace Pledge Union‖. However, in 1937 he went to live in California where he continued writing. He produced mainly ***Heaven and Hell*** and ***The Doors of Perception*** both of which describe his experiments with drugs and mystical experience. He died in 1963.

Brave New World **as a Utopian Satire**

Brave New World is described as ‘the most popular though not necessarily [the] most important novel’ (Monarch notes). The story projects a future utopian society engineered through the combined contribution of various sciences such as genetic engineering, pharmacology, eugenics, Taylorism, behaviourist theory and Psychoanalysis. Although the novel is most often referred to by critics as a utopia, it appears to be meant by the writer as a utopian satire close to the Foucauldian definition of lampoon for reasons I shall discuss later.

Considering the global perspective in which ***Brave New World***(1932) is approached, and considering Aldous Huxley‘s and his critics‘ concern for Man, one is led to wonder whether they were concerned with the condition of humanity at large or whether like most utopian or dystopian discourse they are concerned with a certain portion of humanity to the exclusion of others . In other words, does the excessive manifestation of one reality in a specific part of the world not contribute to conceal another more disturbing reality?

The power of ***Brave New World*** as work of fiction and of Aldous Huxley as a writer lies in the interminable chain reaction of criticism and commentary it has triggered. Indeed, few science fiction novels have been the object of so varied and rich commentary. Praised by some critics and condemned by others , sometimes vilified and sometimes glorified , it has never left readers indifferent .The number of its reprinting in the U.S.A alone, twenty seven, is proof enough of its popularity. But one may wonder what has made the novel such a disturbingly powerful work. One critic said that: 'The answer lies in Huxley's skill as a writer- a writer of science fiction, a writer of social commentary, a writer with prophetic vision, a writer with tremendous breadth and depth of interest and ideas, a writer of satire',(Ibid:25).

Besides, one is tempted to add, because he succeeded brilliantly to express the fears of the British traditional elites whose world was losing ground and whose values were threatened by the rapid changes of the thirties; and conceal the disturbing realities –at home and abroad- that were shaking the foundations of the British Empire. Was the manifestation of a scientifically engineered ideal society at exactly that moment not a means of veiling disturbing realities at home and of diverting readers' attention from the embarrassing issues of decolonisation?

Manufacturing Social Stability through Individual Happiness

Brave New World is a benevolent dictatorship. It is a static, efficient welfare world state under the leadership or rather the supervision of an aristocracy of ten ―World Controllers‖. Society is stratified into a rigid caste system through genetic engineering and sleep teaching also called "hypnopaedia". At the top the pyramid are Alphas who decide and plan the different tasks linked to life because they are supplied with a superior intellectual quotient. In the intermediate positions, there are Betas and Gammas who perform specialised technical

tasks and at the bottom of the pyramid, there are "Bokanovsky groups" of identical twins, up to ninety-six clones in a group who perform menial jobs that require very little training.

The events are set in 632 A.F: (After Ford); but apart from this historical landmark which refers to the foundation of the New World according to the principles of Fordism which as it appears through the book is a combination of the principles of psychoanalysis and Taylorism in the management of society, 'history is bunk', as Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World Controllers, pointed out. The study of history being considered as dangerous to the stability of the system, all the books referring to ancient beliefs, values, or practices were withdrawn from public libraries.

Brave New World is an "ideal" society that has been developed thanks to man's "creative" genius. The founders of the utopian society managed to imitate nature to such an extent that they succeeded to freeze evolution through a complete control of human reproduction. More than this, by reading and rewriting the human genome, but also through total control of the citizens thoughts and values , they were able not only to "produce" the exact number of social subjects needed, but also with the desired racial, intellectual or professional profile. Here the writer ironically hints at the use of eugenics in the service of "Social Darwinism", the ideology of the capitalists in power. This, with certain utopian socialists, will insure stability and order under the rule of the fittest. By controlling social subjects, the rulers of Brave New World succeeded in their 'really revolutionary revolution [which] was to be achieved, not in the external world but in the soul and flesh of human beings' (Huxley, 1932:10).' Rather than attempting to create a social system that would give every subject what he loves, social subjects are so conditioned as to love what society gives them and dislike what they can't get 'Ibid:12).

The first scene of the novel takes place in "The London Hatcheries and Conditioning Centre" a sort of human fabric where the future inhabitants of the World State are Mass-

produced. On the stately building, clearly visible, the World State‘s motto: “*COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY*”(emphasis added). The motto conveys the ideological foundations of the new state. In the minds of the founders, “community” designates a single unifying ideology that admits no divergence. Difference and contradiction which in ordinary times generate tension that may lead to creative action and change are swept aside. “Identity” , contrary to what one might think, refers to similarity, standardisation , rather than to uniqueness .This principle is exemplified by the production of dozens of standardised human clones which are used to perform identical routine jobs .This is the achievement in biological engineering which the rulers of the society are so proud of because it is the basis of stability. As the(D.H.C) put it: “Bokanovsky’s process” is one of the major instruments of social stability[…]Ninety-six identical twins working ninety-six identical machines [….]. If we could “bokanovskify” indefinitely, the whole problem would be solved’ (Huxley,1932: 18). Social stability is the result of individual stability. Since there is a perfect control of the genes as well as the mind, through conditioning, there is absence of conflict.

The director of Hatcheries and Conditioning centre leads a group of students through the centre to show them how human beings ―are produced‖. The process whereby human beings are “hatched”, like the model T., Ford on an assembly line, is totally mechanized .First, ova which are extracted from a human ovary are fertilised in test tubes. Then the fertilised embryos are put into bottles, and labeled bearing such information as the social caste, race, intellectual quotient, sex, function of the future subject .Next, the bottles are placed in racks and move slowly on a conveyor belt through a process during which the bottled embryos are nourished and the future citizen is ‘predestined’ according to his future status, and the geographical area in which he is destined to work. For example, a future “New Worlder” who is destined to work in the equatorial jungle is conditioned to support heat and dampness during maturation besides being vaccinated against equatorial diseases. Finally, the babies are

born or rather ‘decanted’ or extracted from the bottles after they have reached maturity. In Brave New World Darwinism is institutionalised and selection taken in charge by the state to ensure social stability and happiness.

The London Hatcheries and Conditioning is assimilated to “the womb” of society whose function is to “reproduce” the number of social subjects needed with the desired physical as well as intellectual profiles. The process of evolution, adaptation and selection which used to take place naturally but which required time is reproduced artificially with all the abnormalities that often occurred in nature corrected. Science is put in the service of economic efficiency social stability and individual happiness. By “predestining” the future citizen to hold a specific position in society, the founders of the new world state had already acquired certain attributes of God; and excluded from the scene any intervention of heavenly power. As they were leaving the floor where the biological conditioning took place Foster, one of the technicians working in that department of biological conditioning, explained enthusiastically that they were ‘leaving the realm of mere slavish imitation of nature into the much more interesting world of human invention’(Huxley, 1932: 22).

The next step in the process is the socialisation of the babies which, as in most utopias, is taken in charge by the state; the family as a traditional institution having been abolished. After the babies are “decanted”, they are taken to infant nurseries where they undergo neo- Pavlovian conditioning. By means of loud noise and electric shock, the babies are conditioned to respond negatively to certain stimuli. For example, infants belonging to the lower orders are conditioned to hate books. All the babies are taught to associate natural beauty with disagreeable experience. As the director explained, it is important that subjects who belong to the lower orders hate books since their work will mainly be manual. As to natural beauty, it presents an important shortcoming; it is free. Citizens of the new world are conditioned to be

good consumers of the sports, goods and entertainment supplied by the factories and service enterprises to keep the business going on.

In addition to this conditioning, the children are taught to accept their social position, and are also stuffed through sleep teaching with the desired social values and codes. Hypnopaedia is the technique used to instil in the children‘s minds, by means of repeated slogans, ideas, thoughts, prejudices and representations of their respective cast and compatible with their status and function in the ―utopian‖ society. As the D.H.C explained, ‗moral education, ought never in any circumstance to be rational‘(ibid: p. 31). It is during sleep, while there is little resistance, that the children‘s minds are fashioned through slogans whispered insidiously by microphones placed under their pillows. In dormitories where future citizens are taught elementary class consciousness the students led by the D.H.C. can hear the synthetic voice of the microphones whispering under the pillows

> Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do because they are so frightfully clever. I‘m really awfully glad I am a Beta, because I don‘t work so hard and then we are much better than the 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. Epsilons are still worse. They are too stupid to be able to read or write. Besides, they wear black which is such a beastly colour. I‘m so glad I am a Beta […]. Alpha children wear. . .(ibid).

In this way children learn to be proud and contented with their social condition. They are conditioned to respect the higher strata without envy and despise the lower ones. Hierarchy and social stratification is thus accepted as the only natural and necessary form of social organisation which prevents any aspiration or action towards social mobility or change. These slogans are repeated ‘till at last the child‘s mind is these suggestions [suggestions from the state] and the sum of these suggestions are the child‘s mind’ (ibid).

Clearly, Aldous Huxley is criticising the liberal optimistic view of science which places a blind faith in technology to found the earthly paradise. By using the technique of the ―lampoon‖ he presents the most manifest flaws of technology as feats and so stirs suspicion

against the function of technocracy as ideology. The writer seems critical against the theories of the modern age which rather than serving as a means for the improvement and emancipation of man had evolved into an end subjecting to their mechanistic logic both nature and Man. It is this shift in the function of science that has turned it into an ideology in the service of a ruling economic caste. Habermas says that this form of ideology is worse than the traditional ones for

> . . . l'idéologie aujourd'hui plutôt transparente qui domine implicitement l'arrière plan et fétichise la science est plus irrésistible et va beaucoup plus loin que les idéologies de type ancien parce que, masquant les problèmes de la pratique, elle justifie non seulement l'intérêt particulier d'une classe déterminée à la domination et que concurremment elle réprime le besoin partiel d'émancipation d'une autre classe, mais encore parce qu'elle affecte jusqu'à l'intérêt émancipatoire de l'espèce dans son ensemble.(Habermas,1973:55).

Language as a Vehicle of Ideology and Power.

The impact of the slogans learnt in early childhood is so powerful that it constrains the adult's representations thoughts and acts throughout his life. Individuals' state of subjection is reinforced by the frequent repetition of the slogans which convey the values of society and the outlook of their social caste. For example, all the socially valued behaviour is rooted in the citizen's psyche and erupts spontaneously in the form of slogans to remind themselves or each other of the need to preserve orthodoxy as the supreme good. For example, there are slogans urging the Brave New Worlders to be good consumers like 'The more stitches the less riches', or 'ending is better than mending'. Other slogans stress the ethics of altruism, the need for cooperation such as 'everybody belongs to everybody else'. Some slogans still urge on the consumption of soma to prevent tension and deviant behaviour 'a gram [of soma] is better than a damn' (Huxley,1932:78). Whenever an adult citizen displays unorthodox thoughts or behaviour, he is called back to conformity through a slogan. By so doing, social subjects keep each other conditioned by reminding themselves of the need to respect social conventions embedded in these slogans and thus preserve social stability and the relations of power.

In this respect, the ideal subject is one like Lenina Crowne who observes scrupulously the values and conventions of her society. She is a perfectly conditioned social subject who uses sex and soma the way one would chew gum, buy a new dress or play sport. She is happy with her life because her thoughts and acts are the exact reflection of her conditioning which she considers as the only possible form of acceptable behaviour. So; when Bernard Marx, a "deviant" subject, tries to convince her that there are other possible ways of being in the world she just does not understand him. This conversation is a good illustration of how citizens are conditioned to maintain the prevailing ideology:

'Don't you wish you were free Lenina?', Bernard said.

'I don't know what you mean .I am free. Everybody's happy nowadays', she replied .(ibid:p,80).

To a question asked to her about freedom, Lenina Crown preferred to reply about happiness because she had been conditioned to avoid the taboo issue of freedom.

Or this reflection of Henry Foster, another ideal subject telling Lenina as they went past the "Slough Crematoriums" where human corpses were being cremated and phosphorus recovered from the cremated bodies:

> Now they recover over ninety-eight percent of it[…]. More than a kilo and a half per adult corpse, which makes the best part of four hundred tons of phosphorus every year from England alone[…]Fine to think we can go on being useful even after we're dead. Making plants grow (Ibid:67).

The inhabitants of Brave New World are conditioned to be useful to their society even after death. They are conditioned to accept the fact that as social subjects, they are only 'physico-chemical' entities who can continue being useful to others even after death.

Bernard Marx, on the other hand, is the object of his colleagues' suspicion and derision. Although he is an Alpha plus, he is physically different from the standard Alpha. He is suspect because unlike others, he is too self-conscious, he likes being alone, refuses to take soma and holds unorthodox views about, sexual freedom which, as a psychologist, he knows

to be the result of sleep teaching. What is worse is that being smaller than most members of his social caste; he is physically 'below the standard Alpha'. This makes him the object of everybody's mockery. Rumours go that during his maturation as an embryo he had received an overdose of alcohol which is usually given to embryos of the lower Epsilon caste. His physical defect is the result of a technical error.

Bernard Marx is a sort of social misfit who, owing to his rank in the social hierarchy, is a danger to the prevailing conformism and social stability. What he is reproached of was to spend too much time by himself, which, by the moral standards of his society where 'everybody belongs to everybody else', was a crime. As a result of his difference, his drive to lead a personal life, experience true and strong emotions rather than the superficial imbecile happiness of the others and his reluctance to behave 'like a cell in the social body', Bernard is marginalised .It was that unorthodox behaviour that brought him the condemnation of the D.H.C who described him as 'an enemy of society a subverter […]of all order and stability, a conspirator against civilisation itself'(ibid:p. 123) and proposed to cast him out to Iceland to protect society from contamination because as he had explained 'no offence is as heinous as unorthodoxy of behaviour…[which] threatens more than the life of an individual [because] it strikes at society itself'(ibid.:p.122).

One the most important merits of Aldous Huxley as a writer and of ***Brave New World*** as a novel and which critics seem to have paid little attention to is the function he gives language as a vehicle of convention and an instrument for the manufacture of consent. In addition to the fact that the inhabitants of ***Brave New World*** are genetically engineered, their minds and thoughts are shaped through sleep teaching .The values and ideals which are 'deposited' in the minds of the social subjects by the power holders in the form of slogans function as powerful determinants of their representations values and prejudices, and therefore contribute largely to influence their actions as social agents. In the words of Paulo

Freire(1996) , individuals are denied the function of historical subjects by the power elites, who use them as mere receptacles where their ideology is 'deposited' .Through this process, which the author calls

> The banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing-projecting an absolute ignorance into others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education as processes of inquire (Freire, 1996: 53).

In this way, the social subject are deprived of the right and capacity to name the world in 'their own words' and since they merely reproduce the ruler's word, they cannot develop a dialogic interpretation and knowledge of reality. Being thus prevented to grasp and share its problematic nature, they are prevented to develop collective concerted action to produce historical change (ibid). There are, throughout the novel, implicit claims and suggestions that language is a powerful instrument of subjection and thus of social cohesion and historical continuity.

This power of language as a vehicle ideology is instantiated by the opinions and actions of various characters throughout the novel. For example, the D.H.C., commenting on the lessons of hypnopaedia about class consciousness given to children, stresses the importance of suggesting certain attitudes through slogans which are repeated,

> [. . .] till at last the child's mind *is* these suggestions and the sum of these suggestions *is* the child's mind [. . .] 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 [. . .] suggestions from the state (Huxley, 1932:34).

This shows manifestly the role assigned by the ruling elite to language as a vehicle of ideology; the way it determines subjects' representations and so their thoughts and actions, and how it maintains social stability and historical continuity.

Besides, undesired thoughts or values are simply dismissed as taboo subjects and since the world state considers as deviant behaviour loyalty towards any other symbol than the state, and since institutions such as the family and religion have been replaced by the social

body, mention of such words as “father” or “mother”, “viviparous reproduction” or “God” which are considered as taboo are enough to make people uneasy. The following declaration from Linda who is brought back from the reservation by Bernard Marx to the D.H.C : ‘you made me have a baby[…] yes, a baby-and I was its mother’ and then John the savage calling the poor man ‘father’ was enough to ruin definitely the reputation of that influential member of society that example of moral probity, for committing the crime of “fatherhoodé(ibid.: 124-125) .

Another character- Helmholtz Watson, an expert in the conception of slogans and songs for community singing- commenting on the power of language said: ‘Words can be like x-rays, if you use them properly-They’ll go through’ (ibid.:p.64). However, hard though he may try, he does not find those piercing words; the language having been expurgated from them or because by suppressing the causes of strong emotions, the leaders of society have killed tragedy and sacrificed ‘high art’. Strong emotions are suppressed by suppressing the causes that generate them. Besides, inhabitants of the new world are regularly treated by V.P.S (violent passion surrogate) during which violent emotions are stimulated by means of drugs as an outlet to any accumulated passions that might disturb the psychological balance of social subjects which may result in social disorder.

John the savage is yet another character whose personality is determined by language. Being the victim of a double cultural alienation, as the son of a “civilized” woman brought up by Indians, he felt all sorts of strong emotions and confused thoughts which he could not express. However, as soon as John started reading Shakespeare, he was bewitched by his words .For the first time; he found words that reflected faithfully the feelings and emotions that had been choking him.

> The strange words rolled through his mind, rumbled like talking thunder…He hated Popé more and more…and somehow, it was as though he had never hated Popé before, and never really hated him because he had never been able to say how much he hated him. But now he had these words [―remorseless‖, ―treacherous‖, ―lecherous‖,

> ―kindless villain‖]…they gave him a reason for hating Popé and they made his hatred more real; and even made Popé himself more real (ibid: 110).

It was through Shakespeare‘s words that John acquired the capacity to grasp reality because he could name his emotions, he could voice his feelings and attitudes. It was through Shakespeare‘s heroes that he acquires his moral values and code , interprets and enters the world .However, since Shakespeare‘s world was one of tragedy and grand human values, John ,like Shakespeare‘s heroes, was to live and die a tragic man .

Another aspect of Huxley‘s visionary power, next to the use by the rulers of the World State of language ‘to naturalise relations of power’, (Fairclough: 2001) may lie in his anticipation of the spreading hegemony of English language as a locus of a global ideology and culture. Indeed, when one of the students was asked by the D.H.C to explain what was meant by Polish, French and German, the young man replied that they were ‘dead languages’ (Huxley, 1932:30). Huxley may also express the hegemonic aspirations of the political elites through the spread of the English language which would contribute to the naturalisation of the new rulers’ world vision and the maintenance of their power.

The Reservation as a Natural Dystopia

Parallels to the New World, there exists an Indian reservation somewhere in Central America which is the total antithesis of civilisation. A savage reservation, as the headmistress of Eton college explained, ‘is a place which owing to unfavourable climate, geographical conditions, or poverty of natural resources, has not been worth the expense of civilising’ (ibid:132). Nonetheless, the ‘savages and half breeds’ l i v i n g there are under the total control of the civilised world. Here the imperialist intentions of the World State are revealed by the writer through the headmistress that civilization reaches only the parts of the world that are deemed worth the effort. In other words civilisation is an enterprise conducted for egotistic motives.

It is in one of these savage reservations in Mexico that Bernard Marx took Lenina Crowne for a holiday in the hope of impressing her and 'being alone' with her .The reservation which is cut off from civilised world is a caricature of primitive societies .Its inhabitants are plagued with poverty, disease and old age. This plight is aggravated by the religious superstitions, a mixture of Christian practices and fertility rites, practised by the Indians. Nonetheless, the Indians seem to accept their condition and find meaning to their life except for John, a young man of European origin whom Lenina meets at one of the Indian religious rituals.

John "the savage", as he was to narrate his story to Bernard Marx, was born to a woman named Linda who came to the reservation from the ―other place‖, the civilised world. Linda had come on a holiday to the reservation about twenty years earlier with "Tomakin", the familiar name of the D.H.C. Linda got lost in the reservation during a rain storm and her companion, having thought that she had been devoured by a wild animal, returned to the civilised world and left her there. Lynda who had been made pregnant gave birth to John. As she told Bernard Marx, she had always practised her Malthusian drills regularly and felt terribly guilty for her 'crime. The term "Malthusian belt", according to ***Encycopedia Britannica***, refers to Thomas R. Malthus (1766-1834) an English political economist who associated poverty with uncontrolled population growth. The policy of birth control he advocated to prevent the depletion of resources was strictly applied in Huxley's dystopia. Her feeling of guilt notwithstanding, Lynda kept John who was her 'comfort' and tried to bring him up according to the civilised ways but the Indians had a stronger influence on him. As she explained to Bernard Marx, trying to justify John's queer behaviour, 'Being mad's infectious […].Anyhow, John seems to have caught it from the Indians, because, of course, he was with them a lot' (Huxley,1932:103.). Linda regarded the Indian's values as 'madness' because they were different from the values of her original world.

As John was born to a white woman, he was rejected by his society of adoption. He was excluded from the ritual of initiation to manhood because as one of the young Indians jeered at him ‘not for you white hair . . . not for the son of the she dog’, referring to Linda‘s loose morals (ibid.) Linda‘s behaviour towards John and The D.H.C‘s personal relationship to her once in the reservation are used by Huxley as a way to prove that certain human atavisms are stronger than all forms of conditioning.

Being rejected by the Indian society, John found comfort in learning English by listening to Linda telling him about the ―other place‖ and by reading Shakespeare. John grew up hating a world which rejected him and dreaming of the ideal world his mother kept telling him about.

> The happiest times were when she told him about the other place [where people could go flying wherever and whenever they wanted].She would tell him about the lovely music that came out of a box and all the nice games you could play , and the delicious things to eat and drink, and the light that came when you pressed a little thing in the wall, and the pictures that you could hear and feel and smell as well as see…and everybody happy and no one ever sad or angry and everyone belonging to everyone else…and people never lonely, but living together and being so jolly and happy like the summer dances in Malpais but much/ happier and the happiness being there every day (ibid:107-108).

This was how John was fascinated by the beauty, the state of bliss and the happiness that prevailed in “the other place”.

Because John‘s personality was the result of various influences, he was a disturbed subject and became the archetype of the tragic hero. John grew up in a primitive Indian society which rejected him, dreaming to enter the idyllic new world which Linda often told him about. Besides, he was fascinated by Shakespeare‘s heroes whose ordeals he admired and whom he came to identify himself with. So, when Bernard Marx invited john and his mother Lynda to ―the other place‖, secretly plotting to use them against the D.H.C, the savage was elated and it was only by echoing Miranda, Shakespeare‘s heroine in “***The Tempest”,*** ‘oh brave new world,… oh brave new world that has such people in it. Let’s start at once’; that

john could express his delight at the prospects of living in that utopia; to which Bernard Marx knowingly replied '…hadn't you better wait till you actually see the new world?' (ibid: p.116). Like Miranda, John was to realise that the utopian aspects he most admired in the new world were to cause his loss.

Ironically, as John was to discover, the new world was far from being the Eden he had been so eagerly looking for. He progressively realised, by the cultural standards that have shaped his identity, that the new world was an immoral place where all the values that ennoble man have disappeared. The more he visited the place, the more he realised the dehumanising effects of civilisation. John left a world of _madness' only to enter a world of 'insanity'; and owing to his socialisation and the influence of the Indians and Shakespeare, he finally preferred the madness of his human life to the insanity of the modern world.

The cost 'Brave New Worlders" had to pay for stability, their enslavement to the system and happiness through daily rations of soma, and their indifference to the plight of others mainly after Linda's death which was used by nurses as a opportunity for a lesson of "death conditioning", John decided to free the citizens of the new world from their dependence on the state and **soma**(emphasis added). In Huxley's dystopia, soma, a drug that gives the citizens of the world state a holiday from reality has replaced religion as a complement to the ideology of Fordism. However, John soon realised that addiction to happiness and soma among the inhabitants of the new world was stronger than any other ideal. In the end, unable to adapt to life in the new world and having failed in his desperate attempt to make it a little more humane, especially after his philosophical debate with Mustapha Mond the world Controller, who represented and exposed the philosophy of the ruling plutocracy, John the savage decided to divorce definitively with civilisation.

Scientific Utopianism as Ideology

Mustapha Mond, the World Controller for Western Europe who meets the students during their guided visit to the London Hatcheries, exposes the ideological bases of the world state. He explains that "Our Ford", the founder of the new order, saw the need for biological engineering, social conditioning and the quest of happiness and social stability instead of truth and freedom. He makes his thought clearer when he says that there can be 'no civilisation without social stability. No social stability without individual stability' (ibid: 44). He insists on the need to have identical social subjects with similar thoughts and undisturbed by strong emotions or divided allegiances; members that look alike and behave 'like cogs in the wheel'. Society needs docile contented citizens happy with their state and ready to fill the social function they are "programmed" for. The World controller explains that society needs psychologically balanced citizens because 'wheels must turn steadily but can't turn untended. There must be men to tend them, men as steady as the wheels upon their axles, sane men, and obedient men, stable in contentment' (Ibid:44)

Clearly, the rulers of Brave New World are not interested in the social subjects' 'happiness and stability' out of philanthropy but only to insure the stability of the system. Individual happiness is used as a means to perpetuate the bonds of servitude that bind social subjects to their true masters the barons of industry. That is why all the traditional values of religion, family life, ancestry and traditional bonds of allegiance to God, parents, spouse or children had been suppressed, because of the strong emotions they generated and consequently the feelings of awe, misery and conflicts they engendered. Mustapha Mond explained why traditional values and institutions were incompatible with civilised life:

> Our Ford - or our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling danger of family life. The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery: full of mothers - therefore of every kind of sadism from perversion to chastity, full of brothers, uncles, aunts – full of madness and suicide (ibid: 41).

Man‘s traditional bonds of allegiance were broken only to be replaced by new ones which were more compatible with life in an industrialised society. The moral comfort achieved by biological and neo-Pavlovian conditioning was the price paid for by the new masters as a compensation for the loss of individual freedom. Here Aldous Huxley is hinting at the ethical values as defined by the theoreticians of utilitarianism that hedonism is the most powerful normative principle in society. Many social theorists and positivists have observed that what holds systems together is a sort of attraction both in the physical and in the natural world which insures the continuity of systems and equilibrium or absence of tension for individual members. Within society, this absence of tension is assimilated to happiness. This may also hint at the welfare measures decided by the capitalist state in the period of economic depression in return for the loyalty of the labouring classes towards their employers. Habermas observes that measures such as paid holidays and pay rises are introduced in times of crisis and tension as a means to ensure the loyalty of the working classes and prevent trouble (Habermas, 1993: 127).

In Brave New World, all strong feelings and emotions are made gentler. Repression of instinctual drives is no longer necessary, and sex and play are allowed free expression because promoters of “Fordism” have succeeded to reconcile civilisation and contentment. In ***Eros and Civilisation***, Herbert Marcuse argues against Freud that technological development will free man from the need to deflect his libidinal energies into work as machines will take in charge disagreeable labour. As a result modern man will enjoy more free time and be able to satisfy his ―pleasure principle‖. Thus modern civilisation may evolve into a non repressive civilisation. As Huxley (1932) himself pointed out in his foreword to ***Brave New World,*** ‘as political and economic freedom diminishes, sexual freedom tends compensating to increase (Huxley, 1932: 13). In other words the subjection of modern man to the discipline imposed by life in modern society is rewarded by various forms of pleasure.

Indeed, Mustapha Mond , the technocrat representative and advocate of the rising capitalist elites whose values were impregnating society through discourse; the discourse of capitalism, consumerism, economic efficiency and human discipline, explained that progress was incompatible with the traditional values of family, religion and 'divided allegiances'. He was himself a brilliant scientist who was embarked in potentially subversive research. Because of this, he was given the choice between a scientific career as an exile and a political career with the prospect of becoming world controller. He said that '[he] chose [politics] and let the science go [because] truth is a menace . . . every change is a menace, every change is potentially subversive. . . . our Ford himself did a great deal to shift from truth and beauty to comfort and happiness(ibid: 182-183).

To a question asked by John whether it was not natural to believe in a creator, a supreme being, the World Controller explained that science has corrected all the ―sicknesses‖ that push man to seek comfort in religion; sicknesses like old age, disease, anguish have been cured .He added that representatives of the new order have put

> God in the safe and Ford in the shelf. . . .Old age is a sickness that requires the quest of God to alleviate it but the thing which philosophers and thinkers did not dream of was "modern age". We have made people independent of God by keeping them young and prosperous till the end. . . . [Modern] civilisation has chosen machinery and medicine and happiness . . . one believes things because one has been conditioned to believe in them. . . . The Gods are just, no doubt, but their code of law is dictated in the last resort by people who organise society; providence takes its cue from men (ibid: 187-189).

Mustapha Mond, a representative of the ruling elite of the World State, sums up the ideological principles underpinning the new order. The looming world of business needed contented docile workers, human resources, to run the factories and enthusiastic consumers, addicted as strongly as possible to the goods and services produced by capital to maintain them in a permanent state of immersion. As Richard Coyne (1997) explains, to retain state power, the ruling stratum should control 'not only the factors of production but also the

ideology of production and consumption'. To do so workers who are also consumers and social subjects are encouraged through reward to display cooperative attitudes through efficiency, good work loyalty and punctuality. Workers and managers develop corporate identities that involve next to uniform or dress a certain number of skills. Besides, consuming habits which contribute to the strengthening of social identities are constantly reinforced through publicity. In fact this theorist observes that all the social institutions of which apparently serve to the happiness of the social subject are actually subservient to the perpetuation of relations of economic dependence (Coyne, 1997: 187-188).

Characters in *Brave New World*

As in any dystopia, some characters are aware that something is wrong with their society. Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson are close friends and accomplices who share the uneasy feeling and the belief that they are being abused and manipulated. Yet, in spite of their superior intelligence for both belong to the Alpha plus caste they are helpless to alter the system .On the contrary they are condemned to be cast out and excluded because they represent potential dangers to the stability of the system. John who was brought to the new world only as an object of scientific curiosity and as a weapon used by Bernard Marx in his struggle for social influence against the D.H.C may represent a hint to the manipulation of the proletariat by communists in their struggle against the powers of industry and finance. John's values were used to magnify the insignificance of life in a modern world where the social subject is addicted to superfluous pleasures and soma. In Brave New World, little is left to chance or providence as everything is planned, organised or conditioned. It has become dull and unexciting because the miraculous and the tragic have been abolished from it.

Because the new world came out to be the exact opposite of what he was expecting, John who felt soiled from his contact with civilisation drank soda water to purify himself. He

left civilised society to avoid ―moral‖ corruption but being pursued as an object curiosity and excitement, he committed suicide.

John is an interesting character because he is used by the writer to convey the disillusionment o f man and the betrayal of his hopes by science and progress. He is a profoundly humane character imbued by the high moral values of the Shakespearean heroes. Like Miranda, he believes in the delusive appearances of progress only to realise at his expense that progress was not worth all the sacrifices. John may be the character through which Aldous Huxley vehicles the fears and apprehensions of many British people especially the traditional country gentry and land owners whose values, way of life and social influence were threatened by an emergent class of merchant and industrial capitalists whose vulgar tastes are criticised through mention of the "feelies", sport and sexual freedom, which in a later publication ***Brave New World Revisited***(1958***),*** Huxley presents as instruments of subjection used by the capitalist to make up for the loss of freedom. However and ironically, all the characters that represent opponents to the dystopian order of the World State are excluded or eliminated by the power holders. Huxley's dystopia may also express the disillusion of the intellectual elites with the destructive ends science had been put to especially after the First World War, and warn again against its possible perversions in the future. The punishment inflicted to Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson, their exile to an island, expresses the aversion of the ruling technocracy towards critical thought and their constant concern to insure the allegiance of intellectual elites.

Mustapha Mond, on the other hand, represents the cynical advocate of the values of the emerging capitalist order. He is a benevolent man and a brilliant mind. He knows about religion, history, philosophy and true science but explains that all of them have been sacrificed for the sake of individual happiness and social stability. He is among the few men who are endowed with free will but since his status requires that he devote himself to the

preservation of others' happiness he cannot be said to be totally free. Like Bernard Marx, Helmholtz Watson or any other servant of the complex world system, and in spite of his superior intelligence, he is only a servant, an outstanding servant of the complex machinery of power and order. As he explained to John, 'happiness [especially others' happiness] is a terrible master' (Huxley, 1932:182). when John asked him about God, Mustapha Mond replied that ' he manifests himself as an absence' (ibid: 188).

The World Controller may represent the type of capable intellectual who devotes his knowledge and energy to serve power. Although he claims that God manifests himself as an absence, Aldous Huxley makes the reader feel that another power named ―Ford‖ has insidiously crept into the stage and taken the place of God. Here Huxley alludes to the power of Henry Ford in the modern world in which he has assumed the status of God or ―the father‖ because he is the provider. However, if ―Fordism‖, which symbolises the modern division of labour, has led to the increase in production and consumers satisfaction, it has nonetheless resulted in workers' dehumanisation and the alienating impact of the modern factory system. This power has its altars and temples, its ceremonies and its psalms. All the scientific theories of the new century were used to reconcile economic efficiency, individual contentment and social stability. What Huxley warns us against, is that theories instead of serving Man have turned him into an object, a mere element in the modern complex machinery of production and consumption thus threatening his very existence.

Huxley the Intellectual

As an intellectual, Aldous Huxley appears to have an ambiguous attitude towards the issues of his time. Like many intellectuals of his time he was concerned by the rapid changes and the uncertainties affecting the world; but mainly the impact of these changes on their society. The study of the novel is useful since it contains traces of the changes affecting the British and American societies, and the struggle for power between different classes for their

control. For example, the writer refers to the growing influence of American culture through frequent reference to the "feelies" which in the writers mind refer to the development of the cinema. Another source of concern was the invasion of people's lives by the values of capitalism which threatened to turn man into a commodity which is produced and conditioned in such a way as to serve as 'a human element' to the flourishing and maintenance of the power of capital by being immersed in toil and the consumption of goods and leisure.

In parallel to the expansion of capitalism ran the alienating influence of industrial system on the workers. It is no surprise that Huxley traces the foundation of the world state to Henry Ford, the founder of the car factory which applied the principle of the division of work on a large scale although the benefits of Taylorism had been mentioned earlier by Adam Smith in ***The Wealth of Nations.*** The shift from Christianism to Fordism was evidence enough of the influence of industry and organisation and standardisation on people. As evidence of the power of the new religion, 'all the crosses had their tops cut and became Ts' , and people made "the sign of the T" instead of crossing themselves (ibid: 51).

The novel also hints at the increase in the consumption of leisure and the growth of cinema and radio audiences between the wars, and their use by the growing giant industrial concerns and entertainment business to boost consumption as mentioned by John Stevenson (1990) . The historian explains that by the late thirties, there were 5000 cinemas in England with super cinemas that could accommodate more than 4000 seats together with dance halls and sports resorts. This increase in entertainment among the working classes was the result of

> . . . higher standards of living and shorter hours of work, plus the extension of paid holidays to wider groups of workers [which] provided the impetus to an increase in almost every type of leisure activity. . . . Many of the new forms of entertainment were essentially more structured, occurring at set venues and at fixed times, fitting in with a fully industrialised work pattern (Stevenson: 1990, p. 401).

Parallel to the increasing influence of cinema, dance halls, popular sports, car driving and women's emancipation which were the result of paid holidays,David Thomson (1979)

added that British society witnessed a weakening of religious feeling and a decrease in the number of church goers (Thompson,1985:127). Indeed, many conservatives did not seem to appreciate the loosening of morals and the loss of religious feeling , the influence of churches being outdone by the growing influence of popular entertainment .Like his contemporaries, Aldous Huxley was scared by the spiritual barrenness of their society which was often referred to as the "modern wasteland".

At the international level, the writer hinted at the victory of the Bolshevik revolution through the mention of Pavlov, Bernard Marx and the frequent reference of ideological influence on individuals through slogans. Traces of the influence of racial and social Darwinism and its possible subservience by the budding nationalist ideologies in Germany and Italy are included in the novel. However as most of the European countries including Great Britain were committed to peace through the "Brian Kellogg's pact", (ibid: 145) war seemed a secondary threat compared to the impingements of capitalist discourse and the growing blind faith in techno-science. Recent developments in the balance of power worldwide and the triumphant expansion of capitalist ideology and discourse seem to confirm his fears and designate him as on of the most visionary thinkers of his time. In their foreword to a collection of essays Philippe Forget and Gilles Polycarpe 1990, confirmed Huxley's fears by declaring:

> Nous touchons à la fin. N'avons-nous pas gagné les rives nuptiales du meilleur des mondes ?... Immergé dans sa béatitude efficace, l'homme est une question résolue… La modernité voulait la transformation du monde, mais la soumettait à des finalités humaines, sociales, morales, historiques. Elle voulait, par les savoirs techniciens, libérer l'homme de la nature, conquérir la matière .Cependant, elle voulait aussi libérer l'homme de l'homme, l'éduquer à délibérer et à échapper aux évidences du pouvoir. Seulement, le fleuve de la technique est sorti de son lit. Sa puissance s'est emparée des choses, des corps et des âmes (p.9).

In spite of his concern about man's dignity and freedom there are important questions which in Huxley's dystopia _manifest themselves as an absence'. Of the workers' strikes, he did not make any mention although the trade unions were particularly active in the late

twenties and in the thirties. One of the marking social events of the period was the General Strike of 1926. He was more interested to divert the reader‘s attention from the African and the Hindu “savages” who, at the time, were raising their voices to claim emancipation from the generous embrace of the British Empire. Unfortunately, Aldous Huxley, in spite of his exuberant humanism holds an ethnocentric view on man. His romantic plea for freedom and the protection of man from the dehumanizing influence of techno-science in the service of the capitalists’ will to power seems to be a means to silence and conceal the voices of the oppressed that were rising in India and Africa to claim emancipation. Like many political reformers and intellectuals of his time he urged for a progressive and balanced betterment of man, material but also spiritual, and society that would keep away the spectre of a bloody revolution.

Strangely, John the savage, the most important character of the novel, is a white character of European origin that embodies the human values learnt in ***The Complete Works of William Shakespeare***. Albeit John was socialised among Indians, he does all the talking and confronts Mustapha Mond using English and Shakespeare as a cultural resource for his ideas and values while the Indians remain strangely mute. The only time he uses Zuni language was to break the conventions of politeness in vigour in the civilised world and to use insulting words.

In his foreword to the 1946 edition of ***Brave New World,*** Aldous Huxley said: ‘…if I were to rewrite the book, I would offer the savage a third alternative. Between the utopian and the primitive horns of his dilemma would lies the possibility of sanity [. . .], (Huxley,1932 :8)’. This implied that ―the savage‖ not the civilised people needed to make an effort of adaptation to supersede the ―madness‖ he caught from the Indians to reach salvation.

Furthermore, in the civilised world, the only characters endowed with speech are the members of the upper classes, those of the Alpha plus castes, whereas the members of the

lower castes the epsilons and the gammas hardly ever utter any word. The workers' aspirations and the activism of the trade unions of the British society of the 1930s are veiled by the silent orderly mechanical movements of the epsilons and gammas which are portrayed as part of the complex machinery which they operate in ***Brave New World***. The disturbing question of unemployment which reached the highest peak in the early thirties as there were about six to seven million Britons living on the dole,(Stevenson,1992), was solved by depriving the workers of their voices.

On the international level the issue of decolonisation once again manifests itself as an absence. Huxley seems to have relieved the consciences of his contemporaries by diverting their attention from the Hindu and African scenes where the savages were not as absent, as silent and as docile as the "tamed" Indians of Malpais.

As an intellectual, Huxley, although critical of intellectuals like Mustapha Mond who hire their skills to the rising capitalist elites, cannot be ranked as the ideal intellectual described by Benda and Sartre; an intellectual who judges according to universal values of truth and justice. He even prefers the clear responsible position of Mustapha Mond in favour of happiness, spurious though it may be, and social stability to the occasional and opportunistic criticism of Bernard Marx of the social order when he was marginalised, and his exaggerated elation when the company of John "savage" gave him a feeling of power and importance.

Through Bernard Marx, Huxley seems to caricature the rising intellectual elites of lower middle class or working class origins who are critical only as long as they feel excluded from the social elites. Once they get closer to the rulers their sense of justice is corrupted by power and luxury. This may explain the shift in the attitude of many English socialists who preferred the welfare measures of the labour Party to the socialist revolution and confirm Mannheim's claim that the outlook of, an intellectual may change as he ascends in the social scale. The

1926 General Strike may be expressed as a rebellion of the workers against their union leaders whom they accused of having sided with the powers of capital.

Unlike Sartre who took the defence of the Algerians fighting for their emancipation, Huxley preferred to conceal the voices of the Africans and Hindus. As a speaking subject, he appears to be constrained by his cultural capital and seemed to act in defence of the bourgeois values of his class and the imperial interests of England. It is not easy, however, to explain his attitude towards progress and science which seems ambiguous. His attitude may find meaning in the precedence of arts over sciences and technology, and in the prevailing distrust of the intellectual elites of the 1930s towards science and technology. As Stevenson (1990) pointed out:

> Although the social history of twentieth century Britain has been shaped . . . by the products of science and technology‘ [real prestige was still attached to the arts and] _the curriculum of the great majority of public and grammar schools continued to emphasise literary and human education (Stevenson, 1990: 425-432).

Brave New World seems close to the definition of the lampoon as ‘criticism become art’. However, Huxley’s position in relation to progress is ambiguous. Although he sometimes sounds critical of the stratification of British society into distinct castes he does not seem to worry much about the effects of liberalism and their effects on the working classes. He criticises the use of entertainment and consumerism and soma as a substitute to religion to immerse modern man and ensure his dependence on the capitalist system but keeps strangely silent about issues of poverty and unemployment and ends up taking Mescaline and LSD himself. Aldous Huxley is close to the definition given by Mannheim of the disillusioned romantic. Like his hero, Helmholtz Watson, he chooses voluntary exile from a society whose excesses he unmasks through his satirical writings. However he remains attached to the imperial interests of his country.

As there was growing enthusiasm before the successes of science and industry this religion of modern times which would enable man to found on earthly paradise, Aldous

Huxley intended to express his concern as regards the capitalist ideology pervading not only British society but the world as a whole since the society it depicts is presented as part of a global world state. There were even fascist tendencies in Great Britain tempted to «institutionalize" inequalities to prevent instability (Monarch notes).

The concerns raised by the writer were: increased centralised state control, and the colonisation of state institutions by the capitalist discourse underpinned by scientific theories which led to the accumulation of power on the part of hidden masters, on the one hand, and the loss of individual freedom on the other hand, as social subjects were made into mere recipients of the prevailing conventions, stuffed with the ideology of the power holders and conditioned to echo, reproduce and maintain the will of the rulers. Reference to Darwinism and eugenics , which having originated in England had reached Europe and were being used as discourse in the service of the budding Nazi nationalism in Germany and fascism in Italy suggests that Aldous Huxley was worried by the subversive uses these ―sciences‖ were being put to. As Christopher Hutton (2004) stated in « Linguistique et anthropologie raciale en Allemagne Nazie:sciences contradictoires ou sciences complémentaires ? »

> La nature de la diversité humaine a été et reste l'une des questions intellectuelles fondamentales de la modernité, …Un des éléments clés de l'idéologie Nazie était l'accent mis sur la différence. Les théories universalistes d'une égalité humaine, de droits et de valeurs partagés, étaient rejetées au profit d'un relativisme qui considérait la diversité humaine comme l'ordre naturel du monde. Toute théorie politique, sociale ou biologique qui promouvait l'effacement des différences était rejetée. (in ***Discours sur la langue sous les régimes autoritaires :*** Cahiers de L'I.LSL.,NO° 51. p.65).

In addition to the alliance of science and ideology to legitimise the rise to power of new political elites under cover of nationalist motives and racial diversity; the society described in ***Brave New World*** contains traces of the growing influence of communist discourse through the frequent reference to behaviourist psychology and the mention of Bernard *Marx* as well as the invasion of the British society by Yankee consumerist values through the mention of Ford.

The writer himself declares that his novel concerns itself with 'the advancement of science as it affects the human individual'. He wanted his readers to tone down their enthusiasm and blind belief in the "miracles" of science by warning them that unless scientific progress is controlled by a strict code of ethics, it may engender unpredictable ends. As one of his critics put it, 'it is his attempt to make man realise that since knowledge is power, he who controls and uses knowledge wields power'. Huxley himself insists in his foreword to ***Brave New World*** (1932) that 'Science and technology should be the servants of man-man should not be adapted and enslaved to them' (p.8).

Conclusion

Brave New World constitutes a satirical attack on the betrayal of Man's faith in science and progress. The promises of science to emancipate man from ignorance, superstition, fear and subjection have led to his reification to fit in the social and economic system. This shift in centrality from man as an end to man as a means was illustrated throughout the novel. Knowledge which was at the outset theorised experience, accumulated, shared and transmitted through language as a means whereby man had exploited nature and mediated the world, ironically evolved into a tool of subjection with man as its ―object‖. The capitalist ideology spread by the triumphs of the U.S. car industry symbolised by the conquest of the model T. Ford , not only in North America but also in Europe , and the increased efficiency rendered possible by Taylorism inspired social scientists and psychologists to apply these principles to organise society.

The world was organised according to the capitalist ideology in terms of resources, market, commodities and consumers. In this new perception of society, man was both a resource, therefore a commodity whose skills and labour were bought and sold, and a consumer whose loyalty and faithfulness were vital to the stability of the system. As a result of this new vision, man became a productive agent who was to be shaped according to

expressed needs , and a consumer who had to be conditioned in such a way as to absorb the goods and services supplied to the market. The task of engineering the **"Brave New Worlders"**(emphasis added) into docile, productive and consuming machines was entrusted to an elite of superior minds which are themselves guided by the sacred principles of "Fordism", the ideology of the new World State. Huxley's far reaching vision about the trends of the thirties towards the total colonisation of the world by the then rampant capitalist discourse and the establishment of hegemony of a world state was expressed in the following lines:

> We are living now, not in the delicious intoxication induced by the early success of science, but in a rather grisly morning after, when it has become important that what science has done hitherto is to improve the means for achieving unimportant or actually deteriorated ends (Huxley, 1932: 8)

Aldous Huxley was concerned not only by the societal trend of his time which tended to substitute the absolutism of science to the absolutism of religion but also by the apparent benediction of, or at least complacent silence of the intellectual elites. The book was intended to express the writer's disillusionment with his society and its new coming values. In addition, the writer raised his voice to shake the consciences of the intellectual elites whose critical sense had been made drowsy by the consumption of superfluous pleasures and whom the writer charges of selling their skills and voices to the new power holders and who chose to commit themselves to 'happiness and social stability' rather than to truth and individual freedom.

Mustapha Mond, one of the ten World Controllers in charge of western Europe informed "Mister savage" that he was himself a brilliant scientist who chose to sacrifice his quest of truth to devote himself to the happiness of the social members and the stability of the social body. This implies that many intellectuals in Huxley's time sacrificed the will to truth for the ―will to order‖ which is but another form of the "will to power". What made the situation look more desperate was the fact that even the World Controllers who are portrayed

as supermen endowed with free will are determined in their actions by a higher authority hidden in the backstage which the Controller refers to as "Our Ford" or some grand ideal like 'others' happiness or social stability'.

Against the utopian liberal interpretation of science and progress of his time, Huxley responded with a sceptical conservative view. The Darwinian principles which were first discovered in the natural world were later rationalised and extended to society. "Fordism" which draws most of its ideas and practices from Darwinism is unmasked by the writer as an ideological tool which tended to naturalise social inequalities as a logical outcome of the evolutionary scheme and the reign of the "fittest" members as the only way to 'individual and social stability' and the condition for happiness. Worse, science through the state institutions reproduces and enhances these inequalities to prevent disorder or revolution and maintain by concealing their true nature the unequal relations of power. It was also used to justify the primacy of the "fittest European element" worldwide over the coloured people and their exploitation as well as that of t lands and riches as resources.

In spite of his satirical attack on the uses to which science is put in ***Brave New World***, Huxley is not opposed to progress. His merit is to arouse our critical sense and warn us against the uses of science and progress as an ideology to legitimise the power of industrial and financial barons over things and over man. He believes that science and progress should serve man rather than be used to reify and enslave him.

CHAPTER VII: *Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949):* Neo-Liberalism or the Quest for "The Golden Country"

Introduction

In 1948, nearly a century after Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels had issued their "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" and thirty years after the realisation of the workers' utopia predicted as the last stage of historical materialism in Russia, George Orwell wrote ***Nineteen Eighty-four***. Why should one, among the English writers of the twentieth century, single out George Orwell's ***Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949)*** for study after one has dealt with Aldous Huxley's ***Brave New World***? How does the study of this novel help to understand the transformations affecting the British society within, and its future status as a traditional colonial empire and world power towards the new emerging powers, on the one hand, and the colonies' rising voices for emancipation and legitimate aspirations to share in the human dignity recovered with the defeat of Nazism on the other hand?

The answer lies partly in the period in which George Orwell wrote his novel; the period of the ―cold war‖, following the Second World War; a period, characterised by intense social and political struggles and shifts in power nationally and internationally, and partly in the tremendous amount of journalism, letters, reviewing, essays and novels, all of which were linked to English national events or international events, and which inform about the writer's political bias, actions and influence. Tomothy Garton Ash, who wrote the introduction to Orwell and Politics(2001) confirms Orwell's when he remarks that 'the first use of the phrase "Cold War" recorded in The Oxford English Dictionary [. . .] comes from an article by Orwell' (Ash:2001, xiii). More than all this, Orwell's tragic dystopia written immediately, after the horrors of Nazism and the purges of Stalinism seems to constitute an answer to the hedonistic dystopia projected by Huxley in 1932. He was concerned, not only by the possible attraction communism can exert on British socialists but he also hoped to stir resistance to Stalinism among the eastern satellites of the Soviet Union. As a writer, George Orwell was a

product of his time. His writings which bear a direct link to the political events of his time constitute an important documentary source about the evolution of British society.

Indeed, in a period of uncertainty, the second quarter of the twentieth century following the Wall Street Crash, when so much was at stake, there was hardly any political event which Orwell did not analyse and comment. As a man, he was deeply shocked by the state of poverty among the working classes all over Europe which he realised was a direct result of the crisis of the capitalist system. As an Englishman, he was a patriot who was convinced that unless the system were changed by the workers under the inspiration and guidance of an elite of middle class intellectuals through a peaceful socialist revolution, England might fall prey to the rising Fascist or communist ideologies. Through his writings, Orwell has become for many critics the symbol of intellectual honesty and moral rectitude committed to fight all forms of state totalitarianism and control of individual freedom and dignity, but above all, he was the righteous voice of England and the free world which stripped naked the perversion of the workers‘ ideals into dictatorships that had to be contained at all costs. This status and function is insistently underscored by Ash in his Introduction (Ash, 2001: xi).

Nineteen Eighty-Four constitutes the paradigm of Orwell‘s commitment to protect the common man by unmasking the perversion of workers’ aspirations to dignity and social justice into a totalitarian ideology. However, before we proceed to the analysis of the text proper, which we suggest to study as social action, we shall have a look at the circumstances that have shaped Orwell‘s outlook as a speaking subject and social agent.

Biographical Notes: From Sentimental Humanist to Socialist

George Orwell was born Eric Arthur Blair in 1903, in Montihari, Bengal, India. His father Richard Walmsley Blair was a civil servant for the British government. In 1907, the young Orwell moved with his mother and sister to England where he remained until 1922. He entered Eton College which he did not seem to like much as he explained in the preface to the

1947 Ukrainian edition of ***Animal Farm:*** 'I was educated at Eton, the most costly and snobbish of all English public schools', (ibid. P. xi) and took care to note that without a scholarship, he would never have been able to enter this college as his family belonged to the low middle class. He began to write at an early age and while at Eton, 'he contributed regularly to the various college magazines' (Orwell and Politics).

However, as he did not enjoy himself at Eton, his unfavourable school experiences were described in "Such, Such Were the Joys",(1968),and as he failed to win a university scholarship, he went back to India where he served in the Imperial Police from 1922 to 1928 when he resigned because of growing dislike of British imperialism and the contemptuous attitude of the British towards the natives; a dislike he expressed in his essays "A Hanging"(1931) and "Shooting an Elephant", (1950). While on leave with his family in Cornwall, in September 1927, he decided not to return to India in spite of the financial loss entailed by his resignation. It was at that time that he visited the poverty stricken quarters of the East End of London. From the spring of 1928 to 1929, Orwell went to live in the 5th arrondissement in Paris; a working class district near Monge metro station.

While in Paris, he wrote short stories and novels succeeding to have a few articles published in left wing journals and ***Le Monde*** in October 1928. A year later, he returned to London where he took up a post of private tutor and later school teacher (1932), but due to his poor health, he had to give up teaching. It was during that period that Orwell _lived mostly from hand to mouth and went hungry on several occasions (Orwell and Politics: p.316).' [5] He discovered the life of the paupers, the dole queues and crime, and realised the humiliating effects of poverty. It was also during that time that he studied the conditions of life of the miners in the north of England. Meanwhile, he became a regular contributor of ***The Adelphi***, and in 1933, he assumed the pen name of George Orwell for the first time when he published his first novel ***Down and out in Paris and London,*** in which he described his experiences

with poverty. In 1934, he published his second major work, ***Burmese Days***, an attack on British exploitation of the colonised people and their riches .The book seems to be a continuation of an article published in ***Le Progrès Civique***, a French left-wing newspaper, in 1929, where he developed a Marxist view of British imperialism in Burma (Orwell and Politics. pp.1-8). Later, in 1936, he married Eileen O'Shaughnessy. In 1937, following the publication of ***A Clergyman's Daughter*** and ***Keep the Aspidistra Flying***, he published ***The Road to Wigan Pier***, in which he describes the conditions of the working classes in the town of Wigan.

As early as the 1920's, Orwell had begun to express aversion to imperialism and social injustice based on the exploitation of the owning classes to the poor and the workers. His dislike of the upper classes is expressed in a footnote on 'Public Schools [as] expensive residential secondary schools [for] the sons of rich aristocratic families [and] nouveau riche bankers of the 19thcentury (Orwell and Poltics: p. 316)'. He showed empathy to the working classes and the depressed by his frequent visits to the poor districts of London and through the particular interest he took in the miners' life after his return from France in 1929 when he wrote ***The Road to Wigan Pier.***

Although his biographers did not mention specific political influences or activities, his dwelling in a proletarian district among the workers with whom he shared deprivation for some time and whom he may have come to identify himself with seems to have exerted a certain influence on his political sympathies. Besides, the economic depression had struck all of Europe by that time, and socialist and Marxist ideas had begun to impregnate European societies and particularly France which was a receptive and favourable ground to the growth and propagation of Marxist revolutionary action. Tellingly, it was after his return from France that Orwell began to espouse the socialist ideas as he himself explained in the preface he wrote to the Ukrainian edition to ***Animal Farm,***(1947):

> Until 1930, I did not on the whole look upon myself as a socialist. In fact, I had as yet not clearly defined political views. I became pro-socialist more out of disgust with the way the poorer sections of the industrial workers were oppressed and neglected than out of any theoretical admiration for a planned society (***Orwell and Politics***, 2001: 317)

Like many intellectuals of his time, caught in the whirlpool of workers‘ struggles and the revolutionary fever spread by socialist discourse made inevitable by the Great Depression and the workers‘ awareness of their importance, Orwell couldn‘t resist the appeal. However, he was more a humanist concerned by the plight of the workers and the ordinary man than a professional revolutionary theorist plotting to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat**.**

In 1936, sometime after his marriage, he went to Spain with his wife to report about the civil war but found himself involved in the fight for the elected socialist Spanish government against the fascists. However, instead of joining the International Brigade under Russian control, like the majority of foreigners, he fought at the side of the POUM militia, a Spanish anti-Stalinist Workers' Marxist party. In 1937, the communists gained control of the republican government and started a man hunt of the Marxist militants of the POUM militia in the streets of Barcelona.

It was in Spain that Orwell discovered 'Russian led communist terror and duplicity' as the communist hunted him with other members of the workers' militia who were accused of being "Trotskyite Francoiste traitors" by a soviet agent whose action was to defame the POUM and its action. Many members of the workers' Marxist Party who had fought for the republic against the Fascist nationalists were thus tried as traitors and executed (Ash, 2001: xii) . What angered Orwell most was the fact that these trials coincided with the great purges in the USSR which were meant to crush any dissonant voice against Stalin‘s dictatorship at home and control communist action outside. Worse than the Russian action was the complacent attitude of English socialists and communists who were reluctant to overcome their ideological allegiances and denounce the political murders.

From English Socialist to Anti-totalitarian Russophobe

This bitter experience in Spain opened Orwell's eyes to the perversion of the workers' socialist ideals by Russian communists whose strategic aim was to export their revolution, and create outside Russia totalitarian systems that would echo and spread Soviet ideology. It made Orwell reject Russian communism in favour of the 'English brand of socialism' (ibid). Orwell was shocked by the silence of the British intelligentsia which he thought was the result of 'the negative influence of the soviet myth upon the western socialist movement (Orwell and Politics: p.317)'. He explained in the preface to the Ukrainian edition of ***Animal Farm*** that in the USSR the socialist ideals had been perverted into a hierarchical society by a power thirsty oligarchy that was no less favourable to relinquish the levers of power than any other ruling class. Orwell added that this perversion had been made possible by the idealisation of the Bolshevik revolution among the English socialists who consider it as a paradigm of social progress and justice. Because of their complacent silence towards the purges committed by Stalin, English socialists have encouraged the perversion of socialism into totalitarianism for Orwell seems convinced that 'nothing has contributed so much to the corruption of the original idea of socialism as the belief that Russia is a socialist country, and that every act of its rulers must be excused if not imitated' (Ibid: 358).

Although Orwell never visited the USSR, he was able to grasp the totalitarian nature of the Soviet political system by reviewing books written by journalists or intellectuals, usually sympathisers of the Russian revolution, who had spent some time in the USSR and came back west. Albeit the real threat towards freedom in the late 1930s came from Hitler, he directed his attacks more on the Russians whom he came to assimilate with Fascists than on the Nazis. While reviewing Eugene Lions' ***Assignment in Utopia***, he concludes, referring to the USSR, that

> . . .the system that Mr Lions describes does not seem to be very different from fascism. All real power is concentrated in the hands of two or three million people, the town

> proletariat, theoretically the heirs of the revolution, having been robbed even of the right to strike; more recently by the introduction of the internal passport system, they have been reduced to a status resembling serfdom ***(Orwell and Politics***:33).

Meanwhile, he declared his opposition to war against Germany even after this latter invaded Czechoslovakia for he was convinced that a war would only contribute to ‗maintain and extend imperialist possessions and interests . . . [and engender] the destruction of the liberties of the people and the imposition of totalitarian regimes (Ibid., p.43)'. Like many socialists, Orwell believed that the only war worth waging was the war against all forms of imperialism, economic exploitation and social injustice. Later, in 1939, commenting on another book, ***Russia under the Soviet Rule***, by N. De Basily who predicted that ‗an appraisal of the Russian elites is likely to arouse support and sympathy because ―Russian spirit‖ is still there', Orwell was adamant that

> [. . . one] cannot be at all certain that ―human nature‖ is constant. It may be just possible to produce a breed of men who do not wish for liberty as to produce a breed of hornless cows [. . .]. The radio, the press- censorship, standardised education and the secret police have altered everything. Mass suggestion is a science of the last twenty years, and we do not yet know how successful it will be (Ibid: 59).

Orwell was hinting at the increased capacity acquired by the new rulers, thanks to modern mass media and the new forms of psychological manipulation, to control people's thoughts and actions. It is this capacity to use modern science for purposes of indoctrination and hegemony which he brightly satirised in ***Nineteen Eighty Four*** (1949).

Orwell's equal rejection of Fascism and Communism expressed the dilemma of many English socialists who were reluctant to enter the war lest they would only help to boost the power of the capitalists and the imperialists, but who also feared that a victory of Hitler would encourage an English version of fascism. Next to that real threat, the persistence of social inequalities and contradictions within the British society after the war ends may bring about a revolution similar to the Bolshevik revolution and lead to the creation of a clone to the soviet system. What Orwell (1941) favoured was a socialist state based on ‗common ownership of

means of production, equality of income, political democracy and abolition of hereditary privilege, especially in education (***Orwell and Politics***: 109)'. There appeared to be a sort of admiration towards the efficiency of the German National Socialism which Orwell did not succeed to conceal. According to him, German superiority over England in the first years of the war lay in the control exercised by the Nazi Party over all aspects of political, economic and social life and their massive rearmament policy. The only difference between English socialism and German national socialism was that the former was based on equality whereas the latter insisted on difference; on the superiority of the Nordic element (Ibid: p110-112).

When Britain declared war to Germany, in 1939, Orwell's patriotic feelings proved stronger than his socialist principles. He took part in the war effort as a sergeant in the Home Guard and also worked as a journalist for the B.B.C, ***Observer*** and ***Tribune*** where he was literary critic from 1943 to 1945. By that time, signs of the weakening of the German armies especially after the defeat of Stalingrad made possible by the heroic resistance of the population of the city and the Red Army began to appear .The victory of Stalingrad which was obtained at the cost of huge human losses both among the Russian civilians and the soldiers constituted an important turning point in the evolution of the balance of power in the second World War, and contributed to increase European sympathy towards the Soviet Union. Most western democracies were too grateful for the Soviet contribution to the defeat of Hitler to dare criticise Stalin's brutality.

Orwell, on the contrary, particularly now that the danger of fascism was superseded, became vehemently critical of western complacency against the atrocities committed by Stalinist Russia. His attacks were directed towards the intellectuals' and the socialists' reluctance to denounce soviet excesses on the ground that it was unfair to criticise a war ally who paid such a high tribute to defeat Hitler. Orwell's critical attitude turned to manifest Russo phobia especially after "The Yalta Conference" (1945). Towards the end of the Second

World War, when it became obvious that Nazism was defeated and that soviet communism was now the threat, Orwell would go to extremes in his denunciation of soviet influence on the English society and even suspect the existence of an underground organisation of communist agents working for the benefit of Russia. In an essay "Notes on Nationalism", October 1945, Orwell suspects left wing intellectuals and pacifists of showing more allegiance to the USSR than to England where

> [. . .] the dominant form of nationalism is communism. [. . .] A communist, for my purpose here, is one who looks upon the USSR as his fatherland and feels it his duty to justify Russian policy and advance Russian interests at all costs. Obviously, such people abound in England today, and their direct and indirect influence is very great (***Orwell and Politics***: 358).

Totalitarianism, Endism and the Last Man

In addition to the influence the various novels written by western journalists and intellectuals describing the soviet system and which Orwell reviewed, ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1948) may well have been inspired by a political dystopia entitled ***We*** which was written by a Russian literary critic and novelist named Yevgueni Zamyatin. Although George Orwell declared that ‗resemblance between Zamyatin's ***We*** and Aldous Huxley's ***Brave New World*** ***(***1932) is striking,' the description of the society depicted by Zamyatin looks closer to Orwell's dystopia than to Huxley's. The book review, which was titled ―Freedom and Happiness‖ was published in ***Tribune*** of January 4th, 1946.(Ibid.pp. 411-414)

Written in 1923, ***We*** portrays a future political dystopia set in the 26th century A.D., in which the inhabitants who have lost their individuality are called by number. They live in a panoptical system of glass houses under constant surveillance. The narrator, D-530, cannot adapt to the prevailing orthodoxy as he had kept his natural instincts. He falls in love with another member I-330 and joins an underground organisation that rebels against the authority of "The Benefactor"; a sort of benevolent dictator. Finally, the rebellious members are arrested, tortured until they are cured from their disease called "imagination", and made to

betray their confederates before they are sent to 'the machine of the benefactor', the guillotine, to be executed.

The way orthodoxy is enforced in Zamyatin's world through permanent surveillance, absence of loyalty or love between members, torture and conversion of the rebellious elements together with the existence of an underground rebellious organisation and frequent executions of opponents seems to have been an important source of inspiration for the writing of ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1949)**.** Orwell's comment that ***We*** 'is not a book of the first order, but …certainly an unusual one, and it is astonishing that no English publisher has been enterprising enough to re-issue it' (ibid) proves that the writer was all but indifferent to the content of the book.

Written under poor health conditions as Orwell was in and out of hospital in 1948, ***Nineteen Eighty-Four***(1949) depicts life in Oceania, a totalitarian super-state that includes next to England, the United States, Australia, New-Zealand and South Africa. One immediately notices that if the world is to be split into alliances or super states, the English speaking world would naturally form an ideologically united block. Interestingly, this analysis is shared by H.G. Wells, whose little bourgeois outlook Orwell doesn't share, and Bertrand Russell who encourages a globalised system of governance which would combine collective ownership of resources and means of production, with the federal structure and democratic traditions of the English speaking people.

When the novel was published in June 1949, nearly simultaneously both in England and the U.S.A., it was an outstanding success. However, it was subject to misunderstanding, especially among the American readers and reviewers who interpreted Orwell's dystopia as a renouncement by the writer of his socialist ideals and 'an attack on the Labour Party' which had become, because of its social welfare measures, the object of harsh criticism especially from the conservatives. Orwell who was saddened by the reaction of the reading public

declared that he had remained faithful to the British Labour Party which had introduced daring reforms in public health and insurance, nationalised certain industries such as mining and armament, and introduced economic and social development in the depressed areas , felt it his duty to explain that

> [his] recent novel ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** is NOT intended as an attack on socialism, or on the British Labour Party[…]but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have partly been realised in communism and fascism.
> I do not believe [he added] that the kind of society which I described will arrive, but I believe…that something resembling it could arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of people everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences.
> The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasize that the English speaking races [sic] are not innately better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere(Orwell and Politics: p.500).

This means that Orwell intentionally meant his dystopia as a warning and a deterrent against the possible effects of utopianism.

Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949) describes the effects of utopian thoughts turned into a totalitarian ideology on individuals. The oppressive atmosphere which prevails in Airstrip one, the new name of England, the dreary landscape and the lack of the most basic commodities is enough to arouse revulsion and horror at the prospects that such a nightmare might come true. Unfortunately, Orwell did not live long enough to enjoy the consecration brought to him by his last two novels. He died on January 21st 1950.

Nineteen Eighty-Four is the story of Winston Smith‘s rebellion against the dictatorship of Big Brother, the falsification of history by The Party, and denial of truth and objective reality. The novel is about life in Airstrip One, the new name of England, which is only a small part of a totalitarian super state including the English speaking countries of northern America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. The State is administered by four institutions housed in four gigantic buildings which tower high above the rest.

> The ministry of truth. . . was an enormous pyramidal structure of glittering white concrete, soaring up terrace after terrace, 300 metres into the air. . . Scattered about

> London, there were just three other buildings of similar appearance and size. So completely did they dwarf the surrounding architecture that from the roof of Victory Mansions you could see all four of them simultaneously. They were the homes of the ministries between which the entire apparatus of the government was divided (Orwell: 1949: 9).

Seen from any building in London or from the crumbling old houses of victory Mansions where Orwell‘s hero Winston Smith lived, the stately buildings where armies of bureaucrats and party members control every aspect of life in ―Airstrip One‖ contrast with the shabbiness of the other buildings and inspired a feeling of awe.

Ironically, the four ministries: the ministry of truth, the ministry of peace, the ministry of love and the ministry of plenty, respectively referred to as: Minitrue, Minipax, Miniluv And Miniplenty in Newspeak -the new version of the English language- concerned themselves in pursuing the exact opposite of their declared vocations.(In Orwell‘s dystopia, "Newspeak", which is the corrected version of "Oldspeak" , is the language developed by the philologists of the Party; a language that had been expurgated of any words that may enable Party members to unorthodox or independent thinking. Orwell devotes a whole chapter in the novel in which he titles "The Principles of Newspeak", and in which he describes the form of the new language and the purposes behind it.) For example, the ministry of truth where Winston Smith works concerns itself with the falsification of historical records, constantly altering the past to adapt it to the truth of the party and Big Brothers' predictions. The ministry of peace is busy waging a permanent war against one of its opponents East Asia or Eurasia the two other totalitarian super states making up the world. Finally, the ministry of plenty aims at entertaining a state of permanent penury especially of basic commodities while proclaiming regular rises in economic output. The ministry of love, the most dreaded of the four ministries, is the place where deviant and disloyal party members are converted through physical and psychological torture to the love of "Big Brother".

Big Brother is a mythical figure, omniscient and omnipresent. He incarnates the power of the Party, a sort of God whose poster is pinned everywhere with eyes that 'seem to follow you wherever you move'. A notice clearly apparent under the poster "BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU", gives party members the feeling that their movements and gestures are permanently scrutinised. Big Brother may be the Orwellian version of Thomas Hobbes "Leviathan" which impels conformity and obedience to the state through endless observation of the masses'. In addition to Big Brother's eyes, there is, installed everywhere, a device called "the telescreen" which in addition to broadcasting news , patriotic songs and party propaganda enables the police of the state to watch virtually any party member whether he is at home, at work or in the street, asleep or awake which enforces permanent discipline and orthodoxy . As Winston describes it:

> The telescreen received and transmitted simultaneously . . . there was of course no way of knowing whether you were being watched at any given moment. How often, or on what system, the thought police plugged in on any individual wire was guesswork. It was often conceivable that they watched everybody all the time .You had to live-did live from habit that became instinct-in the assumption that every sound you made was overheard, and, except in darkness, every movement scrutinised(Orwell,1949:8).

One feels, after every line he reads, that the atmosphere which prevails in Oceania is the total antithesis of the utopian ideals of equality, absence of constraint and hierarchy projected in the socialist utopias or communist manifestoes.

Language as Power

The official ideology of Oceania, "Ingsoc", meaning English socialism, is epitomised in the three party slogans: "War is Peace", "Freedom is Slavery", and "Ignorance is Strength". Oceania has no written constitution or law and, in theory, the inhabitants are free; yet, they are expected to know as though by instinct, what thoughts, what acts are compatible with Ingsoc and what unorthodox thoughts or acts are considered as heresy and should therefore absolutely be avoided. Party members are expected to believe blindly in whatever the party holds as true and good, and act accordingly.

Moreover, since truth and reality exist in the minds of social subjects in the form of feelings, ideas and representations embedded in language, the party can control reality since it controls language (Newspeak) and consequently peoples‘ minds. For example, the belief according to which the party invented planes is false but since all the historical records, newspapers and school books say it, it has become a truth.

Besides, to prevent any contention to the truth spread by the party, dialogic communication between the social subjects is prevented. Unable to communicate and share their truth to use it against the truth of the party, social subject feel unable to counter official discourse and end up doubting their own eyes. As Hannah Arendt 1966, put it:‘ Inasmuch as man depends for his knowledge upon the affirmation and comprehension of his fellowmen [. . .] this shared but guarded knowledge loses its quality of reality and assumes the nature of a mere nightmare‘ (Arendt: 1966, p.189). Indeed, party members as Winston Smith, Orwell‘s hero in the text, are unable to communicate the perversions of the ideals of the revolution for fear of being betrayed for treachery against the party and Big Brother and suffer due punishment accordingly. Here, Orwell before Hannah Arendt had hinted at the atmosphere of terror that purges in totalitarian systems have created.

Thus, even if social members such as Winston Smith hold material evidence that the party is lying, they cannot share their knowledge with the others. The general atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and distrust acts as a powerful deterrent. This atmosphere of terror is accentuated by rumours about the existence of an underground organisation named ―The Brotherhood‖ under the leadership of a certain Emanuel Goldstein, plotting to overthrow Big Brother and the party, on the one hand, and the omnipresence of the secret police everywhere on the other hand. At regular intervals, news of the arrest of members of The Brotherhood is broadcast on the telescreen. After they make complete confessions of their crimes and betray their friends under unbearable torture, they simply disappear.

In Oceania, "the iron curtain" is the psychological barrier of fear and suspicion that separates people and prevents any form of dialogic relation through communication. This absence of dialogue prevents the establishment of conventions on what truth or reality is. As a result, every individual member is made into a "sloganised" subject; a mere recipient and of the party ideology, and a channel reproducing and amplifying the vision of the party, contributing in this way to the perpetuation and strengthening of the power position of the party and his position as subject. A good example of how the party controls individuals' thoughts is Katharine, Winston's wife. Winston Smith who had become aware of the party's ability to control people's thoughts said of his wife: 'Katharine had not a thought in her head that was not a slogan, and there was no imbecility, absolutely none, that she was not capable of swallowing if the party handed it out to her-—the human sound track'-[Winston] nicknamed her in his own mind' (Orwell,1949: 61).

In the end, sloganised subjects who limit themselves to echoing the official truths are made unable to accomplish any historical change because the very notion of contradictions or opposites is suppressed from the vocabulary of Newspeak. As explained by Berbeshkina Z., Yakovleva L., and Zerkin D. In their book ***What is Historical Materialism*?** (1985), historical evolution is the result of conflicting interests between 'antagonistic social formations'. The authors argue that the cause which sparks off social struggle is the ability for social subjects to recognise and identify as such the antagonistic nature of class interests before they develop appropriate strategies to change it (Berbeshkina:1985: 63-78). However, deprived by the Party of the capacity to identify the conflicting nature of their interests with those of the ruling oligarchy, outer party members and the "proles" cannot act dialogically to communicate and share the problematic aspect of their situation, develop utopian thoughts to transform reality, spread their own interpretation of the world, and thus transform the relations of power. In short, they cannot be historical agents able through collective concerted action to produce

historical change; for the party having succeeded to reconcile opposites by equating between "freedom and slavery" makes the articulation of class differences nearly impossible and thus prevents social change. Social subjects are even unable to understand their world since most concepts are, in Derrida's words 'undecidable'. Indeed, Jacques Derrida explains that human beings understand the world because binary concepts such as 'black and white', 'hot and cold', "freedom and slavery", organise objects, events and relations in their world to give it meaning. These binary concepts govern logical thinking and render decision making possible. Concepts acquire meaning by relating them to their negative or positive binaries. If opposition is suppressed as is the case in Orwell's dystopia where "war is peace", understanding and sharing the problematic aspect of the world becomes extremely hard, not to say impossible, and so does its transformation (Quoted in, Collin and Mayblin: 2000). As Winston realised with horror:

> In the end, the Party would announce that two plus two make five and you would have to believe it. It was inevitable that they would make that claim sooner or later: the logic of their position demanded it. Not merely the validity of experience, but the very existence of external reality, was tacitly denied by their philosophy. The heresy of heresies was common sense (Orwell, 1949: 69-70).

In this way, by controlling individual thought, the Party prevents him from realising the problematic aspect of reality; and by preventing communication between social subjects; it prevents concerted reflection and collective action. Paulo Freire says that social subjects become historical subjects when they use their own language, not the language of the oppressor, to name the world in a dialogic way with other social members. By so doing, they enter into conflict with another interpretation of the world, the discourse of the dominant group, and develop appropriate strategies called 'limit acts' to supersede the 'limit situations' that social relations have reached and thus create social change (Freire,1996: 69-70). It is this function as social subjects, this praxis, which is denied by the Party to the inhabitants of Oceania who are turned into a state of being close to that of animals.

> unable to decide for themselves ,unable to objectify either themselves or their activity, lacking objectives which they themselves have set, living ‗submerged' in a world to which they can give no meaning, lacking a ‗tomorrow' and a ‗yesterday', because they exist in an overwhelming present,[like] animals [they] are a historical (ibid.: 79).

Historical change is the result of conflicting relation between the ideological discourses of the dominant class which impregnates society and the utopian discourse of an aspiring class which strives to impose its interpretation of the world and so transform it. The dominant elite tries to naturalise its symbols, values and practices while the aspiring stratum attempts to deconstruct the dominant discourse and unveil its function as an ideological foundation of power. For example, in Oceania, the Party has established a number of conventions and myths that sustain its dominant position while the opposition through its mouthpiece Goldstein and "The Book" of the Brotherhood aim at undermining the authority of the Party.

Next to its founding myths constructed through a falsification of the past, the authority of the Party is enhanced through the development by its philologists of a new version of English called "Newspeak", as mentioned earlier. It is made up of fewer words than the ancient version of English, (Oldspeak).The new language thus created, is cleared of all the useless synonyms and antonyms that existed in the ancient version as 'every concept that can ever be needed will be expressed by exactly one word' (Orwell,1949: 49). For instance, a word like "bad" will become useless in the new version as the opposite of good will be formed by adding the negative prefix "un" to form the opposite "ungood"; and excellent will become unnecessary as it can be replaced by "plusgood". Syme, one of the philologists of the Party, explained to Winston smith

> [. . .] that "Newspeak" is the only language in the world whose vocabulary gets smaller every year. . . . Don't you see [he adds] that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end, we shall make thoughtcrime literally impossible because there will be no words in which to express it . . . The revolution will be complete when the language is perfect. Newspeak is Ingsoc, and Ingsoc is Newspeak (ibid).

In other words, individuals will not be able to experience feelings, express thoughts, or develop attitudes other than those allowed by their language stock, their only cultural resource. Further, since this resource is shaped by the Party, to vehicle exclusively the ideology of Ingsoc, which stands for English socialism, social subjects will be incapable of "thoughtcrime" or unorthodox thinking. Newspeak, as Geoffrey Leech explains, may well be a satire of the "Basic English"; an idea put forward by C.K. Ogben and I.A. Richards in their book entitled ***The Meaning of Meaning*** (1923).The idea put forward by the two writers was to reduce English language down to 850 words; a language in which words would have precise meaning so that speakers utterances would lead to unique literal interpretations. The two authors felt that the First World War was caused by the passions and prejudices conveyed by language and, as reported by Geoffrey Leech (1979). They felt confident enough that science would clear the ambiguity in meaning and find a way of conceiving a language in which utterances would refer to definite meaning (Leech, 1979: 1-2). John E. Joseph (2004), reports that Orwell was interested in Ogben and Richards' Basic English at first as they exchanged letters about it but the former soon realised that such a language rather than leading to clarity and precision in communication, may, on the contrary, prevent any form of creative use of language which is a prerequisite of freedom of thought without which autonomous action is unconceivable (quoted in: Cahiers de l'ILSL.,NO° 17: 81).

Winston's Memory against Official Forgery.

In Orwell's dystopian world, it is hard for individuals to make out truth from falsehood. The power possessed by the party to alter continuously and systematically the past to make it agree with the Party's present discourse, figures and alignments, destroys the sense of reality among the social subjects and conveys the feeling that the party is infallible. Even if history is perpetually brought up to date nobody can hold material evidence that it is falsified. As Orwell explains:

> This process of continuous alteration was applied not only to newspapers but to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters leaflets, and films sound-tracks, cartoons photographs- to every kind of literature or documentation which might conceivably hold any political or ideological significance. Day by day, and almost minute per minute, the past was brought up to date…In no case would it have been possible once the deed was done to prove that falsification had taken place(Orwell,1949: 39).

Even when individuals like Winston Smith are convinced that historical records are the object of constant updating and forgery- Winston‘s job in the Ministry of Truth consists precisely of permanent falsification and alteration of records- they can neither share their knowledge with another person because of the general climate of suspicion, nor bring any material evidence about the Party's "rectifications". Winston knows that the Party is lying; he knows that the past is being constantly altered and plans to oppose the Party‘s forgery with his own truth. Yet, he feels terribly helpless. What can an individual do against a system? What can an isolated memory do against the official archives of a system? He feared that 'If all records told the same tale, then the lie passed into history and became truth. Who controls the past, ran the party slogan, "controls the future: who controls the present, controls the past' (ibid:p.34). However, in spite of 'the powers arrayed against him' Winston Smith was determined to resist.

The first act of Winston‘s rebellion against the dictatorship of big brother and the Party was to keep a diary and entertain the hope of sharing his truth and communicating it to future generations in the hope of convening on another truth, which shared, would outweigh the influence of the Party. Winston was haunted by the fear that he might be alone and was anxious to establish a dialogic relationship against the party. Of course, there were rumours of an underground organisation called "The Brotherhood' plotting to overthrow Big Brother and undermine the authority of the party. Frequent reports are broadcasted through the telescreen about arrests of members of "the Brotherhood" who always make public confessions of their crimes before they disappear, but it is impossible to make sure that the underground organisation was not another myth invented by the Party to deter opposition.

Nevertheless, he, Winston Smith, is convinced that the power of the party is to a large extent derived from the mystification of reality through official lies and the abolition of the past, and an indomitable desire drives him to resist because, ‗always in[his] stomach and in [his] skin, there was a sort of protest, a feeling that [he] had been cheated of something he had the right to'(Ibid:p.55). At other times, he feels helpless and is tempted to give up resistance although he knew that whether he continued with the diary or not made no difference, for ‗he had committed, would still have committed . . . the essential crime that contained all others in itself thoughtcrime'(Ibid:p.21). In Oceania, the mere fact of having unorthodox thoughts or feelings was already a crime which entailed certain death.

Later, Julia a young outer party member whom Winston suspected of being a member of the thought police enters into contact with him and declares her love to him. Thanks to Julia, Winston discovers, to his relief that the party is not as clean as it appears to be. While manifesting an unflinching orthodoxy to party discipline, Julia inwardly hates the Party especially the inner party and its members that she always refers to in vulgar and coarse language. Winston was pleased by Julia's vulgar language because he knew that the use of conventional language was a sign of submission. She had succeeded, despite the influence of the Party propaganda, to keep her inner self natural and healthy. The party did not succeed to corrupt her which was a sign of hope. Notwithstanding the atmosphere of inquisition, Winston and Julia succeed to arrange meeting in the countryside. It was during that time that Winston discovers traces of "The Golden Country" he often saw in his dreams. He discovered still present but altered or concealed, London's old churches, nursery rhymes and the beauty of a country, that the reign of the party had nearly erased but which resisted valiantly and stubbornly to destruction; remnants of another order of things and other values, rebellious to the "normalization" imposed by the party.

Ironically, the only monument that the party had spared was the statue of the dictator Oliver Cromwell who after having given hope to the poor crushed the movement of the diggers who claimed access to land and the levellers who supported them. Big Brother was somehow the ideological heir of Cromwell, "the Lord Protector", as the first political leader to have introduced the system of purges, instituted a military dictatorship and confiscated the people's revolution against the monarch's absolutism and their aspirations to property, equal access to land and freedom (***Encyclopedia Britannica: 2005***).

Like Cromwell, Big Brother seems to have used utopian aspirations to equality to acquire power before subverting them into a totalitarian system. In the world ***of Nineteen Eighty-fou***r, British traditional values such as family life, religion, love, loyalty towards fellow human beings but also royalty have disappeared. Arts were no longer valued and English measures such as 'pint and quarter' were replaced by imported measures. Children whose education was taken in charge by the party spied on their parents and often betrayed them as traitors. Hierarchy was still there in the new order, so were injustice and poverty; but worse than before, the new order had destroyed all that was human and positive and centralised and enhanced the defects of the ancient rulers. Obviously, Winston's utopia was to be recovered by destroying Big Brother's dystopian world.

As a logical outcome of their rebellion, Winston Smith and Julia join and underground organisation, "the Brotherhood", under the authority of an inner party member, O'Brian, to whom Winston had always been drawn and whom he had instinctively felt as a friend, an ally worthy of trust. They are invited to O'Brian's apartment in a comfortable quarter reserved to members of the inner Party. The lifestyle of the high ranking members of the inner party contrasted sharply with the miserable life of the outer Party members to which Winston and Julia belonged .Whereas the life of outer Party members was characterised by chronic scarcity of the most basic commodities such as razor blades decent food and heated houses, members

of the inner party lived in cosy flats, had lifts , drank real wine and coffee, and could even afford servants and violate the most severe rules such as turning down the telescreen and enjoy intimacy hiding away from Big Brother‘s scrutinizing gaze.

It is before O‘Brian that they pledge themselves to the principles and objectives of the underground organisation and to undertake any act required of them to overthrow Big Brother and the party. They accepted to sacrifice anything except their love to each other; the only thing that kept them human. O‘Brian informs them that ―The Brotherhood‖ is an ―idea‖ and that they may never live long enough to see its triumph; individual members usually die but **“the idea”** is indestructible (emphasis added). This form of ― idea‖ is defined by Mannheim as the liberal idea. The duty of the opponents is to sacrifice themselves to keep the idea alive. Winston learns from O‘Brian that Goldstein, the leader of the Brotherhood, exists but like Big Brother of whom he constitutes the negative counterpart, he is a myth and so can‘t be met. Later; Winston receives from O‘Brian “The Book” of the underground organisation.

The Demystifying Power of “The Book”.

The book entitled “***The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism”***, by Emanuel Goldstein is written in essay form and sets as its objective the unmasking of communist ideology. It is a sort of Bible of the opponent which, by stripping bare the practices of the Party aims at turning the worship of big Brother and the faith in Ingsoc into heresy. Patiently, the Book explains how the inhabitants of Oceania, are made to swap their freedom for security, and democracy for bureaucracy. In “Airstrip One”, the new name of England, the state of permanent revolution justifies restriction of freedom, food rationing and frequent purges, while ignorance, especially among the proles, turns social subjects into mere recipients of the party ideology totally dependent on the party and unable to undertake any individual reflection or action. As it is explained in the book ‘The citizen of Oceania is like a man of inter-stellar space who has no way of knowing which direction is up and which

is down. The rulers of such a state are as absolute as the Pharaohs or the Caesars could not be' (Orwell,1949: 172).

The book explains that the political system in Oceania, albeit the claim of its leaders of having abolished private property, is actually a rigidly structured hierarchical society. Officially, party members own nothing individually, but collectively, the Party owns everything. Abolition of the past, next to preventing individuals from having standards of comparison that would allow them to realise that they have actually regressed, conveys the feeling that the party is always right. Furthermore, the Party has grasped the nature of historical change which is the result of historical materialism and is now in a position to prevent it. Indeed, as the Book explains, the fundamental structure of societies has never changed .Societies have always been made up from three distinct classes: the high, the middle and the low with power occasionally shifting from the high to the middle who temporarily become the masters; until they are overthrown again. In the perpetual struggle for power the low are always used by the middle against the high and then betrayed. As a result they have always kept their status of subjection .Since historical evolution is made possible by class consciousness and class struggle, history can be frozen by abolishing consciousness of class differences. This process is achieved by controlling individuals who are reified into mere extensions of a larger body, thus reduced to receive and reproduce the truths, thoughts and will of Big Brother and the Party.

In addition to altering records, the Party has imposed on the adepts of Ingsoc a mental discipline that insures from the party members total submission to party ideology and prevents any form of doubt or questioning. This technique which is called "Crimestop" consists 'of being bored or repelled by any train of thought which is capable of leading into heretical direction. Crimestop in short means protective stupidity' (Ibid: 182). This technique is completed by another mental disposition on the part of party members called "Blackwhite"

which refers to total disposition to accept as true two contradictory meanings just because party discipline requires it. Next to this, party members are required to resort to the techniques of "Doublethink"

> . . . [which] lies at the heart of Ingsoc, since the essential act of the party is to use conscious deception, while retaining the firmness of purpose that goes with complete honesty. To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them . . . to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies . . .(Ibid:p.183)

With time, this mental discipline grows into a second nature that turns party members into automata able to "spontaneously' know what behaviour is expected of them and act accordingly. In short, the individual was abolished, so are the perception of objective reality, critical thinking, consciousness, and free will. Literally, party members having no existence of their own, no will of their own, behave as though they were cells which depend on a centralised will of the social body which annihilates autonomous action. Actions and the very existence of the individual members are allowed to exist only as long as they are subservient, to the perpetuation of the social body. As Orwell (1949) rightly points out:

> If one is to rule and continue ruling, one must be able to dislocate the sense of reality . . . It is only by reconciling contradictions that power can be retained indefinitely . . . If human equality is to be forever averted, . . . then the prevailing mental condition must be controlled insanity (Ibid:184-185).

Winston at last understood, thanks to the Book , how the Party was about to subvert socialist ideals into a totalitarian system that would 'freeze history' at a given moment ; the moment that power thirsty members of the middle class seize power, and annihilate free thought , the very idea of man and end history by preventing class consciousness. Winston was fascinated by the Book although, or rather because

> . . . [it] told him nothing that was new, [which] was part of the attraction. It said what he would have said, if it had been possible for him to set his scattered thoughts in order. It was the product of a mind similar to his own, but enormously more powerful, less fear ridden (Ibid:.p172).

It was thanks to the deconstruction operated by Goldstein‘s powerful mind that Winston became aware of the enterprise of the Party and the fate awaiting people who pursue _utopian thinking‘. It was by reactivating and propounding the teachings of the Book that Winston hoped to shatter by rendering apparent the ideological shackles that bind the inhabitants of Oceania by spurring aversion to and suspicion of utopian ideas. Aware of the Party‘s grip on him and his condition of reified being , Winston mechanically said to Julia who was standing next to him in Mr Charrington’s hired room: ‘we are the dead’ ; upon which an iron voice coming from a hidden telescreen echoed their phrase: ‘ you are the dead’ (Ibid:p.188). The thought police had caught them.

Facing the “Great Inquisitor”

Winston‘s totalitarian world in ***Nineteen Eighty-four*** is a world of delusion, false appearances and treachery. Those he hated and feared as enemies like Julia proved to be allies while those he trusted to be friends came out to be foes. Mr Charrington, the antiquarian, who sold him the diary, taught him forgotten nursery rhymes and rented him a room where he and Julia could hide away was an officer of the thought police. O‘Brian whom Winston had considered as a political opponent was actually a member of the grey eminence of the party in charge of torturing him, wrenching confessions from him before bringing him back, like a lost lamb, to Ingsoc and the love of Big Brother. Even while being tortured by O‘Brian, Winston was not sure who his tormentor really was: ‘O‘Brian was the tormentor, he was the protector, he was the inquisitor, he was the friend […] ‘Don’t worry Winston; [O‘Brian‘s voice] murmured in his ears, you are in my keeping [. . .] I shall save you; I shall make you perfect’ (Ibid: 210).

O‘Brian sounds like the voice of social conscience, like an inquisitor leading him patiently through suffering and penitence towards redemption, towards salvation. The party through its representative, O‘Brian, knows everything about Winston Smith. There was not a

gesture; there was not an action that Winston had done which the Party did not know. Once in the hands of the thought police, Winston had the feeling that for many years the Party had observed him ‘like a beetle under a magnifying glass’ (Ibid: 240). O‘Brian seems to outwit Winston all the time. He even displayed the capacity to read Winston‘s thoughts which increased this latter’s sense of helplessness and led him gradually to give in to O‘Brian‘s ascending influence and authority. Gradually, in spite of the intolerable torture he endured, he trusted O‘Brian to help him recover from the “Sickness” he suffered from. As he explained to Winston: ‘you are mentally deranged. You suffer form a defective memory. You are unable to remember real events and you persuade yourself that you remember other events that never happened. Fortunately it is curable’ (Ibid: 212).

O‘Brian reminded Winston that what made him sick was his lack of faith in Ingsoc and his inability to assimilate the party ideology. As a result, all of Winston‘s previous discontent and his present suffering were caused by his heresy and his clinging to what his mind called reality and his rejection of the official reality kept in party records and broadcast through the telescren and in the collective mind of the Party which is “sane” and uncorrupted by thoughtcrime. O‘Brian reminded Winston again of the Party slogan ‘Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past’ (Ibid: 213); and since, in addition to the past, records and books, the party controls also people‘s minds, it controls truth. Truth is therefore, neither phenomenological nor statistical; it is what the Party holds as truth. ‘It is impossible to see reality [as O‘Brian explains] except by looking through the eyes of the party’ (Ibid).

“Ingsoc” is like a religion which is not underpinned by rational political, economic, or social arguments, but is founded on the dogma that Big Brother and the Party are infallible. Political opponents are taken to the Ministry of love where they undergo, under torture and the influence of drugs, a systematic process of brainwashing, and reconditioning which goes

,as O‘Brian explained to Winston, through three stages before the heretic is reintegrated : ‘learning[Ingsoc], understanding, and acceptance’ (Ibid:p.225). This process of reintegration is achieved by the Party police and ideological apparatuses through a combination of drugs, physical torture and psychological persuasion, punishment or reward and reinforcement depending on the responses of the “sick subject”.

O‘Brian explained that in Oceania, the Party oligarchy was different from the traditional despots, the inquisitors of the Middle Ages or the totalitarian systems of the twentieth century; for unlike the traditional absolute powers, the Party did not seek power for the welfare or the happiness of the others, ‘The Party seeks powers for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness: only power, pure power …Power is not a means; it is an end’ (Ibid: 227). In O‘Brian’s world, the new totalitarian system that governed Oceania, was worse than Nazism or Russian Stalinism. It was a definite closed system, like death, from which recovery was impossible. Clearly, Orwell’s novel was meant as a direct answer to Huxley’s benevolent despotism.

It was through a gradual process of torture, starvation, bullying and occasional encouragements and rewards that Winston Smith was brought around to learn the principles of INGSOC anew, deny the existence of phenomenological reality and finally accept that ‘two and two make five’. By abandoning his individuality, the Party member becomes powerful and immortal by continuing to live even beyond his death through the party. Moreover, by submitting his individual will to the will of the Party, he feels free, in harmony with the social body.

The world of Oceania as described in ***Nineteen Eighty-Four***, was the total antithesis of the western liberal world of the time. The traditional rights of man, the values of family love, intimacy, compassion, charity and above all the religious feeling are abolished. The very

concept of man as theorised by the humanists and the philosophers of the Enlightenment as well as scientific evidence are brought to an end. O'Brian, the voice of the Party, conveys this idea when he says:

> Our [civilisation] is founded upon hatred. In our world, there will be no emotions except fear, rage, triumph, and self-abasement. . . . We have cut the links between child and parent, and between man and man, and between man and woman. No one dares trust a wife or a child or a friend any longer . . . there will be no loyalty except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love except the love of Big Brother (Ibid: 230).

In Oceania, the state ideology which is based on fear, hatred and torture, on inflicting pain to the social subject rather than pleasure appears as the antithesis of the hedonistic liberal utopias of the 19th and the 20th centuries.

Instead of the sovereign subject of the enlightenment, a new subject, a reified being, is created by the Party, emptied of his natural attributes and values and stuffed with the principles of Ingsoc embedded in Newspeak that would help echo and reproduce the Party ideology and maintain its domination forever. A revolution is under way but it is a revolution similar to the movement of celestial orbs, an endless repetition of the present, the same state, the same order. When Winston tries to challenge O'Brian's argument claiming that somehow, someday, the Party will be defeated by 'the spirit of man', O'Brian replied that 'If you are a man, Winston, you are **the last man**(emphasis added). Your kind is extinct; we are the inheritors. Do you understand that you are alone' (Ibid: 232*).* Winston who was ordered by his tormentor to get up and stand before a mirror discovered that he was turned into a human wreck , toothless, bony and bald , a picture evoking in the readers' mind the starving prisoners discovered in the Nazi concentration camps.

Finally, humiliated, broken and isolated, Winston set out to make the necessary mental efforts to accept as true whatever the Party held as such. There was but one thing that the party had not succeeded to alter: his emotions, his natural instincts. In spite of all the suffering

he endured, the party did not get ‘inside’ him. He had kept his inner self inviolate. The Party controlled his mind but it did not control his instincts.

That was what the Party, through unendurable torture, finally extirpated out of him, his last parcel of humanity; they tortured him until his life preserving instincts pushed him to betray Julia. Eventually, he even ended up earnestly loving Big Brother and was saved, redeemed from his ‘Stubborn self-willed exile from the loving breast! . . .but it was all right, everything was all right, the struggle was finished. He had won the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother’ (Ibid: 256). It is only through conversion to the ‘religion’ of Ingsoc and sincere worship of Big Brother that the social subject is redeemed, purified.

Playing the “Proles” against Leviathan

Winston Smith feels a strong admiration, close to envy, towards the proles whom, in spite of their drudgery and state of utter destitution, have succeeded to keep mentally sane and physically healthy. It is true, as the Party slogan runs that ―the proles are like animals‖, for they are so immersed in toil, gambling and drinking that they do not perceive the shackles that bind them. Even Winston is aware that ‗proles are like ants‘ that are unable to see farther than their immediate surroundings. Yet, there is a mysterious power about them that fascinates him.

The “proles” are decent because they have retained their humanity, their natural power for love, loyalty towards their kins and fellow human beings, the capacity to experience spontaneous sorrow or happiness, to sing .Winston was struck by the fact that, unlike the proles, Party members never sang. Besides, they swore and became quite vulgar when angered. Proles did not respect conventions; a fact that he interpreted as an additional symptom of their rebellious spirit. It is this resistance to the corruption of the minds by Ingsoc that will someday sweep the Party and its ideology notwithstanding the walls of prejudice and hatred that the party has erected between individuals, classes and peoples. Winston‘s view of the

proles is close to the anarchists‘ mystique of the people as expressed by Bakounine: ‘La révolution est un acte pur, réservé aux purs. La masse rurale, plus sauvage, vierge de toute civilisation bourgeoise, incarne toutes les vertus et reste la source de toute les révolutions’ (Quoted in Servier, 1967 : 281).

Winston smith, Orwell’s mouthpiece, thought that the socialist revolution, not only in England but throughout Europe was yet to come. He often expressed the frustration that the Labour Party, in spite of the reforms and pay rises it introduced, had contributed only to protect capitalism, and that Bolshevik revolution was only another more pernicious version of capitalism. For Orwell, socialist activists have used the socialist discourse to rise in the social scale, access power positions and control state institutions only to betray workers‘ aspirations whose conditions had remained roughly unchanged .What Orwell advocated in ***Nineteen Eighty-Four***, was a renewed revolution by the proles, a workers‘ revolution worldwide, but this time, the enemy is not the bourgeois or the capitalist, the revolution will be led against the totalitarianism of the Party and Big Brother; a new revolution with a different agenda.

> . . . everywhere, all over the world, hundreds of thousands of millions, . . . ignorant of one another‘s existence, held apart by walls of hatred and lies, and yet almost exactly the same- people who have never learned to think but who were storing up their hearts and bellies and muscles, the power that would one day overturn the world. If there was hope, it lay in the proles . . . the future belonged to [them] . . . they were immortal…Out of these mighty loins, a race of conscious beings must one day come. You were the dead, but theirs was the future, but you could share in that future if you kept alive the mind as they kept alive the body . . . (Orwell, 1949:187-188)

However, the proles being immersed needed a mind that would canalise their brutal energy to alter the existing order and produce historical change, or prevent the realisation of the dystopian society of Orwell‘s novel. Idealization of the proles under the dictatorship of the party may be meant for other audiences than the English speaking ones. Britain‘s system and values being safe in the late 1940s, the War having even contributed to strengthen the patriotic feeling among its most critical citizens, who was Winston’s appeal to revolt destined to?

The answer may be provided by Hannah Arendt (1963) who , commenting on the exploitation of human emotions, declares that 'silent compassion' for the suffering of human beings is better than 'pity' which, being 'loquacious', arouses legitimate suspicion. She thinks that manifest pity or admiration 'has a vested interest in misfortune in much the same way as thirst for power has a vested interest in the existence of the weak', (Arendt,1963: 89). Here, the suffering of the ordinary party members or the workers is turned into a discourse whereby the victims are idealised by the speaking subject who manipulates them into accepting a new identity that is projected on them and thus conditioned to carry out the historical mission that becomes naturally theirs by virtue of their new identity, and which consists of 'sweeping away the Party, and overturning the world of Big Brother'.

Dystopia as Discourse and Orwell as an Intellectual

The structure, practices and objectives of the totalitarian state projected by Orwell in his future dystopia fit globally those analysed by Hannah Arendt in her book ***The origin of Totalitarianism***(1966) written more than thirty years later. In Orwell's Oceania Party ideology has pre-eminence over state institutions. The secret police which is part of the Party apparatus seems to permeate the entire texture of society and appears as the only ruling force. Moreover, because 'hidden power' has pre-eminence over 'ostensible power'(Arendt: 1996), there prevails a state of general suspicion, where the traditional bonds of allegiance are undermined by permanent psychological insecurity. Social members face the dilemma of dissolving their self and merging into the social being or remaining individuals and run the risk of disappearing all of a sudden and becoming "unpersons" ,(people who have never existed). Unlike traditional despotisms which tended to limit freedom or constrain social subjects, 'the totalitarian state aims at abolishing freedom, the individual, spontaneity and self' Ibid.).

Right at the outset, Orwell makes it clear that his novel is deliberately dystopian and is meant to shake by shocking the drowsy consciences of the intellectuals and the public that the English society is not immune from a totalitarian regime 'if not fought against'. Here, Orwell's statement can be interpreted in Searle's words as an 'indirect speech act',' for in addition to asserting - telling the reader how things will be- , the speaking subject directs – gets people to do things-, to prevent through their actions the realisation of such a society. In fact, the common example which Searle uses as an illustration of a speech act is the assertive: 'Sir, you are standing on my foot', to get the hearer understand the implied meaning which is actually a directive which means: 'Sir, get off my foot!' which disrespects discourse conventions of politeness. Hence, indirect speech acts are usually the most convenient forms of communication, between the participants in discourse, and are more likely to materialise into social action when the participants share the same social conventions (Searle, 1979: 28). Discourse brings about desired social actions when it vehicles implicit assumptions and conventions shared by the participants; what Norman Fairclough (2001) calls "Members' resources". As Searle1979 argues:

> In indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than what he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information , both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general power of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer (Ibid: 31-32).

Orwell is, therefore, acting as a speaking subject aware of the influence of his symbolic capital and status which he uses to produce a statement because 'there is some lie that [he] wants to expose, some fact to which he wants to draw attention' (Orwell and Politics:p.416) but also aware of his moral and intellectual duty to deconstruct falsehood and manifest in its stead what he perceives as truth and justice; or simply let his readers infer or construct as a substitute to the deconstructed ideology a reality that would stand as its binary counterpart. Orwell, as a speaking subject, uses his capital, his knowledge of communist totalitarianism, to convince other social members to preserve English society from its influence.

If Orwell ennobles the " proles" whom he deems worthy of respect because they have remained human, a humanity that may be used against the Party, he denies more than one fifth of the world population the status of human beings. In 1948, in spite of the participation of former British and French colonies in the war effort to defeat Nazism, he wrote that "" the slave populations of the equatorial lands, who pass constantly from conqueror to conqueror, are not a permanent or necessary part of the structure [of Oceania]'(Orwell:1949:p.174). Orwell was more concerned by 'the absorption of Europe by Russia and the British empire by the U.S.A., to bother about the fate of the "slave populations". Africa, Asia and The Middle-East were still regarded as possessions, mere resources that added to the strength and the welfare of the colonial power, for he claims that

> All the disputed territories contain valuable minerals . . . but above all they contain a bottomless reserve of cheap labour. . . . The inhabitants of these areas, reduced more or less to the status of slaves, pass continually from conqueror to conqueror and are expanded like so much coal or oil in the race to turn out more armament, to control more labour power [. . .] (Ibid:p.165)

Clearly, Orwell could not conceive of Africa, Asia and the Middle East as anything but battle fields between the European powers, and their inhabitant as 'cheap labour'.

Conclusion

Nineteen Eighty-four, looks like a caricature of the feelings and attitudes of the largest segments of British society in the post-war period. Indeed, most of the population, made up of middle and working class, looked back with anger at the inter-war and post-war periods and with resentment towards the owning classes which had been spared by the war effort. The working classes felt that they were not fairly rewarded for their sacrifices and efforts during the war. The well-off who had not suffered the privations of the ordinary English man looked with apprehension at the welfare measures and the social legislation which consisted in partial nationalisation of transports, banking and insurance, fearing that a revolution following the Russian model would turn the English speaking world into another totalitarian state.

In fact, from 1945 onward, England witnessed an increased state intervention under the instigation of the Labour government which passed a series of acts of parliament to provide welfare to the population, organise reconstruction, and grant employment to demobilised soldiers. However, the fears of England undergoing a socialist revolution or turning totalitarian were exaggerated and were to a large extent prevented thanks to a tacit consensus built by the Labour government and the trade unions. The welfare measures and improved employment opportunities contented trade unions which accepted to freeze pay rise claims and radical demands in return for higher standards of living. On the whole, the welfare state struck a balance between the owning classes and the working and middle classes as Thomson D., explains

> . . . Labour‘s tenure of power, far from involving a social revolution, marked the establishment of labour as the regular parliamentary alternative to conservatism. . . . It made impossible any sense of alienation from the community on the part of the workers. The British state was now ―theirs‖ as much as anybody else‘s (Thomson,1965 :229).

It was this sense of participation, this sense of ownership, which made the prospects of a socialist revolution in England a remote possibility. So, why did George Orwell, a Labour supporter who admitted that the dystopian system as depicted in his novel ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** was somehow exaggerated, project a totalitarian state in the western world?

The answer to the question asked above lies partly in the need to scare away the spectre of communist ideology which threatened to colonise the western world. Aversion towards the Russian system was obtained by gradually associating communism to Nazism through the use of signs and images. For example, the picture of the officer of the thought police in his black leather uniform in the ministry of love reminds the European readers of the Nazi SS officers known for their cruelty, while the images of starving prisoners are strongly evocative of the horrors of the concentration camps whose images were still vivid in peoples memories after

the second World War. Indeed, Orwell‘s novel was meant only partly to help contain communist ideology because as we pointed out earlier, England was not really in danger of a communist revolution. Fundamentally, the novel aimed at sowing the seeds of dissent in the countries of Eastern Europe where the Party and Big Brother, the ‗moustachioed‘ face evoking Stalin, have betrayed the workers‘ ideals and where Goldstein, in the traits of Trotsky, was calling for resistance.

Clearly, what Orwell did, goes beyond the mere act of manifesting a dystopian society. More than removing the mask that may be worn by new masters moved by the will to power in England, Orwell, as an intellectual, took part in another war waged by “the liberal world” against “the totalitarian ideologies” pervading not only Europe, but also the colonial dependencies of England and France in the form of an emancipating discourse in the hands of “the wretched of the earth”. The use of literature together with political and economic measures such as the Marshall Plan, the Conference of Brussels which paved the way to the creation of the NATO and then the E.E.C were the weapons developed by the capitalist bloc to contain the expansion of the communist ideology (***Encyclopedia Britannica, 2005***). The struggle for international predominance culminated with the victory of liberal ideology in the 1990s a victory symbolised by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the weakening of Soviet influence worldwide.

The use of the term “Big Brother” to refer to a dictator, the assimilation of totalitarianism to communism in the minds of many people and the use of “free world” to refer to the capitalist world, thus associating capitalism with freedom while communism was associated with totalitarianism and permanent control, were signs that socialist ideology was losing ground before capitalist ideology in discourse. The cold war which began in the mid-1940s when it became apparent that Nazism would be defeated turned to the advantage of the west with the upheavals which occurred in Prague in the spring of 1956, then in Poland where

ironically the workers‘ union “Solidarnosk” with the support of the Catholic church defeated the communist party, before the Russian regime decided to introduce “Perestroika” meaning political reforms of the Russian system, and “glasnost” meaning transparency as a commitment from the communist party and the state to abolish secrecy and opacity in the management of internal affairs (Ibid).

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the chain reaction of cracks it occasioned in the communist bloc seem to have sealed the fate of communist vision at least in its ancient version. As to the position assigned to the “slave populations’, their treatment as a labour force, a resource occasionally changing owners, may reveal the ethnocentric vision of the writer who is organically linked to the interests of his community. Nietzsche had already revealed the mystifying function of the act of writing by asking:

> …does not one write books to conceal what lies within us? One will doubt whether a philosopher could have final and real opinions at all, whether behind each of his caves there does not and must not be another deeper cave-a stranger, more comprehensive world beyond the surface, an abyss behind every ground, beneath every foundation. Every philosophy is a foreground philosophy. . . Every philosophy conceals a philosophy; every opinion is a hiding place, every word also a mask (Novack, 1996: 289).

If one accepts philosophy as interpretation of the world then Nietzsche‘s saying could be applied to utopian to dystopian literature and writers as well.

As an intellectual, Orwell appears to be a conservative scared by change. He was a romantic attached to old things and the English country which he painted so artfully in ***Animal Farm.*** It was this England, referred to as ‘The Golden Country’, Winston’s lost paradise, in his last novel ***Nineteen Eighty-Four,*** which Orwell strove to protect from the deadly grip of INGSOC. He was a linguistic puritan who believed that the fate of the English nation depended on the preservation of the English language from “corruption” ‘(Orwell and Politics:398).

He knew that language was a weapon which, used conveniently, could determine the fate of a whole nation. In, “Why I Write” (1946),he explains that the historical circumstances have forced him ‘into becoming a sort of pamphleteer’ with clear political purposes which he explains as

> . . . the desire to push the world in a certain direction, to alter people‘s idea of the kind of society that they should strive after. Once again, no book is genuinely free from political bias…Political writing in an age like our own is unavoidable, one has only got on to choose on which side to stand. . . . Every line of serious work I have written since 1936 has been written directly or indirectly against totalitarianism and for democratic socialism as I understand it (Ibid: 460-461).

In the dystopian world of ***Nineteen Eighty-Four,*** Orwell uses his influential status of speaking subject to arouse in the minds and in the hearts of the of the English people revulsion towards such an order that would end the British **idea (**emphasis added). [76] At the same time, as a cold war militant, he spreads through his act of writing the hope that would someday inspire the “proles” out of England shake their consciences and stir them into revolt against the authority of “Big Brother”. In Foucault‘s words, the eruption of Orwell‘s statement in the archaeological field of political discourse will leave a trace that will someday, when reactivated, produce effect.

During the cold war period, Orwell was considered as the voice of the liberal world in its battle against communism. The term “Orwellian” which, used to qualify a speaker or a writer, came to be associated with intellectual honesty and which, used to qualify a political system, was usually associated in people‘s minds with dictatorship, thought control, falsification of history and total state control of individual‘s lives, is proof enough of the influence Orwell acquired as a political writer. Orwell‘s admirers like T.G.Ash claim that

> Both his life and his work are case studies in the demands of political engagement. . . . It matters to be sure that there is no flagrant contradiction between the work and the life- as there often is with political intellectuals. The Orwellian voice, placing honesty and single standards above everything would be diminished (Introduction to Orwell and Politics:pxvii)

Observed from a British perspective, Orwell may seem the perfect example of commitment to man‘s freedom and dignity, but for people like ourselves who suffered from colonial domination, the claim that Orwell placed honesty and single standards above everything sounds like renewed denial of our humanity. Indeed, the natives in British colonies of Africa and Asia seem to be excluded from Orwell‘s agenda of human emancipation from

exploitation, humiliation and all forms of totalitarian domination. For he claims that British presence in India and Africa protected these lands, the people being hardly noticed, from another fascist or communist exploitation; which clearly implied that the natives ought to show gratitude rather than ask for emancipation. He thought that former colonies were incapable of self-determination and was, therefore, opposed to their independence because

> . . . backward agricultural countries like India and the African colonies can no more be independent than a cat or a dog [sic]. Had any labour government come into office with a clear majority and then proceeded to grant India anything that was close to independence, India would simply have been absorbed by Japan or divided between Japan and Russia(Orwell and Politics:175).

Obviously, for Orwell then, 'All [human beings] are equal but certain [human beings] are **[less]** equal than others'(emphasis mine, Orwell,1951: 114)

In an age of fierce economic and political competition, of rapid changes threatening to disrupt the traditional balance of power; a troubled uncertain age characterised by fierce struggles for power , struggles waged in discourse to conquer people's consciences before and after they are fought on the battlefields, Orwell's commitment through literature to preserve English society from collapse was fully justified. He grasped the power of language an said in ―Writers and Leviathan‖(1948): 'What kind of state rules over us must depend partly on the prevailing intellectual atmosphere[…] on the attitude of writers and artists themselves, and on their willingness to keep the spirit of liberalism alive' ("Writers and Leviathan", in ***Orwell and Politics*** : 482). What is hard to understand is that this quest of freedom is denied to former colonies notwithstanding their contribution to the defeat of Nazism.

Orwell's excessive patriotism, a term he prefers to nationalism which he thinks expresses loyalty more towards the USSR than the mother land, seems to have outgrown his humanist anti-imperialistic feelings and obliterated his infallible sense of justice. Indeed, Orwell seems to deny Ghandi and his followers of the Congress Party the ideals of emancipation and dignity he was striving to achieve for his fellow citizens in England. Worse,

he accused Ghandi, who had been leading a campaign of non-violent civil disobedience to claim India‘s independence from England, of strengthening Nazi fascism by weakening England in its war effort against Hitler. Although he had denounced in previous writings British imperialism in India and the exploitation of Indian coolies, he knew that British wealth depended largely on its colonies and realised what the loss of India would entail. It was no surprise, therefore, that he opposed the independence of India and tried on various occasions to defame Ghandi’s actions.

Meanwhile, conscious of the influence of language on the consciences and representations of its users, Orwell encourages Mulk Ray Anand , an Indian nationalist, author of ***Letters on India,*** who stood for India‘s independence to continue writing in the English language which ‘represents the best bridge between Europe and Asia[avoiding direct reference to colonial relation between England and India], better than trade or battleships or aeroplanes’ (***Orwell and Politics***: 175). Orwell knew that the “bridge” was actually a one way road leading British imperialistic interests to India while denying Indian coolies access to the English standards of comfort, freedom and human dignity. Further, as long as Indians used English, respecting the conventions of politeness this implied, like avoiding to tell the English socialists, as did Anand in his ***Letters on India*** that _They are closer to the blimp than [they] are to the Indian peasant‘, all was well and British interests in India were safe. Notwithstanding his humanist feelings and socialist principles, Orwell remained, at heart, a patriot who never lost sight of England‘s strategic interests.

Are Orwell’s attacks on totalitarianism manifesting only the shortcomings of communism while silencing all the progress achieved by socialist Russia in a matter of a few years in the fields of education, industry medicine and space research, and the romantic view he holds on “proles”, reducing them to the proportion of a body devoid of mind and capacity for reflection not a mask hiding the voice of a conservative? The England that lies, buried but

still alive, under the dystopian world of ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** his "Golden Country" as well as its institutions, values and inhabitants which are to be inferred as the binary counterpart erased by the nightmarish world of Oceania cries to be recovered or protected.

Although Orwell rejects the term "conservative" to which he prefers "patriot": " My country Right or Left" (Orwell,1970:590), one can't help ranking him among the intellectuals who were haunted by the idea that England might lose its soul. The choice of the name "Winston" his hero may not be fortuitous. It may remind English readers of the image and the fighting spirit of their Prime Minister Winston Churchill who was the symbol of British resistance to Hitler and inspire readers to oppose the new enemy that had stepped in the shoes of the Nazi dictator and worn the mask of Big Brother.

As a political fiction, ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** appears as a radical criticism of utopian thought in its possible evolution into the Soviet form of ideology and its effects on history and man. Implicit in his attack against utopianism is the suggestion to accept on-going reality as the utopian counterpart of the nightmarish world of his fiction. However, Orwell's implied message is not a call to resignation but an invitation to a critical analysis of the utopian ideas and trends that have shaped the economic and political systems of the twentieth century.

As a speaking subject, Orwell seems constrained by the outlook of his national group (**Anglo-Saxonism**) which was exacerbated by the tensions induced by the Cold War. Indeed the nations of the third world and their populations were not included in Orwell's agenda for emancipation and human dignity.

The election of a conservative government in England at the end of the 1940s and the collapse of the communist bloc in the late1980s seems to confirm the function of this political dystopia as discourse and the power of words as living tools that are used to shape the world.

Conclusion to Part Three

This third part which set out to analyse the use of utopian and dystopian discourse in ***Brave New World (1932)*** and ***Nineteen Eighty- Four (***1949) has revealed a series of facts linked to that genre. It has sought to identify the conditions that give rise to a particular statement as an interpretation of the world and its relation to the historical and social conditions in which it was produced as well as to other statements. Besides, it has attempted to explain the social function of utopian and dystopian thoughts, the role of the writer as a social agent whose outlook and action are determined by his social stratum and the use he makes of his knowledge and language as a resource and cultural capital to interpret and shape the world.

The historical overview of utopian writing has shown that its regular eruption, rejection and reactivation appeared to be linked to transitional periods characterised by dereliction, uncertainty and ideological struggle. The eruption of utopian or dystopian thought in periods of breaks[1] tends to confirm the function of this genre as discourse. In this respect, utopian thought has been defined as the situationally transcendent ideas borne by a socially ascendant group which have had a transforming effect on reality. However the moment the ascending social stratum succeeds to transform society and impose its own interpretation of the world as natural it turns into an ideology and attempts to freeze the present and prevent change.

In contrast, counter-utopian or dystopian writing is used as a form of deconstruction unveiling the power of myth and ideal conveyed by utopian thought and its possible subversion into a totalitarian ideology that would be the total antithesis of the ideal initially projected. Thus, the liberalism of the Renaissance period which expressed the dreams of the ascending bourgeoisie to share power and emancipate itself from the grip of the Catholic Church and the absolute monarchies of the Middle Ages turned into an ideology of domination once this class had acceded to economic then political power. Capitalism, in its t u r n was

attacked by socialist utopian thought which as Mannheim and Servier explain takes its origin in the millenarian and chiliastic peasant revolts of the sixteenth century and which expressed the aspirations of the poor to equality and which finally was subverted into a totalitarian ideology; the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dystopian worlds depicted respectively by Huxley (1932) and Orwell (1948) express the scepticism of the writers as to the exploitation of the aspirations raised by science and socialist ideas in the modern age and their use by the power elites as ideological then bureaucratic instruments of economic or political domination. Blind faith of the capacity of "the invisible hand" to regulate the market and economic and social success as signs of God's favour resulted in the great depression of the late 1920s while the aspirations of the workers and peasants to equality were betrayed into a dictatorship by a bureaucratic oligarchy.

Darwinism which was originally a branch of natural sciences "colonized" the field of social sciences and by means of consequence politics, by being adopted by liberals, socialists and Marxists alike. It was precisely at that moment when empirical sciences entered the realm of politics that they acquired an ideological function. As E.J. Hobsbawn explained before the widespread belief in the infallibility of the scientific method, 'Social Darwinism and racist anthropology belong not to the science of the nineteenth [and the early twentieth] centuries but to [their] politics' (Hobsbawn, n.d :265). A desire to prevent social revolutions in the troubled periods of the early twentieth century was probably not absent from the schemes of the social theorists and the politicians of the time.

If the British intellectuals were concerned by the dramatic effects of liberalism and the threat of fascism during the years of the great depression, containing the expansion of communist discourse by correcting the imperfections of capitalism through the inception of the welfare state became the challenge in the late forties once Hitler and Mussolini were defeated. The spectre of end brandished in both dystopias constitutes an appeal on the part of

the writers to reconsider the utopian trends of their respective societies and warn against their perverse outcomes as totalitarian ideologies.

There was a state near to rioting due to mass unemployment in the 1920s and a profound feeling of disillusion after the Second World War within society. Although there was a certain admiration- which was sometimes openly expressed- towards German national-socialism, the radical schemes of social Darwinism based on a rigid stratification of society envisioned in ***Brave New World*** did not evolve into a fascist ideology as the interests of the extreme right in Great Britain were not seriously threatened. After the Second World War, despite the effects of the welfare measures and a relative economic recovery, there was no real redistribution of wealth, while the full employment promised as a reward to men and woman who had stood so bravely with an unprecedented patriotism and sense of sacrifice in the face of Hitler did not come true. The social inequalities were still there as revealed by D. Thomson, '54 percent of all capital wealth was owned by a mere1.5 percent'.

There was growing concern among the British elites that the disappointed working masses and a few left wing intellectuals might be allured by the spreading communist ideology. However, this threat was averted by the readiness of upper and middle classes to show certain flexibility and assimilate into their ranks ascending elites composed of businessmen, financiers, civil servants, intellectuals and even trade union leaders who changed their radical outlook as they ascend the social scale.

Rather than undergoing the revolutionary changes that occurred elsewhere, British society, partly thanks to the actions of its intellectuals, was able to escape the extremes of fascism and communism. Although the majority of British society was made up of the labouring class and trade unions were very powerful, a ―Fair Deal‖ which never went further than the improvement of the living conditions through welfare was struck. The threat of Soviet communist expansion was probably exploited by British propaganda in the cold war

period to strengthen British national self and insular spirit to keep British society aside from the upheavals occurring in other parts of the world. As John Stevenson (1990) wrote describing British capacity to cope with that period of doubt and trouble: _Custom and culture certainly involve some of the deepest and most obscure forces at work in British society during these years; a complex web of history, tradition and ―myth of ourselves‖.' (P. 465). In 1940, George Orwell expressed the general mood of frustration of the British working and middle classes at their society which he describes as

> [. . .] a family with rich relations who have to be kow-towed and poor relations who are horribly sat upon and there is a deep conspiracy of silence about the family income. [. . .] still it is a family. It has a private language and common memories and at the approach of an enemy it closes its ranks (Cited in Stevenson, 1990: 469).

Huxley was critical of the exaggerated faith in science, and "soma" instead of religion as panacea to social inequalities. In spite of his ambiguous attitude, he is not opposed to scientific progress as such but to the uses it is put to. He unmasks the perversion of scientific and technical progress as instruments of subjection in the hands of the capitalist elites which may, if not countered, lead to the reification and end of man.

Similarly, Orwell who began his literary career as a socialist in the 1930s, in the midst of the Great Depression, turned into an anti-communist conservative who fought to rid not only England but the world of the influence of the totalitarian ideology of the Party and Big Brother. This was to be done once the increasing influence of Soviet Russia which threatened British influence as a traditional world power was undermined.

Although the dystopian societies projected in ***Brave New World*** and ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** differ in nature, there are striking similarities in the concerns expressed by the writers. Besides its critical function, both authors apprehend the influence of utopian thought on society, history and individual freedom.

The former being a scientific dystopia where the rulers are benevolent and concerned by the welfare and the happiness of the social subject is built on the manufacture of consent.

Science and technology rather than serving man condition him to hold a specific social status and feel content with it. In this society where the new religion is "Technolatry" man is reduced to the proportions of a mere element in the system. The loss of freedom is compensated by happiness.

The latter, on the other hand, is obtained through coercion and fear. The Social subject, deprived of his free will, is stuffed with "Ingsoc" the ideology of the party and the worship of Big Brother, is reduced to echo the ideology of the party and carry out the will of the power holders.

In both dystopias knowledge and science which have once constituted Man's hope of emancipation and progress through the exploitation of nature have been turned into instruments of control, exploitation and subjection of the social subjects by the ruling elites. As Huxley (1957) explains:

> In the totalitarian East, there is political censorship, and the media of mass communication are controlled by the state. In the democratic west, there is economic censorship and the media of mass communication are controlled by the power elites. Censorship by rising costs and concentration of commercial power in the hands of a few big concerns is less objectionable than state ownership and government propaganda. But certainly, it is not something that a . . . democrat would approve of. (Huxley, 1959 : 60).

Identity rather than designating uniqueness and originality among social subjects has come to mean in both dystopian worlds mass- production of identical standardised social members to facilitate control and obtain standardised behaviour and conformity to preserve the existing relations of power and prevent historical change. Moreover, there are striking similarities in the global perspectives projected in both dystopias with the English speaking world holding a central position. As to the rest, it is either constructed as an extension of self as it is the case with the Indians of the reservation or the slave populations of Africa and Asia, or perceived as a potential threats as is the case of the Eurasian army in Orwell's Oceania which contributes once again to the strengthening of self.

Furthermore, the English language and culture hold a central part in both dystopias revealing the ethnocentric view of the writers and their belief in the superiority of the English language and culture which both authors expressed explicitly. This tends to confirm Mannheim‘s claim that thought being socially rooted, the speaking subject expresses the interests of his social or national group. Indeed, although critical of the way utopian thought has been diverted from its original objective both authors do not seem to lose sight of their national interests.

Strangely, today’s discourse of globalisation seems to take its roots from Huxley‘s “World State” and “the **idea”** of the English world” mentioned by Orwell in his writings and suggest that the same myths of good and truth are still at work to shape international relations. Today’s discourse of globalisation spread by “free world” which is the result of English tradition and founding myths and the victory of the discourse of liberalism is once again trying to impose itself as a paradigm of good and justice, the protector of freedom and the rights of man .

The merit of the two writers and their novels lies in their emphasis on language use as an instrument of subjection. Their unmasking of how power and authority are wielded through language may contribute to raise individuals’ critical awareness. Accordingly, the approach used to analyse the documents helps in developing awareness that language use being an instrument of subjection, may lead social subjects and dominated groups to recognise the ideological shackles that bind them for what they are and develop emancipating action through language. Philippe Forget and Gilles Polycarpe(1990), insist on the power of language to emancipate man from the deadly grip of totalitarian ideologies when they claim:

> Relever le défi impose de savoir derechef le bouclier de percée, la parole. Puissance de nomination des choses, protection et miroir, elle éclaire le regard, désigne des repères, trace des limites. Elle saisit l‘à-propos. Elle mesure. Sans elle, le glaive du politique frappe le vide ou cesse de trancher. Le pouvoir roule alors comme une meule. La parole commande aux techniques de servir la cité non de l‘évider (Foorget et al.1990 : 122.)

The case of Indian and African nationalist leaders who used the language of the European as a weapon against the coloniser is a good instance of that use.

Finally, in utopian or dystopian writing, the speaking subject is committed to the alteration or the conservation of a prevalent social order. Therefore, he is involved in the struggle for power. Further, since thought is socially determined and used as a tool in social action, the writer as a social agent being constrained both by his status and his function as a voice of his group or nation cannot escape the influence of ethnocentricity, class or national interest and appears incapable of meeting the ideal set by Julien Benda or Edward Said.

The idea of a globalised world under the rule of an elite of lawgivers and executives committed to the preservation of peace and the human race from a major conflict was to reactivated by H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell. The idea of global governance for the benefit of the human race is the theme discussed in the last part.

References

- -Althusser, Louis. ― Ideology and Ideological State apparatuses‖ **,** ***Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays***. Trans. Ben Brewster, Lndon: New Left Books,1971.

- Arendt,Hannah. ***On Revolution***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin BooksLtd., 1963.

- ..... ***The Origins of Totalitarianism***. New York: Harcourt, 1966.

- Berbeshkina ,Z., Yakovleva, L., Zerkin, D. ***What is Historical Materialism?*** Moscow: Francis Longman and Dick Shneierson Editors, Progress Publishers, 1985.

- Bodin, Louis. ***Les Intellectuels.*** Paris : ¨Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.

- Candlin, Christopher L., et al. ***Sociolinguistics and Social Theory***. Harlow: Nocholas Coupland, Srikant Saranji, Christopher N. Candlin Editors, Longman, England, 2001.

- Collins, Jeff and Bill Mayblin. ***Introducing Derrida***. Cambridge: Richard Apignassi Editor, Icon Books, 2000.

- -Coyne, Richard. ***Designing Technology in the Post-Modern Age*** .Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1997.

- Duranti, Alessandro. ***Linguistic Anthropology.***Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Fairclough, Norman. ***Language and Power***. Essex:Pearson Education Ltd., Longman, 2001.

- Forget, Philippe, Gilles, Polycarpe. ***L"homme machinal : technique et progrès :n Anatomie d"une trahison***. Paris : Editions Syros Alternatives, 1990.

- Freire, Paulo. ***Pedagogy of the Oppressed***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex:Penguin Books Ltd., England, 1996.

- Foucault, Michel. ―Discourse and Truth: The Problematisation of *Parrhesia"*. Berkley: Berkley University Press, 1983.

- Habermas, Jürgen. ***La technique et la science comme idéologie***. Paris: Traduit de l'allemand et préfacé per Jean René Ladmiral, Editions Gallimard,

- Harding, Adrian. Sur***vey of English Literature; Vol.4: The Twentieth Century.***Paris: Mark Mortimer editor, DUNOD, 1992.

- Hobsbawn, E.J. ***History of Civilisation: The Age of Capital.*** London:Weidenfeld and Nicholson Editors, nd.

- Huxley, Aldous. ***Brave New World***. London: Triad Panther Books, Granada Publishing Ltd., 1932.

- ……..***Brave New World Revisited.*** London: First published in Great Bitazin by Chato and Windus Ltd., 1959, Reprinted by Granada Publishing Ltd., 1983.

- ..... ***Vulgarity in Literature***. Doubleday: Doran, 1931)

- Kumar, Krishan. ***Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times.*** Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1991.

- -Lawrence, Jane and Kitty Chan. ***Introducing Nietzsche***. New York: Token Books, 1998.

- Leech, Geoffrey. ***Semantics: The Study of Meaning***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Pelican Books, 1974.

- Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge***. San Diego, New York, London: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace and Company, 1936.

- Marcuse, Herbert. ***Eros and Civilization***. New York: Vintage Books, 1951.

- ***Orwell and Politics.*** Edited by Peter Davidson, Introduction by Timothy Garton Ash, London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2001.

- Orwell, George. ***Animal Farm***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, England, 1951.

- ……. ***Nineteen Eighty-Four***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, England 1949.

- Pelling, Henry. ***A History of Trade Unionism***. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1982.

- Said, Edward. ***Des Intellectuels et du Pouvoir***. Alger : Editions Marinoor, 2001.

- Searle, John R. ***Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

- Serriot, Patrick et André Tabouret Keller Editeurs. ***Discours sur la langue sous les régimes autoritaires.***Lausanne : Cahiers de l'ILSL., N° 51, 2004.

- Stevenson, John. ***The Penguin History of Britain, British Society 1914-1945***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., England, 1990.

- ***The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell.*** Edited by Ian Angus and Sonia Orwell, Vol. I., Harmondsworth, Midlesex: Penguin Books in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, Penguin Books Ltd., England, 1970.

- ***The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell.*** Edited by Ian Angus and Sonia Orwell, Vol. II., Harmondsworth, Midlesex: Penguin Books in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, Penguin Books Ltd., England, 1970.

- Thompson, David. ***England in the Twentieth Century: 1914-1979.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1985.

- **Internet Resources and Encyclopedia**

- ***"Brave New World*** by Aldous Huxley : Monarch Notes‖. Available at http://www.somaweb.org

- ***Encyclopedia Britannica.*** Edited by Robert C. Preble, compiled under the editing staff of Encyclopedia Britannica and Louis R. Rossi; Harry Edward Hauser, London:2005

PART FOUR

Globalization: Utopia or ideology?

Introduction to Part Four

Alongside the faith placed in scientific and technical progress to lead to eutopia, Western intellectual elites were haunted by two possible misuses of progress. They feared that a proletarian revolution may lead to anarchy or the dictatorship of some popular demagogue. They also feared that competition among industrialized nations over the control or resources and markets might result in a conflict that would lead back to barbarity or to the extinction of the human race. Given the atrocities produced by Nazism, and later Stalinism, the fears proved justified. The dropping by the U.S. army of two atomic bombs over urban centres, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the possible development of more destructive arms by the industrial powers were omens of humanity‘s nearing end.

H.G.Wells envisions an open modern utopia that would synthesize what is best in the human race and in social organization would have a planetary scope. This global society, which would own all the resources of the planet, would be ruled by elite of Samurai who will constitute the theoreticians and executives of the World Government as well as the local ones. In this global industrial society, from which all sorts of racial, geographical or ethnic barriers are banned, Darwinism is the rule and order is enforced. Wells expresses the dream of the rising western middle class for power and prestige.

Like H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell who felt horrified by the possible outbreak of a nuclear war militated for peace and advocated the institution of a World Government instead of the League of Nations and the United Nations to which he contributed with Wells, but which he felt were not strong enough to enforce their decisions. Instead, Russell advocates the dissemination of the U.S. Federal form of governance to the rest of the world.

In this part, I explore the possible conflation of utopian aspirations with the ideological discourse of triumphant return of liberal utopia. This claim by a panel of social scientists that ‘in the twentieth century, industrialism as developed by western societies has become the goal of mankind and the essence of [human] aspiration’, is indicative enough of Western plans for the future of humanity (C. Kerr et al., pp: 264-5).

CHAPTER VIII: Socialism, Darwinism, and Globalism in H.G.Wells's *A Modern Utopia* (1905) and Other Writings.

Introduction

It has become customary among critics of the utopian genre to underscore the central function of utopianism in social practice by citing a celebrated statement by Oscar Wilde which he formulated in "***The soul of Man under socialism***" (1891). Considering the late 19th century and the prospects opened by the materialization of aspirations which had been formulated centuries earlier by such icons of utopian thought as Plato, sir Thomas More, Francis Bacon, and E. Bellamy, to name but the most familiar, Wilde proclaimed that

> [any] map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the only country at which humanity is always landing. And when humanity lands there, it looks out, and seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realization of Utopia. (Wilde, 1889: 303-304).

For Wilde, then, human beings' unquenchable thirst for and pursuit of a better order of things is a response to the permanent discontent resulting from life in a civilized world (Freud, 1961). It is a powerful catalyst of human thought and praxis; and therefore of historical evolution. It is the relentless quest for Utopia, Wilde suggests, not the achievement of utopia that constitutes the motive power of human societies. Utopia is the fuel of human progress.

Oscar Wilde's claim seems to be in tune with the atmosphere characteristic of the fall of the nineteenth century, a period in which, to quote G.W. Foote, 'social dreams were once more rife' (Qtd.in. in Beaumont, 2005:1). The late 19th century witnessed the triumphant advance of the industrial revolution in England and its corollary emergence of an enterprising capitalist class which controlled the levers of power at home- economic, but also political and ideological-, and which dreamed to expand its empire to the "backward" areas of the globe. This dream of continuous evolution was backed up by an ideology of Enlightenment and progress. However, this belief in progress which had benefitted an oligarchy of moneyed

interests was toned down by the widespread state of poverty, hunger, and ill health plaguing the mass of the working class people, and which caused a decline in life expectancy among adults, and a soaring of death rates among children and newborn to unprecedented levels. This unnatural, reluctant cohabitation of affluence and poverty, at the eve of a new millennium, also stirred, among the laboring class, dreams for the abolition of property, synonym of exploitation, and the common appropriation by the workers of the means of production through revolutionary action. This vision, as prophesized by Marx and Engels in "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" (1848), would make the proletariat master of its fate and the new society. These contradictory aspirations which reflected the crisis of capitalism and which threatened the system with collapse informed British culture.

Mathew Beaumont argues in ***Ideologies and Social Dreaming*** that the culture of the late 19th century British society as expressed in arts and literature 'consists of contradictory class forces which reflect the fears of the dominant class for its future history; and these fears in a refracted form, [. . .] reflect the hopes of the dominated classes that inform them' (Beaumont: 2005, 21). The millennial dreams of a class-conscious proletariat, confident in its growing economic influence and role as historical agents, echoed the Darwinian dreams of rising capitalist bourgeois classes which claimed the natural right for the fittest-be they captains of industry, financiers, philosophers, or scientists- to organize and rule the new society. _The Parisian communards' experiments with proletarian democracy in 1871', Beaumont notes, momentarily dramatized the possibility of an historical alternative to capitalism' (Beaumont, 2005:p.6). The late 19th century constituted a watershed between an ancient order in decline and a new order which suffered to be born. Symptomatic of this atmosphere of _decline and promise of regeneration', to borrow Max Nordeau's terminology, was the bulk of utopian novels which were produced. It was in that period that H. G. Wells began his writing career.

Review of the literature

The importance of Wells‘s contribution to the utopian genre is undeniable. The amount of utopian and science fiction texts he produced between the 1880s and the 1940s was such that critics came to identify the term “Wellsian” with the quest for the World State and the globalist utopia. His name has often been associated with science, modernity, progress, and Darwinism. Simon J. James, for example, considers him ‘ the most influential English writer of the first half of the twentieth century’ (James: 2012,X);and Krishan Kumar ranks him ‘the greatest of the modern utopists [. . . and]the leading apostle of the utopia of science [but also a writer whose] apocalyptic visions of the disasters science may bring [inspired. . .] the dystopias and anti utopias of the twentieth century’ (Kumar,1987: 168). In The ***Pattern of Expectation: 1644-2001,*** *I.F.Clarke*, just like Kumar, highlights the dialogic relationship of Wells‘s texts with former utopias and the stakes of his time, for he argues that ***A Modern Utopia***

> is the most up to date utopia in the history of the genre [. . . and] remains the most important utopia of the twentieth century because it made the most complete act of faith in the idea of progress, and by a cruel irony of fiction, it became the model from which the dominant dystopias of the last fifty years have taken their mark (Clarke, 2005 : 209-213).

Lewis Mumford also notes the historicist and discursive function of Wells’s texts when he assimilates ***A Modern Utopia*** to ‘the quintessential utopia in which Wells sums up and clarifies the utopias of the past and brings them into contact of the world of the present’ (Mumford, 1923:184).

However, this is not to say that Wells was a unanimously acclaimed hero. His play with themes that most haunted popular imaginary at the end of the millennium made his fame but also made him the target harsh of criticism. Simon J. James writes that _most critics have disagreed with Wells‘ views when they have not been openly hostile to them or dismissed them altogether‘ (Simon: 2012, x.) A.L. Morton notes the lack of conviction of the author

which he explained by his propensity, as a professional writer, to produce cellophane utopias to meet the needs of a growing fiction thirsty readership. Indeed, Morton ironically observes that Wells

> spent his life in a permanent state of having second thoughts about everything, of mistaking prejudices for principles, and, lacking any scientific understanding of society; he was forever running up blind alleys [. . .]. He made a whole series of guesses about the future, each guess ostensibly scientific, and each by its difference from all the others, exposing its own pretentions to science (Morton: 1969, 238).

Wells had suffered this charge earlier and had dismissed it by pointing out the need to produce as many utopias as need be, each one better than the other, each one having a positive transformative effect on the topia, the real world, until there is no longer any need for utopia because ‘our world will be that utopia‘ (A.M.U, 1905: 5).Writing in the heat of the Second World War, George Orwell, another socialist critic, acknowledges his debt as a writer to Wells, but considers Hitler‘s National Socialist State as a perversion into a fascist order of the Wellsian utopia. In an essay entitled “Wells, Hitler, and The World State” (1941), he remarks that ‘Much of what Wells has imagined and worked for is physically there in Nazi Germany; the order, the planning, the state encouragement of science, the steel, the concrete, the airplanes, are all there, but in the service of ideas appropriate to the stone age’(Orwell,1970: 170-1).

Another facet of Wells, as noted by Morton, is his fascination by ‘imperialism, its power, its smoothness, its order, its science, its headlong technical advance’ (Morton, 1969: 241). Like many lower middle class intellectuals who had risen in the social scale, and the Fabians with whom he fell at the time and whose doctrine he attempted to provide _with a body of forward looking ideas‘,(ibid, 242) socialism meant no more than the gradual improvement of capitalism under the guidance of an enlightened elite of intellectuals committed to progress and social reform; a form of government which Orwell later satirized as “oligarchical

Collectivism" in his dystopian novel ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** (1948).His utopias expressed the bourgeois attitude of the late Victorian time. As a member of an emergent social formation astride between a parasitic class and a revolutionary proletariat, Wells advocated a progressive improvement of society through a gradual emergence of the fittest species and elimination of the weakest, both locally and globally, until a global order which constituted 'the compendium' of what is best in human social organization was achieved.

The utopian impulse which informed Wells's texts is, related by M. Beaumont to 'the ambivalent attitude of the middle classes committed to improve the conditions of the workers but anxious at the prospect that the development of the labour movement would sweep away capitalism altogether' (Beaumont, 2005: 3). This ambivalence was the result of the intellectual and political impact of socialism on middle-class consciousness on the one hand, and the medial position intellectuals hold between the owning classes and the proletariat as Karl Mannheim(1936) explains, on the other hand. A form of peaceful evolutionary process of capitalism, which had reached a point of crisis, toward a global form of socialism was advocated as a substitute to the institution of a proletarian dictatorship through revolutionary action. This deal, as Mannheim notes, had the merit of preserving both the system and the interests of the conflicting parties: the owning classes and the working classes. But, above all, it would earn the little bourgeoisie the privileged status of 'advocates of the interests of the whole' (ibid). Intellectuals' ambivalent attitude toward socialism is brightly summed up by Matthew Beaumont who observes that 'socialism appealed to intellectuals of the middle class to the extent that it opened up the possibility of ameliorating the capitalist system; but it tended to appal them to the extent that it tended to overthrow it altogether' (Beaumont, 2005:3).

Issue and Hypothesis

Strangely enough, and with respect to Wells‘s apparent obsession with globalization and the need to order the chaos induced by the crisis of capitalism at the end of the 19th century by means of a World State, Marxist critics have noted the writer‘s little bourgeois ideological complicity with capitalism, in spite of his proclaimed allegiance to socialism. However, most of them seem to have overlooked, at least to my knowledge, the writer‘s treatment of power, and air control as they relate to world dominance. The systematic control of sources of energy, its production and distribution worldwide, the strategic importance of air control to insure to the new emerging "World Empire" as featured in ***A Modern Utopia*** (1905), and ***When the Sleeper Wakes*** are strangely evocative of the tensions that inform our time and underpin today's discourse of globalization.

The end of The Cold War, which resulted in the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the communist bloc, the demise of communist ideology and the triumphal advance of ―The Liberal Idea‖ to former communist hunting grounds (Mannheim, 1926) seem to corroborate Wells‘s vision. The last decades of the twentieth century and the early twenty first century have been characterized by conflicts in oil producing areas such as Asia and the Great Middle East, and the attempt to prevent certain countries- North Korea and Iran- from developing their nuclear potential on the ground that they represent a threat to the Free World, are good instances of the central role of energy in an industrial and technologically oriented world. The ease with which the Iraqi army was defeated, and later Kaddafi‘s regime crushed owing to the superiority of the coalition air forces under the leadership or the complacency of the U.S.A. explains the close connection between air control and power. Accordingly, it seems quite relevant to explore the connections which Wells draws between monopoly over energy, the establishment of the world state, and the Darwinian logic that informs his texts.

The present chapter considers utopian socialism and globalization as continuity of the Enlightenment project. It is read as a discourse spread by an emergent class of bourgeois intellectuals in the Anglo-Saxon sphere to order the chaos produced by capitalism nationally, and imperial expansion as its corollary by-product globally. It draws from K. Mannheim, Norman Fairclough, and M. Bakhtin to discuss the premise that the World State as portrayed ***in A.M.U (1905),*** and the recent crusade of "Global Wars on Terror", may represent continuity, under a respectable guise, of the aggressive geographical and colonial expansions of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. It considers present trends in world politics, such as competition for the control of sources of energy and markets, as the realisation by the liberal world of the globalist theses developed by the author in **A.M.U.** (1905). The novelty with the study is that the idea of globalization as a system, and "The World State" as an instrument for its implementation, are critically considered from the perspective of a member of the so called "subject populations". Let us now consider the salient features of Wells's utopia.

Modernity, Progress, and Darwinism in *A Modern Utopia*

Like many middle class intellectuals of the late Victorian age, Wells believed in the idea of evolution and progress. Simon J. James (2012) argues that Wells's writings engage with the forces that shape identity and civilization in the present such as education, money, class, gender, and literacy. For Wells, the identities created by such forces are not irreversible but contingent. Accordingly, if the nature of the operant forces can be altered, so might the kind of subjectivities that they produce. At a time in which literature, especially the novel as an emergent form, constituted an important cultural and social phenomenon, he believed that fiction could influence society either towards conservation or towards change. Against the conservative trends of the realism of his early writing career which purported to freeze the social order by reproducing the ideologically constructed social categories and perpetuating the system, Wells's utopianism envisions a kinetic world in which the fetters of class, wealth,

race, education, and gender are removed. This vision of perpetual change and progress allows gifted individuals to emerge, experiment, and leave their imprint on society, until a fitter and better one intervenes. His Darwinian convictions in evolution by means of natural or cultural selection, both at individual and societal levels, inform most of his works and ***A.M.U.*** (1905) in particular.

Dialogue and Polemics in *A Modern Utopia*

The story relates the adventures of the narrator and his friend, a biologist, on a remote utopian planet that is the exact replicate, albeit in a perfected form, of the planet earth and its populations. It is a global society ruled by an aristocratic order referred to as "**the Samurai"** (emphasis mine). The society featured in Wells's novel can by many of its features be traced back to Plato. Like modern Man who is the result of evolution and selection, his modern utopia has accumulated what is best in social organization to adapt it to the exigencies of the modern world. It is Darwinian, kinetic, liberal, and global. For James (2012), Wells's regular rewritings of his utopias partake of the writer's proclaimed faith in the utopian function of literature. He believes that the on-going dialectic interplay between the ideological and utopian world views, being and thinking, may orient social praxis towards change when utopian aspirations are stronger (**Mannheim, 1936).** Social improvement can, thus, be brought about by the gradual improvement of the ideal state portrayed in his social fictions. James considers that _ the rewriting of his utopian visions also constitute a kind of forward movement, as if by periodic repetition of the same process of literary creation, reality must each time be improved' (James, 2012:125). Wells himself, who believes in the importance of utopia for social progress, advocates the need for a regular on-going dialogue between utopia and society to correct its flaws, until social reality is brought to coincide with the utopian ideal. 'There will be many utopias', he writes,

> each generation will have its version of utopias, a little more certain and complete and real, with its problems lying closer and closer to the problems of the thing in being, until

> at last, from dreams, utopias will have come to be working drawings and the whole world will be shaping the final World State, the fair and great and fruitful World State that will only not be a utopia because it will be this world‘ (Wells: 1905, 5).

Thus, this permanent dialogue between utopia and social reality has a beneficial invigorating effect on society.

However, the writer‘s intellectual fertility, next to his proclaimed vow to serve society, can be explained as a self- preserving reflex if we are to follow his Darwinian logic. The author‘s career began with the passing of The Education Act of 1870 (Simon J. James, 2012: 1), and the emergence of the novel as a new literary form (Beaumont: 2005). There resulted in the following years an increase in the reading audience made possible by the development of education, and concomitantly an increase in the number of novels written to meet the needs of a growing fiction thirsty readership. In other words, writing became a trade, a money making activity, which made social ascension possible, and with it social prestige. Novels became a sort of commodity in the culture market. Accordingly, intellectual fertility meant survival and success, while passivity for a novelist meant failure and elimination.

Wells‘s utopia, despite his opposition to liberalism which allows the coexistence of contradictory views that may result in war and chaos, is liberal through and through. It is based on the free play of individualities which allows the best to survive. However, as a liberal view underpinned by the Darwinian logic of competition and the survival of the fittest, it may in the long run lead to a conspiracy of the elites tempted by total power as is the case with the reign of the Samurai which will be discussed later, or to a global empire controlled by an industrial and military superpower. Wells‘s belief in evolution is applied not only to individuals and states as the ‘compendium’ of what is best in the species but also to his utopias. Like the World State or the Samurai, his utopias, critics agree, have appropriated what is best in Plato, More, Bacon, Auguste Comte, Saint Simon, and Bellamy. At the same time, Wells takes care to dismiss features incompatible with a modern, scientifically informed

society in which knowledge, technology, and power are central motive and organizing elements, and the bearers of this knowledge, the rising social theorists, scientists, and technocrats, its natural leaders. Didn't Frederic Jameson rightly remark that 'in utopian writing the individual text carries with it a whole tradition, reconstructed and modified with each new addition?' (Jameson, 2005:24).

Although Wells draws heavily upon the utopian tradition, he considers certain features of traditional utopias such as stability, collectivism, and isolationism, as being conducive to stagnation and entropy; therefore, incompatible with progress and modernity. In the opening of ***A.M.U.,*** he writes that

> The utopia of a modern dreamer must needs differ in one fundamental aspect from the nowheres and utopias men planned before Darwin quickened the pace of the world. Those were all perfect and static states, a balance of happiness won forever against the forces of unrest and disorder that inhere in things. One beheld a healthy and simple generation enjoying the fruits of the earth in an atmosphere of virtue and happiness, to be followed by other virtuous, happy, and entirely similar generations until the gods grew weary. Change and development were damned back by invincible dams for ever (Wells, 1905: 1-2).

For Wells, the perfection of traditional utopias meant stagnation and immobility, synonyms of entropy and death. They do not reflect the conditions of real life in which evolution is the result of permanent interaction and conflict which allows the fittest species to vie and multiply. For Wells, then, a modern utopia must be 'kinetic' rather than 'static'; the aim of a modern utopist is 'to build not citadels, but ships of state [. . .] in which perpetually novel successions of individualities may converge most effectually upon a comprehensive onward movement' (Wells, 190:7). Wells considers that the modern industrialized western society is the result of this free play of individualities. Therefore, for progress to continue, competition should be left to operate freely. _We are going to accept the world of conflict', he writes, _[. . .] to face it in no ascetic spirit but in the mood of the **western peoples whose purpose is to survive and overcome** (Ibid,: 8, emphasis mine). Here the writer advocates the

right of the powerful western nations to conquer ―backward‖ areas and less advanced peoples of the globe, and integrate them as structures, mere parts of the global system of his modern utopia. He seems to express the global imperialist dreams of the industrialized capitalist nations which sought to swap destructive nationalisms for a form of globalised rule of the world by the fittest.

Globalizing "the Liberal Idea"

Wells seems haunted by the need to reconcile Darwinism with a form of social justice. For him, individualism, competition, and selection are central characteristics of modern human society. He is adamant that the 'fertilizing conflict of individualities [which] is the ultimate meaning of the personal life' (Wells: 1905, 11) stimulates improvement both among individuals and organized groups; and it is the duty of social systems as is the case with ***A.M.U.*** to encourage competition. This utopia which will acquire planetary scope, through subjection and assimilation of ―backward‖ populations, will be established by a state powerful enough to colonize or eliminate all others and establish a global World State. His globalist Darwinian convictions stemmed from the belief that the progress achieved in modern communications had brought the realization of his planetary utopia closer. It is his conviction that

> no less than a planet will serve the purpose of a modern utopia, [adding that] a state powerful enough to keep isolated under modern conditions would be powerful enough to rule the world, would be indeed, if not actively ruling, yet passively acquiescent of all other human organizations, and so responsible for them altogether. World State, therefore, it must be (Ibid: 12-13).

While traditional utopists considered that individuals' virtue and happiness, and social stability were preferable to liberty, Wells argues that liberty, which he considers as _the substance of life', is inseparable from happiness. The risk that liberty may lead to abuse is limited by education which makes individuals committed to 'the preservation of the welfare of the community as a whole' (Ibid: 38). Against the Christian ethics of charity toward the

weak and the poor, and the communist discourse which called for a levelling of society by means of a proletarian revolution, Wells seems to favour Nietzsche‘s Master‘s Morality which will allow a New Class of Overmen to emerge, establish, and rule the new global society.

Culture, Power, Economy, and Politics in *A Modern Utopia.*

This society, as Wells conceives it, is a culturally homogeneous, strongly organic global state. The language of this modern utopia is mostly a synthesis of the ‘English tongue’ that will have ‘coalesced‘ with other Anglo-Saxon and Latin languages but welded into a speech more ample and more powerful and beautiful than either (Ibid, 24)’. Here, Wells’s Darwinian vision applies to culture as well as to economy and politics. In the future globalized world, cultural imperialism of the industrialized Anglo-Saxon nations will serve their hegemony by naturalizing their economic and political control. Although he represents his social model as a multiracial society, his ethnocentric view prevents him from acknowledging any cultural influences that might come from the “subject populations” in the Orient or Africa; influences that might contribute to the cultural wealth and diversity of the World State.

Power plays a central part in Wells‘s utopian World State. Its economic and political philosophy is based on ‘the conception of society as an organization for the conversion of all available energy in nature to the material benefit of mankind; [. . . an organization] whose main ends are reproduction and education in an atmosphere of freedom’ (ibid: 99-100). In the new society, all natural sources of power are vested in the local authorities who generate electric power from the available natural resources: wind, water, coal, oil etc…. The energy thus produced is devoted in part to local needs such as lighting, public works, transportation - wells foresaw high speed electric trains-, or sold to private companies. Part of this energy will be used to subsidize the World State authority which controls communications, administration, and other public services worldwide (Ibid,: 91-92). Like any living organism

that needs energy, which it takes from its environment to survive, grow, and vie, the World State depends on a secure and permanent supply of power to run its various industrial and commercial activities.

Cultural homogeneity, economic centralization, a modern system of communications, backed up by thorough bureaucratic control, give Wells's ideal society a strong organic unity. He argues that the trend in modern thought is entirely against private property in land or natural objects. In this ―socialist‖ utopia, these resources will be the inalienable property of the World State which exerts a total monopoly over natural resources. The local states act as tenants on behalf of the World State over all forms of power and activities. They manage the production and distribution of power and human activities locally, and the taxes which are recovered by local governments are, to a large extent, transferred to the World State. 'This scheme', as Wells has it, 'makes the state the sole owner of energy and the final legatee' (p. 108). Men, in Wells's view, depend for their freedom on the production and possession of some private property. Likewise, organized bodies will depend for their freedom on the amount of value their labour has generated. The monopoly over the different sources of energy, its exploitation and distribution is but a modernized version the ownership, distribution, and exploitation of land by king, barons, and villains under the feudal system. As Wells conceives it,

> The World State in this ideal represents itself as the sole landowner of the earth, with the great local governments; I have adumbrated the local municipalities, holding as it were, feudally under it as landlords. The state or these subordinates hold all the sources of energy, and either directly, or through its tenants [. . .] develops these sources and renders this energy available for the work of life. [. . .] The energy developed and the employment afforded by the state will descend like water that the sun has sucked out of the sea to fall upon a mountain range, and back to the sea again it will come at last, in ground rent, and loyalty and license fees, in the fees of travelers and profits upon carrying and coinage, in death duty, transfer tax, legacy and forfeiture, returning to the sea (Ibid: 107).

In other words what the World State gives in the form of salary (energy) it recovers in the form of various taxes. What is noteworthy here is that the modern utopia fulfills the wish of

the rising Western capitalist empire for free access to the sources of energy. By erasing national boundaries and setting up a global open society, this system grants industrialized capitalism unlimited supply of energy and labor from the rich areas peopled by the prolific "subject populations", and a global market for their commodities and services.

This relation of near feudality between local and global structures in today's world seems to confirm Wells's vision. Globalization, as Roland Robertson notes, 'refers to the compression of the world, and the intensification of the world as a whole [. . . and to] the increasing acceleration of both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole in the twentieth century' (Robertson, 1992:8). Modern monopoly capitalism has played a central part in this process. Indeed, scholars like Wallerstein agree that globalization has resulted from the extension of financial flows, trade, investments of transnational corporations, all of which have been made possible by advances in transportation and information technologies. This global interdependence has created a situation in which an event in New York or Tokyo impacts citizens living in South America, or the MENA region. Wallenstein argues further that _the spread of capitalism united the world further into one inter-related set of economic networks, albeit one divided into geographically based hierarchies in which core countries benefit from a globally unequal and exploitative division of labor' (Wallerstein I.: Qtd. In Fominaya, 2014: 16). Accounts between central and local government could be kept in terms of the energy produced. Value and payment are no longer expressed in money or gold but in units of energy. The wealth, the success, and the power of a government are measured by the amount of energy it produces. 'Every local government', Wells notes, 'issues energy notes that reflect its saleable energy' (Ibid: 93). Wells's prediction about the central function of energy in the modern world, whether this energy is produced by means of

mechanical appliances or through the conversion of natural resources into energy, has proved accurate.

Competition over the control of sources of energy such as oil, gas, or nuclear technology in our world provides strong evidence in support of his prediction. Recent Western interventions in the Middle East and North Africa region: Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Syria, Libya, Sudan, Algeria, Mali, Niger, and Nigeria, all of which are known to harbour immense reserves of oil, gas or uranium, may be said to partake the industrialized Western nations' plans to control these areas, and keep the balance of power in their favour, especially now that the Eastern communist bloc has been economically and ideologically defeated. Ideologically, the ―pill‖ of intervention is sugared by wrapping it in the promotion of democracy, human rights, good governance, and a crusade against terrorism which in very recent times was greeted as jihad, financed and armed to crush the communist regime of Nadjibullah in Afghanitan and oust the soviet army from this country, overthrow Saddam in Iraq and then Kaddafi in Libya, and weaken the once ―socialist and anti-imperialist‖ regime of the Assad family in Syria. Once again, the common denominator between these countries not to name Nigeria, Niger, and Sudan, is their energetic potential.

The social protests that have been sweeping the world especially the MENA region recently are read by certain critics as a popular reaction to counter the effects of global monopoly capitalism. Cristina Flesher Fominaya, explains that modern means of communications which have allowed capitalism to exercise global economic monopoly and ideological hegemony are now being used by social networks. For example, she reads the Arab Spring as a questioning by cyber activists of ‗the [capacity] traditional actors to represent their interests, [. . . and their quest for] a more direct and unmediated relation to power and the decisions that affect their lives' (Fominaya, 2014: 1). She thinks that just as transnational corporations are using ICTs to control the world, social networks are resorting to

the same media to unveil the junction of interests between transnational corporations and the modern global plutocracy. However, other critics like Keane and Meiers doubt the capacity of 'thousands of associations working transnationally to effect [positive] global change in a world governed by powerful states and supranational institutions, and in which multinational corporations have more resources and power than the global civil society actors who resist and challenge them' (Keane and Meiers,2008:15) This is only one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is the difficulty to decipher the agendas of the NGOs which use the cyber space to stir unrest. One would doubt if these organizations are not ideologically linked to the powers of liberal globalization. Once a local government has become too unpopular to serve the interests of the "new empire", or "too patriotic" to open up its market to transnational business, a revolt may be stirred using ICTs and social networks to demonize it, and replace it by a more cooperative one.

The World State and the Reign of the Samurai

From Plato, Bacon, Thomas More, and E. Bellamy, Wells borrows the idea of a ruling aristocracy which is embodied in the Samurai order. However, slavery, religion in the traditional sense, the police or the army as "Althusserian" state apparatuses have been banned as unnecessary. Industry in the modern industrialized world meets the needs of people. Devotion to the social body is the new religion, and though competition is still there, education has rendered coercion useless. While traditional utopias dreamt of ideal insulated or isolated worlds peopled by constructed ideal social subjects, Wells sets out from the basic assumption that systems of life are the temporary outcome of the struggle for self-preservation and domination. ***A.M.U*** does not turn its back to 'the unmanageable complications of real life' Wells declares; on the contrary it considers it as central in shaping the modern world. With respect to order and stability which he assimilates to death, Wells considers

> [t]he real world [as] a vast disorder of accidents and incalculable forces in which men survive or fail. A modern utopia, unlike its predecessors dare not pretend to manage the last condition. It may order and humanize the conflict, but men must still survive or fail (Wells, 1905:160).

Wells then, the Darwinian, the student of Leonard T. Huxley, advocates strife, competition, and predation as conducive to better and healthier life forms and social organizations. He insists that the job of social theorists should not be limited to the study and description of society; it should rather concern itself with the correction of the flaws of the real world to lead to the realization of utopia. It is no surprise then that the new society is ruled by the fittest of its subjects: the Samurai.

The Samurai as a Modern World Aristocracy

The Samurai constitute an order whose members rule the World State. The order comprises two sub-categories. The poetic, the first category, comprises the thinking creative elites in charge of putting forward new ideas and theories likely to cope with current problems. The kinetic, whose function is to implement the schemes put forward by the poetic, hold executive positions. The order is open to any mentally healthy adult ready to respect the ascetic life of its members. 'It was several hundred years ago' says the narrator's utopian double, 'that the great organization of the Samurai came into its present form, and it was this organizations' widely sustained activities that had shaped and sustained the World State' (p: 309). The Samurai order is the culmination of an evolutionary process of the human kind. Their rule is inspired by a guiding philosophy contained in the "Book of the Samurai", which unlike The Bible, 'has constantly been under revision' (Wells, 1905:337).The World State, as planned and managed by this order represents the perfected outcome of systems of government tried and improved throughout time until it had reached its present condition.

Wells, like many reform minded socialists of his time, was concerned by the imminent outbreak of a destructive war which would be triggered by the quest by the emerging industrial nations for colonial expansion, and fuelled by exacerbated nationalist feelings.

Another reason for concern was a possible degeneration of the human species; a degeneration caused by uncontrolled demography, uneven distribution of wealth and education, the increase of criminality, infirmity, brutality and child mortality, among the majority of improvident poor. An increase in the proportion of 'the base' would constitute a burden on human society, impede human progress, and may in the long run lead to the extinction or degeneration of the human race. The solution to these ills lay in the monopoly by the World State of the world resources and markets which would be made available for the expanding capitalism, and a bettering of the general standard of life, and an improvement of the human populations through the combined implementation of Malthusian and eugenic principles as he explains in ***Mankind in the Making*** (1906).

The World State appears, then, as a new form of global empire in which national, racial, and ethnic boundaries have been removed. The ruling aristocracy of the Samurai need no longer wage colonial wars to appropriate the land, resources, labour or markets required by the fast developing industries. The base, the dull, and the poor who may hamper human progress, or who may be stirred into revolutionary action by a power thirsty demagogue as was depicted in ***When the Sleeper Wakes (1903)*** are simply prevented from breeding.

The Samurai order is the rising new middle class of scientists, social theorists, and social prophets whom Wells refers to as the 'New Republicans', or 'the Mind of the race' in ***Mankind in the Making*** (1906). 'Our movement' said the narrator's double,

> had something of the spirit of your New Republican in the beginning [. . .] but while your men seem to be thinking disconnectedly, upon a very narrow and fragmentary basis of accumulated conclusions, ours had a fairly comprehensive basis of human associations, and a very careful analysis of the failures of preceding beginnings to draw upon. After all, your world must be as full as ours of the wreckage and decay of previous attempts; churches, aristocracies, orders, cults [. . .].The novelty in the scheme of the statesmen who founded the World State is to contrive a revolutionary movement that shall absorb all existing movements and fuse them with itself, and that must be rapidly progressive and adaptable, and yet coherent, persistent, powerful and efficient.(Ibid:p,32)

The utopia of the modern theorist is the result of an expert combination of evolution and progress with social stability and continuity. It integrates the poetic innovations in sciences, arts, utopian tradition, social theory, without disrupting the global order. The extremes of entropy, characteristic in the perfection of traditional utopias that may lead to stagnation and death, or uncontrolled revolutionary change that may result in anarchy are thus avoided.

The advent of this order is not the result of a random evolution but the result of utopian thought on human societies. For Wells, the role of social theorist is not to describe society but to improve it. He argues that sociology, as a descriptive activity, is of little use while utopia, which is advocatory, inspirational, and transformative, is the real motive power for social progress. He writes, in "The so-called Science of Sociology" that

> [t]here is no such thing in sociology as dispassionately considering what is without considering what it is intended to be. [. . .] The history of civilization is really the history of the appearance and reappearance, the tentative and hesitations and alterations, the manifestations in this mind and that of a very complex, imperfect, elusive idea, **the social idea**[emphasis mine].[. . .] I think, in fact, that the creation of utopias [. . .], is the proper and distinctive method of sociology. Sociology is the description of the ideal society and its relation to the existing one (Wells, 1914: 200).

Stated otherwise, the function of any science is to increase man's grip and control over his environment to the benefit of the human race. Any social theory that does not aim at the realization of this **social idea** but only contents itself with a detached observation and description of the past or present social bodies is inappropriate for social progress and the realization of the ideal human society.

Evolution and the World State

Krishan Kumar traces the origin of Wells's World State idea to Medieval Christendom and medieval Islam which had built on the empires of Antiquity. Although the Reformation in the west had broken up the unity of Christendom giving birth to isolating nationalisms, later developments in modern technology and communications worked to redress the trend. Nineteenth century positivism and imperialism, together with the development of such

'synthetic ideas as Anglo-Saxonism and Pan-Germanism', have continued the universalizing movement. However, these have been increasingly perverted by pseudo-scientific theories of race'. Wells denies the existence of pure separable races, with fundamental differences between them. Cultural differences there are; and education and national histories, actual or constructed, can accentuate them; but so too can education, if we want it, work in the opposite direction, Wells firmly believes. A worldwide synthesis need not mean either fusion or uniformity; it can be based on a synergy of physically and culturally varied segments (Kumar, 1997: 194-195). From a position of local or national leadership as advocated in traditional utopias, the intelligentsia rises in status to act as the thinking organ of the race and assume global legislative and executive functions.

Such, then, was the vision of Wells. The modern utopia is to be envisioned and constructed by a new class of social prophets and agents of change: the Samurai which Kumar assimilates to a global Free-Masonry. The new middle class of scientific, professional and managerial people whom he calls 'The Efficient', 'The Mind of the Race' will be the natural creators, rulers, and inheritors of the global society constituted as The World State. The Samurai, who will hold key positions in the World State and the local states, will monopolize power for they will control all sources of energy, labour, and services both locally and worldwide. By doing so, Kumar notes further, the new rulers will disqualify both the propertied and moneyed but functionless aristocracy, and the proletariat as agents of change (ibid:188-189). In ***Mankind in the Making,*** Wells appeals directly to the rising class of disinterested intellectuals, whom he calls 'The New Republicans', to assume their historical role in the creation of the World State. He urges these new elites, who will have synthesized the experiences of the human kind,

> [to] see our wills only as temporary manifestations of an ampler will, our lives as passing phases of a greater life, and to accept these facts even joyfully, to take our places in that larger scheme with a sense of relief and discovery, to go with that larger being of his army, and serving joyfully his army into battle (Wells: 1906, p.13).

This passage reminds us strikingly of Bellamy's rule by Industrial Army in his utopian romance ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** (1887); with the difference that nationalism for Wells is but a step that would pave the way to globalism.

Conclusion

Wells's ***A.M.U.*** seems to conform to Mannheim's type of the liberal utopia. It has appropriated and synthesized what is best in Western utopian tradition to meet the challenges of The Great Depression, ward off proletarian revolution through a gradual improvement of capitalism, and prevent a destructive major conflict by suggesting a globalized system in which collective rule of the world by the fittest grants the major industrial powers economic and political pre-eminence. The two World Wars and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia proved the fears of the intellectuals justified. In 1946, The Movement for the Creation of a World Federal Government was born. Sponsored by three British MPs and including different organizations and leaders it held three congresses in the hope of promoting justice and preserving world peace. The end of the Cold War marked the demise of socialism and ideological and economic victory of the liberal idea. Because of the discourse of peace that followed the Second World War, England and France were disqualified as a traditional imperial power. The exceptional status of the USA, its role during the Second World War, its status as a rising power entitled it to world leadership

The popular upheaval that have swept through North Africa and the Middle East under the liberal slogans of ―democracy, good governance, human rights, and civil society‖, together with the military campaigns such as ―Desert Storm‖ which have ended in the public executions of former symbols of National power and pride in the MENA, are indicative of the ideological direction the trend is taking. Thomas Peiser seems to agree with Wells that 'society is a cultural construct'.

CHAPTER IX: The Quest for Peace and the World State in B. Russell's Political Writings (1924-1972).

Introduction

If the decades marking the turn of the 19th century and the eve of the 20th were characterized by the crisis of the capitalist system in western industrial societies and the quest for acceptable substitutes, the periods following the two World Wars were infused with disillusion and a deep feeling of concern for the future of the human race. The rise of ideologies of nationalism and racism backed up by pseudo-scientific theories had resulted in two destructive armed conflicts. The end of the Second World War with the defeat of Germany and Japan saw the emergence of two ideologically opposed blocs, the liberal West and the communist bloc with their respective satellites. The fact that the new emerging world powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., had developed mass destruction arms and were striving for world dominance, made the prospects even gloomier. The strategic alliance against Germany and Japan which had been sealed between the U.S.A. and the USSR collapsed and turned into competition over the control of strategically important regions of the world. This competition which took the name of "Cold War" could at any time evolve into a nuclear conflict between the two superpowers and bring human civilization to an end.

It was in that period of distrust, doubt and fear that adequate instruments for international cooperation and the peaceful settlement of conflicts were being south for. The League of Nations had failed to prevent the First World War. The United Nations Organization, an improved version of the League created after the Second World War, was not deemed strong enough to prevent other major conflicts in a period of exacerbated tensions and race to armaments between the communist and the liberal blocs. Among the most fervent advocators of peace was Bertrand Russell, a British aristocrat who produced, alongside a rich academic career, a series of essays related to a world order that would not only insure human happiness by spreading the boons brought about by science and technical

progress to all parts of the world, but mainly construct a stable and peaceful human society. This global ideal order was to be achieved through the centralization of power and decision, and education that would mitigate the strong emotions of allegiance, love, fear, or hatred, all of which, Russell argues, are conducive to war and destruction. His profound humanism and the liberal outlook he inherited from his family led him to aspire to and help in the conception of a political and economic organization of the human society that would transcend racial, ethnic, national, and class barriers to institute a World Government that would grant a lasting peace, spread progress through education and trade to the backward parts of the globe, and safeguard the human species by further strengthening the organic links that bind local governments to the envisioned World Government. Considering his views on religion and science, peace and world governance, self-determination and national sovereignty, Russell‘s views have been the object of various critical appraisals.

Review of the literature

From a conservative stance, Bertrand Russell was labelled as a libertine and advocator of the over man theory. In an article entitled “Bertrand Russell: Prophet of a New World Order”, David J. Peterson charges Russell of having lent his authoritative voice to the ‘eradication of [. . .] the moral order’. Peterson assimilates him to a disciple of Nietzsche who has pronounced the death of the Christian God and called for a transvaluation of values. Indeed, Russell considers the Christian religion, which he refers to as “the fear doctrine” to be incompatible with human natural drives to seek happiness through the gratification of their innate appetites. As a positivist, Russell considers that Christian religion and its moral values are incompatible with a scientific civilization. Instead of the traditional Christian ethics, Russell advocates eugenics, Malthusianism, and social control through education to achieve welfare, happiness, and social stability. This Nitzschean perspective, partly developed in —

Icarus or the Future of Science‖ (1924), which considers man as 'the creator of value', hardly conceals an aspiration to power in the name of peace and stability (Peterson, 2000)

Paul Meier**,** another critic, reads the discourse of globalization which underpins Russell's militancy for world peace and the institution of a World Government as a conspiracy of Anglo-American intellectual elite. Under cover of the quest for peace and the prevention of a nuclear conflict, the spread of progress to the backward areas of the world and the abolition of private property even among states, Paul Meyers argues, Russell and other advocators of globalism like H.G.Wells were actually serving the hegemony of the rising U.S. Empire. As an example of Russell's ideological siding with a U.S. leadership of the world, Meyers cites the philosopher's strong support of the Barruch Lilienthal plan. The plan consisted in a proposal put forward in the issues of ***The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist*** of 1946 in the period following the dropping by the U.S. army of two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The proposal which was put to Stalin for approval included three basic ideas: the institution of a World Government instead of the U.N. which was not strong enough to enforce its resolutions, an Agency for Nuclear Energy that would control the production of radioactive ores and the development of nuclear arms, and the suppression of the right of Veto. Knowing that at the time the proposal was made, the U.S.A. was the only nuclear power, the Barruch Plan was meant to prevent any other power from developing nuclear arms. This would leave the Americans complete monopoly of military power. Russell went further since he suggested exerting pressure on the Russians even to the point of _risking war' to accept the plan. His reputation as a pacifist suffered severe damage but he continued to militate for one world power convinced as he was that it was a lesser evil than a multi polar world in which ideologically opposed nuclear powers were contending for pre-eminence.

Oddly enough, Russell‘s advanced views on decolonization, workers‘ control, and the nature of the utopian ideas that inform his political writings have not received enough attention. It is all the more perplexing that critical studies of the utopian genre have not included his ideas for analysis. Neither have his ideas on decolonization and the construction of an open society (Carl Popper) been the object of critical analysis by scholars belonging to the Third World despite his commitment in favour of self-determination, education, and progress in favour of the peoples of the traditionally colonized lands in Asia and Africa.

Issue and Hypothesis

The present chapter attempts to complete former studies on Russell‘s ideas related to the quest for a better World Order. Although Russell did not write a utopia in the conventional sense, a formal utopia, this study is premised on the assumption that his writings, as a social and political thinker, are informed by utopian aspirations which deserve closer examination. This chapter, accordingly, explores the following hypothesis: in a world made strongly organic by technical progress and tighter economic relations, the traditional forms of military or colonial domination had been rendered unpopular, obsolete, and inefficient. His plea for decolonization, control of population growth among ―the prolific races‖, and the monopoly by a World Government of military power and all natural resources, reads, in fact, as a plea for the protection of the human kind under the leadership of a liberal industrialized west. Like E. Bellamy and H.G.Wells, he felt that the contradictions of the capitalist system could be solved through a World Government that would globalize liberal values and practices to the rest of the world under the supervision of intellectuals and scientists committed to the happiness and welfare of their fellow men. By so doing, competition between firms, trusts, and nations would be prevented, and with it the impending disaster awaiting the human kind in case of a major conflict. However, his philanthropic plans hardly conceal an ethnocentric view that favours an Anglo- American alliance as a

modernized version of Noah‘s arch. Recent studies of the U.S/ U.K. “special relationship” will be used to back up our claim that the quest for a global order is a form of discourse that partakes of an aspiration to project the constructed idealized Anglo-Saxon self onto the rest of the world. The U.S.A. is thus constructed as a modernized version of the Promised Land, and its inhabitants assume the status of the People Elect whose mission is to rescue humanity from The Flood. In this chapter, I consider that present geostrategic trends, especially U.K backed American growing influence in world affairs to constitute the outcome of western globalist liberal views of which Russell after Bellamy and H.G.Wells was a key proponent.

Peace, Stability, and New World Order

Russell‘s concern about the impact of technical progress on society was expressed as early as 1924. In an essay entitled ***“Icarus or the Future of Science”*** (1924), Russell voiced his fears that given the economic and political conditions prevailing then, _science will be used to promote the power of the dominant groups rather than make men happy‘. He feared that like Icarus who had used rashly the art of flying he had learnt from his father Daedalus, governments were using scientific and technical progress unwisely and so may very well lead human society to ruin or back to barbarity. He goes on to argue that science, technology, and industry have increased man‘s power of gratifying his desires by increasing his control over nature; yet this has not increased his happiness. Humans‘ instinct of rivalry and their lust for power have greatly reduced the positive impact of technical progress. For industrialism to achieve the *summum bonum*, ‘the human instincts of rivalry and power lust need to be artificially curbed (ibid)’.

To achieve a balance of technical progress and human happiness, Russell argues, certain scientific disciplines need to be developed further. He believes that the laws of heredity discovered by Mendel and which have promisingly been applied to agriculture could be used

to improve human society. Combined with anthropology, psychology, and sociology, eugenics could contribute to the engineering of a better society through the engineering of the desired social subject. These ideas have been the object of a satirical treatment by Aldous Huxley in Brave New World (1932).He was convinced that the Industrial Revolution which began in England should '**conquer'** the world (emphasis added).He was adamant that economic integration will result in political centralization. 'Industrialism', he writes,

> still has great parts of the earth's surface to conquer. Russia and India are very imperfectly industrialized; China hardly at all. In South America there is room for immense development. One of the effects of industrialism is to make the world one economic unit: its ultimate consequences will be very largely due to this fact. But before the world can be effectively organized as a unit, it will probably be necessary to develop industrially all the regions capable of development that are at present backward'(Russell, 1924, 3/ 15).

Unfortunately, however, industrialism which had led to an increase in the production of food, commodities, and services did not result in a general improvement of humans' standard of life because of a parallel uncontrolled population growth in Africa and Asia which may lead to the depletion of resources. Industrialism had rather been achieved at the expense of the country peasants and the labouring urban classes at home, and through the expropriation and exploitation of "subject populations" abroad in the name of progress, racial superiority, or freedom of trade. The First World War which had just ended was eloquent enough on the extent of the damage that technical progress combined with imperialism fuelled by feelings of nationalism or racialism could produce.

From Nationalism to Globalism

Russell considers that progress and modern industrialism, which have led to the formation of nation states, have also brought about a struggle between nations for the acquisition of raw materials and markets which would insure or preserve their domination. He believes that as a

result of the frequent wars, the labour saved by machinery and the surplus of commodities produced is squandered in financing war rather than improving the general standard of life. Military power, in his view, is the inevitable instrument of technological, industrial, and economic power in the quest for national prestige and pre-eminence, for he observes that

> It is science above all that has determined the importance of raw materials in international competition. Coal and iron, and oil especially, are the bases of power, and thence of wealth. The nation that possesses them and has the industrial skill required to utilize them in war, can acquire markets by armed force and levy tribute upon the less fortunate nations. War is often resorted to to possess these sources of power. (ibid, 4/15)

Science has been used by industrialized nations to increase their military power which in turn is used to control raw materials and markets without which power is quickly lost to a potential competitor. Hence, science has created the conditions for a globalized economy in favour of the most advanced nations and made the use of power nearly ‗a necessity' to keep industrial supremacy. However, with the development and use of nuclear weapons during World War II, the possible proliferation of nuclear weapons and the outbreak of a major conflict that might end human civilization, the institution of a World Government that would enforce peace became an urgent necessity.

Russell argues that just as nationalism as a modern form of political organization had been made possible by industrialization and technical progress in the 19th century, further developments in industry, communications, and concomitantly in the size of markets, has enhanced international economic interdependence by reducing distances and increasing the interdependence of the periphery and the centre; thus imposing political globalization as a more appropriate form of organization which completes a *de facto* economic globalization. He argues further that technical development has increased governments' control over education and the media of press. This control has enabled governments to influence the taste and opinions of large numbers of people and thus insure economic dependence and ideological allegiance to the powers that control the market and politics. In an over organized

world, Russell writes, a man‘s thoughts and acts are, to a large extent, determined by the groups to which he belongs. As a result, he becomes _more disciplined, more group conscious and more docile to leaders’ (ibid, 5/15). The only concern is that organizations do not exceed the national scope to assume a global scope. This can lead powerful national trusts to control politics and thus start large scale destructive wars.

The U.S.A as a Paradigm for World Governance

The solution to a potentially destructive international conflict lies in the institution of a planetary organization, a World Government that would prevent wars. He believed that owing to the speed of technical progress, the world would soon evolve toward

> [. . .] _one producing and consuming unit. If when that time comes, two rival groups contend for mastery, the victor may be able to introduce that single worldwide organization that is needed to prevent the mutual extermination of civilized nations. [. . .] There would be at first economic and political tyranny, [. . .] and a drastic suppression of liberty but [in the end], the vanquished will give up hope and accept the subordinate place assigned to them by the victors in the great world trust.(Russell, 1924: 10-15)

Interestingly, Russell‘s evocation of “world trust” reminds us of the dream of Julian West, Bellamy‘s hero in ***Looking Backward 2000-1888***, in which U.S industrial system naturally evolved from a number of private trusts competing for control of the market into a national trust, before it impregnated the rest of the world. Later, H.G.Wells in his ***Modern Utopia*** (1905) envisioned a planetary system under the rule of an elite of legislators and executives he called the Samurai.

Following the Marxist interpretation of ideology as developed in his ***Theses on Feuerbach*** (1845), Russell agrees that the function of philosophers is not to interpret the world but to change it. Accordingly, a globally organized system of production should produce not only structures but also an outlook that would sustain it. He believes that in a world that is organized as a single unit of production and consumption, a World Government, even if it were to rely on nothing but armed force, would reduce the events that threaten civilization.

This government may be cruel and despotic at first but it is necessary if the human scientific civilization is to be preserved.

One notices that Russell condones the use of power by the mightiest nations to govern the world in the name of economic efficiency, peace and human civilization. 'I believe', he writes in "Icarus or the Future of Science"

> that owing to men's folly, a world government will only be established by force, and therefore be at first cruel and despotic. But I believe it is necessary for the preservation of a scientific civilization. Despotism and coercion will diminish with time (Russell, 1924: 10-15).

He is convinced that hope for salvation lies in the benevolent domination of the world by one group which would spare competing nations mutual destruction. Notwithstanding the reserves he expresses as to the possible imperial temptations of such a system, Russell names the United States as a model of economic and political system that would progressively impregnate the world, and evolve into an orderly economic and political global organization.

Despite his aristocratic descent, Russell considers that the U.S. society is the best suited model for the construction of a global system of governance. As a new nation, it is the outcome of exceptional historical development (David and Grondin, 2006). Symbolically, it is the Promised Land, the New World, the asylum for mankind, the Beacon on the Hill, the land of opportunity, of liberty, equality and happiness, but above all, the land where the first form of federal government was successfully instituted. The U.S. economic, cultural, and political success story seems to entitle it to serve as a paradigm of economic success, political stability, and human happiness to impregnate the rest of the world. Between 1924 and 1968, Russell published a series of articles and essays in which he calls for the institution of a global system of governance. This World State, he indefatigably argued, is the best suited to human economy, made strongly organic by technology, and the most likely to preserve human civilization by preventing conflicts.

In an essay entitled "The Taming of Power" (1938), Russell argues that the quest for power has guided men's actions throughout history; but so has the quest for taming this power among philosophers and social thinkers too. Among the various systems that have been considered and tried out, Russell seems to favour democracy in spite of the risk involved that the system may be subverted into tyranny by popular demagogues. To prevent such perversion, democracy has to be 'sustained by economic conditions, propaganda conditions, and psychological and educational conditions' (Russell, 1938:pp.663-664). It is democracy, he observes, that has checked the power of monarchs and reduced the power of industrialists by making trade unionism possible. Within small states, direct representation is possible, but in the case of large states where different groups coexist, a federal system combined with devolution may insure the representation of the interests of the different groups without threatening the whole system with anarchy or disintegration. Russell remarks that this system of government that had been perfected in the USA could serve in the constitution of a federal World Government in which the authority of the national or local governments will be subordinate to the authority of the World State in such strategic matters as peace, education policies, access to raw materials, and War (Ibid: 665-666).

Writing in a period rife with ideological struggle- liberalism, Nazism, soviet communism, and fascism- Russell was convinced that next to technical progress, the outbreak of a major conflict which seemed imminent had made the constitution of a World Government inevitable for various reasons. First and most importantly, a world government would prevent a major war resulting from conflicting national interests. Next to this, it would help to disseminate the boons brought about by technical progress. Further, it will found a human society in which the best will be allowed to emerge. Last but not least, it will grant unrestricted access to resources and markets in a world from which frontiers and private ownership are banned. Again, he takes the U.S.A. as an example and argues that a federal

system will grow into a more centralized system with time although ‘the sentiments and interests of the constituent units are stronger than the sentiments connected with the federation’ (p: 666). He gives as an example of evolution towards more centralization the growing influence of the U.S. Federal Government and its institutions over that of the individual states since the constitution was drafted. The U.S. War of Secession is a case in point of the growing control of the central authority over its peripheral constituents. It follows that a federal world government, once instituted, would follow the same course, even in case of rebellion and conflict with one of its national governments. Save for matters connected with peace, education, and the property of raw materials, certain tasks like taxation, health, security are to be devolved to national governments. Russell is well aware that there might be cultural or psychological resistance at first. However, if democracy and the comforts that technical progress and justice provided are spread to the different parts of the world, fear, envy, and the risk of war will diminish.

Along with this Federal World Government, economic democracy, a free press, and education for freedom will limit abuses of power. By economic democracy, Russell conceives a system in which the world state, acting on behalf of citizens, owns and controls certain strategic sectors such as land, raw materials, and energy to prevent concentration of economic powers in private hands. This will help to correct the errors of communism in which an oligarchy of party members who exercise bureaucratic control on the economy accumulate both political and economic power, which, combined with the control of mass media, will give the party absolute power. Orwell’s 1984 is a good example of the perversions that state socialism can give rise to. Another measure against abuse of power depends on the existence of a free press that would denounce corruption, monopoly of power, or injustice to check the temptations of oligarchs or plutocrats. Education should work toward the suppression of strong emotions of fear, hate or love; all of which lead to radical ideology because of the blind

submission they may inspire to a creed or a leader. Education should foster rational evaluation rather than dogmatic belief. It should, as far as possible, avoid strong emotions which lead to collective hysteria that prepares for war and annihilation. In short, Russell advocates a liberal education

> [. . .]which regards the welfare of the state as residing ultimately in the welfare of the individual [by contrast to education in] a totalitarian state which regards the state as the end and individuals merely as indispensable ingredients whose welfare must be subordinated to a mystical totality which is a cloak for the interests of the rulers (p. 680).

Peace, salvation, progress, and happiness for humanity seem to lie in the institution of a new centralized world order that would have the monopoly of military power and certain strategic resources, and work towards the abolition of national frontiers, feelings and allegiances.

Globalization or Americanization?

It was in the early 1950s that Russell campaigned most vigorously for peace and the institution of a World Government. In 1951, he published a series of essays in which he explains that economic and social units had grown in size in proportion as technique had become more and more elaborate. Commerce, which used to be an affair of trade between individual merchants, had been taken up by companies which grew into trusts, before it is taken up by governments. Economic interdependence between nations was stronger then than it had ever been before. However, since nations' economic systems have developed from activities based on the quest for private profit, 'economic interdependence instead of producing friendliness, tends to be a cause of hostility' (Russell; 1951). Russell goes on to explain that military power plays an important part in economic competition for it grants access to raw materials, energy, and markets. Politics is subservient to economy. The quest for economic domination has been the main cause in the development of human association from the state of tribes, to that of nations, and to alliances of nations to ensure victory. However, in a world where the contending powers have developed mass destruction nuclear weapons, the greatest victory lies in the enforcement of peace and the prevention of war.

Peace was a strategic necessity if human civilization, nay if human life was to continue. As long as there were many sovereign states with diverging interests, Russell observes, war cannot be prevented. The only hope lay in the creation of a unique sovereign power that would represent the interests of the whole humanity (pp. 700-701).

Attributes of The World Government.

To preserve peace and insure the welfare and happiness of the human kind, the World Government should have complete monopoly of power. By power, Russell means not only military power but equally the natural sources of energy such as coal, oil, uranium, or any other form of energy that scientific progress may come to develop. Monopoly of all major weapons by the army of the World Government, combined with a total loyalty of this army to the World Government would empower this supreme authority to prevent conflicts by arbitrating and settling disputes between local states. A legislative body dependent on the new hegemon will pass laws binding all the local states, and the World Government will have an irresistible power to enforce them. Recourse to war between local states will be deterred as any use of force by these latter shall bring deserved punishment (Russell, 1951: 699-703).

This World Government, Russell explains, ‗may owe its origin to consent or to conquest'. It may be the national government of a state which has achieved world conquest. Russell believes that the U.S.A., owing to its economic dynamism and military power, its federal constitution and democratic culture, its leading role against Nazism, and then Communism, possesses the required assets to be the seed that would, with time, grow into the global authority so eagerly sought for. To prevent resistance, affluence and a certain level of comfort should spread to the ―backward states‖ which concomitantly will supply the energy, raw materials, and markets necessary to the world industry to thrive and prosper. 'It will be impossible', Russell writes,

> to feel that the world is in a satisfactory state, until there is a certain degree of equality and a certain acquiescence everywhere to the power of the World Government. And this will not

> be possible until the poorer nations of the world have become educated, modernized in their technique, and more or less stationary in population (p. 702) .

Ethics in the Globalized World

Along with the centralization of power in the hands of a World government made inevitable by stronger organic links between nations and the impervious necessity to preserve peace, freedom and personal initiative should be encouraged if progress is to take place; Russell writes in "Individual and Social Ethics"(Russell,1949: 357). Freedom of initiative through devolution should be granted to national states, local governments, groups and individuals if despotism and injustice are to be prevented. Men may even inspire or lead revolutions against the new world order in case it proves iniquitous on condition that the leaders of such revolutions are imbued with a deep respect for law. Russell cites 1688 and 1774 as important dates for successful revolutions because they did not lead to anarchy although they reinforced democracy and freedom. These revolutions, which are the core of the Anglo-American liberal tradition, managed to strike a balance between order and individual initiative. Scientific enquiry and technical progress have diminished man's dependence on nature and expanded his empire over it. However, thirst for power inherent in men's nature has remained as strong as ever thus turning knowledge and progress into instruments of subjection and alienation. To prevent injustice, ethics should encourage men's creative impulses that do not lead to the subjection and suffering of their fellow men.

Colonialism is another ethically unacceptable form of institutionalized subjection and injury which is incompatible with a globalized human society. In an essay entitled ―The Next Half Century‖ (1951), Russell suggests to work progressively toward the self-determination and independence of the colonized territories in Africa and Asia. The period following the defeat of Nazism, Militarism, and Fascism was particularly propitious for a discourse of liberation, self-determination and international cooperation toward stability and peace.

Russell had two strategic objectives in mind. The first and most urgent was to contain Soviet ideological and military influence by establishing a balance of power in favour of the liberal West. The next step consisted in the reconstruction of the world in a form that would spare humanity further injustice and destruction. To that effect, Russell suggested replacing the traditional colonial relations based on military domination, economic and political annexation, by a New World Order in which the newly independent states would keep privileged relations with the metropolis. The West, once peace was secured, should 'find ways of raising Asia and Africa to the economic level of Western Europe if not America' (Russell, 1951:705). For example, the French and the English should work toward the modernization of their former colonies, which with time, would be integrated in the globalized economy. This could be done through investment to modernize infrastructure, agriculture, and industry in the backward areas of the world. Meanwhile, population should be educated and encouraged to practice birth control to prevent the depletion of the planet's resources.

The new system will present a double advantage. Besides helping to overcome native suspicion in European imperialism, it will replace costly unpopular military occupation and economic exploitation by close, voluntary cooperation within a globalized liberal system and prevent anarchy or communism from taking root in the newly decolonized areas. Thus, independence, together with improved education, birth control, and tight relations with a stable technologically advanced west will result in economic prosperity in Asia and Africa. This prosperity, in turn, will benefit the Western nations by granting them access to energy and raw materials, prosperous markets, and a better educated and highly skilled labour force (Russell, 1951: 705-706).

To preserve peace and institute global governance respectful of human rights, Russell, calls for scientists to join their voices to prevent a nuclear conflict 'lest what Western civilization has achieved may be forgotten in bitterness and poverty' ("If we Are to Survive these dark

Times", ***New York Times,*** Sept. 3rd, 1950). This can be done by translating the ideals embodied in philosophy and social theory into practical actions. In other words, Russell is a pragmatist who believes with Karl Marx and John Dewey that the value of ideas is measured by their capacity to transform society. 'Contemplation', he writes, 'if it is to be wholesome and valuable, must be married to practice; it must inspire action and ennoble aims of practical statesmanship. While it remains secluded in cloisters, it is only a means of escape' (ibid, 682). As a scientist and a pragmatist, Russell believes that technical progress has given man power and control over nature and his fellow men and has enabled him to change the world for the better. As a pragmatist, he considers that truths are those theoretical tools that enable men to achieve suitable ends. They will remain valid as long as they constitute suitable means to desired ends. In their contest with the metaphysical and religious interpretation of the world scientific truths have come out victorious, Russell observes in **The Impact of Science on Society:** 1971). Traditional religious dogmas find no support in science as science has proven that nature is governed by immutable laws. By scientific and technical knowledge, man is now master of his fate as he has acquired mastery over natural phenomena. Considerations of good and evil are no longer the monopoly of religion but of science which has supplanted it in the interpretation and control of the world. Science not religion is the source of ethics in a modern technologically oriented world. Reflecting about the leading role of intellectuals and scientists in modern societies, he notes in :

> In the world of value, we are greater than nature. In the world of value, nature in itself is neutral; neither good nor bad; deserving of neither admiration nor censure. It is we who create value and our desires which confer value. In this realm, we are kings and we debase our kingship if we bow down to nature. It is for us to determine the good life; not for nature, not even for nature personified in God (Russell, 1957: 367-390,).

It is, therefore, the responsibility of scientists, not that of the clergy, to define the good society and work to its realization.

The good society, for Russell, is necessarily one guided by knowledge and inspired by love. Although both knowledge and love are necessary, love is in a sense more fundamental,

since it will lead people to seek knowledge in order to find out how to benefit those whom they love. 'Love makes us benevolent', Russell notes in "Individual and Social Ethics", 'and knowledge increases the impact of our benevolence' (Russell: 1949, 358). Ethics is improved by knowledge. Science is subservient to ethics. However, since the value of actions is decided by those who hold power, ethics are usually set by the mighty to serve and preserve their collectively organized interests. Those in power often cooperate to instill into the minds of the social subjects all forms of value judgment that sustain the order. The good life depends on the good society; and the good society depends on the will and interests of those who wield power. Russell who was culturally immersed in the English liberal tradition could not fail to praise liberal values and present the U.S.A as a paradigm for the good society.

Making the Bed for the Rising Hegemon

Recent developments on the world scene, especially since the end of the Cold War in favour of the liberal west seem to confirm the rising of the USA as a leading world power. Alternating hegemony with imperial practices, David Grondin (2006) observes, the U.S.A. is gradually remapping the world in accordance to its national narrative, self-perception and strategic interests. Commenting on the modern reterritorialization of the world, Grondin notes that the national state is the 'primary locus of political, economic and cultural organization [in which] the state reinvests its nation with new meaning' (Grondin: 2006, 3). However, when we take into account the U.S. growing global influence, facts seem to run counter to the official story. Grondin observes further that

> When considering global power, the resulting map is necessarily an approximation, an interpretation, a codification of reality. The globe in its entire cartographic representation is of interest to the U.S. because it has global power, responsibilities and interests (Ibid).

As a modern nation and hegemon, the U.S.A. is a product of its founding text (the U.S. Constitution) which it has authored, and which in turn determines its outlook and constrains its actions. This founding narrative, constantly revisited to fit new challenges, turns into a

dominant discourse which gives identity to the U.S. nation, statesmen, and citizens; fashions their representations, and orients their praxis at home and worldwide.

In recent times, especially after the 9/ 11 terrorist attacks on the U.S. symbols of power and the subsequent American intervention in Afghanistan and invasion of Iraq, the scenario envisioned by Bertrand Russell is beginning to materialize. Some provisions taken by the neo-conservative think tanks and executives under the G.W. Bush's administration seem to confirm the global unilateral role of the USA. The Global War on Terror and the National Security Strategy (2002) which take the whole globe as their field of action, heedless of international legality, public opinion, and the resentment and fear that these actions can engender, betray the imperial pretentions of the USA.

From Exeptionalism to Liberal Millenarianism

Because of its exceptional history, the USA has always incarnated, in the minds of its people and leaders, novelty and leadership. It has alternatively been viewed as "an empire of liberty", an "empire by destiny" then "an empire by invitation" to defeat Nazism and then contain Soviet communism. The end of the cold war in favour of the liberal West and the demise of the Soviet Union seem to have consecrated the victory of capitalism and the liberal version of millenarian ideology over the dream of the dictatorship of the proletariat which was assimilated by liberal thinkers to totalitarianism. Today, liberalism has become a matter of common sense. As such, it has turned into an ideology that sustains U.S. Capitalist interests.

'The presumption that liberal values are **self-evidently true'**(emphasis is the authors') as stated in the U.S. constitution , Patrick Thadeus Jackson and Daniel Nexon observe,

> underscores the possibility that other societies could be more like America in practice given the proper incentive or tutelage. Hence, the familiar spectacle of American presidents making appearances in foreign countries and pressing those countries to enact such liberal institutions as free market economy, the separation of [religion]and state, and increased freedom of the press. While non-Americans resent such actions, in the United States, they are seen as the simple reaffirmation of things that Americans **know** to be **true**(emphasis is the authors')**.** America imagines the rest of the world as somehow, at base, just like America if not for the distortion produced by ideology, corrupt regimes, and the historical effects of culture.'

("Representation is Futile? American Collectivism and the Borg". Qtd in ***Hegemony or Empire*** p.11).

Hence, imposing liberal values as commonsensical is a form of ideology that constrains the actions of the social subjects according to Norman Fairclough 2000. Acting outside common sense is a form of folly that must be corrected lest it disrupt the prevailing order. It must therefore be treated accordingly. This explains why countries that ignore the expectations of a liberal world hegemon are diplomatically interpelated or forcefully constrained.

Conclusion

Bertrand Russell was writing in an age of distrust, fear, and apprehension into which he attempted to infuse some measured hope. The twentieth century was an age of disillusionment as the hopes placed in science and technical progress were thwarted by the ends that were achieved: an unequal distribution of wealth and power, exploitation and subjection at home and abroad, totalitarian ideologies, and international competition, which has resulted in of traumatic experiences of two World Wars. Russell insists that it is Man's emotions of fear and hatred combined to his drive to control and dominate which are responsible for injustice, exploitation, and human suffering. Scientific and technical progress as such is neither good nor bad, and Russell believes that it can lead to the good society if it is inspired by love of the human kind, not that of a particular group or race, and guided by wisdom.

In a world made strongly organic by technical progress, a world of immediacy in which time and distances have been reduced, Russell suggests a liberal form of Federal World Government in which the traditional relations of colonial or imperial domination are replaced by tight economic and political cooperation. A globalised system, from which frontiers have been erased, offers the advantage of granting the technologically advanced liberal nations free access to markets, energy, and a selected qualified labour force. Another advantage in an economically and politically integrated global system, it becomes easier for the central

government to disseminate its values through education and the modern mass media to insure cultural and ideological allegiance. Resistance, opposition or sedition from one the peripheral constituents could bring about legitimate and legal action from the world power.

The growing influence of the U.S.A. and the liberal world especially following the demise of the communist bloc seems to confirm the victory of the liberal idea and the gradual evolution to the open society and the rule of the Samurai or the **Managerial Revolution** envisioned by Karl Popper. Globalization is a form of discourse that tends to confirm a return to the monopolistic trends of modern capitalism. This neo-liberal system in which transnational corporations and a club of highly industrialised countries led by the U.S.A. control not only the world resources and economy, but also its cultural, financial and legislative institutions is about to evolve into a totalitarian world governance similar to the system envisioned by A. Huxley nearly a century ago. In a post-Cold War atmosphere in which economic, cultural and ideological diversity is demonised by the liberal victors, pressure is often exerted, and "wars on terror" are waged to discipline the "rogue elements", spread the values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, and integrate them into the global system.

Conclusion to Part Four

Western society in the Twentieth Century was the temporary outcome of an ongoing interplay between a long tradition of Myths, religious creed, utopian aspirations, and modern social theory. The long quest of man for the good society took the form of The Republic, the Celestial City, a New Atlantis under the wise rule of a board of scientist, the monarchy of divine rights; before it assumed the shape of democracy and Communism in modern times. Communism or the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was a secularized version of the millenarian aspirations for the reign of the equals, challenged the pretenses of the modern liberal capitalists to grant affluence, happiness and comfort for all. As shown by Aldous Huxley and George Orwell, the materialization of utopian aspirations in their liberal as well as socialist visions proved equally flawed. What is worthy of notice is that in both dystopias the ruling ideology assumed global scope.

What social thinkers were mostly concerned with in modern times was the use of technical progress to achieve narrowly egotistic or nationalist ends. Struggle over access to wealth, property, and power made possible by technological development resulted in labour conflicts at home and major wars between powerful nations over resources and markets. H.G.Wells and Bertrand Russell believed in progress and the capacity of human beings to devise systems of organisation and instruments of governance to adapt to life in a world where the notion of distance has been abolished by speed and technical progress. Socialism and the abolition of property worldwide would be the solution.

H.G.Wells and Bertrand Russell's vision of a World Government seems to conform to K. Mannheim's **Liberal Idea.** It will be the result of a gradual evolution that will, under the leadership of the industrialised west and the best fitted members of humanity result in a system of rule that would benefit humanity as a whole. The authors' opposition to the traditional forms of colonial domination and its substitution by a form of tight cooperation,

their plea for integration of the "backward populations" through eugenics, education, and control of population growth among "the prolific races" must be noted, however, their Darwinian convictions, and their insistence to disseminate Anglo-Saxon liberal values and institutions worldwide arouses in the minds of their readers legitimate suspicions with regard to their actual schemes.

References

- **A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations from the Cold War to Iraq.** Edited by John Dumbrell, New York: Pallgrave Mac Millan, 2006.

- Beaumont, Matthew. ***Utopia Ltd.: Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England 1870-1900.*** Boston: Brill Leiden, 2005.

- Clarke, I. F. ***The Patterns of Expectations: 1644-2000***. London: MacMilan, 1979.

- Fominaya, Cristina, Flesher. ***Social Movements and Globalization: How protests, Occupations and Uprisings are Changing the World***. Hampshire: Palgrave. MacMillan, 2014.

- Foote G.W. ―Social Dreams‖(1886), ***Progress***, 6: pp. 189-94, (Qtd. In Beaumont, 2005: p.1.)

- Freud, Sigmund. ***Civilization and its Discontents***. Translated from German and Edited by John Strachey; W.W. Norton and Company INC. New York, 1961.

- **Hegemony or Empire? The redefinition of U.S. Power under George W. Bush.** Edited by Charles Philip David and David Grondin, England and USA: 2006.

- Jameson, Frederic. ***Archaeologies of the Future: The desire called Utopia and Other Science Fiction.*** London: Verso, 2005.

- Keane J.,and P. Meiers. ***Global Civil Society.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Kumar, Krishan. ***Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times***. Cambridge, Massachussetts: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1991.

- Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge***. San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1936.

- Marx,Karl and Frederick Engels. "Manifeto of the Communist Party". 1848.

- Morton, A.L. ***The English Utopia***. London : Lawrence & Wishart, 1969.

- Mumford, Lewis. ***The Story of Utopia***. London: Harrap, 1923.

- Nordeau, Max. ***Degeneration***. London: W. Heinemann, 1895.

- Orwell, George. "Wells, Hitler, and the World State". In ***Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell. Vol.4***, Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, Harmondswoth, Middlesssex: Penguin Books, 1970.

- Peterson David, J. "Bertrand Russell: Prophet of a New World Order". ***New Oxford Review***:35-40, June 2000.Available at :http://www.catholicculture.org, accessed in October 2015.

- Popper, Karl. ***The Open Society and its Enemies; the Spell of Plato.*** London: Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1947.

- Robertson, Roland. ***Globalization, Social Theory, and Global Culture***. London: Sage, 1992.

- Russell, Bertrand. ***The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism.*** London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.

- …… .. "Icarus or the Future of Science". London: Allen and Unwin, 1924.

- ……... "Science and Values", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Laeter E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 90-107).

- …… "Individual and Social Ethics", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 357- 366).

- ……. "What I Believe", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 367-390).

- ……..."The Taming of Power" ( ), in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 663-681).

- …….. "If we are to Survive this Dark Time". ***New York Times:*** Sept.3, 1950, in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 682-687).

- ……. "What would Help Mankind Most?" (1951). in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 663-681).

- ……. "World Government",(1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 699-703).

- …… "The Next Half Century", (1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 704- 709).

- ……. "Life without Fear", (1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 710- 715).

- …… "Science and Human Life", In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 716- 725).

- …….. "Man's Peril", In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 729- 732).

- ……. . ***The Impact of Science on Society.*** London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1976.

- Wallerstein, I. ―Globalization or the Age of Transition‖ ***International Sociology:*** 15, (249-265).

- Wells, H. George. ***A Modern Utopia***. London: Chapman and Hall, 1905.

- .. . . ***When the Sleeper Wakes***. London: Chapman and Hall, 1903.

- ……. ***Mankind in the Making***. London: Chapman and Hall, 1906.

- ……..""The So called Science of Sociology", (1906); reprinted in: ***An Englishman Looks at the World***. London: Cassel, 1914.

- Wilde, Oscar. ***The soul of Man under Socialism***. New York: Max N. Maisel, 1915.

General Conclusion

The discovery then the appropriation of Greek thought in the late middle Ages led to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment in Europe. Thomas Mores' ***Utopia*** (1516) and Francis Bacon's ***The New Atlantis*** (1526***)*** seminal works, although still embedded in the Christian tradition, undoubtedly owe much to Plato's ***Republic and*** his other writings. These founding texts which reflected critically on the societies in which they errupted by proposing improved versions of their institutions and mores, together with their negative echoes in the form of satire, cacotopia, and dystopia, established the European utopian tradition which partly inspired Western social thought and oriented their practice since then. This tradition which is based on appeal to reason and empirical observation in the interpretation of phenomena instead of superstition, fear, and subjection, led man to a gradual understanding, mastery and control of these very phenomena to his own advantage. The discovery of the laws of nature resulted in the mastery of its forces and their appropriation through science and technology to serve Man's power and growing aspirations. The brighter the lights of European knowledge shone, the faster and more systematic its accumulation and communication, the more systematic its use to practical ends, the stronger Man's control over his physical environment, his fate and that of his fellow men grew.

Scientific and technical developments opened boundless horizons, raised man's self-confidence and expectations, and stirred the most ambitious dreams, many of which actually materialized. Progress fed utopian aspirations which in turn fuelled men's energy for action to push farther the limits of the unknown and the impossible and to build, the ideal city in the present world. Auguste Comte (1851) became the apostle of a "Positive Religion of Humanity" as a more compatible creed with an enlightened and industrial human society. In the 1870s- 1880s, his English disciples James Mill, his son John Stuart Mill, and Jeremy Bentham popularised Utililitarianism, the quest for pleasure and the avoidance of pain,

instead of the traditional fear of God , as the guiding ethical principle to men‘s actions. Meanwhile, Edward Bellamy, who published his seminal socialist utopia ***Looking Backward 2000-1888*** relied on “The Religion of Solidarity” as a revived version of Christianity to settle the conflicts raging between capital and labour, cement the organic unity of the American nation, before disseminating this culture of industry and solidarity to the rest of the world. This new faith in science and industry instead of revolution and anarchy to lead to the good society under the rule of an elite was again satirised as a quest for power and prestige conducive to totalitarianism with its inevitable corollaries the end of man, entropy and stagnation.

Utopia, Krishan Kumar (1996) observes, is Pellagian rather than Augustinian. It expresses man‘s faith in progress and his belief in his capacity to found the ideal city here and now. Religion as a source of reference, a world view and ideology was being displaced by science; and with it, enlightened man became a historical agent and a culture hero.

As stated in the general introduction to the present thesis, this research does not pretend to rewrite another history of utopian thought, which has been done more thoroughly and much better by such authors as **A.L. Morton, Mathew Baumont, Louis Munford, K. Kumar, Keith Booker and E.S. Rabkin** to name but a few. Instead, and since its object is ―the quest for utopia from Samuel Butler to Bertrand Russell‖, we selected a number of authors from of the nineteenth century to the second half of the twentieth century to follow the peregrinations of “the **Liberal Idea**” in utopian thought in the English speaking world. Next to the historicist function of the utopian texts, their function as social criticism, their on-going dialogue with the socio-historical reality against which they emerged as well as with other texts in the utopian tradition, the present thesis explored the possible function of utopian writing as discourse. In other words, the present thesis was premised on the assumption that utopian discourse and with it the **liberal idea** which developed following the epistemological break of

the sixteenth century and which resulted in a renewed interpretation and organisation of the world, partook of the quest and struggle for the pre-eminence prestige and power of the western liberal ideology.

A new class which placed its faith in the empire of reason, free scientific enquiry, critical thinking, and progress pointed at the ills of their respective societies and suggested appropriate remedies by resorting to utopia. Never content with things as they are, as Mannheim (1936) writes, members of this trans-class stratum who momentarily detach themselves from the ruling class, act as the advocates of the interests of the whole by suggesting progressive reforms that would reconcile the interests of the conflicting parties and prevent recourse to violent revolutionary action that may result in anarchy and the disruption of the social order. This medial position held by intellectuals, between the power holders and the subject classes or populations, places them in an uneasy cultural and ideological position which Paul Ricoeur in his ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*** (1975) refers to an "Mannheim's paradox". Albeit critical of the potentially corrupting influence of power, be it financial, military or political, intellectuals seem unable to totally emancipate themselves from the outlook of their class; hence William Morris's suspicion of utopian writers of being ideologically complicit with capitalist order by precluding radical change by means of violent revolutionary action and delaying change to an indefinitely remote point in the future. However, as suggested with Beaumont (2005) and Mannheim (1991) in the present thesis, the culture of any given society, especially in periods of transition, is a conglomerate of ideological and utopian energies in permanent interaction. Ideology which resorts to situationally transcendent ideas to naturalise the here and now usually thrives on utopian aspirations which it integrates in its superstructure and thus operates the necessary adaptations to ward off radical transformations. Thus, the situationally transcendent ideas of freedom, equality, common property, and the quest for happiness were integrated into the

superstructure of the nascent capitalist societies to prevent the disintegration of the social body by revolts, civil war, or proletarian revolution. The relation between ideology and utopia appears to be more a relation of partnership than of opposition.

To better understand the key concepts related to our theme, and to analyze the dialectical interplay of the texts with their respective contexts as well as with other texts, we drew upon Karl Mannheim (1936), Mikhail Bakhtin (1996), Norman Fairclough (2000), and Hannah Arendt (1963 and 1966). Besides having underscored the social origin of thought, all of these theorists insist on the function of texts and utterances as forms of social action. As such, utopian texts purport, through 'situationally transcendent ideas', to transform the on-going order sustained by ideology by means of satire or by presenting the current beliefs, commonsensical assumptions, and practices as absolute evil. Ideology in turn, feeling threatened by the potentially transformative power of utopia, either defames utopian aspirations as 'mere vaporous dreams', or appropriates and subverts these very aspirations into unattainable chimeras with a "carnivalesque" function allowing temporary escape from reality but emptied of their transformative energy. Cacotopia and dystopia are yet two other discursive strategies deployed by the tenants of power to warn against the perversions in the form of mob rule or totalitarianism that utopianism may lead to, and so preclude its transforming effect.

The late nineteenth century in England and the U.S.A was characterised by the crisis of industrialism and monopoly capitalism. Symptoms of this crisis was the growing tension between conservatism represented in tradition and the perpetuation of the status quo and liberalism represented by the rising powers of modernity and progress. This tension took the form of opposition between religion and science, capitalism and socialism, Luddism and industrialism. This tension was characterised in G.W. Foote's words 'by an explosion of utopian aspirations'. This inflation of utopian utterances at the eve of the new millennium

constituted as many detached perspectives from which 19th century was critically considered and remedies to its flaws prescribed.

If 'utopian fiction', as Beaumont (2005) notes, 'dreams that the diffusion of its ideas in the present will create the conditions necessary for instituting its ideal society in the future' (p.197), utopian satire and dystopia hint at the possible conflation of utopia and ideology warning against the possible stalemates and disillusions the pursuit of utopian schemes may lead to.

Samuel Butler's **Erewhon**(1871)provides a good example of this conflation. Conceived as an anagrammatic inversion to Thomas More's "Nowhere", this satire is meant to hint at the possible evolution of utopia into its reverse ideology. In the name of Luddism, Erewhon is a society which had waged a victorious war against machines and industrialism only to evolve into a backward pastoral society. However, just like Victorian England, the "Erewhonian" society has its flaws and follies in the form of technological backwardness and the criminalisation of ill health. Higgs, Butler's hero, who criticises Erewhonians 'skin deep religiosity' alluding to Victorians superficial faith, nonetheless resorts to proselytising to control the native Chowbok in the same way as Victorian missionaries become the ideological allies of industrial England in its imperial expansion.

A few years later, Bellamy premised his utopia ***Looking Backward*** 'on the hope that it will somehow find sympathetic readers who can stir up a race of [. . .] partisans [. . . who will] become the advocates of an alternative future they have already started to bring into being' (Beaumont: 2005, p.196). Writing in a period of tension, social and industrial unrest, Bellamy, through his mouthpiece Dr. Leete reconciles between the Darwinian ambitions of the captains of industry to control society, the class conscious proletariat's legitimate aspirations to enjoy the fruits and comforts of technical progress, and the dream of the rising intelligentsia, as architects of the consensual deal, for social prestige and power. Reception

and circulation of Bellamy‘s ideas, both in the U.S.A. and Britain, was made possible by the atmosphere of doubt and fear mingled with faith and hope characteristic of the Great Depression of the late nineteenth century. Darwinian evolutionary tactics advocated by the author instead of the proletarian revolution added to the novel‘s popularity which made converts on both sides of the Atlantic. What was equally worthy of notice is the intersection of capitalist ideology with socialist utopianism to come out years later through liberal reforms with such syntheses as the New Deal and the welfare state. However, its “Religion of Solidarity” instead of Christianity, its Industrial Army instead of a rebellious proletariat, and its globalist ambitions already represented the seeds of totalitarianism, militarism, and imperialism.

William Morris, wrote ***News from Nowhere (1889)*** precisely to counter the gradualists strategies of the utopian socialists and the liberal bourgeois reformers. Like Marx, he suspected them to be the accomplices of capitalists in power. While capitalism, through the alienating conditions created by the modern division of labour, robbed the individual workers of the fruit of their labour, reform minded socialists such as the members of the Social Democratic Federation or the members of The Fabien Society wanted to prevent the advent of the proletarian revolution and deny the class conscious proletariat their role as historical agents. Through his decentralised pastoral utopia, Morris suggested that alienating labour, poverty, shabbiness, ill health, and unhappiness were the result of monopoly capitalism which was based on competition and the permanent quest for profits and larger markets. Morris questioned the utilitarian ethics of his society which mistook the means for the end. The quest for wealth through industrialisation at home and imperial expansion abroad led to exploitation of the working classes and the expropriations of the subject populations abroad. The fears expressed in Morris’s utopia with regard to the alienating effects of modern industrial societies, the threats posed by competition on the environment and natural resources proved

justified. However, the revolution he envisioned didn‘t lead to the epoch of rest and fellowship he predicted.

The alienating effects of modernity did confirm Morris‘s fears while his hopes that a socialist revolution would cure the ills of industrial monopoly capitalism didn‘t materialise. Faith in science and socialism led to new forms of dependence on other dogmas and other masters. These modern forms of alienation are satirised in ***Brave New World*** and ***Nineteen Eighty-Four***.

Brave New World was read as a utopian satire. It echoed critically the fears and the hopes expressed in Bertrand Russell‘s, “Icarus or the Future of science” (1924), and stirred doubts about H.G. Wells‘s faith in science and the rule of the “Samurai” or “The New Republicans”, as he called the new leading elites in A ***Modern Utopia***(1905) and ***Mankind in the Making***(1906). In Huxley’s satire, scientific progress and education which were presented by the controllers of the new world as means to economic efficiency, psychological and social stability, and human happiness and were unveiled by the writer as instruments of subjection of a new liberal ideology which he named “Fordism”. Like Russell, Huxley expressed concern that scientific progress and education may be used to spread beliefs, values, conventions, and practices which would strengthen the bonds of subjection of the lower orders to the system and its masters. Huxley doubts that the standardisation of identities through ‘conditioning’ is the best means to stability and genuine human happiness. In the modern world, social subjects may be led, for the sake of economic efficiency and social stability, to swap their freedom for happiness by power thirsty elites. Again, Huxley showed the smiling mask of the liberal utopia to hide the grinning face of ideology. The research also revealed the ethnocentric view of Huxley with regard to ‘other cultures’ which are denied the fruit of progress and assigned to reservations at the periphery of the modern world.

Unlike the hedonistic world society satirised by Huxley, Orwell‘s text is read as a cacotopia. It is a nightmarish world in which permanent discontent, insecurity, scarcity, fear and pain prevail. In Oceania, freedom and happiness have been banished. The mythical Big Brother and the Party exert a total control over the thoughts, the actions and the lives of people. Permanent surveillance and spying of the social subjects, wherever they are, by means of the “telescreen”, the secret police, colleagues and even children is enough to deter any form of deviance. Indoctrination through “INGSOC”, the official ideology, and the coining of a language, “NEWSPEAK” that prevents unorthodox thinking, makes any break from the official system impossible. Unlike Huxley‘s benevolent world controllers, the ruling oligarchy in Orwell‘s text displays a pathological fascination for power. ***Nineteen Eighty –Four*** is close to the nineteenth century Cacotopian novel.

Cacotopian texts play on the fears of their audience to stir aversion and opposition. English Tories resorted to this form of writing to defame the French Revolution and prevent the virus of popular democracy and anarchy from contaminating the English labouring classes. During the Cold War, Orwell resorted to this sub-genre to unveil the betrayal of the workers‘ dreams in the Soviet Union and the subversion of the socialist revolution by Stalin and an oligarchy of party members into a totalitarian system. Like Bertrand Russell and other English socialists who visited the Soviet Union, he opposes the British brand of democratic socialism to the brutal practices of Soviet Stalinism. In addition to keeping British society immune from such a system, Orwell‘s dystopia was meant to arouse aversion and stir opposition in the East to overthrow Big Brother and transform the totalitarian system it depicts. As such, ***Nineteen Eighty-Four*** may also be labelled as a ―utopian dystopia‖ for it purports, according to Tom Moylan, to transform the bad place into a better one(Moylan:2000, p.xii). The growing unpopularity of communism in Eastern Europe and the final collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellites mark the victory of the west and the liberal

ideology and may serve as evidence of the use of Nineteen Eighty-Four as an ideological weapon by the liberal West..

The birth of a New World Order, global in scope and liberal in outlook, seems to have emerged with the end of the Cold War. This objective which has been continuously sought for as a logical continuity of the myth of "The Promised Land", and the missionary role of the Americans as the vanguard of humanity is beginning to materialise. The decisive intervention of the U.S.A. during the two World Wars on the side of justice, democracy, and liberty strengthened U.S. citizens' belief in their role of leadership. The role played by American presidents Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jenel Virden writes, in the institution of the League of Nations and the United Nations Organisation and the just settlement of the conflicts, following the Americans conception of "The Just War Theory" consolidated the status of leader. The world of our present is being remapped to assume the global shape first dreamed of by Julian **West,** Edward Bellamy's hero. The same globalised world was envisioned by H.G.Wells as the inevitable outcome of progress, before it was advocated by Bertrand Russell as the most appropriate instrument toward peace and the preservation of the human race and its civilisation.

To conclude, I will say that that in my interpretation of the different texts, I have been guided by Paul Ricoeur's definition of "Mannheim's paradox", and Norman Fairclough's concept of "ideological common sense" which he defines as 'common sense in the service of sustaining unequal relations of power' (Fairclough:2000,p.70). As social critics, and despite their moral loftiness, the utopian writers cannot find an ideologically neutral point from which they can objectively consider the ills of the societies they consider. In their critical and reformist endeavours, these 'social subjects draw upon their 'members' resources' which are the result of a cultural and intellectual tradition which is also the expression of a world view. It follows that their practice, the text they produce as an interpretation of the world, cannot be

immune of cultural or ideological bias. Hence, and save for William Morris, all the writers considered sought only to improve the industrial system and to extend the values and the comfort brought about by the Enlightenment, science, industry, and modernity to the "backward areas" of the global village.

The vision of globalisation spread by Bellamy, H.G Wells, Huxley, G. Orwell, and Bertrand Russell is gradually ordering the world. As Fairclough explains 'the discourse of globalisation' gradually glides into a 'globalisation of the liberal discourse'. He observes that 'the discursive practices of any particular country now change in ways which are framed within international relations of power' (Fairclough; 2000: 206). With the demonization of "totalitarianism", "despotism", "terrorism", since the 1990s, and their gradual elimination, a gradual process of colonisation of the different international and national institutions by the discourse and practices of the liberal world is under way. Notwithstanding the philanthropic motives of H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, one cannot help reading their globalist utopia as in which the "the backward areas" with their riches and human resources are integrated into the liberal hegemon.

As a critic of the different texts, I can't help underscoring the healthy influence of the utopian tradition on the improvement of society either through aspirations it raises and the transformative action it may inspire; or the critical awareness it develops among its readership and the resistance it may stir. However, as a member of the so called "subject races", I can't help noting our exclusion as active agents of the utopian schemes drafted and our passive integration together with the riches that our lands harbour as "mere resources" in the utopian texts and the new maps that are being drawn for the new world.

Selected Bibliography

I°)-Primary Sources:

1. Butler:

- Butler, Samuel. ***Erewhon***. London: Trubner and Co., 1872.
- ***The Notebooks of Samuel Butler Author of Erewhon***. Edited by Henry Festing Jones, Preface by Burns Hacket, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1990.

2. Bellamy:

- -Bellamy, Edward. ***Looking Backward 2000-1888.*** Edited with an Introduction by John L. Thomas, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- ***Unpublished Papers of Edward Bellamy***. Houghton Library, Harvard University,n.d.

3. Morris:

- Morris, William**.** ***News from Nowhere and Other Writings*****.** Edited with an Introduction by Clive Wilmer, London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- ***Morris William Political Writings: Contributions to "Justice" and "Commonweal" 1883-1890***. Edited by Nicholas Salmon, Bristol: Thoemes, 1994.

4. Huxley:

- Huxley Aldous. ***Brave New World.*** London: Triad Panther Books, Granada Publishing Ltd., 1932.
- ..... ***Brave New World Revisited***. London: First Published in Great Britain by Chato and Windus Ltd., 1959, Reprinted by Granada Publishing Ltd., Triad Panther Books, 1983.

5. Orwell:

- Orwell, George. ***Animal Farm***. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, England, 1951.
- ..... ***Nineteen Eighty-Four.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, England, 1954.
- ***Orwell and Politics***. Edited by Peter Davidson, Introduction by Thimothy Garton Ash, London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2001.
- ***The Collected Essays Journalism and Letters of George Orwell.*** Edited by Ian Angus and Sonia Orwell, Vol. I., Harmondsworth,Middlesex: Penguin Books

in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, Penguin Books Ltd., 1970.

- ***The Collected Essays Journalism and Letters of George Orwell***. Edited by Ian Angus and Sonia Orwell, Vol. II., Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books in Association with Martin Secker and Warburg, Penguin Books Ltd., 1970.

6. Wells:

- Wells, H. George**. *A Modern Utopia.* London:** Chapmazn and Hall, 1905.
- ..... ***Mankind in the Making.*** London: Chapman and Hall, 1906.
- ..... ***When the Sleeper Wakes***. London: Chapman and Hall, 1903.
- .....—The so-called Science of Sociology‖ (1906); in ***An Englishman Looks at the World.*** London: Cassel, 1914.

7. Russell

- Russell, Bertrand. ***The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism***. London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.
- ..... "Icarus or the Future of Science". London: Allen and Unwin, 1924.
- ..... Religion and Science.
- ..... ***The Impact of Science on Society.*** London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1976.

- …….. "Science and Values", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Laeter E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- …… "Individual and Social Ethics", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ……. "What I Believe", in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ……..”The Taming of Power" ( ), in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- …….. "If we are to Survive this Dark Time". ***New York Times:*** Sept.3, 1950, in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ……. "What would Help Mankind Most?" (1951). in: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ……. "World Government",(1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- …… "The Next Half Century", (1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ……. "Life without Fear", (1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- …… "Science and Human Life", In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- …….. "Man's Peril", In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1905***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell***: 1903-1959. Edited by Robert E. Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York:Simmon and Schuster, 1961.

II°) Secondary Sources

1°) Theory Books:

- -Althsser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State apparatuses". Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays. Trans. Ben Brewster, London: New Left Books,1971.

- Arendt, Hannah. ***On Revolution.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963.

- …… ***The Origins of Totalitarianism.*** New York: Harcourt, 1966.

- Berbeshkinaz, N., Yacovleva, L., Zerkin, D. ***What is Historical Materialism?*** Moscow:Francis Longman and Dick Shneierson Editors, Progress Publishers, 1985.

- Braga, di Corin. « Utopie, Eutopie, Dystopie et anti-utopie ». ***Rivista di filosofia on-line,*** Septembre 2006, N°.2, Available at : WWW.METABASIS.IT, accessed in: June 2008.

- Dentith, Simon. ***Bakhtinian Thought.*** London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

- Duranti, Alessandro. ***Linguistic Anthropology***. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Candlin Christopher N. et al. ***Sociolinguistics and Social Theory***. Harlow: Edited by Nicolas Coupland, Srikant Saranji, and Christopher N. Candlin, Longman, England, 2001.

- Fairclough, Norman. ***Language and Power.*** Essex: Pearson Education Ltd., Longman, 2001.

- Foucault, Michel. ***The Archaeology of Knowledge.*** London, Routledge, 1997.

- ……. "Discourse and Truth: The Problematisation of *Parrhesia"*. Berkeley: Berkeley University Press, 19893.Available at —:http://www.the foucauldian.co.uk/techne, accessed on March 12th, 2008.

- Freire, Paulo. ***Pedagogy of the Oppressed.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1996.

- Freud, Sigmund.***Civilization and its Discontents.*** (Translated from German and Edited by John Strachey), W.W. Norton and Company INC., New York: 1961.

- Leech, Geoffrey. ***Semantics, the Study of Meaning.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Pelican Books, 1974.

- Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.*** (Trans.: Louis Wirth and Mark Schills), New York: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace and Company, 1936.

- Marcuse, Herbert. ***Eros and Civilization.*** New York: Vintage Books, 1951.

- Ricoeur, Paul. ***Lectures on Ideology and Utopia***. Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1975.

- Said W. Edward. ***Des Intellectuels et du Pouvoir***. Alger: Editions Marinoor, 2001.

- Searle, John R. ***Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.***Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

- Serriot, Patrick, et André Tabouret Keller Editors. ***Discours sur la langue sous les régimes autoritaires***. Lausanne: Cahiers de l'ILSL., N°, 51, 2005.

2°) Utopian Studies :

- Beaumont, Matthew. ***Utopia Ltd., Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England 1870-1960.*** Boston: Brill Leiden, 2005.

- Booker, Keith. ***The Dystopian impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism.*** Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994.

- Clarke I.F. ***The Patterns of Expectations: 1644-2000***. London: Mac Milan, 1979.

- Jameson, Frederic. ***Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fiction***. London: Verso, 2005.

- Kumar, Krishan. ***Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times***. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1991.

- ***No Place Else: Exploration in Utopian and Dystopian Fiction***. Edited by Eric S. Rabkin, Martin H. Greenberg, and D. Olander, Illinois: Carbondale University Press, 1983.

- Morton A.L. ***The English Utopia.*** London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1969.

- Moylan, Tom. ***Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia***. Oxford and Colorado: Westview Press, 2000.

- Mumford, Lewis. ***The Story of Utopia.*** London, Harrap, 1923.

- Parrington Vernon Louis Jr. ***American Dreams: A Study of American Utopias.*** New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

- Peyser, Thomas. ***Utopia and Cosmopolis: Globalisation in the Era of American Literary Realism.***Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1952.

- Recatala, Denis Fernandez. ***Mémoires du futur : une anthologie de l"utopie.***Paris : Messidor, Editions Sociales, 1991.

- Robert, Edgar V., ***Writing Themes about Literature.*** Englewood cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1991.

- Servier, Jean. ***Histoire de l"utopie***. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1967.

3°)- History Books :

- ***A SpecialRelationship: Anglo-American Relations from The Cold War to Iraq.***Edited by John Dumbrell, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

- Carpenter, Edward. ***England"s Ideal: A Tract.*** Manchester: Heywood, 1885.

- Coyne, Richard. ***Designing Technology in the Post-modern Age***. Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press,1997.

- Engels, Fiedrich. ***The Condition of the Working Classes in Englnd.***

- Flesher, C., Fominaya. ***Social Movements and Globalization: How Protests, Occupations, and Uprisings are changing the World.***Hampshire: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2014.

- Forget, Philippe and Gilles Polycarpe. ***L"Homme machinal; technique et progrès : Anatomie d"une trahison***.Paris: Editions Syros Alternatives, 1990.

- Harding, Adrian. ***Survey of English Literature: Vol.4, the Twentieth Century.*** Paris: Mark Mortimer ed., DUNOD, 1992.

- Hobsbawn, E. J., ***History of Civilisation: The Age of Capital.***Weidenfeld and Nicholson eds., n.d.

- ……. ***Industry and Empire, the Penguin Economic History of GreatBritain***.Vol.III, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex: England 1968.

- Keane, J. and P. Meiers. ***Global Civil Society.***Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Lellouche, Pierre. ***Le Nouveau Monde : de l"ordre de Yalta au désordre des nations.***Paris : Editions Grasset & Fasquelle, 1992.

- Mac Guy, Josephine. ***The Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and Documents***. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

- Nordeau, Max. ***Degeneration***. London: W. Heinemann, 1895.

- Robertson, Roland. ***Globalization, Social Theory, and Global Culture***. London: Sage, 1992.

- Stevenson, John. ***The Penguin History of Great Britain: British Society 1914-1945.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1990.

- Thomson, David. ***England in the Twentieth Century: 1914-1979.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1985.

- Thompson, E.P. ***The Making of the English Working Class.*** First Published in 1963 by Victor Golancz, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex: 1984.

- Virden, Jenel.***Americans and the Wars of the Twentieth Century***. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

- Wallerstein, I. ―Globalization or the Age of Transition.‖ In ***International Sociology: 15***, (249-265).

- Warwick, Arthur. ***The Penguin Social History of Britain: British Society since 1945***. Harmondsworth, Middlessex:Penguin books Ltd., England, 1982.

- Wilde, Oscar. ***The Soul of Man under Socialism.*** New York: Max N.Maisel, 1915.

- Young, J. C. ***White Mythologies: Writing History and the West***. New York: Routledge, 20004.

4°) **Critical Studies*:***

- Abiteboul, Maurice**.** « Faiblesses, lacunes, et limites de l'utopie dans ***News from Nowhere ». In William Morris News from Nowhere***. Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Beaumont, Matthew. "Reinterpreting Oscar Wilde's Concept of utopia: The Soul of Man under Socialism". In: ***Journal of Utopian Studies***, Volume 15, Issue:1, 2004.

- Berthet, Dominique. « L'utopie d'un esthète ». In ***William Morris News from Nowhere***, Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Boos Florence S. "Personal and Political Lieux d'Anticipation in News from Nowhere". In ***William Morris News from Nowhere***, Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du Temps, 2004.

- Bowman, S. et al. ***Edward Bellamy Abroad: An American Prophet's Influence***. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1962.

- Claeys, Gregory. "Socialized Individuality? A Reassessment of the Sources and Classification of Morris's Socilaism". In ***William Morris News from Nowhere***;Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du temps, 2004.

- Falzon, Frederic. « Entre rupture et fidélité : un communisme de nulle part ». In ***William Morris News from Nowhere,*** Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du temps, 2004.

- Himmerfeld, Gertrude. "The Intellectual in Politics: The Case of the Webbs". Journal of Contemporary History, 6:3, (1972: July).

- Laski, Harold. "The Fabian Way". In ***Current History***, (New York), 41:1 (1934: Oct.).

- Latham, David. "Living in Heaven: Morris's News from Nowhere" . In ***William Morris News from Nowhere,*** Edited by Beatrice Laurent, Nantes: Editions du temps, 2004.

- Meyers, Paul. ‖ Bertrand Russell: Prophet of a New World Order‖. ***New Oxford Review***, 35-40,June 2000. Available at: http://www.catholicuklture.org, accessed in March 2015.

- Nelson, Francis. ***Shakespeare and "The Tempest"***. New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith Publisher INC., 1956.

- Orwell George. "Wells, Hitler and the World State". In: ***The Collected Essays,Journalismand Letters of George Orwell,*** Vol. 4, Edited by and Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1970.

- Parrinder, Patrick. "Entering Dystopia, Entering Erewhon". ***Crical Survey***,Vol.17.,Issue:1, 2005.

- Porter, Roy. "Matrix of Modernity". In: ***History Today***,Vol. 51. Issue:4, April 2004.

- Sharma, Govin Narain. "Samuel Butler as a Literary Artist". Ph.D. Thesis, Toronto: 1975.

- Soljenitsyne, Alexandre. ***L"Archipel du Goulag.*** Traduction Française : Jacqueline Lafont, José Johanet, Serge Oswald et Nikita Struve, Paris : Editions du Seuil, © 1974

- Thomson, E.P. ***William Morris: from Romantic to Revolutionary***. London: Merlin, 1997.

5°) **Dictionaries and Encyclopaedia :**

- Cuddon J.A. ***Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory.*** London: Penguin Books, PenguinBooks Ltd., 1991.

- ***Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, Histoire de la Philosophie I, Orient, Antiquité Moyen Age.*** (Parrain, Brice : Directeur de publication), Paris : Editions Gallimard, 1969.

- ***Encyclopedia Britannica.*** Edited by Robert C. Pebble, compiled under the editing staff of Encyclopedia Britannica, Louis R. Rossi; Harry Edward Hausser, London:2005.

6°) **Miscellanies:**

- Attali, Jacques. ***Demain qui Gouvernera le Monde ?*** Alger :Editions Hibr, 2011.

- Aubert, Philipe. ***Ces voix qui nous gouvernent***. Paris : Editions Alain Moreau, 1979.

- Bodin, Louis, ***Les Intellectuels***. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.

- Habermas, Jürgen. ***La technique et la science comme idéologie***. Paris : Editions Gallimard, 1967

- Lawrence, Jane and Kitty Chan. ***Introducing Derrida.*** Cambridge: Richard Appignassi editor, Icon Books,2000.,

- Marx, K. and Friedrich Engels. "Manifesto of the Communist Party". 1948.

- Michnik, Adam. ***La deuxième révolution***. Paris: Editions La DECOUVERTE, 1990.

- Nelson, Francis. ***Shakespeare and The Tempest.*** New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith Publisher INC., 1956.

- Novack, Philippe. ***The Vision of Nietzsche***. Rockport: Jacob Niedelman Ed., USA, 1995.

- Sartre J. Paul. ***Qu"est-ce que la littérature ?*** Paris : Editions Gallimard, 1948.

- Stafford, D. Clerc. ***Ce que Freud a vraiment dit.*** Paris : Marabout Université, Editions Stock, 1967.

- Swift, Jonathan. ***Gulliver"s Travels.*** Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Peter Dixon and John Chalker Eds., Penguin books, England, 1967.

- Zigler, Jean. ***L"Empire de la honte***. Paris : Editions Fayard, 2005.

7°) **Internet Resources:**

- Anderson, David. "Exclusion and Utopian Thinking", copyright@ 1997, somaweb.org. 1995-2005.

- ***—Brave New World***. A Defense of Paradise Engineering‖, file:// Aldous Huxley Brave New World.htm. Accessed in May 2008

- —Brave New World by Aldouds Huxley: Monarch Notes, —Aldous Huxley, The Author and his Time‖, file://A:/ Brave New World by AldousHuxley.htm

- Breton, Yves. « 1984: une Dystopie de la communication. » . Available at : http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/123/yves.htm

- "Diggers and Levellers".Available at: « http://www.british-civil-wars.co.uk/diggers.htm »

- Engels, Frederick. "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific". Available at: http://www.marxists.org/archive

- Martin L.H et al. « Truth Power Self :An Interview with Michel Foucault. London Tavistock. Website: http//www.the foucauldian.co.uk/techne

- Hope, Ronald. —Aldous Huxley's philosophy‖, ***Contemporary review,*** Feb.2001, available at: http: //www.somaweb.org. 1995-2005.Accessed 10 May 2008.

- Sir Francis Galton,(1822-1911) « Eugenics ». http://www.somaweb.org.copyright somaweb.org. 1995-2005.

- Stuart Mill, John. ―Utilitarianism‖, (1863). Available at: http://www.marxists.org/archive/, accesed on March 10th 2008.